



Flash Eurobarometer 497

Citizens' awareness and perception of EU regional policy

Report



Fieldwork:

July-August 2021

Publication:

October 2021

Survey requested by the European Commission, Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy and coordinated by the Directorate-General for Communication

This document does not represent the point of view of the European Commission. The interpretations and opinions contained in it are solely those of the authors.

Flash Eurobarometer 497 – Ipsos European Public Affairs



Flash Eurobarometer 497

Report

Citizens' awareness and perception of EU regional policy

July-August 2021

Survey conducted by Ipsos European Public Affairs at the request of the European Commission,
Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy

Survey coordinated by the European Commission, Directorate-General for Communication
(DG COMM “Media Monitoring and Eurobarometer” Unit)

Project title	Flash Eurobarometer 497 Citizens' awareness and perception of EU regional policy – July- August 2021
	Report
Linguistic version	EN
Catalogue number	KN-01-21-265-EN-N
ISBN	978-92-76-41871-9
	doi:10.2776/079208
© European Union, 2021	

<https://europa.eu/eurobarometer>

Table of contents

Introduction	1
Key findings.....	4
Section 1. EU co-financed projects that improve local areas.....	8
1.1. Awareness of EU co-financed projects that improve local areas.....	8
1.2. Impact of EU co-financed projects on development in local areas.....	14
Section 2. Sources of information on EU co-financed projects.....	19
Section 3. Awareness of EU Cohesion Policy.....	24
3.1. Awareness of EU funds.....	25
3.2. EU regional support to COVID-19 recovery.....	34
Section 4. Perceived benefits of EU regional policy.....	36
4.1. Personal benefits from EU funded projects.....	36
4.2. 'Feeling like an EU citizen'.....	40
Section 5. Priorities regions for EU regional policy.....	43
5.1. Targeting all regions vs less developed regions.....	43
5.2. Targeting specific territories.....	47
Section 6. Important areas for EU regional policy investment.....	52
6.1. EU regional policy investment in respondents' regions.....	52
6.2. EU regional investment in the next few years.....	60
Section 7. Primary level of governance.....	66
Section 8. Cross-border cooperation.....	69
8.1. Awareness of EU regional funding for cross-border cooperation.....	70
8.2. Areas benefiting from an EU cooperation strategy.....	75
Section 9. Knowledge of EU outermost regions.....	86
Technical specifications.....	92
Questionnaire.....	95
Data annex.....	101

Introduction

EU Cohesion Policy aims to enhance economic, social and territorial cohesion among EU Member States by correcting imbalances among countries and regions within the European Union (EU). EU Cohesion Policy is one of the most significant areas of EU activity, accounting for around a third of its budget or €392 billion in the 2021-2027 programme period. Priorities of the EU Cohesion Policy 2021-2027 correspond to the broader strategic agenda for the EU 2019-2024 - the five objectives of regional policy should ensure the building of a smarter, greener, more connected and more social Europe that is closer to its citizens.

EU Cohesion Policy is delivered through several funds that reflect the objectives of this multifaceted framework. The **European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)** finances programmes that support the social and economic development of all EU regions and cities. The **European Social Fund Plus (ESF+)** focuses on improving employment and education opportunities and promoting social inclusion across the Member States. The ERDF and ESF+ funds are allocated in the regions where support is most needed: they mainly target the regions with a GDP per capita under 75% of the EU27 average but cover also all other regions. Additionally, **the Cohesion Fund (CF)** supports investments in environment and transport in the less prosperous Member States with a gross national income per capita below 90% of the EU27 average. The **Just Transition Fund (JTF)** was introduced in the context of the European Green Deal to mitigate regional inequalities triggered by the transition to climate neutrality. JTF helps the regions that are negatively affected by climate transition to successfully adapt their economy and labour market to the ongoing changes.

Following the health crisis caused by the coronavirus pandemic, the **REACT-EU (Recovery Assistance for Cohesion and the Territories of Europe)** programme with an ambitious budget of €50.6 billion was introduced in addition to the cohesion policy allocations. REACT-EU aims to ensure **a balanced and fair recovery of the Member States, by providing financing to the regions that are particularly affected by the pandemic.**

EU Cohesion Policy targets the regions taking into consideration their needs and socio-economic situation. It pursues an ultimate goal of supporting economic growth, sustainable development and improving citizens' quality of life in the EU. While individual Member States and their regions are the main recipients of co-financing for development projects, cross-border collaboration and policy exchange in macro-regions, which could include countries outside the EU, are also stimulated by, notably, the **European Territorial Cooperation (ETC or Interreg).**

Visibility of EU-funded projects is one of the priorities of the EU Cohesion policy 2021-2027. More effective communication of these interventions could raise awareness of the benefits of the EU to people's lives and improve the public image of the EU. In this context, the present Flash Eurobarometer informs the European Commission on EU citizens' awareness of, and attitudes towards, EU regional policy.

On behalf of the European Commission, Directorate-General for Urban and Regional Policy, Ipsos European Public Affairs interviewed a representative sample of citizens, aged 15 and over, in each of the 27 Member States of the EU. Between 22 July and 8 August 2021, 25 706 interviews were conducted over the telephone (landline and mobile phones).

Being a part of a series of studies, this report is based on five previous surveys: the Flash Eurobarometer 480 (FL480) study of June 2019, FL452 of March 2017, FL423 of June 2015, FL384 of September 2013 and FL298 of June 2010.

This report covers the following topics:

- Citizens' awareness of and opinion on EU regional policy support, including the recovery programme in the context of COVID-19 pandemic, as well as information on the sources of information from which respondents found out about the support
- Priorities for EU regional policy from the citizen perspective: which geographical regions and areas of investment the EU should target and who should take decisions about regional investments
- Public awareness of cross-border cooperation, including four EU macro-regional strategies in the Baltic Sea, along the Danube, the Adriatic and Ionian Sea regions, and the Alpine region.

Notes:

- 1) Survey data are weighted to known population proportions. The EU27 averages are weighted according to the size of the 15+ population of each EU Member State.
- 2) Survey results are subject to sampling tolerances meaning that not all apparent differences between groups may be statistically significant. Thus, only differences that are statistically significant (at the 5% level) – i.e. where it can be reasonably certain that they are unlikely to have occurred by chance – are highlighted in the text.
- 3) The report looks at long-term trends at the EU27 level and the most recent year-on-year changes at national level. The term percentage point is used when comparing two different percentages (the abbreviation is pp). Year-on-year differences are calculated from percentages with one decimal and are then rounded to the nearest integer.
- 4) Due to rounding, the percentages shown in the charts and tables do not always exactly add up to the totals mentioned in the text.
- 5) In this report, countries are referred to by their official abbreviation. The abbreviations used in this report correspond to:

BE		Belgium	LT		Lithuania
BG		Bulgaria	LU		Luxembourg
CZ		Czechia	HU		Hungary
DK		Denmark	MT		Malta
DE		Germany	NL		Netherlands
EE		Estonia	AT		Austria
IE		Ireland	PL		Poland
EL		Greece	PT		Portugal
ES		Spain	RO		Romania
FR		France	SI		Slovenia
HR		Croatia	SK		Slovakia
IT		Italy	FI		Finland
CY		Rep. of Cyprus*	SE		Sweden
LV		Latvia			

* Cyprus as a whole is one of the 27 EU MS. However, the 'acquis communautaire' has been suspended in the part of the country which is not controlled by the government of the Republic of Cyprus. For practical reasons, only the interviews carried out in the part of the country controlled by the government of the Republic of Cyprus are included in the 'CY' category.

Key findings

EU co-financed projects that improve local areas

- **41% of respondents say they have heard about EU co-financed projects that improve the area where they live.** This proportion ranges from a fifth – or less – in Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium and Germany (between 16% and 20%) to more than two-thirds in Latvia, Lithuania, Croatia, Czechia, Slovakia and Poland (between 68% and 82%).
- Since 2019, awareness of EU co-financed projects has significantly increased in Finland, Greece, Italy and Lithuania. A significant decrease is observed in Bulgaria, Czechia, Germany, Malta and Slovakia.
- In all but three Member States, **three-quarters – or more –** of respondents who have heard about EU co-financed projects in their area, also **think that these projects have had a positive impact on the development of their city or region** (from 75% in Belgium to 95% in Poland). In Italy, the Netherlands and Denmark, between 57% and 67% of respondents share this view.

Information on EU co-financed projects

- **The Internet has become as important as (national) television** as source of information about EU co-financed projects, with 38% of respondents who have heard about EU-financed project saying they are informed via the Internet (+7 pp compared to 2019) and 37% via national TV (-6 pp).
- Other sources of information mentioned by one in five – or more – respondents are local and regional newspapers (27%, -6pp compared to 2019), billboards (25%, +3 pp), personal knowledge (25%, +2pp) and local or regional TV (21%, +1 pp).
- **The Internet** is the **(joint) most frequently mentioned information source in 11 Member States**; in 2019, this was the case for just four Member States. National television is the most mentioned information source in eight EU countries, while newspapers take this place in another eight EU countries.

Awareness of EU Cohesion Policy

- 49% of respondents have heard about the **European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and/or the Cohesion Fund**, and the same proportion have heard about the **European Social Fund**. 10% have heard about **Interreg** and 11% about the **Just Transition Fund**. 34% of respondents have heard about **REACT-EU or NextGenerationEU**.
- 69% of respondents have **heard of at least one the shared management funds** (ERDF/Cohesion Fund, European Social Fund, Interreg, Just Transition Fund). Slovakia tops the

ranking with an awareness level of 92%. In Denmark and the Netherlands, less than half as many respondents have heard about one of the funds (both 36%).

- In 25 of the 27 Member States, **more than 60% of respondents are aware that the EU regional policy supports economic recovery in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic**. The highest level of awareness is measured in Finland (85%). In Denmark and the Netherlands, awareness of this fact is the lowest (50% and 44%, respectively).

Perceived benefits of EU regional policy

- **16% of respondents say they have benefitted in their daily life from a project funded by the ERDF or the Cohesion Fund**. Poland stands out with 58% of respondents who say they have benefitted in this way. In Latvia, Slovenia, Estonia, Slovakia and Czechia, the figure is between 32% and 39%.
- **59% of respondents reply that EU funded projects in their area contribute to their feeling of being an EU citizen** (21% 'to a large extent' and 38% 'to some extent').

Priorities regions for EU regional policy

- **64% of respondents say that the EU should invest in all its regions, while 33% say the EU should only invest in the poorer regions**. The proportion who think all regions should be targeted has increased by three percentage points compared to 2019.
- A majority of respondents in 25 Member States say the EU should invest in all its regions, but respondents in Portugal and Bulgaria are divided on the subject. Since 2019, there has been **a significant increase in the proportion of respondents who think the EU should invest in all its regions in 11 countries**.
- The highest priority is given to **regions with high unemployment** (mentioned by 69% of respondents). These are followed by **deprived urban areas** (55%) and **remote rural or mountain areas** (54%). Maintaining and improving competitiveness of developed regions or border regions is considered of highest priority for investment by 23% and 22%, respectively, of respondents.
- **In all but two of the EU Member States, the largest share of respondents think that areas of high unemployment should be targeted** for investment under EU regional policy. In Cyprus, on the other hand, remote rural or mountain areas are ranked highest, while in Romania, this place is taken by deprived urban areas.

Important areas for EU regional policy investment

- All domains of EU regional policy listed in the survey are regarded as being among the more **important domains for their city or region** by a majority of respondents.
- 92% consider investment in **education, health or social infrastructures** as important for their city or region, followed by investments in **the environment** (91%) and **renewable and clean energy** (87%). More than eight in ten respondents say that **research and innovation** (85%), **support for small and medium-sized businesses** (85%) and **vocational training** (81%) are important domains.
- Education, health or social infrastructures emerges as the top (or top equal) policy domain in 17 Member States, and the environment in nine Member States. In Italy, research and innovation is the top policy domain, and in Denmark, this is renewable and clean energy.
- When asked about **priority areas for the next few years**, 50% say that **education, health and social infrastructures** should be prioritised, and 42% think that the EU should invest in **the environment** in the next few years. Between one in four and one in three respondents mention transport facilities, research and innovation, support for SMEs and renewable and clean energy. Fewer respondents say that EU investment should be targeted at vocation training, reception and integration of migrants and refugees, tourism and culture or broadband Internet access.

Primary level of governance

- **A majority of respondents think that decisions about EU regional policy projects should be taken at sub-national levels**, with 32% opting for the regional level and 23% for the local level. The remaining respondents think that decisions should be taken at the national level or higher, with 20% opting for the national level and 21% who think that the EU should take decisions on projects funded by its own regional policy.
- Across all countries, respondents are divided in their view about the preferred level at which decisions about projects within the scope of EU regional policy should be made.

Awareness of cross-border cooperation

- **26% of respondents say they are aware of cooperation between regions from different countries because of EU regional funding.** In Poland, Latvia, Czechia and Malta, respondents are the most likely to be aware of this type of cooperation (between 51% and 64%).
- **One in four respondents say they are aware of at least one of the four macro-regional strategies:** 13% say being aware of the Baltic Sea Area Strategy, 8% of the Danube River Area Strategy, 7% of the Adriatic and the Ionian Sea Area Strategy and 9% of the Alpine Area Strategy.

- The proportion of **respondents who have heard about at least one of the macro-regional strategies** varies between 7% in Portugal and 66% in Finland. The country ranking for awareness of these strategies shows similarities with that observed in 2019.

The EU's outermost regions

- The EU counts **nine outermost regions**: French Guiana, Guadeloupe, Martinique, Mayotte, Reunion Island and Saint-Martin (France), Azores and Madeira (Portugal), and the Canary Islands (Spain).
- 32% of respondents can name at least one of the nine outermost regions. The EU level result is mostly driven by the high level of knowledge in France and Spain. **In 17 Member States, less than one in four respondents can name at least one of the nine EU outermost regions.**
- The outermost region mentioned most frequently is the Canary Islands (14%), followed by the four of the five French overseas departments: Martinique (10%), Guadeloupe (10%), Reunion Island (10%) and French Guiana (8%). The Azores and Madeira are each mentioned by 6% of respondents. A handful of respondents (2%-3%) could name Mayotte and/or Saint Martin.

Section 1. EU co-financed projects that improve local areas


The first section deals with EU citizens' general awareness of EU co-financed projects in their local area and their assessment of the impact of these projects on the development of their city or region.

As in previous years, respondents were first asked if they have heard about any projects in their local area supported by EU regional funding. Respondents who said they have heard of EU co-financed projects were then asked whether this support has had a positive or a negative impact on the development of their city or region.

1.1. Awareness of EU co-financed projects that improve local areas

Four in ten (41%) respondents say they have heard about EU co-financed projects that improve the area where they live. When this question was asked in 2019, a similar figure was observed (as can be seen in the trend graph below) – the EU average for 2019, however, included the UK, where awareness of EU co-financed projects was low. The EU average for 2019, after removing the UK, is 43%; the current figure of 41% means there is a **small (but significant) decrease in the proportion of respondents who have heard about EU co-financed projects** in their area.


Q1A Europe provides financial support to regions and cities. Have you heard about any EU co-financed projects to improve the area where you live? (% - EU27, comparison 2010 to 2021)



Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

There is a **large variation across EU Member States in the proportion of respondents who have heard about EU co-financed projects that improve the regions and cities where they live**. This proportion ranges from a fifth – or less – in Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium and Germany (between 16% and 20%) to more than two-thirds in Latvia, Lithuania, Croatia, Czechia, Slovakia and Poland (between 68% and 82%). This also means that in almost half of the EU Member States (12), a majority reply they have heard about this type of projects, while in the remaining Member States (15), a majority state the opposite.

Q1A Europe provides financial support to regions and cities. Have you heard about any EU co-financed projects to improve the area where you live? (% by country)




Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

Since 2019, awareness of EU co-financed projects that improve the regions and cities where respondents live has **significantly increased in four Member States**: Lithuania (68%, +7 pp), Italy (56%, +6 pp), Greece (55%, +7 pp) and Finland (35%, +6 pp).

A significant decrease in awareness is observed in five Member States. The most sizable decreases are observed in Germany (20%, -10 pp), Bulgaria (35%, -8 pp) and Malta (60%, -9 pp). In Slovakia and Czechia, awareness dropped by 4 and 5 percentage points, respectively; both countries, nonetheless, stay at the top of the country ranking, although there is now a larger gap between them and Poland, where awareness of EU co-financed projects stays at 82%.

Q1A Europe provides financial support to regions and cities. Have you heard about any EU co-financed projects to improve the area where you live? (% by country, 2021 and 2019)




▼▲ Evolution 2021-2019 (comparison with Flash Eurobarometer 480, June 2019 – statistically significant changes shown in bold blue/pink); Base: all respondents (n=25 706 in 2021 and 26 144 in 2019)


On the next page, **national differences in awareness about EU co-financed projects** are mapped against **structural funds (ERDF and CF) eligibility** for the period between 2014 and 2020. The European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) finances programmes that support the social and economic development of regions across Europe; funds are mainly targeted at less developed regions with a GDP per capita under 75% of the EU average. Additionally, the Cohesion Fund (CF) supports investments in environment and transport in the less prosperous Member States with a gross national income per capita below 90% of the EU27 average.

In the map showing the Flash Eurobarometer survey results (left-hand side on the next page), darker blue countries are those where more respondents are aware of EU co-financed projects in their local area. The map on the right-hand side shows which regions in Europe are less developed vs transition and more developed regions. It can easily be seen that there are similarities between the two maps (awareness and eligibility) and countries where awareness is higher also tend to have a higher number of less developed regions where more of the ERDF and CF funds are targeted at.

Q1A Have you heard about any EU co-financed projects to improve the area where you live? (% Yes)




Structural funds (ERDF and CF) eligibility, 2014-2020
 (Source: European Commission, DG REGIO)



In the chart below, the **regional policy budget of ERDF/CF for the period 2014-2020** per country is calculated as a **“per capita”** value. The amount for each country is calculated by dividing a country's total planned EU budget by its (adult) population.

A clear correlation exists between the per capita value of the regional policy budget of ERDF/CF for the period 2014-2020 per country and the proportion of respondents saying they have heard about EU co-financed projects in the regions and cities where they live. In countries in the top right corner of the scatter graph, such as Slovakia and Poland, the per capita budget is more than four times higher than in countries in the bottom left corner, such as Belgium, Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands. Awareness of EU co-financed projects in countries in the top right corner is also more than three times higher than in countries in the bottom left corner.


Scatter graph “% has heard about EU co-funded projects” vs “2014-2020 Regional policy budget (ERDF and CF), per capita”



As in the previous wave, there are some significant **socio-demographic differences** for the question on awareness of EU co-financed projects:

- Males (44%) are more likely than females (38%) to be aware of EU co-financed projects that improve the regions and cities where they live.¹
- Respondents aged 40 and over are more likely to say that they have heard of EU co-financed projects (43%-44%), while the youngest respondents – those aged between 15 and 24 (and those still in education) – are the least likely to say so (29%).
- Respondents who completed their education aged 20 or over are the more likely to say that they have heard of EU co-financed projects (46%), compared to those who left school at or before the age of 15 (35%).
- Respondents living in small and medium-sized towns and in large towns and cities are somewhat more likely than respondents in rural areas to be aware of EU co-financed projects that improve the regions and cities where they live (41%-43% vs 38%).

Q1A Europe provides financial support to regions and cities. Have you heard about any EU co-financed projects to improve the area where you live? (% by socio-demographics)



Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

¹ The gender question of the Flash Eurobarometer allows respondents to choose between “male”, “female”, “in another way” or “prefer not to say”. In this report, only the results for respondents who answered “male” or “female” are shown as the number selecting the other responses is below the reporting threshold.


1.2. Impact of EU co-financed projects on development in local areas

Respondents who said they have heard of EU co-financed projects were then asked whether this support has had a positive or a negative impact on the development of their city or region.

Eight in ten respondents who have heard about EU co-financed projects in their region also **believe that the impact of these projects has been positive for the development of their city or region**, while less than one in ten (6%) think the impact has been negative and a similar share (7%) spontaneously say there has been no impact.

Although there appears to be a small drop in awareness of EU co-financed projects (see previous section), the proportion of respondents who say the impact of such projects has been positive remains **at the same level as in 2019**. In the longer term, the trend since 2010 shows that the proportion seeing a positive impact has slightly increased – from 76% to 80%.

Q1C Taking into consideration all the projects you have heard about, would you say that this support has had a positive or negative impact on the development of your city or region? (% - EU27, comparison 2010 to 2021)




Note: "Don't know" not shown; Response "No impact" not present in 2010
Base: respondents who have heard about EU co-funded projects (n=12 182)

In all but three Member States, **at least three-quarters of respondents** who have heard about EU co-financed projects in their regions **think that these projects have had a positive impact on the development of their city or region**. In eight countries, this view is shared by at least nine in ten respondents; this is the case, for example, in Hungary (91%), Ireland (92%) and Poland (95%).

At the lower end of the country ranking, in the Netherlands and Denmark, about two-thirds (65%-67%) say that that EU co-funded projects have had a positive impact on the development of their city or region, but the overall lowest proportion is observed in Italy (57% 'positive' impact).

One in seven (14%) respondents in Italy think that the EU support has had a negative impact on the development of their city or region, as do close to one in ten respondents in Romania and the Netherlands (both 9%). Italy was also found at the bottom of the country ranking in 2019.²

Q1C Taking into consideration all the projects you have heard about, would you say that this support has had a positive or negative impact on the development of your city or region? (% by country)



Base: respondents who have heard about EU co-funded projects (n=12 182)


² This question was only presented to respondents who have heard about EU co-funded projects and the base size per countries varies between 166 and 852 respondents. Due to the smaller base sizes, it is more difficult to detect significant changes in the trend compared to 2019. In the Netherlands and Austria, however, a significant decrease is seen in the proportion of respondents who think that EU co-funded projects have had a positive impact on the development of their city or region.

In the next chart, the results of this question are analysed by looking at all respondents. By doing this, one can see **how many respondents, in total, have seen a positive impact on the development of their city or region from EU co-financed projects** (dark blue bars); this proportion is set against the proportion of respondents who have heard about EU co-financed projects in their area (light blue bars).

In total, 33% of respondents have seen a positive impact on the development of their city or region from EU co-financed projects. This figure ranges from 11% in Denmark to 78% in Poland. **In addition to Poland, there are nine more countries where a majority of respondents observe a positive impact from EU co-financed projects.** The Netherlands, Belgium and Germany join Denmark at the lower end of the country ranking with less than one in six respondents who share this experience.

It was noted above that, as in 2019, Italy stood out with many respondents, who have heard about EU co-financed projects, saying that these projects had no (or even a negative) impact. However, looking at the total population (all respondents), there are still three times more respondents in Italy who have seen a positive impact on their region from EU co-financed projects than there are in Denmark (32% vs 11%).

Q1C Taking into consideration all the projects you have heard about, would you say that this support has had a positive or negative impact on the development of your city or region? (% 'positive' by country, 2021 and 2019 – **Base: all respondents**)




Evolution 2021-2019 (comparison with Flash Eurobarometer 480, June 2019)
Base: all respondents (n=25 706 in 2021 and 26 144 in 2019)

In the chart below, the **(per capita) regional policy budget of ERDF/CF for the period 2014-2020** is plotted again against the survey results. The Y-axis in the scatter graph below shows the proportion of all respondents who think that EU co-funded projects have had a positive impact on the development of their city or region.

Although there is a **strong positive correlation** between the per capita value of the regional policy budget of ERDF/CF for the period 2014-2020 per country and the proportion of respondents who see a positive impact of EU co-financed projects on the development of their city or region, there are **some outlier countries**. For example, Portugal is characterised by a relatively low proportion of respondents saying that that EU co-funded projects have had a positive impact on the development of their city or region, but it is among the countries with higher regional policy budgets.


Scatter graph “% positive impact from EU co-funded projects (base: all respondents)” vs “2014-2020 Regional policy budget (ERDF and CF), per capita”



The **socio-demographic analysis** reveals that:

- Respondents who left school aged 15 or below are much less likely than those who remained in education longer to say that EU co-funded projects have had a positive impact on the development of their city or region (59% vs 77%-84%) and they are about twice as likely to say that the impact of these projects has been negative (13% vs 5%-8%).
- Respondents in small and medium-sized towns are also somewhat less likely to say that EU co-funded projects have had a positive impact on the development of their city or region (78% vs 82% in rural areas and 84% in large towns and cities).

Q1C Taking into consideration all the projects you have heard about, would you say that this support has had a positive or negative impact on the development of your city or region? (% by socio-demographics)




Base: respondents who have heard about EU co-funded projects (n=12 182)

Section 2. Sources of information on EU co-financed projects

This section focuses on sources of information on EU co-financed projects. Respondents who have heard of EU co-financed projects in their local area were asked where they have done so – e.g. in newspapers or via online social networks. They were asked where they have first heard about the project, and then to name any other sources through which they have heard about it.

National TV is the most mentioned **first source of information** about EU co-financed projects (16%), followed by the Internet (14%), billboards (13%) and local or regional newspapers (11%). Less than 10% mention any of the other media as the first source of information. Compared with 2019, respondents are now **less likely to mention local or regional newspapers** (11%, -4 pp) and are **more likely to mention the Internet** (14%, +3pp) and **online social media** (5%, +2 pp).

Q1B Where did you hear about it? Firstly? And then? (% total mentions, by country)



▼▲ Evolution 2021-2019 (comparison with Flash Eurobarometer 480, June 2019)

Base: respondents who have heard about EU co-funded projects (n=12 182 in 2021 and 12 505 in 2019)

When first and subsequent responses are combined ('first' with 'and then'), **national TV and the Internet are the most frequently mentioned sources**, with close to four in ten respondents (37% and 38%, respectively) saying that they get their information from this source. National TV stayed at the same level as in 2019, but the proportion mentioning the Internet has increased by seven percentage points. There is also an increase of six percentage points in the proportion mentioning online social media. Other sources selected by one in five – or more – respondents are local and regional newspapers (27%, -6 pp compared to 2019), billboards (25%, +3 pp), personal knowledge (25%, +2 pp) and local or regional TV (21%, +1 pp).

The analysis of country results concentrates on the combined responses to this question. The proportion of respondents who have heard about EU co-financed local projects via **national television** ranges from 12% in Sweden to 63% in Slovakia, where it is the joint most frequently mentioned source (together with the Internet). National television is the most mentioned information source in another eight countries, such as Croatia (51%), Italy and Malta (both 47%). Across most countries, local or regional television is mentioned by fewer respondents than national television; the most important exception being Germany, where 17% mention national television, compared to 24% who cite local or regional television.

Newspapers are the most mentioned source of information in eight countries. In Ireland and Luxembourg, the largest share of respondents name **national newspapers** (33% and 34%, respectively), while in the Netherlands, Austria, Sweden, France, Germany and Finland, **local or regional newspapers** are the most mentioned source of information about EU co-financed projects in their local area (between 27% and 49%). Local and regional newspapers are also an important information source in Czechia (mentioned by 36%).

The largest proportion of respondents who have heard about EU co-funded local projects on **national radio** is found in Slovakia (34%) and the largest proportion for **local or regional radio** in Germany (24%). In most other countries, however, less than one in six respondents have heard about EU co-financed projects via national or local/regional radio.





























The Internet is the most frequently mentioned information source in ten Member States, and it is the joint most frequently mentioned source in Slovakia; in 2019, this was the case for just four Member States. The proportion mentioning the Internet in this group of 11 countries varies between 38% in Estonia and 63% in Slovakia. In Croatia and Hungary, more than four in ten respondents have read about EU co-financed projects on the Internet (48% and 44%, respectively), but it is not the most mentioned source in these countries. In countries where the Internet is an important information source, there also tends to be a larger proportion mentioning online social media as information source – this proportion mentioning social media is the highest in Slovakia and Romania (36%–37%).

The proportion of respondents who have heard about EU co-financed projects via **a billboard** varies between 3% in Denmark and 45% in Hungary, where it is the most frequently mentioned information source. Billboards were also the most-mentioned information source in Hungary in 2019, as was the case in Estonia and Ireland, but in the latter two countries, other sources of information are now more important (the Internet for Estonia and national newspapers/radio in Ireland).

The proportion of respondents who have heard about EU co-funded projects at their **workplace** remains below a fifth in most Member States, with Denmark being the most important exception. In Denmark, it is the most important information source mentioned by 24% of respondents. Similar figures are also observed in Sweden (24%) and France (22%), but the workplace is not the most important information source in these countries.

Finally, the proportion of respondents giving **personal knowledge** as their answer ranges from 9% in the Netherlands to 41% in Czechia. Slovakia and Germany, with both 33% of respondents selecting this answer, are closest to Czechia.

Q1B Where did you hear about it? Firstly? And then? (% total responses, by country)





	National newspapers	Local or regional newspapers	National TV	Local or regional TV	National radio	Local or regional radio	Internet	Online social networks	Billboard	Workplace	Personal knowledge
EU27 	19	27	37	21	15	14	38	18	25	17	25
BE 	29	25	40	23	21	13	25	21	18	19	12
BG 	8	6	40	12	9	5	40	18	18	18	25
CZ 	25	36	49	18	25	15	60	28	29	20	41
DK 	17	17	16	18	5	6	7	7	3	24	18
DE 	24	44	17	24	15	24	30	16	21	20	33
EE 	18	26	29	8	18	9	38	13	32	10	16
IE 	33	30	33	14	20	17	16	9	30	9	23
EL 	15	20	40	17	13	13	59	21	41	16	26
ES 	21	28	36	28	19	16	29	16	21	14	15
FR 	18	43	33	23	20	17	29	15	31	22	30
HR 	16	18	51	22	11	17	48	27	10	15	17
IT 	28	20	47	24	10	8	32	14	5	18	25
CY 	14	10	42	15	11	6	46	21	24	9	13
LV 	6	26	25	18	14	12	51	26	25	16	19
LT 	10	17	41	11	14	7	47	24	44	11	29
LU 	34	25	25	17	14	12	29	13	13	19	12
HU 	8	21	28	9	13	6	44	16	45	9	23
MT 	14	11	47	33	11	8	31	19	20	7	10
NL 	20	27	22	8	2	2	24	8	8	14	9
AT 	23	36	18	22	10	11	25	11	10	17	12
PL 	13	20	38	20	13	13	50	18	43	14	23
PT 	20	18	41	13	5	5	19	9	17	12	18
RO 	13	25	47	31	18	21	53	37	30	20	38
SI 	22	30	46	17	17	21	47	19	19	14	14
SK 	13	30	63	18	34	14	63	36	36	20	33
FI 	18	49	14	10	8	9	25	11	15	13	13
SE 	14	39	12	12	7	14	23	15	17	24	18

Base: respondents who have heard about EU co-funded projects (n=12 182)

The **socio-demographic analysis** focuses on the combined responses to this question ('first' with 'and then'):

- Males are more likely than females to say they have learned about EU co-financed projects in their local area via a billboard (28% vs 21%), while females are somewhat more likely to have heard about these projects at their workplace (18% vs 15%).
- The younger the respondents are, the more likely they are to mention the Internet (from 30% for over 54 year-olds to 46% for 15-24 year-olds), online social networks (from 12% to 29%) and billboards (from 20% to 34%) as their source of information about EU co-financed projects. The older the respondents are, the more likely they are to say their information comes from national TV (from 27% for 15-24 year-olds to 45% for over 54 year-olds), local or regional newspapers (from 16% to 32%), local or regional TV (from 17% to 26%), national newspapers (from 13% to 23%), the national radio (8% to 18%) and local or regional radio (from 5% to 16%).
- Respondents who spent longest in education are more likely to mention the Internet (39% vs 15% for those who left school aged 15 or less), billboards (28% vs 11%), personal knowledge (26% vs 15%), national newspapers (22% vs 18%), their workplace (19% vs 8%), online social networks (18% vs 8%) and local or regional newspapers (35% vs 28%). Those who left school aged 15 or less are more likely to get their information from national TV (47% vs 35% of the highest-educated) and local or regional TV (24% vs 19%).
- Respondents in rural areas and small or medium-sized towns are more likely than their counterparts in large towns and cities to have heard about EU co-financed projects in their local area via local and regional sources: 29%-33% (vs 20% in urban areas) for local or regional newspapers and 21%-24% (vs 17%) for local or regional TV. Respondents in large towns and cities, in turn, are more likely to get information from the Internet (43% vs 35%-37% in more rural areas), billboards (31% vs 21%-23%) and online social media (20% vs 16%-18%).

Q1B Where did you hear about it? Firstly? And then? (% total responses, by socio-demographics)

	National newspapers	Local or regional newspapers	National TV	Local or regional TV	National radio	Local or regional radio	Internet	Online social networks	Billboard	Workplace	Personal knowledge
EU27	19	27	37	21	15	14	38	18	25	17	25
 Gender											
Men	20	26	36	20	16	13	38	17	28	15	25
Women	19	29	39	23	13	14	38	18	21	18	25
 Age											
15-24	13	16	27	17	8	5	46	29	34	14	29
25-39	15	22	27	15	11	11	44	25	31	18	28
40-54	19	28	37	20	14	15	43	17	25	23	24
55+	23	32	45	26	18	16	30	12	20	13	23
 Education											
Up to 15	18	25	47	24	12	12	15	8	11	8	15
16-19	17	29	42	25	16	15	39	17	19	15	25
20+	22	29	35	19	15	14	39	18	28	19	26
Still studying	14	16	26	15	6	5	46	29	38	15	29
 Place of residence											
Rural area	17	33	35	21	15	15	35	18	21	18	25
Small/medium-sized town	21	29	38	24	14	14	37	16	23	17	24
Large town/city	19	20	39	17	15	12	43	20	31	16	26

Base: respondents who have heard about EU co-funded projects (n=12 182)

Section 3. Awareness of EU Cohesion Policy

This section analyses awareness of the **shared management funds of the EU Cohesion Policy**. There are two main types of EU funding: funds which are managed centrally and directly by the European Commission, e.g. for research; and funds whose management is shared between the EU and the Member States, e.g. funds for regional policy.³ The EU entrusts management of the latter to the Member States. The bulk of EU spending involves funds which come under shared management by the EU Member States.

The **European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)** finances programmes that support the social and economic development of all EU regions and cities. The **European Social Fund Plus (ESF+)** focuses on improving employment and education opportunities and promoting social inclusion across the Member States.

Additionally, **the Cohesion Fund (CF)** supports investments in environment and transport in the less prosperous Member States with a gross national income per capita below 90% of the EU27 average.

The **Just Transition Fund (JTF)** was introduced in the context of the European Green Deal to mitigate regional inequalities triggered by the transition to climate neutrality.

Finally, European Territorial Cooperation (ETC), or **Interreg**, provides a framework for the implementation of joint actions and policy exchanges between national, regional and local actors from different Member States.

Following the health crisis caused by the coronavirus pandemic, **REACT-EU (Recovery Assistance for Cohesion and the Territories of Europe)** was introduced and aims to ensure a balanced and fair recovery of the Member States, by providing financing to the regions that were particularly affected by the pandemic.


³ Source: https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/policy/what/glossary/s/shared-management

3.1. Awareness of EU funds

One in two respondents (49%) say they have heard about the **European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and/or the Cohesion Fund**, and the same proportion (49%) have heard about the **European Social Fund**. For the other two shared management funds, however, just one in ten respondents say they have heard about it: 10% for **Interreg** and 11% for the **Just Transition Fund**. One in three respondents (34%) say they have heard about **REACT-EU or NextGenerationEU** (the EU's COVID-19 recovery plan).

In total, 69% of respondents have **heard of at least one of the shared management funds** (ERDF/Cohesion Fund, European Social Fund, Interreg, Just Transition Fund). This number increases to 73% when also including those who have heard about REACT-EU or NextGenerationEU.

Q2 Which, if any, of the following forms of EU support you've heard about before? (% - EU27)




Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

In this Flash Eurobarometer, awareness of EU regional policy funds is assessed against awareness of other EU funding tools, such as Erasmus+. This assessment shows that the highest level of awareness overall is observed for **Erasmus+** (the EU's programme to support education, training, youth and sport in Europe), with a majority of respondents (58%) saying they have heard about this programme. Awareness of the **European Solidarity Fund** (set up to respond to major natural disasters and express European solidarity to disaster-stricken regions within Europe) is at the same level as for the ERDF and/or Cohesion Fund, and the European Social Fund (all 49%).

Awareness of **Horizon Europe** (the EU's key funding programme for research and innovation) and **Connection Europe Facility** (a key EU funding instrument to promote growth, jobs and competitiveness through targeted infrastructure investment at European level) is again lower – at 10%-11%.

In 11 Member States, **at least eight in ten respondents have heard about at least one of the shared management funds (ERDF/Cohesion Fund, European Social Fund, Interreg, Just Transition Fund)**. Slovakia tops the ranking with 92% of respondents who say they have heard about one or more of these funds. In Denmark and the Netherlands, less than half as many respondents say the same (both 36%); relatively low figures are also observed in Sweden (49%), Germany (51%) and Belgium (56%).

Q2 Which, if any, of the following forms of EU support you've heard about before?
Heard of at least one shared management fund (ERDF/CF, ESF, Interreg, JTF) (% by country)



Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

Shared management funds

In this section, cross-country differences in awareness for each of the shared management funds of the EU Cohesion Policy are discussed. Awareness of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the Cohesion Fund were measured in one joint item.

In Slovakia, 86% of respondents reply that they have heard of **the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and/or the Cohesion Fund**. Greece, Croatia, Slovenia and Poland are also found at the higher end of the country ranking with close to eight in ten respondents (77%-79%) who say that they have heard of ERDF and/or the Cohesion Fund. In the Netherlands and Denmark, on the other hand, just over one in five respondents say the same (21%-22%), and in another five countries at the lower end of the country ranking (Germany, Belgium, Austria, France and Sweden), this figure is between 32% and 37%.


Awareness of the **European Social Fund** varies between 17% in Sweden and 72% in Spain. In Italy, Greece and Slovakia, more than six in ten respondents have heard about this fund (64%, 65% and 68%, respectively). Respondents in the Netherlands and Denmark are not only the least likely to have

heard about ERDF and/or the Cohesion Fund, but they are also among the least likely to have heard about the European Social Fund (18% in Denmark and 23% in the Netherlands). At the higher end of the country ranking, however, there are some important differences in awareness about these funds. For example, respondents in Croatia were among the most likely to have heard about ERDF and/or the Cohesion Fund, but their level of awareness about the European Social Fund is a little lower than the EU average level (46% vs 49%).


Awareness of **Interreg** remains below 20% in all Member States and varies between 4% in the Netherlands and 19% in both Greece and Romania. A similar picture emerges for the **Just Transition Fund**, with awareness being below 20% in all but one of the Member States. In Poland, 30% of respondents say they have heard about the Just Transition Fund.

Q2 Which, if any, of the following forms of EU support you've heard about before?
(% mentioned by country)


% heard about the Just Transition Fund




% heard about Interreg



% heard about the European Social Fund



% heard about the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and/or the Cohesion Fund




Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

The European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the Cohesion Fund

In the Flash Eurobarometer of 2019, respondents were asked a separate question to measure their awareness of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the Cohesion Fund. As such, the findings about awareness of these two funds are not directly comparable, but a comparison of country rankings across time remains possible (see bar chart below).

In both 2019 and 2021, public awareness of the two funds varies considerably between Member States. In 2019, respondents in Croatia, Poland, Bulgaria, Latvia, Slovakia and Slovenia were the most likely to be aware of at least one of the funds. Croatia, Slovenia, Poland and Slovakia remain at the top of the country ranking in 2021. Latvia and Bulgaria still score better than the EU average, but there are more countries now ranked higher, such as Hungary and Greece. Respondents in the Netherlands and Denmark had the lowest level of awareness in both years.

Q2 Which, if any, of the following forms of EU support you've heard about before?
The European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and/or the Cohesion Fund
(% mentioned by country, 2021 and 2019)⁴



Evolution 2021-2019 (comparison with Flash Eurobarometer 480, June 2019)


Note: Country codes in dark blue are countries eligible for support from the Cohesion Fund 2014-2020

Base: all respondents (n=25 706 in 2021 and 26 144 in 2019)


On the next page, **national differences in awareness of ERDF and the Cohesion Fund** are mapped again against **structural funds (ERDF and CF) eligibility** for the period between 2014 and 2020. In the map showing the Flash Eurobarometer survey results (left-hand side on the next page), darker blue countries are those where more respondents have heard about ERDF and the Cohesion Fund. The map on the right-hand side shows which regions in Europe are less developed vs transition and more developed regions. It can easily be seen again that there are similarities between the two maps in terms of awareness levels and eligibility.

⁴ Question wording in 2019: Q2. Have you heard about the following funds? (READ OUT – ONE ANSWER ONLY)
1) The European Regional Development Fund (ERDF); 2) The Cohesion Fund; 3) Both; 4) Neither; 5) DK/NA

Q2 Which, if any, of the following forms of EU support you've heard about before? **ERDF and/or CF** (% Mentioned)




Structural funds (ERDF and CF) eligibility, 2014-2020
 (Source: European Commission, DG REGION)



In the charts below, the **regional policy budgets of ERDF/CF** (first scatter plot) and **regional policy budgets for the European Social Fund** (second scatter plot) **for the period 2014-2020** per country are calculated as a **“per capita”** value. The amounts for each country are calculated by dividing a country's total planned EU budget by its (adult) population.


The first scatter plot shows that there is a clear correlation between the per capita value of the regional policy budget of ERDF/CF for the period 2014-2020 and the proportion of respondents saying they have heard about at least one of these two funds at country level. In the countries in the top right corner of the scatter graph, such as Slovakia, Czechia and Hungary, the per capita budget is more than four times higher than in countries in the bottom left corner, such as Belgium, Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands; in the former countries, awareness is also almost two times higher than in the latter group of countries. It should, however, also be noted that there are clear exceptions weakening this correlation; for example, on the left-hand side of the scatter graph, where one finds countries with similar, low regional policy budgets for ERDF/CF, there still is a large variation in awareness – from 20% in the Netherlands to 63% in Ireland.

Scatter graph “% has heard about ERDF and/or CF” vs “2014-2020 Regional policy budget (ERDF and CF), per capita”



A different picture emerges when the (per capita) regional policy budgets of the **European Social Fund (ESF)** for the period 2014-2020 are compared to the awareness level of this fund across countries. Both the ERDF and ESF funds are allocated in the regions where support is most needed, mainly targeting the regions with a GDP per capita under 75% of the EU27 average. However, while this focus on less developed regions of ERDF seems to offer at least a partial explanation for differences in awareness, this is not the case for differences in awareness of the ESF.


Scatter graph “% has heard about ESF” vs “2014-2020 Regional policy budget (ESF), per capita”



NextGenerationEU or REACT-EU

In Italy, Slovakia and Spain, more than half of respondents (56%-58%) say they have heard about **NextGenerationEU** or **REACT-EU**; in Lithuania and Poland, this figure is close to one in two (48%-49%). There are, however, also four countries where knowledge of these funds remains below 20%: Estonia (9%), the Netherlands (12%), Germany (16%) and Latvia (18%).

Q2 Which, if any, of the following forms of EU support you've heard about before?
Next Generation EU/Recovery Plan/REACT-EU (% mentioned by country)







Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

Socio-demographic analysis

The **socio-demographic analysis** shows that:

- Males are more likely than females to say that they have heard of ERDF and/or the Cohesion Fund (53% vs 46%) and REACT-EU/NextGenerationEU (36% vs 33%); no significant differences are observed for the other funds.
- Awareness of the different funds tends to increase with age; the exception being awareness of Erasmus+. For example, 42% of 15-24 year-olds indicate that they have heard about the European Social Fund; this figure increases to 52% for respondents aged 55+. For Erasmus+, awareness ranges from 52% for over 54 year-olds to 66% of 15-24 year-olds.
- Among respondents who stayed longest in education, 11% have not heard about any of the funds; this figure is 19% in the other two educational groups. The largest difference in awareness is observed for Erasmus+, with 66% of the highest educated having heard of this programme, compared to 43% of the least-educated respondents. There is also a large difference in awareness of ERDF and the Cohesion Fund (55% vs 44%, respectively).
- In rural areas, 19% of respondents have not heard about any of the funds, compared to 14% of respondents in small/medium-sized towns and 12% in large towns and cities. The largest differences are again observed for Erasmus+ (66% is 'aware' in large towns/cities vs 50% in rural areas) and ERDF and the Cohesion Fund (53% vs 45%, respectively). There is also a difference in awareness for REACT-EU/NextGenerationEU, with 37% of respondents in large towns/cities and 36% of those in small/medium-sized towns having heard about this recovery plan, compared to 30% of respondents in rural areas.

Q2 Which, if any, of the following forms of EU support you've heard about before?
(% mentioned by socio-demographics)

	ERDF and/or the Cohesion Fund	The European Social Fund	Interreg	The Just Transition Fund	Next Generation EU/ Recovery Plan/REACT EU	Erasmus+	The European Solidarity Fund	Horizon Europe	Connecting Europe Facility	None of these /Don't know
EU27	49	49	10	11	34	58	49	11	10	15
 Gender										
Men	53	48	10	12	36	58	49	12	11	14
Women	46	50	10	11	33	58	49	11	10	15
 Age										
15-24	34	42	8	9	32	66	39	12	9	14
25-39	46	47	9	9	33	64	44	14	9	13
40-54	52	50	12	10	34	57	47	12	9	15
55+	55	52	11	13	36	52	55	10	12	15
 Education										
Up to 15	44	55	10	10	39	43	54	9	12	19
16-19	46	47	8	10	31	45	46	9	9	19
20+	55	51	12	13	36	66	51	13	11	11
Still studying	36	43	9	9	32	69	41	13	9	14
 Place of residence										
Rural area	45	47	9	10	30	50	45	10	9	19
Small/medium-sized town	50	51	10	11	36	58	50	12	11	14
Large town/city	53	49	11	13	37	66	49	12	11	12

Base: all respondents (n=25 706)


3.2. EU regional support to COVID-19 recovery

In total, across the EU, **69% of respondents answer affirmative when being asked if they are aware that EU regional policy supports the economic recovery in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic**; this is a much higher figure than the 34% who reply having heard of NextGenerationEU or REACT-EU.

In 25 of the 27 Member States, more than six in ten respondents say they are aware that the EU regional policy supports economic recovery in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. The highest level of awareness is measured in Finland (85%). In Denmark, however, just one in two respondents say they are aware of EU regional support to COVID-19 recovery; this figure decreases further to 44% in the Netherlands, where awareness is overall the lowest.

There are some similarities in country rankings for more general awareness of EU regional support to COVID-19 recovery and awareness of the specific recovery programmes, NextGenerationEU and REACT-EU. For both questions, for example, the Netherlands and Denmark are found at the lower end of the country ranking. There are, however, also dissimilarities. In Latvia and, even more so, in Finland, for example, respondents were less likely than average to have heard about NextGenerationEU or REACT-EU, but they are more likely than average to say they are aware that EU regional policy supports COVID-19 recovery.


Q3 Are you aware that the EU regional policy supports the economic recovery in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic? (% by country)



Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

The **socio-demographic analysis** shows that awareness of EU regional support to COVID-19 recovery is higher among the oldest respondents (73% vs 65% of 15-24 year-olds), respondents who completed their education aged 20 or over (71% vs 65%-66% in less educated groups) and those living in large towns and cities (73% vs 65% in rural areas).

Q3 Are you aware that the EU regional policy supports the economic recovery in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic? (% by socio-demographics)



Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

Section 4. Perceived benefits of EU regional policy


This section focuses on benefits from EU funded projects, in particular those funded by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) or the Cohesion Fund. Respondents were first asked whether they have benefitted in their daily life from a project funded by the ERDF or the Cohesion Fund, followed by a question whether EU funded projects make them feel like an EU citizen.

4.1. Personal benefits from EU funded projects

On average, **16% of respondents say they have benefitted in their daily life from a project funded by the ERDF or the Cohesion Fund**, 80% say they have not and 4% that they do not know.

Poland stands out with 58% of respondents who say they have benefitted in their daily life from a project funded by the ERDF or the Cohesion Fund. In Latvia, Slovenia, Estonia, Slovakia and Czechia, between 32% and 39% of respondents say that they have benefitted in this way. In five countries, less than 10% of respondents say the same: France (4%), Belgium (5%), the Netherlands and Denmark (both 6%) and Sweden (8%).

Q4A Have you benefitted in your daily life from a project funded by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) or the Cohesion Fund? (% by country)




Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

In the Flash Eurobarometer of 2019, only respondents who said that they have heard of the ERDF or the Cohesion Fund were asked whether they had benefitted in their daily life from a project funded by one of these funds. In the following chart, the results of the 2019 survey and the current survey are presented only focusing on respondents who have heard of ERDF or the Cohesion Fund.⁵

Among respondents who have heard of ERDF or the Cohesion Fund, 27% say they have also benefitted in their daily life from a project funded by one of these two funds.⁶ At the individual country level, this figure ranges from 8% in France and Belgium to 66% in Poland.

The country ranking of the 2019 survey and the current survey are similar – with the same countries found at the higher and lower ends of the country ranking, but there are also some differences. While Romania had an above average result in 2019, the country is now found at the lower end of the country ranking with 15% of respondents who have benefitted in their daily life from a project funded by the ERDF or the Cohesion Fund.

Q4A Have you benefitted in your daily life from a project funded by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) or the Cohesion Fund? (% by country, 2021 and 2019)




Evolution 2021-2019 (comparison with Flash Eurobarometer 480, June 2019)
Base: respondents who have heard about ERDF and/or CF (n=14 816 in 2021 and 16 544 in 2019)

⁵ In the current and previous survey, a different question was used to measure awareness of ERDF or the Cohesion Fund; as such, the results of the question on personal benefits from these funds are not directly comparable. In this section, the comparison across surveys focuses on differences in country ranking.

⁶ If all respondents who have heard about EU co-financed projects in their area are considered, this figure increases to 30%.


There is a **positive correlation** – at the country level – between the **proportions saying they have benefitted** from a project funded by ERDF or the Cohesion Fund and **countries' (per capita) regional policy budget of ERDF/CF** for the period 2014-2020. The scatter graph shows again that Poland stands out with 58% of respondents who have benefitted from a project funded by ERDF/CF; most of the other countries, however, are positioned closer to the trendline.

Scatter graph “% has benefitted from a project funded by ERDF/CF” vs “2014-2020 Regional policy budget (ERDF and CF), per capita”



The largest differences in the proportion saying they have benefitted from a project funded by the ERDF or the Cohesion Fund are observed across **educational groups**. Compared to those who left school at or before the age of 15, respondents who remained in education until at least the age of 20 are twice as likely to say that they have benefitted from a project financed by these funds (19% vs 9%).

Q4A Have you benefitted in your daily life from a project funded by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) or the Cohesion Fund? (% by socio-demographics)




Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

4.2. 'Feeling like an EU citizen'

The (Standard) Eurobarometer produces repeated results on the question 'Do you feel like an EU citizen'. The winter wave of 2020-2021 showed that 34% of Europeans 'definitely' feel like an EU citizen and for 40% of Europeans this is true 'to some extent'.⁷ At the level of the Member States, the proportion feeling at least to some extent like an EU citizen ranges from 59% in Bulgaria and Italy to 94% in Portugal.

In this Flash Eurobarometer, respondents were asked whether EU funded projects in their area make them feel (more) like an EU citizen. **One in five (21%) reply that EU funded projects in their area contribute to a large extent to their feeling of being an EU citizen, while 38% say these projects contribute to some extent to this feeling.** Another 38%, however, see no link between EU funded projects and feeling a citizen of the EU.

Q4B Do EU funded projects in your area make you feel like an EU citizen? (% - EU27)




Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

⁷ Source: <https://europa.eu/eurobarometer/surveys/detail/2355>


In 24 Member States, a majority of respondents agree that EU funded projects in their area make them feel at least some extent like an EU citizen. Poland stands out with 47% of respondents saying these projects make them, to a large extent, feel like an EU citizen, and 36% saying this applies to some extent.

In Denmark, Belgium and the Netherlands, on the contrary, a majority of respondents reply that EU funded project do not make them feel like an EU citizen (52%, 53% and 69%, respectively). The results of the (Standard) Eurobarometer (second bar chart below), however, show that respondents in these countries are not necessarily less likely to feel like an EU citizen but it seems they are less likely to feel that EU funded projects in their local area contribute to this feeling.

Q4B Do EU funded projects in your area make you feel like an EU citizen? (% by country)



% who feel at least to some extent like an EU citizen (Standard Eurobarometer 94.3, Winter 2020-2021)




Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

The **socio-demographic data** shows that:

- The oldest respondents are more likely to say that EU funded projects in their area to a large extent make them feel like an EU citizen (25% vs 19%-20% of 25-54 year-olds); the youngest respondents, on the other hand, are more likely to say that this is true but only to some extent (46% vs 34%-38% of 25-54 year-olds).
- While 18% of respondents living in rural areas say that EU funded projects in their area to a large extent make them feel like an EU citizen, this figure reaches up to 25% for respondents in large towns and cities.

Q4B Do EU funded projects in your area make you feel like an EU citizen? (% by socio-demographics)



Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

Section 5. Priority regions for EU regional policy


In this chapter, attitudes of respondents towards EU regional investment are studied. Respondents were asked to identify socio-economic and geographical targets for EU regional investment. They were also asked which types of investment – such as the environment or energy – should be prioritised by EU regional policy.

5.1. Targeting all regions vs less developed regions

Respondents were first asked whether the EU should continue to invest in all its regions, or if it should concentrate its investment only on the poorest regions. EU Cohesion Policy targets **all regions and cities** in the EU in order to support job creation, business competitiveness, economic growth, sustainable development and improve citizens' quality of life. The bulk of Cohesion Policy funding, however, is **concentrated on less developed European countries and regions** in order to help them catch up and reduce the economic, social and territorial disparities that exist in the EU.

A majority of respondents (64%) say that the EU should invest in all its regions, while one in three (33%) say the EU should only invest in the poorer regions. The proportion of respondents who believe the EU should continue to invest in all its regions had increased from 53% in 2017 to 58% (+5 pp) in 2019, and the current figure represents a further increase in this figure. The EU average without the UK was 61% in 2019, while it is 64% in the current survey; this means there is an increase of three percentage points in the proportion saying the EU should invest in all its regions.

Q5A European regional policy supports economic development projects in all regions. In your opinion, should the EU continue to invest in all regions or concentrate exclusively on the poorer ones? (% - EU27, comparison 2010 to 2021)




Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

A majority of respondents in 25 Member States say the **EU should invest in all its regions**, led by respondents in Poland (71%), Finland (70%), Latvia and Sweden (both 69%).

Respondents in Portugal and Bulgaria are divided on the subject, with half of respondents (48%-49%) saying that the EU should invest in all its regions and the other half (47%-49%) replying that **investments should be targeted only at the poorer regions**. In another four countries, about four in ten respondents say that the EU should only invest in poorer regions: Slovakia (42%), Romania (41%), Ireland and Slovenia (both 39%).

Respondents in the Netherlands and Denmark are somewhat more likely than their counterparts in other countries to say they do not have an opinion on this topic (10% and 13%, respectively).


Q5A European regional policy supports economic development projects in all regions. In your opinion, should the EU continue to invest in all regions or concentrate exclusively on the poorer ones? (% by country)



Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

Since 2019, there has been a **significant increase in the proportion of respondents who think the EU should invest in all its regions in 11 countries**, most strikingly in Spain (62%, +12 pp), Hungary (62%, +11 pp), Malta (68%, +10 pp) and Bulgaria (49%, +9 pp). There are no countries where this proportion has significantly decreased since 2019.

Q5A European regional policy supports economic development projects in all regions. In your opinion, should the EU continue to invest in all regions or concentrate exclusively on the poorer ones? (% by country, 2021 and 2019)




▼▲ Evolution 2021-2019 (comparison with Flash Eurobarometer 480, June 2019 – statistically significant changes shown in bold blue/pink); Base: all respondents (n=25 706 in 2021 and 26 144 in 2019)

The **socio-demographic analysis** reveals that:

- Younger respondents are more likely than the oldest age group to think the EU should invest in all its regions (66%–68% vs 59% of those aged 55+).
- Respondents who left school aged 15 or below are much less likely than those who remained in education longest to think the EU should invest in all its regions (55% vs 66%). Respondents still in education are overall the most likely to share this view (70%).
- City residents are more likely than rural residents to think the EU should invest in all its regions (66% vs 62%).

Q5a European regional policy supports economic development projects in all regions. In your opinion, should the EU continue to invest in all regions or concentrate exclusively on the poorer ones? (% by socio-demographics)



Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

5.2. Targeting specific territories

All respondents, irrespective of their answer to the first question (targeting all regions vs only poorer regions), were asked to identify the types of regions they would target for investment.

EU Cohesion Policy provides special care or investment tools to specific territories, such as:


- Urban areas
- Islands, and remote, mountainous or sparsely populated areas
- Border regions.

In the questionnaire, regions with high unemployment and developed regions were added as response options to the above list.

The highest priority is given by respondents to **regions with high unemployment** (69%). These are followed by **deprived urban areas** (55%) and **remote rural or mountain areas** (54%). **Maintaining and improving competitiveness of developed regions** and **border regions** are considered of highest priority for investment by just under one in four respondents (23% and 22%, respectively).

The current findings are similar to those observed in 2019; the largest change is observed for deprived urban areas which is now selected by a slightly higher proportion of respondents (55%, +3 pp).

Q5B Which regions would you target for investments under EU regional policy? (% - EU27)



▼▲ Evolution 2021-2019 (comparison with Flash Eurobarometer 480, June 2019)
Base: all respondents (n=25 706 in 2021 and 26 144 in 2019)

In all EU Member States, a majority of respondents reply that **areas of high unemployment** should be targeted for investment under EU regional policy. This proportion ranged from 56% in Latvia and 58% in Bulgaria to 80% in Hungary, 81% in Spain and 84% in Slovakia.

The largest proportions selecting **deprived urban areas** as a priority for EU investment are observed in Cyprus (61%), Hungary (64%), Belgium (66%), Romania (68%) and Spain (69%). In Slovenia and Estonia, less than four in ten respondents mention deprived urban areas (36% and 39%, respectively); this proportion further decreases to 23% in Bulgaria.





























Remote rural or mountain areas are mentioned as a priority by 79% of respondents in Cyprus. In another 17 countries, this view is shared by a majority of respondents – from 51% in Sweden to 71% in Slovenia. The lowest proportions selecting remote rural or mountain areas are observed in Italy (35%) and Denmark (37%).

There is a large variation across countries in the proportion selecting **border regions** as a priority for EU investment. In Greece, border regions are mentioned by 57% of respondents – the largest figure observed. In Portugal, on the other hand, just 12% select this response. In seven countries, a third – or more – of respondents mention border regions as a priority; this is the case, for example, in Estonia (47%), Czechia (43%) and Latvia (37%).

The proportion saying that the EU should invest in **developed regions to maintain and improve their competitiveness** remains below 30% in all Member States. In Belgium, Poland and Slovakia, the proportion is very close to this mark (28%-29%); in Bulgaria, on the other hand, just 8% of respondents select developed regions as a priority for EU investment.

In all but two of the EU Member States, the largest share of respondents think that areas of high unemployment should be targeted for investment under EU regional policy. In Cyprus, on the other hand, remote rural or mountain areas are ranked highest, while in Romania, this place is taken by deprived urban areas.

Q5B Which regions would you target for investments under EU regional policy?
(% by country)





	Regions with high unemployment	Deprived urban areas	Remote rural or mountain areas	Border regions	Developed regions, in order to maintain or improve their competitiveness
EU27 	69	55	54	23	22
BE 	74	66	45	23	29
BG 	58	23	52	18	8
CZ 	73	59	58	43	19
DK 	60	44	37	20	20
DE 	69	50	58	29	26
EE 	71	39	60	47	18
IE 	62	55	54	29	19
EL 	76	52	66	57	17
ES 	81	69	64	30	23
FR 	62	59	59	12	20
HR 	74	41	66	18	19
IT 	72	51	35	13	21
CY 	73	61	79	24	17
LV 	56	41	44	37	24
LT 	69	53	48	36	17
LU 	61	58	39	29	24
HU 	80	64	45	27	20
MT 	62	43	38	27	26
NL 	65	56	39	23	16
AT 	66	41	62	36	20
PL 	66	53	53	21	28
PT 	68	59	55	12	15
RO 	62	68	66	18	18
SI 	75	36	71	34	16
SK 	84	58	64	27	28
FI 	67	50	54	28	27
SE 	72	42	51	23	23

Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

The analysis of the **socio-demographic data** shows that:

- Across most socio-demographic groups, the EU average rank order of regions to target is retained; for example, among female respondents, 71% mention high unemployment areas, 58% deprived urban areas, 56% remote rural or mountain areas, 22% border regions and 21% developed regions.
- Male respondents are more likely than their female counterparts to mention developed regions (24% vs 21%); for most other regions, the opposite is observed. For example, 58% of female respondents mention urban areas, compared to 52% of male respondents.
- The largest difference across age groups is observed for deprived urban areas, with 61% of 15-24 year-olds mentioning this type of regions, compared to 51% of over 54 year-olds. Remote rural or mountain areas are less likely to be mentioned by 15-24 year-olds (50% vs 54%-55% across older age groups).
- Respondents who stayed longest in education are more likely to mention each of the regions: regions with high unemployment (71% compared to 67% of those who left school at or before the age of 15), deprived urban areas (56% vs 52%), remote rural or mountain areas (56% vs 49%), border regions (24% vs 19%) and developed regions (23% vs 17%).
- Respondents who live in rural areas are more likely to mention remote rural and mountain areas than those who live in small or large towns (60% vs 51%-53%). Similarly, those who live in large towns are more likely to mention deprived urban areas than those who live in rural areas (59% in large towns/cities and 55% in small/medium-size towns compared to 51% in rural areas).

Q5B Which regions would you target for investments under EU regional policy?
(% by socio-demographics)

	Regions with high unemployment	Deprived urban areas	Remote rural or mountain areas	Border regions	Developed regions, in order to maintain or improve their competitiveness
EU27	69	55	54	23	22
 Gender					
Men	68	52	52	24	24
Women	71	58	56	22	21
 Age					
15-24	71	61	50	25	24
25-39	71	58	55	24	23
40-54	70	55	54	23	23
55+	68	51	54	22	20
 Education					
Up to 15	67	52	49	19	17
16-19	68	52	52	22	21
20+	71	56	56	24	23
Still studying	70	62	53	26	24
 Place of residence					
Rural area	65	51	60	22	21
Small/medium-sized town	72	55	51	24	22
Large town/city	70	59	53	23	23

Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

Section 6. Important areas for EU regional policy investment

After identifying the types of regions the EU regional policy should prioritise, respondents were asked to identify domains that should be targeted by the EU for investment. Two questions were asked: (1) for each of ten domains, respondents were asked if they consider these important or not for their city or region; and (2) respondents were also asked in which of these ten domains the EU should invest in the next few years. For this question, they had to select the top priority domain or domains (more than one response was allowed).


6.1. EU regional policy investment in respondents' regions

All domains of EU regional policy listed in the survey are regarded as being meaningfully important domains by a majority of respondents. At the EU level, 92% consider investment in **education, health or social infrastructures** as important for their city or region, followed by investments in **the environment** (91%) and **renewable and clean energy** (87%). More than eight in ten respondents say that **research and innovation** (85%), **support for small and medium-sized businesses** (85%) and **vocational training** (81%) are important domains.

Smaller majorities support the other investment domains: 75% state that investment in **transport facilities** is important for their city or region and 64% say the same about **tourism and culture**. Finally, 59% say that **broadband Internet access** is an important area for investment and 54% say the same about the **reception and integration of migrants and refugees**.

There is no shift in priorities compared to 2019, and education, health or social infrastructures, and the environment remain at the top of the priorities' list. Compared to 2019, for both the policy domains of research and innovation and support for SMEs, there is a three-percentage point increase, compared to 2019, in the proportion saying it is important. **The largest changes compared to 2019, nonetheless, are seen at the bottom of the priorities' list: +5 pp for tourism and culture, +6 pp for reception and integration of migrants and refugees and +7 pp for broadband Internet access.**

Q6A EU regional policy can invest in many different domains. Which of the following examples do you consider among the more important or less important for your city or region? (% - EU27)



▼▲ Evolution 2021-2019 (comparison with Flash Eurobarometer 480, June 2019)
Base: all respondents (n=25 706 in 2021 and 26 144 in 2019)

In 24 of the 27 Member States, at least nine in ten respondents answer that **education, health or social infrastructures** are an important domain for EU investments. The highest proportions are found in Portugal (98%), Bulgaria, Croatia, Latvia, Slovakia, Spain and Romania (all 96%). In Denmark, France and Sweden, respondents are the least likely to consider this an important area for EU investment (between 78% and 85%). Education, health or social infrastructures emerges as the top (or top equal) policy domain in 17 Member States.

While **vocational training** is also selected by at least nine in ten respondents in Italy and Portugal (90% in both), in all other countries, however, this figure remains below 90% and drops to less than 70% in four Member States: Czechia (57%), Denmark (64%), Romania and Poland (both 68%).

The **environment** is considered an important area for EU investment by at least 90% of respondents in 17 Member States, with the highest proportions being observed in Slovenia (95%), Portugal (96%) and Malta (97%). In the remaining 10 Member States, at least 80% of respondents indicate that the investment in the environment is important for their city or region. The environment emerges as the top (or top equal) policy domain in nine Member States.

Respondents in Slovenia (93%), Portugal (93%) and Malta (95%) – together with respondents in Luxembourg (94%) – are also the most likely to state that investment in **renewable and clean energy** should be important in EU regional policy. This view is also shared by 86% of respondents in Denmark where this domain is the top policy domain. At the bottom of the country ranking, 67% of

respondents in Latvia, 71% in Estonia and 78% in Czechia say that renewable and clean energy is an important policy area.

The proportion saying that EU investment in **research and innovation** is important for their city or region ranges from 69% in Latvia to 95% in Italy, where it is the top policy domain. Portugal and Spain join Italy at the top of the country ranking (89% and 92%, respectively). Looking at the figures for **investment in SMEs**, Portugal, Spain and Italy again rank highest – this time joined by Bulgaria and Cyprus (between 90% and 93% of 'important' responses). In Denmark and Sweden, on the other hand, less than seven in ten respondents say that investment in SMEs is an important domain for EU regional policy (62% and 65%, respectively).

Transport facilities are considered an important domain for EU regional policy by 92% of respondents in Romania; the highest figure observed across the EU. Other countries at the higher end of the country ranking include Malta (86%), Slovakia and Italy (both 87%). At the bottom of the country ranking, in Denmark and the Netherlands, six in ten respondents (59%-61%) indicate that investment in transport should be a priority in EU regional policy.

The proportion answering that investment in **tourism and culture** is important for their city or region varies between 44% in Sweden and 87% in Italy. In five Member States, at least eight in ten respondents say this is an important domain: Portugal (80%), Romania (81%), Bulgaria (83%), Malta (83%) and Italy (87%). In four member states, this view is shared by less than half of respondents.

There is also considerable variation across countries in the proportion saying that investment in **broadband Internet** should be important in EU regional policy. This domain is described as important for their city or region by more than seven in ten respondents in Malta (71%), Ireland (73%) and Germany (77%), compared to less than half of respondents in nine Member States, with the overall lowest figure being found in Czechia (40%).

The domain showing the largest variation across Member States, however, is the **reception and integration of migrants and refugees**. The difference between Luxembourg (highest ranked) and Slovakia and Bulgaria (lowest ranked) is 73 percentage points (80% vs 17%). Luxembourg is joined by Germany (74%) and Sweden (77%), while other countries at the lower end of the country ranking are Latvia (18%), Czechia (18%), Romania (19%), Hungary (21%) and Estonia (23%).

The table on the following page shows that in some countries, all domains are considered important by large majorities of respondents. This is the case, for example, in Malta (between 71% and 97% 'important' responses across the domains listed in the survey), Ireland (between 68% and 94% 'important' responses) and Austria (between 60% and 94% 'important' responses). In other countries, however, there is a large variation in perceived importance across the domains for EU regional policy. In Czechia, for example, 18% say that the reception and integration of migrants and refugees is important, 40% say the same about broadband Internet and 52% about tourism and cultures; this compared to 92% who find the environment important and 93% who say the same about education, health or social infrastructures.

Q6A EU regional policy can invest in many different domains. Which of the following examples do you consider among the more important or less important for your city or region? (% by country)

		Education, health or social infrastructures	Environment	Renewable and clean energy	Research and innovation	Support for small and medium-sized businesses	Vocational training	Transport facilities (rail, road or airports)	Tourism and culture	Broadband internet access	Reception and integration of migrants / refugees
EU27		92	91	87	85	85	81	75	64	59	54
BE		92	91	85	81	77	83	64	52	42	64
BG		96	92	80	78	90	88	83	83	58	17
CZ		93	92	78	81	84	57	79	52	40	18
DK		78	85	86	79	62	64	59	46	47	63
DE		92	92	90	87	80	82	73	48	77	74
EE		92	84	71	78	77	77	73	67	53	23
IE		94	92	91	76	89	76	81	68	73	68
EL		93	92	83	75	87	80	75	73	52	53
ES		96	89	87	92	93	89	64	71	48	60
FR		85	87	81	79	86	80	65	60	50	54
HR		96	89	88	77	89	88	84	74	63	30
IT		94	94	92	95	90	90	87	87	62	58
CY		91	94	91	76	91	83	73	79	46	47
LV		96	85	67	69	89	76	78	67	51	18
LT		95	81	80	83	80	84	75	67	44	34
LU		92	94	94	85	84	86	79	59	45	80
HU		95	92	87	82	84	89	81	64	60	21
MT		94	97	95	87	88	79	86	83	71	71
NL		92	87	84	79	70	80	61	47	44	65
AT		93	94	91	87	88	87	74	60	60	62
PL		91	92	88	83	87	68	84	65	65	29
PT		98	96	93	89	93	92	83	80	55	65
RO		96	92	89	79	85	68	92	81	66	19
SI		94	95	93	84	85	82	83	78	62	38
SK		96	93	83	83	83	79	87	71	46	17
FI		92	90	87	80	77	83	81	52	50	61
SE		85	89	87	85	65	71	67	44	63	77

Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

The table on the next page presents the change in proportions of 'more important' responses from 2019 to 2021. The majority of (significant) changes observed are showing an increase in these figures.

For the policy domain of **reception and integration of migrants and refugees**, the proportion of 'more important' responses has increased in 18 EU Member States. The largest increases in the proportion saying that investment in this domain is important for their city or region is seen in Portugal (+12 pp), Austria and Lithuania (both +11 pp), and Luxembourg (+10 pp). In Romania, there is a significant decrease in the importance attached to this policy domain (-7 pp).

Increases of 10 percentages points – or more – are also observed for the importance of investing in **broadband Internet access** (+11 pp in Germany, +13 pp in Spain, Latvia and Portugal, and +14 pp in Romania) and in **tourism and culture** (+10 pp in Ireland and France, +11 pp in Austria and Spain, and +14 in Finland).

The largest number of **decreases in the proportion of 'more important' responses** are observed for the policy domain of **renewable and clean energy**; this proportion has decreased in seven EU Member States, with the largest decrease observed in Lithuania (-7 pp).

Q6A EU regional policy can invest in many different domains. Which of the following examples do you consider among the more important or less important for your city or region?
(▼▲ Evolution 2021-2019)





		Education, health or social infrastructures	Environment	Renewable and clean energy	Research and innovation	Support for small and medium-sized businesses	Vocational training	Transport facilities (rail, road or airports)	Tourism and culture	Broadband Internet access	Reception and integration of migrants / refugees
EU27		▲1	=	=	▲3	▲3	▲2	▼-2	▲5	▲7	▲6
BE		▲2	▲2	▼-2	▲5	▲3	=	▼-8	▲2	▲1	▲6
BG		▲1	▲1	▲9	▲7	▲1	▲1	▲4	▲6	▲8	▲6
CZ		=	=	▲4	▲6	▲3	▲6	=	▲5	▲3	▲1
DK		▼-7	▼-5	▼-5	▼-1	▲5	▼-5	▼-3	▲6	=	▲1
DE		▼-1	▲1	▲3	▲5	▲1	▼-1	▼-3	▲6	▲11	▲8
EE		▼-4	▼-5	▼-5	▲1	▲4	▼-5	▼-7	▲3	=	▼-1
IE		=	▲2	▲2	▲7	▲5	▲7	▲6	▲10	▲3	▲8
EL		▼-1	=	▼-1	▼-2	=	▼-4	▼-4	▼-7	▲6	▲9
ES		▲2	▼-2	▼-3	▲4	▲5	▲2	=	▲11	▲13	▲3
FR		▲5	▼-1	▼-4	▲2	▲5	=	▲1	▲10	▲1	▲6
HR		▼-1	▼-1	▼-1	▼-3	▼-1	▼-1	▼-3	▲1	▼-3	▲2
IT		▼-1	▼-1	▲1	▲2	▲1	▲4	▲1	▲1	▲8	▲5
CY		▲3	▲1	▲1	▲4	▲4	▼-3	▲6	▼-1	=	▼-2
LV		▲1	▲2	▲3	▲7	▲4	▼-4	▼-2	▲4	▲13	▲5
LT		▲2	▼-1	▼-7	▲4	▲1	▲5	▼-2	▼-4	▼-3	▲11
LU		▲1	=	▲1	▲6	▲6	▲1	▲6	▲8	▲4	▲10
HU		▼-2	▼-2	▼-4	▼-3	▼-1	▼-4	▼-4	▼-2	▲2	▲7
MT		▼-2	▼-1	▼-3	=	▲2	▼-1	=	▼-3	▲5	▲4
NL		▲2	▲1	▲5	▲4	▲10	▲6	▼-4	▲5	▲6	▲5
AT		▲1	▼-1	▼-1	▲6	▼-2	▲2	▲3	▲11	▲8	▲11
PL		▲1	▲2	▲1	▲1	▲3	▼-1	▼-2	▲7	▲6	▲8
PT		=	=	▲2	▲5	▲4	▲2	▲3	▲5	▲13	▲12
RO		▲1	=	▼-2	▲8	▲6	▲10	▼-6	▼-1	▲14	▼-7
SI		▲3	▲4	▲2	▲6	▲3	▲1	▼-5	▲4	▲5	▲8
SK		▲2	▼-1	=	▲3	▲8	▲6	▲2	▼-2	▲2	▼-2
FI		▲1	▲4	▼-1	▲3	▲3	=	▲3	▲14	▲5	▲9
SE		▲11	=	▲2	▲4	▲6	▲7	▼-3	▼-2	▲7	▲6

▼▲ Evolution 2021-2019 (comparison with Flash Eurobarometer 480, June 2019 – statistically significant changes shown in bold blue/orange); Base: all respondents (n=25 706 in 2021 and 26 144 in 2019)

The analysis of the **socio-demographic data** shows that:

- For most policy domains, the proportion of females saying it is important for their city or region tends to be higher than the proportion of males. The largest difference is seen for the reception and integration of migrants and refugees (58% vs 51%).
- There are also differences across age groups for various domains, but the largest difference is again seen for the reception and integration of migrants and refugees. This domain is described as important by 65% of 15-24 year-olds, compared to 51% of over 54 year-olds. There is also a relatively large difference across age groups in the proportion saying that investment in broadband Internet should be important in EU regional policy (52% for 25-39 year-olds vs 60% of 15-24 year-olds and 63% of over 54 year-olds).
- In terms of educational groups, the largest differences are seen for the domains of vocational training, and tourism and culture. Both of these domains are more frequently described as important by the lowest educated respondents. For example, 91% of respondents who left school aged 15 or earlier say that the EU should prioritise vocational training, compared to 77% of respondents who remained longest in education.
- Respondents in large towns and cities are more likely than those living in rural areas to support investment in research and innovation (87% vs 82%), while the opposite is observed for support for SMEs (86% in rural areas vs 82% in large towns/cities) and vocational training (83% vs 78%). Respondents in rural areas are also more likely to say that investment in broadband Internet is important for their region (62% vs 56% in large towns/cities), while respondents in large towns/cities more frequently refer to the reception and integration of migrants and refugees (59% vs 50% in rural areas).

Q6A EU regional policy can invest in many different domains. Which of the following examples do you consider among the more important or less important for your city or region? (% socio-demographics)

	Education, health or social infrastructures	Environment	Renewable and clean energy	Research and innovation	Support for small and medium-sized businesses	Vocational training	Transport facilities (rail, road or airports)	Tourism and culture	Broadband Internet access	Reception and integration of migrants and refugees
EU27	92	91	87	85	85	81	75	64	59	54
 Gender										
Men	90	89	85	86	83	80	75	62	61	51
Women	93	92	89	84	86	83	75	66	58	58
 Age										
15-24	94	93	89	81	85	84	73	62	60	65
25-39	92	91	86	83	83	77	71	62	52	56
40-54	91	91	87	85	84	79	75	62	59	52
55+	92	90	87	87	86	84	77	67	63	51
 Education										
Up to 15	95	89	86	86	88	91	76	72	57	52
16-19	94	92	88	84	88	85	78	67	60	46
20+	90	90	86	86	82	77	73	61	59	57
Still studying	94	93	88	83	84	82	72	63	59	68
 Place of residence										
Rural area	91	90	86	82	86	83	74	61	62	50
Small/medium-sized town	92	91	87	85	86	83	76	66	60	53
Large town/city	92	92	89	87	82	78	75	64	56	59


Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

6.2. EU regional investment in the next few years

In this Eurobarometer, respondents were also asked which domains should be targeted for EU investment in the next few years. They were presented with the same list of policy domains and were asked to name all the ones that they think should be prioritised in the next few years.

One in two respondents say that **education, health and social infrastructures** should be prioritised in EU regional policy in the next few years, and 42% think that the EU should invest in **the environment** in the next few years. Between one in four and one in three respondents mention **transport facilities** (25%), **research and innovation** (28%), **support for SMEs** (29%) and **renewable and clean energy** (33%). Fewer respondents say that EU investment over the next few years should be targeted at **vocational training** (22%), **reception and integration of migrants and refugees** (17%), **tourism and culture** (13%) or **broadband Internet access** (12%).


Q6A In which domains should the EU invest in the next few years? (% - EU27)



Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

When comparing respondents' ranking of the domains they consider **important for their city or region** and the ranking of the same domains in terms of **priority areas for the next few years**, many similarities are seen. For both questions, education, health and social infrastructures, the environment, and renewable and clean energy are ranked highest. At the lower end of the priorities' list, some differences can be seen, for example, the reception and integration of migrants and refugees ranks lowest in terms of priorities for respondents' cities and regions, but comes in eighth position in terms of priorities for the next few years (before both tourism and culture, and broadband Internet).

Q6 EU regional investment – Comparison across questions (% - EU27)



Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

At the national level, in 16 EU countries, the largest share of respondents select **education, health and social infrastructures** as an important domain for future EU investment. In three countries, more than seven in ten respondents select this domain: Lithuania (72%), Latvia (73%) and Hungary (74%). In Luxembourg, Denmark, Italy, Ireland and Sweden, on the other hand, less than four in ten respondents select this domain. In the latter countries – and in Austria, Greece, Cyprus and Malta – respondents are more likely to select **the environment** as top priority (between 39% and 56%). The environment is also selected as an important domain for future EU investment by a slim majority of respondents in Belgium (51%), Czechia (52%), Slovakia (54%) and the Netherlands (55%).

The proportion selecting **renewable and clean energy** as a domain for EU regional investment in the next few years ranges from 13% in Bulgaria and Latvia to 40% in Slovenia and 45% in Poland.

Respondents in Spain are among the most likely that want to see a focus on **research and innovation** (39%) and **support for SMEs** (45%). Respondents in Latvia are also very likely to say that the EU should invest in support for SMEs (45%), but they are less likely to say the same about research and innovation (16%).





























In Romania, equal shares of respondents reply that education, health and social infrastructures, and **transport facilities** should be prioritised in EU regional policy in the next few years (both 62%). In all other countries, transport facilities are selected as a priority by less than four in ten respondents (from 13% in the Netherlands to 35% in Czechia, Poland and Slovakia).

The proportion selecting **vocational training** as a domain for EU regional investment in the next few years ranges from 8% in Romania and 9% in Czechia to 30% in Hungary. The latter country is joined by Belgium, Austria, Bulgaria and Cyprus (27%-29%).

In Sweden, 42% of respondents say that EU investment should be targeted at **the reception and integration of migrants and refugees**. In Germany, Belgium and Denmark, this view is shared by between 25% and 28% of respondents. In sharp contrast, in countries, such as Slovakia, Bulgaria and Romania, just a handful of respondents mention this domain when asked about EU priorities for the next few years.

Finally, the proportion selecting **broadband Internet access** as a domain that should be targeted for EU regional investment in the next few years ranges from 4% in Lithuania and the Netherlands to 19% in Germany and 22% in Ireland, while the proportions for **tourism and culture** range between 5% in Sweden and 6% in Finland to 23% in Bulgaria, Italy and Malta, 24% in Romania and 25% in Cyprus.

Q6B In which domains should the EU invest in the next few years? (% by country)





		Education, health or social infrastructures	Environment	Renewable and clean energy	Support for small and medium-sized businesses	Research and innovation	Transport facilities (rail, road or airports)	Vocational training	Reception and integration of migrants and refugees	Tourism and culture	Broadband internet access
EU27 		50	42	33	29	28	25	22	17	13	12
BE 		54	51	39	23	24	17	27	27	9	8
BG 		64	29	16	39	14	25	28	2	23	6
CZ 		69	52	31	34	31	35	9	5	13	7
DK 		33	50	39	14	23	14	13	28	8	7
DE 		48	46	34	19	28	23	25	25	7	19
EE 		64	33	24	26	32	27	24	4	16	12
IE 		38	40	35	26	20	24	16	18	14	22
EL 		51	52	28	40	21	20	23	22	21	8
ES 		62	33	31	45	39	17	25	22	12	5
FR 		45	44	34	32	26	21	22	19	9	10
HR 		59	30	30	38	17	32	24	4	20	10
IT 		36	39	32	28	30	25	25	13	23	14
CY 		48	56	35	35	24	14	29	12	25	5
LV 		73	27	16	46	16	32	21	2	19	7
LT 		72	20	32	31	33	25	26	11	15	4
LU 		30	41	35	32	29	21	25	23	11	11
HU 		74	30	33	32	26	25	30	3	12	10
MT 		49	56	33	20	21	22	15	24	23	8
NL 		61	55	31	17	22	13	24	23	7	4
AT 		43	47	38	25	28	19	27	16	12	14
PL 		46	43	45	33	29	35	16	6	11	12
PT 		51	31	25	30	22	19	25	16	21	10
RO 		62	31	25	27	15	62	8	2	24	10
SI 		59	45	40	28	23	31	14	8	17	10
SK 		67	54	30	34	32	35	13	1	18	6
FI 		61	40	37	25	31	22	25	21	6	6
SE 		39	52	31	18	30	21	16	42	5	9

Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

The **socio-demographic analysis** reveals that:

- Females are more likely to prioritise education, health or social infrastructures (55% vs 45%), the environment (45% vs 39%), and the reception and integration of migrants and refugees (19% vs 15%). Males, on the other hand, are more likely to mention renewable and clean energy (35% vs 32%), research and innovation (31% vs 25%), transport facilities (27% vs 23%) and broadband Internet access (13% vs 10%).
- The younger the respondents are, the more likely they are to say that EU investment in the next few years should be targeted at the environment (from 38% for over 54 year-olds to 49% for 15-24 year-olds), renewable and clean energy (from 32% to 37%) and the reception and integration of migrants and refugees (from 15% to 23%). Older respondents are more likely to mention support for SMEs (30% of over 39 year-olds vs 24% of 15-24 year-olds) and transport facilities (26% vs 22%). Respondents aged between 25 and 54 are more likely than their younger and older counterparts to want to see education, health and social infrastructures being prioritized (52%-53% vs 48%-49%).
- The largest differences by education groups are seen for the domain of renewable and clean energy (selected by 25% of respondents who left school aged 15, compared to 36% of respondents who remained longest in education). Other differences observed are, for example, that respondents who left school aged 15 are more likely to prioritise support for SMEs (34% vs 28% of the highest educated) or tourism and culture (16% vs 11%).
- Respondents in large cities, compared to those in rural areas, are more likely to say that future EU investment should be targeted at the environment (44% vs 40%), renewable and clean energy (36% vs 31%) and the reception and integration of migrants and refugees (21% vs 12%). Respondents in rural areas, on the other hand, show a larger preference for investment in SMEs (33% vs 26%), vocational training (23% vs 20%) and broadband Internet (14% vs 10%).

Q6B In which domains should the EU invest in the next few years? (% socio-demographics)

	Education, health or social infrastructures	Environment	Renewable and clean energy	Support for small and medium-sized businesses	Research and innovation	Transport facilities (rail, road or airports)	Vocational training	Reception and integration of migrants and refugees	Tourism and culture	Broadband Internet access
EU27	50	42	33	29	28	25	22	17	13	12
 Gender										
Men	45	39	35	29	31	27	22	15	12	13
Women	55	45	32	29	25	23	22	19	13	10
 Age										
15-24	49	49	37	24	25	22	21	23	14	13
25-39	52	45	33	29	29	23	21	19	12	11
40-54	53	42	33	30	27	26	22	16	13	11
55+	48	38	32	30	28	26	23	15	13	12
 Education										
Up to 15	48	35	25	34	26	21	24	15	16	12
16-19	51	39	30	32	24	26	25	13	15	11
20+	50	43	36	28	30	25	21	19	11	12
Still studying	53	52	38	22	27	21	18	25	12	11
 Place of residence										
Rural area	51	40	31	33	26	24	23	15	12	14
Small/medium-sized town	49	42	33	29	28	25	23	16	14	11
Large town/city	51	44	36	26	29	25	20	21	12	10

Base: all respondents (n=25 706)


Section 7. Primary level of governance

This section of the report addresses the issue of governance. Respondents were asked to identify the level – EU, national, regional or local – at which decisions about projects within the scope of EU regional policy should be made.

As in the previous Eurobarometer, **a majority of respondents think that decisions about EU regional policy projects should be taken at sub-national levels**, with 32% opting for the regional level and 23% for the local level. The remaining respondents think that decisions should be taken at the national level or higher, with 20% opting for the national level and 21% who think that the EU should take decisions on projects funded by its own regional policy.

In 2019, the proportion selecting the EU level for decisions about EU regional policy projects was 18% (after removing the UK). In the current wave, **21% of respondents think it is the EU that should take these decisions (+3 pp compared to 2019)**. Respondents in 2021 are somewhat less likely than those in earlier waves to express a preference for decision at local or national level; the proportion selecting the regional level remains at the same level.

Q7 At which level should decisions about EU regional policy projects primarily be taken? (% - EU27, comparison 2010 to 2021)



Base: all respondents (n=25 706)


Across all countries, respondents are divided in their view about the preferred level at which decisions about projects within the scope of EU regional policy should be made. For example, there is only one country where one of the level is selected by less than 10% of respondents (in Malta, 9% prefer the regional level) and there are no countries where one of the levels is preferred by a majority of respondents.

The **regional level** is the preferred level for decisions about EU regional policy of 40% of respondents in Germany, 39% of those in France, 38% in Czechia and 37% in Austria and Slovakia. The figure below shows that, compared to 2019, the proportion selecting this level has increased in Czechia (+6 pp) and Slovakia (+6 pp), as well as in Slovenia (31%, +7 pp) and Denmark (30%, +5 pp).

In Poland, 39% of respondents reply that decisions about EU regional policy should be made at **local level**; this view is also shared by 34% of respondents in Estonia, Hungary and Romania. In Luxembourg, on the other hand, just 11% of respondents share this view. The proportion selecting the local level has increased in Romania (+8 pp) and Estonia (+5 pp). In a number of countries, however, a significant decrease is observed in this proportion. This is the case in Malta (21%, -7 pp), but for example also in Czechia (32%, -7 pp)

In half of the EU Member States, at least one in two respondents think that decisions should be taken at **sub-national levels** (regional or local). In the three smallest EU Member States, respondents are less likely than their counterparts in larger countries to think decisions should be made at sub-national levels; this opinion is expressed by 30% of respondents in Malta, 33% in Luxembourg and 38% in Cyprus.

Q7 At which level should decisions about EU regional policy projects primarily be taken? (% by country, 2021 and 2019)



▼▲ Evolution 2021-2019 (comparison with Flash Eurobarometer 480, June 2019 – statistically significant changes shown in bold blue/pink); Base: all respondents (n=25 706 in 2021 and 26 144 in 2019)


The largest shares of respondents who think that decisions about EU regional policy should be made at **national level** are found in Finland and Malta (both 42%); in Denmark, Estonia, Latvia, Ireland, Sweden, this level is selected by between 30% and 32% of respondents. The largest increase in this proportion, since 2019, is seen in Lithuania (27%, +6 pp) and the largest decrease in Romania (23%, -10 pp).

Finally, the view that **the EU** should take decisions on projects funded by regional policy ranges from 10% in Czechia and Poland, and 11% in Estonia to 30% in Belgium and Spain, and 35% in Luxembourg. The proportion selecting the EU level has significantly increased in 11 countries, with the largest increase being observed in Romania (24%, +8 pp). A decrease is seen in only one country: Belgium (30%, -6 pp).

The **socio-demographic analysis** reveals that:

- Females are somewhat more likely to choose the sub-national level as preferred level for decision-making about EU regional projects (57% vs 54%), while males are somewhat more likely to prefer the national or EU level (43% vs 39%).
- Respondents aged 40 to 54 are more likely to think decisions about EU regional projects should be made at the local level (27% vs e.g. 16% of 15-24 year-olds), while those aged 15 to 24 are more likely to prefer that these decisions are taken at the European level (26% vs 19% of 40-54 year-olds).
- The largest difference by level of education is seen in preference for the regional level; this level is selected by 34% of respondents who completed their education aged 20 or over, compared to 29% of those who left school at or before the age of 15.
- Respondents in rural areas are more likely to say that decisions about EU regional projects should be made at the local or regional level (60% vs 52% in large towns and cities), while respondents in towns and cities are more likely to prefer that these decisions are taken at national or EU level (42%-45% vs 36% in rural areas).

Q7 At which level should decisions about EU regional policy projects primarily be taken? (% by socio-demographics)



Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

Section 8. Cross-border cooperation

European Territorial Cooperation (ETC), better known as **Interreg**, is one of the two goals of EU Cohesion Policy; it provides a framework for the implementation of joint actions and policy exchanges between national, regional and local actors from different Member States. The aim of Interreg is to jointly tackle common challenges and find shared solutions in fields such as health, environment, research, education, transport, sustainable energy and more.

Before the 2021-2027 programming period, Interreg has traditionally supported three strands:⁸ – :

- **Interreg cross-border cooperation** supports cooperation between NUTS III regions from at least two different Member States lying directly on the borders or adjacent to them – awareness of this type of cooperation is discussed in Section 8.1.
- **Interreg transnational cooperation** involves regions from several countries of the EU forming bigger areas where it aims to tackle common issues (such as the pollution of a river or a sea) – awareness of 'macroregional' cooperation is discussed in Section 8.2.
- **Interreg interregional cooperation**, which consists of four programmes, Interreg Europe, Interact, Urbact and Espon, works at **pan-European level**, covering all EU Member States, and more.


⁸ Source : <https://interreg.eu/about-interreg/>

8.1. Awareness of EU regional funding for cross-border cooperation

European Cross-Border cooperation, known as Interreg A, supports **cooperation between NUTS III regions from at least two different Member States lying directly on the borders or adjacent to them**. It aims to tackle common challenges identified jointly in the border regions and to exploit the untapped growth potential in border areas, while enhancing the cooperation process for the purposes of the overall harmonious development of the EU.

About one in four respondents (26%) say they are aware of cooperation between regions from different countries because of EU regional funding. This figure is similar to that recorded previously, as can be seen in the trend figure below. In the longer term, the trend since 2010 shows that the overall level of awareness of this type of cooperation between regions has increased – from 19% to 26%.


Q8 Are you aware of cooperation between regions from different countries because of EU regional funding? (% - EU27, comparison 2010 to 2021)



Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

The map below shows the areas of the cross-border programmes co-financed by the ERDF. Each programme area is shown with a specific colour and hatched areas are part of two or more programme areas simultaneously. The map clearly shows that there are cross-border programmes co-financed by the ERDF in all EU Member States – awareness of this type of cooperation, however, varies across Member States, as can be seen in the bar chart on the next page.


Figure ERDF Cross-border cooperation programmes 2014-2020



Source: https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/policy/cooperation/european-territorial/cross-border

At the national level, **in four EU Member States, a majority of respondents say they are aware of cooperation between regions from different countries because of EU regional policy:** Poland (64%), Latvia (56%), Czechia (53%) and Malta (51%). In the six countries at the lower end of the country ranking, less than one in five respondents are aware of this type of cooperation: 15% in Belgium and France, 16% in Denmark, 17% in Cyprus and 18% in Italy and Sweden.

Q8 Are you aware of cooperation between regions from different countries because of EU regional funding? (% by country)




Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

The difference in awareness across EU Member States was also observed in the previous wave of this Flash Eurobarometer. In 2019, awareness of cross-border cooperation was highest in Latvia, Poland, Malta and Czechia. The chart below shows that Poland's current figure of 64% is an increase of six percentage points compared to 2019; in Czechia, Latvia and Malta, there is no significant change in awareness.

From 2019 to 2021, awareness of cross-border cooperation because of EU regional funding has increased in Poland (discussed above), Finland (28%, +8 pp), Romania (26%, +4 pp), Greece (21%, +8 pp), Denmark (16%, +7 pp), but has decreased in Luxembourg (37%, -5 pp) and Belgium (15%, -5 pp).

Q8 Are you aware of cooperation between regions from different countries because of EU regional funding? (% by country, 2021 and 2019)




▼▲ Evolution 2021-2019 (comparison with Flash Eurobarometer 480, June 2019 – statistically significant changes shown in bold blue/pink); Base: all respondents (n=25 706 in 2021 and 26 144 in 2019)

The **socio-demographic analysis** reveals that awareness of cross-border cooperation is higher among:

- males than females (27% vs 24%)
- older respondents than the youngest age group (26%-27% vs 21%)
- those who remained in education longer (30% vs 18% for those who left school aged 15 or below)
- respondents living in town and cities rather than rural areas (26%-28% vs 23%).

Q8 Are you aware of cooperation between regions from different countries because of EU regional funding? (% by socio-demographics)



Base: all respondents (n=25 706)


8.2. Areas benefiting from an EU cooperation strategy

The '**Macroregional strategies**' are an integrated framework, supported by the European Structural and Investment Funds (ERDF) among others, to address common challenges faced by a defined geographical area. The strategies contribute to achievement of economic, social and territorial cohesion.

Four EU macro-regional strategies, covering several policies, have been adopted so far:

- The EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (2009)
- The EU Strategy for the Danube Region (2010)
- The EU Strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian Region (2014)
- The EU Strategy for the Alpine Region (2015)


Figure Macro-regions: Adriatic and Ionian, Alpine, Baltic and Danube



Source: https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/policy/cooperation/macro-regional-strategies

One in four respondents say they are aware of at least one of the four macro-regional strategies: 13% say being aware of the Baltic Sea Area Strategy, 8% of the Danube River Area Strategy, 7% of the Adriatic and the Ionian Sea Area Strategy and 9% of the Alpine Area Strategy. Each of these strategies is discussed in more depth in the following paragraphs.

Q9 Are you aware that there is an EU strategy to promote cooperation between countries in the following areas? (% - EU27)




Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

The proportion of **respondents who have heard about at least one of the macro-regional strategies** varies between 7% in Portugal and 66% in Finland. The country ranking for awareness of these strategies shows similarities with that observed in 2019 (but due to a change in question wording, comparability across waves is limited).

The countries with higher levels of awareness are those countries directly involved in one or more of the macro-regional strategies, such as Finland (Strategy for the Baltic Sea Area) and Croatia (Danube River Area, Adriatic and Ionian Sea Area, and Alpine Area Strategies). More details are presented below.

Q9 Are you aware that there is an EU strategy to promote cooperation between countries in the following areas?

Heard of at least one macro-regional strategy (% by country, 2021 and 2019)



Evolution 2021-2019 (comparison with Flash Eurobarometer 480, June 2019)

Base: all respondents (n=12 182 in 2021 and 12 505 in 2019)

EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (EUSBSR)


The area covered by the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (EUSBSR) is mainly the basin of the Baltic Sea and stretches from Lapland to the North of Germany. Involving 12 countries, it is the second largest and most diverse macro-regional strategy: eight EU Member States (**Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Sweden**) and four Neighbouring Countries (Belarus, Iceland, Norway, Russia).





























The EUSBSR is the first Macro-regional Strategy in Europe. The Strategy was approved by the European Council in 2009.

Across the EU, 13% of respondents are aware there is an EU strategy to promote cooperation between countries in the Baltic Sea area. **Awareness of EUSBSR** is, as expected, highest in the Baltic Sea macro region countries: 64% in Finland, 45% in Estonia, 44% in Sweden, 41% in both Lithuania and Latvia and 39% in Poland. Denmark and parts of Germany are also involved in the strategy, but awareness is lower in these countries – at 17%.

Q9 Are you aware that there is an EU strategy to promote cooperation between countries in the following areas?

Yes, I am aware about the Baltic Sea area strategy (% by country)



EU27  13%		
BE  9%	FR  5%	NL  6%
BG  8%	HR  19%	AT  9%
CZ  11%	IT  4%	PL  39%
DK  17%	CY  6%	PT  4%
DE  17%	LV  41%	RO  8%
EE  45%	LT  41%	SI  13%
IE  12%	LU  13%	SK  10%
EL  8%	HU  9%	FI  64%
ES  6%	MT  15%	SE  44%

Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

EU Strategy for the Danube Region (EUSDR)



The EU Strategy for the Danube Region (EUSDR) was formally created in 2011 and mainly covers the basin of the 2 857 km long Danube River, including also the parts of the mountain ranges where its tributaries originate (like the Alps and the Carpathians). It stretches from the Black Forest (Germany) to the Black Sea (Romania-Moldova-Ukraine).

Involving 14 countries, it is the largest and most diverse macro-regional strategy: nine EU Member States (**Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, parts of Germany, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia**), three Accession Countries (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia) and two Neighbouring Countries (Moldova, parts of Ukraine).

Across the EU, 8% of respondents have heard about the EU Strategy for the Danube Region. Focusing on the Member States covered by this macro-regional strategy, the proportion saying they are **aware of this strategy** to promote cooperation between their countries ranges from 8% in Germany to 32% in Hungary. Awareness is again lowest in Germany, but also in the other countries covered by this strategy, awareness is at a lower level than awareness of the Baltic Sea Region strategy in the countries around the Baltic sea.

Q9 Are you aware that there is an EU strategy to promote cooperation between countries in the following areas?

Yes, I am aware about the Danube river area strategy (% by country)



Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

EU Strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian Region (EUSAIR)


The Adriatic and Ionian Region is primarily defined by the Adriatic and Ionian Seas basin. The **EU Strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian Region (EUSAIR)** involves nine countries, four EU Member States (**Croatia, Greece, Italy, Slovenia**) and five Accession Countries (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia).





























Building on the lessons learnt and experience from the EUSBSR and the EUSDR, the Commission adopted the EUSAIR in 2014.

Across the EU, 7% of respondents have heard about the macro-regional strategy to promote cooperation in the Adriatic and Ionian Region. **Awareness of EUSAIR** is highest in Croatia (42%) and Slovenia (32%), but is lower in Greece (17%) and Italy (10%).

Q9 Are you aware that there is an EU strategy to promote cooperation between countries in the following areas?

Yes, I am aware about the Adriatic and the Ionian Sea area strategy (% by country)



EU27  7%		
BE  6%	FR  5%	NL  5%
BG  8%	HR  42%	AT  11%
CZ  6%	IT  10%	PL  6%
DK  4%	CY  6%	PT  2%
DE  4%	LV  6%	RO  4%
EE  4%	LT  5%	SI  32%
IE  7%	LU  12%	SK  9%
EL  17%	HU  10%	FI  5%
ES  4%	MT  12%	SE  6%

Base: all respondents (n=25 706)


EU Strategy for the Alpine Region (EUSALP)





























The EU Strategy for the Alpine Region involves seven countries, four EU Member States (**Austria, France, Germany, Italy, Slovenia**) and two EFTA countries (Liechtenstein and Switzerland). The EUSALP is the youngest of the four macro-regional strategies; the Commission adopted the strategy in 2015.

Across the EU, 9% of respondents are aware of the EU strategy to promote cooperation between countries in the Alpine Region. **Awareness of EUSALP** is highest in Slovenia (33%) and Austria (29%). In the other countries covered by this strategy, however, awareness is again lower: Germany (12%), France (12%) and Italy (9%).

Q9 Are you aware that there is an EU strategy to promote cooperation between countries in the following areas?

Yes, I am aware about the Alpine area strategy (% by country)



EU27  9%		
BE  7%	FR  12%	NL  5%
BG  7%	HR  17%	AT  29%
CZ  14%	IT  9%	PL  6%
DK  4%	CY  3%	PT  2%
DE  12%	LV  4%	RO  9%
EE  4%	LT  5%	SI  33%
IE  8%	LU  14%	SK  13%
EL  4%	HU  7%	FI  7%
ES  4%	MT  12%	SE  6%


Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

The **socio-demographic data** show that:

- Respondents who completed their education aged 20 or over are more likely to say that they are aware of at least one of the macro-regional strategies (27% vs 20% for those who left school at or before the age of 15).
- There is also an effect of age, with respondents aged 55 and over being the most likely to be aware of at least one macro-regional strategy (28% vs 22% of 23-39 year-olds and 40-54 year-olds).

Q9 Are you aware that there is an EU strategy to promote cooperation between countries in the following areas?

Heard of at least one macro-regional strategy (% by socio-demographics)



Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

Section 9. Knowledge of EU outermost regions

This final chapter of the report focuses on EU citizens' knowledge of the EU outermost regions. The EU counts **nine outermost regions**: French Guiana, Guadeloupe, Martinique, Mayotte, Reunion Island and Saint-Martin (France), Azores and Madeira (Portugal), and the Canary Islands (Spain).

Despite the thousands of kilometres separating the outermost regions from the European continent, these regions are an integral part of the EU. Therefore, EU law and all the rights and duties associated with EU membership apply to the outermost regions.⁹

Figure EU & outermost regions



Source: https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/policy/themes/outermost-regions/

⁹ Source: https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/policy/themes/outermost-regions/


Respondents were explained that there are nine EU outermost regions, which are territories or islands located far away from the European continent, and they were asked if they could name any of these nine islands and territories.

On average, across the EU, 32% of respondents can name at least one of the nine outermost regions. It will be noted below that the EU level result is mostly driven by the high level of knowledge observed in two large Member States – France and Spain. In 17 Member States, less than one in four respondents can name at least one of the nine EU outermost regions.

The outermost region mentioned most frequently is the **Canary Islands** (14%), followed by the four of the five **French overseas departments**: Martinique (10%), Guadeloupe (10%), Reunion Island (10%) and French Guiana (8%). The **Azores and Madeira** are each mentioned by 6% of respondents. A handful of respondents (2%-3%) could name **Mayotte** and/or **Saint Martin**.

About one in four respondents (26%) names a region that is not one of the nine EU outermost regions.

Q10 There are nine EU outermost regions which are territories or islands located far away from the European continent. Which territories or islands can you name? (% - EU27)




Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

At national level, the proportion who can name at least one of the EU outermost regions remains below one in five in 12 Member States, with the overall lowest figure being observed in Romania (4%). In another 12 Member States, between 21% and 35% of respondents mention at least one region (from 21% in Sweden to 35% in Portugal). Finally, 50% of respondents in both Luxembourg and Spain, and 75% of those in France are able to name at least one of the EU's outermost regions.

In the next section, knowledge of each of the outermost regions is discussed separately – it will be noted that, in **France and Spain**, respondents have a high knowledge of the outermost regions that belong to their countries. Knowledge is also high in **Luxembourg** and this for all outermost regions, those belonging to France, Spain and Portugal.

Compared to 2019, it appears that knowledge of the outermost regions has increased in a number of Member States.¹⁰ The largest increase in knowledge is observed in **France**. It should be noted that fieldwork for this Flash Eurobarometer took place in the summer of 2021, during the COVID-19 pandemic. In the year prior to the fieldwork, there was a daily reporting of COVID-19 cases and vaccination ratios across news media; in France, this often also meant an increase in attention for the overseas areas, for example when presenting the number of new infections or when giving information on travel rules and restrictions. There is also a large increase in knowledge in **Belgium**.

Q10 There are 9 EU outermost regions which are territories or islands located far away from the European continent. Which territories or islands can you name?
Knows at least one outermost region (% by country, 2021 and 2019)




Evolution 2021-2019 (comparison with Flash Eurobarometer 480, June 2019)
Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

¹⁰ Caution should, however, be exercised when interpreting the trend data. This question is an “open-ended” question meaning that interviewers do not read out possible response options. Interviewers are instructed to give the respondent time to formulate their response. Differences in interviewer probing behaviours can lead to differences in survey results. Fieldwork for the current Flash Eurobarometer is carried out by Ipsos European Public Affairs, while the 2019 survey was coordinated by Kantar.

On average, 26% of respondents name **a region that is not one of the nine EU outermost regions**. In France, this is the case for 51% of respondents (this includes, for example, respondents who name Corsica – which is part of Metropolitan France – or one of the French overseas communities that are not part of the EU – such as French Polynesia). In Greece, Sweden and Spain, between 31% and 38% of respondents name ‘another’ non-outermost region.

Q10 There are 9 EU outermost regions which are territories or islands located far away from the European continent. Which territories or islands can you name?

Names another region (% by country)



Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

The **Canary Islands**, a Spanish autonomous community, is the most mentioned answer in 23 Member States. As expected, by far the highest proportion is observed in Spain with 48% of respondents who name the Canary Islands. In Slovenia and Estonia, roughly one in four respondents name the Canary Islands (23% and 27%, respectively).

The **Azores and Madeira**, both autonomous regions of Portugal, are the most mentioned in Portugal: 29% name the Azores and 26% Madeira. In most other countries, less than one in ten respondents could name these regions. Although, in most countries, fewer respondents can name the Azores or Madeira than the number naming the Canary Islands, knowledge of the Portuguese autonomous regions seems to be a little higher than knowledge of the French overseas areas – discussed in the next paragraph.

In France, Guadeloupe, Martinique and Reunion Island are each named by a slim majority of respondents (55%-56%). French Guiana is named by 30% of respondents in France and Mayotte by 18%. The results for the remaining Member States show that, outside of France, knowledge of the **French overseas departments** is highest in Belgium and Luxembourg. As mentioned above, knowledge of these departments in Belgium is mainly higher in the French-speaking parts of the country.

Finally, **Saint-Martin**, a French overseas community, is named by 5% of respondents in France and Luxembourg, and by 8% of respondents in the Netherlands. In the Netherlands, Saint-Martin is the second most mentioned response. It is quite likely that respondents in the Netherlands were thinking about “Sint Maarten”. Saint Martin is an island in the northeast Caribbean Sea, divided between the French Republic and the Kingdom of the Netherlands. The French part of the island is part of the EU, but this is not the case for the Dutch part.

Q10 There are 9 EU outermost regions which are territories or islands located far away from the European continent. Which territories or islands can you name? (% by country)

		Canary Islands	Azores	Madeira	Guadeloupe	Martinique	Reunion	French Guiana	Mayotte	Saint Martin
EU27		14	6	6	10	10	10	8	3	2
BE		12	5	3	14	12	10	8	2	2
BG		8	4	3	1	1	1	3	1	1
CZ		14	4	5	1	2	3	6	0.4	1
DK		13	4	5	1	2	1	3	0.2	1
DE		14	6	10	3	3	4	10	2	3
EE		27	6	11	3	1	1	7	1	3
IE		11	3	4	3	2	2	6	0.2	2
EL		8	4	1	2	1	1	2	0.1	0.3
ES		48	12	10	1	2	1	4	0.0	0.0
FR		4	1	1	56	56	55	30	18	5
HR		7	3	2	1	2	1	4	0.2	1
IT		6	3	1	0.3	1	0.3	2	0.1	0.1
CY		6	3	2	1	1	1	3	1	1
LV		10	3	4	1	1	1	2	1	1
LT		6	2	3	0.3	0.3	0.4	1	1	0.3
LU		15	8	11	18	17	17	16	4	5
HU		9	3	4	1	1	1	3	0.4	1
MT		10	2	2	2	2	0.3	5	2	3
NL		19	6	4	1	1	1	3	1	8
AT		14	7	7	3	3	6	8	2	3
PL		15	6	9	1	1	1	3	2	1
PT		14	29	26	2	3	1	3	1	1
RO		2	1	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.4	1	0.0	0.2
SI		23	11	11	3	4	3	9	1	2
SK		9	3	3	1	2	1	3	0.2	0.3
FI		18	5	9	1	1	1	4	0.1	1
SE		16	3	3	2	1	1	2	0.1	1


Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

The **socio-demographic data** show that:

- Male respondents are more likely than female respondents to be able to name at least one of the EU outermost regions (37% vs 28%).
- Respondents who stayed longer in education are overall the most likely to mention at least one of the EU outermost regions (38% vs 22%-26% in the other educational groups); among those still in education, 35% could name at least one of the outermost regions.

Q10 There are 9 EU outermost regions which are territories or islands located far away from the European continent. Which territories or islands can you name?

Knows at least one outermost regions (% by socio-demographics)































Base: all respondents (n=25 706)

Technical specifications

Between 26 July and 8 August 2021, Ipsos European Public affairs carried out Flash Eurobarometer 497 at the request of the European Commission, Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy. It is a general public survey coordinated by the Directorate-General for Communication, “Media monitoring and Eurobarometer” Unit. Flash Eurobarometer 497 covers the population of EU citizens, residents in one of the 27 EU Member States and aged 15 years and over.

All interviews were carried via Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI). In each country, respondents were called both on landlines and mobile phones. The telephone numbers sampled and contacted were generated via Random Digit Dialling (RDD) methods. The basic sample design applied in all countries is a random (probability) design. In households contacted via a landline phone, the respondent was drawn at random from all household members (aged 15 years and over) following the ‘most recent birthday rule’.

Interviews took place from 9:00 until 21:00 local time on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays and Fridays. On Saturdays or Sundays, they took place from 12.00 (midday) to 18.00 local time. No interviews took place on public holidays. The fieldwork rules specified that all cases without a final call outcome (e.g. no answer, answering machine, busy, soft and hard appointment) have to be contacted at least five times to be considered a ‘final’ contact for which no further effort is required.

		Number of interviews	Fieldwork dates	Population 15+ (absolute number)	Population 15+ (as % of EU27 population)
EU27		25 706	26.07.2021-08.08.2021	379 697 871	100%
BE		1 002	26.07.21-04.08.21	9 580 326	2.52%
BG		1 023	23.07.21-30.07.21	5 949 224	1.57%
CZ		1 000	22.07.21-04.08.21	8 983 737	2.37%
DK		1 001	22.07.21-02.08.21	4 869 645	1.28%
DE		1 003	28.07.21-08.08.21	71 775 452	18.90%
EE		1 018	22.07.21-30.07.21	1 110 274	0.29%
IE		1 006	22.07.21-30.07.21	3 958 375	1.04%
EL		1 004	22.07.21-28.07.21	9 191 046	2.42%
ES		1 009	22.07.21-29.07.21	40 455 461	10.65%
FR		1 007	22.07.21-29.07.21	55 281 445	14.56%
HR		1 001	22.07.21-28.07.21	3 476 694	0.92%
IT		1 010	22.07.21-30.07.21	51 913 934	13.67%
CY		506	22.07.21-29.07.21	745 621	0.20%
LV		1 010	22.07.21-29.07.21	1 602 487	0.42%
LT		1 009	22.07.21-31.07.21	2 371 346	0.62%
LU		514	26.07.21-31.07.21	526 031	0.14%
HU		1 004	22.07.21-30.07.21	8 348 190	2.20%
MT		505	22.07.21-30.07.21	445 406	0.12%
NL		1 007	23.07.21-04.08.21	14 681 486	3.87%
AT		1 010	22.07.21-30.07.21	7 618 004	2.01%
PL		1 013	22.07.21-02.08.21	32 096 067	8.45%
PT		1 007	22.07.21-30.07.21	8 898 924	2.34%
RO		1 010	22.07.21-30.07.21	16 297 460	4.29%
SI		1 011	22.07.21-03.08.21	1 780 059	0.47%
SK		1 003	22.07.21-01.08.21	4 594 153	1.21%
FI		1 013	22.07.21-02.08.21	4 654 256	1.23%
SE		1 000	22.07.21-31.07.21	8 492 768	2.24%

Margin of error

Survey results are subject to sampling tolerances. The “margin of error” quantifies uncertainty about (or confidence in) a survey result. As a general rule, the more interviews conducted (sample size), the smaller the margin of error. A sample of 500 will produce a margin of error of not more than 4.4 percentage points, and a sample of 1,000 will produce a margin of error of not more than 3.1 percentage points.

The maximum margin of sampling error when comparing individual country results between surveys is ± 8.8 percentage points for countries with a sample size of 500 and ± 6.2 percentage points for countries with a sample size of 1,000.

Statistical margins due to sampling tolerances (at the 95% level of confidence)

various sample sizes are in rows

various observed results are in columns

	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	95%
n=50	± 6.0	± 8.3	± 12.0	± 13.9	± 12.0	± 8.3	± 6.0
n=100	± 4.3	± 5.9	± 8.5	± 9.8	± 8.5	± 5.9	± 4.3
n=200	± 3.0	± 4.2	± 6.0	± 6.9	± 6.0	± 4.2	± 3.0
n=500	± 1.9	± 2.6	± 3.8	± 4.4	± 3.8	± 2.6	± 1.9
n=1000	± 1.4	± 1.9	± 2.7	± 3.1	± 2.7	± 1.9	± 1.4
n=1500	± 1.1	± 1.5	± 2.2	± 2.5	± 2.2	± 1.5	± 1.1
n=2000	± 1.0	± 1.3	± 1.9	± 2.2	± 1.9	± 1.3	± 1.0

Questionnaire

	ASK ALL	
Q1A	Europe provides financial support to regions and cities. Have you heard about any EU co-financed projects to improve the area where you live?	
	(ONE ANSWER)	
	Yes	1
	No	2
	Don't know (DO NOT READ OUT)	3
	<i>Trend FL480 - Q1A</i>	
	ASK IF Q1A=1	
Q1B1	Where did you hear about it? Firstly?	
	(READ OUT - ONE ANSWER) (RANDOMISE 1-11)	
	National newspapers	1
	Local or regional newspapers	2
	National TV	3
	Local or regional TV	4
	National radio	5
	Local or regional radio	6
	Internet	7
	Online social networks	8
	Billboard	9
	Workplace	10
	Personal knowledge	11
	Other (DO NOT READ OUT)	12
	Don't know (DO NOT READ OUT)	13
	<i>Trend FL480 - Q1B1</i>	

ASK IF Q1B1=1 to 12

Q1B2 And then?
(READ OUT - MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE)
(EXCLUDE THE ANSWER GIVEN AT Q1B1 FROM THE LIST, CODES 1-11, SHOW ITEMS IN SAME ORDER AS IN Q1B1)

National newspapers	1
Local or regional newspapers	2
National TV	3
Local or regional TV	4
National radio	5
Local or regional radio	6
Internet	7
Online social networks	8
Billboard	9
Workplace	10
Personal knowledge	11
Other (DO NOT READ OUT)	12
No other channels (DO NOT READ OUT) (N)	13
Don't know (DO NOT READ OUT)	14

FL480 - Q1B2

ASK IF Q1A1=1

Q1C Taking into consideration all the projects you have heard about, would you say that this support has had a positive or negative impact on the development of your city or region?

(ONE ANSWER)

Positive	1
Negative	2
No impact (DO NOT READ OUT)	3
Don't know/No Answer (DO NOT READ OUT)	4

FL480 - Q1C

	ASK ALL	
Q2	Which, if any, of the following forms of EU support you've heard about before?	
	(READ OUT - MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE) (RANDOMISE 1-9)	
	The European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and/or the Cohesion Fund	1
	Interreg	2
	The European Solidarity Fund	3
	The Just Transition Fund	4
	The European Social Fund	5
	Next Generation EU/Recovery Plan/REACT EU	6
	Erasmus+	7
	Horizon Europe	8
	Connecting Europe Facility	9
	None of these (DO NOT READ OUT)	10
	Don't know (DO NOT READ OUT)	11
	<i>NEW</i>	
	ASK ALL	
Q3	Are you aware that the EU regional policy supports the economic recovery in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic?	
	(ONE ANSWER)	
	Yes	1
	No	2
	Don't know (DO NOT READ OUT)	3
	<i>NEW</i>	
	ASK ALL	
Q4A	Have you benefitted in your daily life from a project funded by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) or the Cohesion Fund?	
	(ONE ANSWER)	
	Yes	1
	No	2
	Don't know (DO NOT READ OUT)	3
	<i>FL480 - Q3 (modified, change in routing)</i>	
	ASK ALL	
Q4B	Do EU funded projects in your area make you feel like an EU citizen?	
	(ONE ANSWER)	
	Yes, to a large extent	1
	Yes, to some extent	2
	No	3
	Don't know (DO NOT READ OUT)	4
	<i>NEW</i>	

	ASK ALL	
Q5A	European regional policy supports economic development projects in all regions. In your opinion, should the EU continue to invest in all regions or concentrate exclusively on the poorer ones?	
	(READ OUT - ONE ANSWER)	
	The EU should invest in all regions	1
	The EU should only invest in the poorer regions	2
	Don't know (DO NOT READ OUT)	3
	<i>FL480 - Q4a</i>	
	ASK ALL	
Q5B	Which regions would you target for investments under EU regional policy?	
	(READ OUT - MAX. 3 ANSWERS) (RANDOMISE 1-5)	
	(ONLY IF THE RESPONDENT ASKS, EXPLAIN THAT BY "BORDER REGIONS" WE MEAN "REGIONS SHARING A BORDER WITH ANOTHER EU COUNTRY OR A COUNTRY OUTSIDE THE EU")	
	Regions with high unemployment	1
	Border regions	2
	Deprived urban areas	3
	Developed regions, in order to maintain or improve their competitiveness	4
	Remote rural or mountain areas	5
	Other (DO NOT READ OUT)	6
	Don't know (DO NOT READ OUT)	7
	<i>FL480 - Q4b</i>	
	ASK ALL	
Q6A	EU regional policy can invest in many different domains. Which of the following examples do you consider among the more important or less important for your city or region?	
	(READ OUT; ONE ANSWER PER LINE) (RANDOMISE 1-10)	
Q6A_1	Research and innovation	
Q6A_2	Support for small and medium-sized businesses	
Q6A_3	Renewable and clean energy	
Q6A_4	Broadband Internet access	
Q6A_5	Environment	
Q6A_6	Transport facilities (rail, road or airports)	
Q6A_7	Vocational training	
Q6A_8	Education, health or social infrastructures	
Q6A_9	Tourism and culture	
Q6A_10	Reception and integration of migrants and refugees	
	(RESPONSE SCALE)	
	More important	1
	Less important	2
	Don't know (DO NOT READ OUT)	3
	<i>FL480 - Q5</i>	

	ASK ALL	
Q6B	In which domains should the EU invest in the next few years?	
	(READ OUT - MAX. 3 ANSWERS)	
	(SHOW ITEMS IN SAME ORDER AS IN Q6A)	
	Research and innovation	1
	Support for small and medium-sized businesses	2
	Renewable and clean energy	3
	Broadband Internet access	4
	Environment	5
	Transport facilities (rail, road or airports)	6
	Vocational training	7
	Education, health or social infrastructures	8
	Tourism and culture	9
	Reception and integration of migrants and refugees	10
	Other (DO NOT READ OUT)	11
	Don't know (DO NOT READ OUT)	12
	<i>NEW</i>	
	ASK ALL	
Q7	At which level should decisions about EU regional policy projects primarily be taken?	
	(READ OUT - ONE ANSWER ONLY)	
	Local	1
	Regional	2
	National	3
	EU	4
	Don't know (DO NOT READ OUT)	5
	<i>FL480 - Q6</i>	
	ASK ALL	
Q8	Are you aware of cooperation between regions from different countries because of EU regional funding?	
	(ONE ANSWER ONLY)	
	Yes	1
	No	2
	Don't know (DO NOT READ OUT)	3
	<i>FL480 - Q7</i>	

ASK ALL

Q9 **Are you aware that there is an EU strategy to promote cooperation between countries in the following areas?**

(READ OUT - MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE) (RANDOMISE 1-4)

Yes, I am aware about the Baltic Sea area strategy	1
Yes, I am aware about the Danube river area strategy	2
Yes, I am aware about the Adriatic and the Ionian Sea area strategy	3
Yes, I am aware about the Alpine area strategy	4
None	5
Don't know (DO NOT READ OUT)	6

FL480 - Q10 (revised wording)

ASK ALL

Q10 **There are 9 EU outermost regions which are territories or islands located far away from the European continent. Which territories or islands can you name?**


(DO NOT READ OUT - MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE)

Azores	1
Canary Islands	2
French Guiana	3
Guadeloupe	4
Madeira	5
Martinique	6
Mayotte	7
Reunion	8
Saint Martin	9
Other	10
None	11
Don't know	12

FL480 - Q11 (revised wording)

Data annex

Q1A Europe provides financial support to regions and cities. Have you heard about any EU co-financed projects to improve the area where you live?

	Yes	No	Don't know
EU27 	41▼-2	58▲3	1=
BE 	19▼-3	79▲2	2▲1
BG 	35▼-8	64▲8	1=
CZ 	70▼-5	27▲5	3=
DK 	16▲2	81▼-3	2▲1
DE 	20▼-10	80▲13	0▼-3
EE 	60▲2	37▼-1	2▼-1
IE 	29▲4	70▼-3	0▼-1
EL 	55▲7	45▼-7	1▼-1
ES 	36▼-2	61=	3▲1
FR 	31▼-4	68▲4	1=
HR 	68=	31=	1=
IT 	56▲6	43▼-6	1=
CY 	39▲1	59▲1	2▼-1
LV 	68▲1	31▼-2	2=
LT 	68▲7	30▼-6	2▼-1
LU 	37▲2	61▼-3	2▲1
HU 	63▼-1	36▲1	2=
MT 	60▼-9	38▲11	2▼-2
NL 	18▼-2	80=	3▲2
AT 	26▲1	72▼-2	2=
PL 	82=	16▼-1	2▲1
PT 	42▲4	56▼-3	3=
RO 	47▼-2	53▲4	1▼-2
SI 	64▼-2	34▲2	2=
SK 	73▼-4	24▲2	3▲2
FI 	35▲6	64▼-5	1▼-1
SE 	26=	73▲1	2▼-1





























Q1B1 Where did you hear about it? Firstly?

		National newspapers	Local or regional newspapers	National TV	Local or regional TV	National radio	Local or regional radio	Internet	Online social networks	Billboard	Workplace	Personal knowledge	Other	Don't know
EU27		5▼-1	11▼-4	16=	7=	3=	2▼-1	14▲3	5▲2	13▲1	8▲1	10▼-1	5▼-1	2▲1
BE		11▼-2	13▲3	21▲5	7=	3▼-3	1▼-1	8▼-2	8▲3	8▲2	11▲1	3▼-7	4▼-3	3▲3
BG		0▼-2	2▼-1	26▼-3	2▼-3	2▼-1	1▼-3	17▼-1	7▲1	9▼-2	10▲3	12▲5	10▲5	2▲1
CZ		3▼-2	11▼-7	16▲1	2▼-2	2=	1=	18▲8	2=	10▲1	8=	14▼-1	7=	5▲3
DK		10=	10▼-7	9▼-6	10▲1	1▼-2	2▲1	2▼-3	3▼-4	3▲3	21▲8	13▲4	12▲3	3▲1
DE		6▲1	25▼-7	3▼-1	6▼-2	3▲3	4▼-3	5▲2	5▲3	14▲2	10▲3	12▲3	6▼-3	2▼-1
EE		5▼-2	14▼-1	12▲3	2▼-1	4▼-1	2▼-1	19▲6	4▲1	21▼-3	5=	6▼-4	5▲2	2▲1
IE		15▲3	12▼-2	7▼-2	5▲3	4▼-2	4▼-2	5▲1	3▲1	20▼-5	4▼-1	11▲3	8=	3▲2
EL		2▼-2	3▼-5	17▲4	5▲3	2=	2=	27▲8	5▲1	19▼-3	5▼-2	8▼-2	3=	0=
ES		5▼-1	11▼-5	14▲6	10▲3	6▲3	5▼-1	10▲4	4▼-1	11▼-6	5▼-5	8▲2	10▲3	0▼-3
FR		4▼-5	17▼-3	8▼-3	6▼-1	4▲2	3=	5▼-3	5▲3	19▲3	13▲6	9=	6▲1	1▲1
HR		3▲2	5=	25▼-5	6=	1▼-2	3▼-4	19▲3	9▲2	4=	8▲1	9▲1	5▲2	2▲1
IT		8▲1	8=	31=	9=	1=	1=	12=	3=	2▲1	9▼-1	10▼-2	4=	1▲1
CY		6▲1	5▲1	26▲10	3▼-4	3▼-1	2=	23▲7	5▼-2	13▲1	5▲1	6▼-10	2▼-5	1=
LV		1=	8▼-6	10▼-5	5▲1	3▼-1	4▲1	24▲6	10▲5	15▼-1	8=	8▼-1	3▼-1	2▲1
LT		1▼-2	6=	16▲2	3=	2▼-2	1▲1	20▲6	6▲3	24=	5▼-1	10▼-2	4▼-3	1=
LU		18▲2	7▼-1	10▲2	5▼-1	5▼-3	5▲2	13▲3	3=	6▼-3	0▼-1	0▼-5	0▼-2	0▲7
HU		2=	10▼-4	8▼-3	3▼-1	3=	1▼-2	23▲10	6▲3	25▼-5	4▼-2	11▲2	2=	3▲2
MT		6▲1	3▼-1	31▲2	21▼-2	2▲1	2=	10▼-1	5▲1	9▲2	3=	4▼-1	4=	2=
NL		12▲1	21▼-5	13▲7	4=	0▼-2	1=	11▲3	5▲1	6▼-9	10▲2	5▼-3	8▲4	5▲3
AT		10▲1	22▼-4	5▼-3	11▲3	2=	5=	9▲5	3▲1	7▲1	8▲1	7▼-5	4▼-3	7▲2
PL		2▼-1	5▼-3	14▼-4	8▲2	2▼-2	2▼-2	21▲2	4▲2	22▲9	6▲1	9▼-4	3▼-3	2▲1
PT		8▲1	7▼-2	26▲1	7=	2▲1	1▲1	8▼-2	2=	12=	8▼-1	10▼-1	6▼-2	4▲4
RO		2▼-4	5▼-1	18▼-5	9▼-5	1▼-1	2▼-3	19▲10	9▲7	11▲1	7▲4	13▼-5	5▲2	1=
SI		5=	11▼-2	22=	5▼-3	2=	4▲2	19▲7	4=	10▲1	8▲2	6▼-1	3▼-6	2▼-1
SK		1▼-2	5▼-4	24▲2	2▼-6	4▲2	2▼-1	20▲4	6▲3	13▲3	6▼-1	8▼-1	5▲1	2=
FI		8▼-3	34▲11	5=	4▲3	1▼-1	3▲1	9▲3	4▼-2	9▼-2	10▼-4	7▼-4	5▼-4	1=
SE		4▲1	21▼-11	2▼-3	5▲2	1▼-2	4▲3	6▲4	3▼-1	11▲5	18▲5	8▼-2	13▼-3	6▲4

Q1BT Where did you hear about it? First? And then?

		National newspapers	Local or regional newspapers	National TV	Local or regional TV	National radio	Local or regional radio	Internet	Online social networks	Billboard	Workplace	Personal knowledge	Other	Don't know
EU27		19=	27▼-6	37▲1	21▲1	15▲2	14=	38▲7	18▲6	25▲3	17▲3	25▲2	10▼-3	5▲4
BE		29▼-3	25▼-4	40=	23▼-2	21▼-2	13▼-3	25▼-1	21▲6	18▲2	19▲2	12▼-14	10▼-4	5▲4
BG		8▼-5	6▼-7	40▼-10	12=	9▼-1	5▼-7	40▲2	18▼-3	18▼-4	18▲5	25▲9	19▲7	2▲2
CZ		25▼-5	36▼-9	49▼-1	18▼-4	25▼-2	15▼-4	60▲7	28▲5	29▲2	20▼-2	41▼-2	10▼-3	6▲4
DK		17▼-1	17▼-9	16▼-11	18▲2	5▲1	6=	7▼-5	7▼-3	3▲3	24▲4	18▲3	18▲1	14▲11
DE		24▲7	44▼-11	17▼-2	24▲1	15▲7	24▲5	30▲9	16▲8	21=	20▲6	33▲15	10▼-4	5▲2
EE		18▲1	26▼-3	29▲6	8▼-2	18▲1	9▼-2	38▲2	13▲7	32▼-6	10▲3	16▼-4	7▼-3	9▲7
IE		33▲1	30▼-4	33▲5	14▲2	20▼-9	17▼-6	16▼-6	9▼-4	30▼-12	9▼-9	23▼-6	17▲3	4▲4
EL		15▼-2	20▲1	40▲7	17▲1	13▲2	13▲3	59▲19	21▲6	41▲3	16▲3	26▲2	4▼-5	1▲1
ES		21=	28▼-10	36▲11	28▲6	19▲7	16▲3	29▲9	16▲3	21▼-3	14▼-1	15▲1	14▲1	2▼-1
FR		18▼-3	43▼-3	33▲1	23▲2	20▲2	17▲2	29▲7	15▲8	31▲8	22▲9	30▲7	9▼-4	4▲4
HR		16▲2	18▼-1	51▼-5	22▲3	11▼-3	17▼-7	48▲7	27▲8	10▲1	15▲5	17=	9▲1	4▲3
IT		28▲7	20▲4	47▲2	24▲6	10▲6	8▲5	32▲5	14▲5	5▲2	18▲3	25▲6	9▼-3	8▲7
CY		14▼-5	10▼-1	42▲2	15=	11▼-3	6▲1	46▲13	21▲8	24▲4	9▲1	13▼-12	6▼-16	14▲13
LV		6▼-6	26▼-8	25▼-15	18▲4	14▼-6	12▲2	51▲6	26▲13	25▼-4	16▼-1	19▼-3	7▼-4	4▲3
LT		10▼-2	17▲1	41▲4	11▲4	14▲2	7▲4	47▲14	24▲15	44▲10	11▲1	29▲8	9▼-6	2=
LU		34▲4	25▲5	25=	17▲2	14▼-6	12▲5	29▲7	13▲4	13▼-8	0▼-2	0▼-3	0▼-2	0▲13
HU		8▼-1	21▼-8	28▼-2	9▼-6	13▲1	6▼-5	44▲11	16▲6	45▼-6	9▼-1	23▲1	5▼-1	4▲3
MT		14▲3	11▼-1	47▲5	33▼-3	11▲3	8=	31▲3	19▲9	20▲5	7=	10▲1	10▼-2	3▲1
NL		20▼-4	27▼-14	22▼-1	8▼-5	2▼-7	2▼-6	24▲2	8▼-1	8▼-16	14▼-1	9▼-7	13▼-1	12▲10
AT		23▼-2	36▼-8	18▲2	22▲3	10▲4	11▼-1	25▲5	11▲1	10▲1	17▲1	12▼-3	9▼-6	12▲8
PL		13▼-4	20▼-12	38▼-7	20▼-3	13▼-5	13▼-7	50▼-1	18▲3	43▲12	14▼-1	23▼-6	10▼-3	4▲3
PT		20▼-1	18=	41▼-4	13▲2	5=	5▲1	19▲2	9=	17▼-1	12▼-1	18▼-1	13▼-5	11▲11
RO		13▼-5	25▲6	47▼-1	31▼-2	18▲6	21▲8	53▲21	37▲25	30▲9	20▲9	38▼-2	10▲2	1▲1
SI		22▲5	30▲1	46▼-1	17▼-3	17▲5	21▲9	47▲18	19▲11	19▼-3	14▲4	14▲3	8▼-9	6▲3
SK		13▼-1	30▲8	63▲19	18▼-4	34▲18	14▲2	63▲23	36▲25	36▲15	20▲8	33▲17	11=	3▲1
FI		18▼-3	49▲7	14▼-1	10▲5	8=	9▲2	25▲8	11▼-3	15▼-2	13▼-7	13▼-3	10▼-6	4▲3
SE		14▲2	39▼-9	12▼-1	12▼-1	7▼-1	14▲5	23▲15	15▲4	17▲8	24▲7	18▲2	22▼-5	10▲8





























Q1C Taking into consideration all the projects you have heard about, would you say that this support has had a positive or negative impact on the development of your city or region?

		Positive	Negative	No impact	Don't know / No answer
EU27		80=	6=	7▼-1	7▲1
BE		75▼-4	5▼-3	7▼-1	13▲8
BG		82▼-5	7▼-1	5▲3	6▲3
CZ		89▲3	5▼-2	1=	4▼-2
DK		67▼-1	5▲2	12▼-4	17▲2
DE		89▼-1	4▲1	4▲1	3▼-1
EE		89▼-2	3▲2	4▲2	5▼-1
IE		92▼-4	2▲1	1=	5▲4
EL		88▲4	8▼-1	3▼-3	1▼-1
ES		78▼-5	5▼-3	10▲5	7▲3
FR		79▲4	7▼-1	2▼-7	12▲4
HR		88▲2	4▼-2	3▼-2	5▲2
IT		57▲5	14▼-1	19▼-5	11=
CY		91▼-3	4▲1	2▲1	3▲1
LV		90▲1	3=	4▲1	3▼-2
LT		92▲4	2=	3▼-1	4▼-3
LU		81▼-3	4▲1	7▼-1	8▲3
HU		91▲1	4▲1	2▼-1	3=
MT		91▼-1	5▲3	2▼-2	2▼-1
NL		65▼-16	9▲5	8▲2	18▲9
AT		82▼-9	3▲2	9▲5	6▲3
PL		95=	1▼-2	1▲1	3=
PT		76▼-2	5=	8▼-2	11▲4
RO		87▲4	9▲2	2▼-5	2▼-1
SI		91▲1	4▲1	2▼-2	3=
SK		85▼-1	6▲2	4▼-1	6▼-1
FI		87▼-3	2▲1	5▲1	6▲1
SE		82=	4▲2	5▼-2	9=





























Q2 Which, if any, of the following forms of EU support you've heard about before?

	The European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and/or the Cohesion Fund	Interreg	The European Solidarity Fund	The Just Transition Fund	The European Social Fund	Next Generation EU/Recovery Plan/REACT EU	Erasmus+	Horizon Europe	Connecting Europe Facility	None of these	Don't know
EU27	49	10	49	11	49	34	58	11	10	14	1
BE	35	9	57	9	42	29	60	14	7	15	1
BG	64	9	25	12	30	33	48	17	12	17	1
CZ	72	6	50	11	46	26	63	10	13	10	0
DK	22	7	18	6	18	22	39	10	7	35	1
DE	32	9	42	5	39	16	45	8	6	26	1
EE	63	10	30	19	42	9	55	9	18	14	2
IE	63	10	43	12	55	42	56	20	8	10	1
EL	77	19	79	12	65	39	78	15	12	3	0
ES	53	10	48	9	72	59	58	12	8	7	0
FR	37	5	60	13	47	24	70	11	8	11	0
HR	77	11	56	13	46	34	45	9	13	7	2
IT	53	11	61	10	64	56	70	15	16	4	1
CY	49	11	56	7	45	41	84	14	11	4	2
LV	61	8	25	4	37	18	62	9	21	11	4
LT	55	7	23	6	43	48	53	8	41	13	2
LU	49	17	57	12	51	43	57	26	16	11	1
HU	67	13	39	10	41	32	50	11	20	16	1
MT	52	8	48	17	53	34	65	17	26	17	2
NL	21	4	21	5	23	12	22	5	4	44	3
AT	36	16	50	11	53	36	61	15	13	13	1
PL	79	17	50	30	53	49	65	13	10	7	1
PT	57	16	39	10	54	30	70	16	11	4	2
RO	70	19	50	12	45	28	43	9	17	12	1
SI	77	17	45	13	50	36	74	14	14	5	1
SK	86	12	52	12	68	58	71	12	17	4	1
FI	61	9	26	9	33	24	60	8	8	14	1
SE	37	10	26	11	17	24	39	9	12	27	1





























Q3 Are you aware that the EU regional policy supports the economic recovery in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic?

	Yes	No	Don't know
EU27 	69	30	2
BE 	64	33	3
BG 	71	28	1
CZ 	63	33	4
DK 	50	48	1
DE 	63	35	2
EE 	71	27	2
IE 	66	33	2
EL 	75	22	3
ES 	72	27	1
FR 	68	32	0
HR 	73	27	1
IT 	75	25	1
CY 	76	21	3
LV 	75	23	3
LT 	75	22	3
LU 	68	31	1
HU 	75	21	3
MT 	78	21	2
NL 	44	52	5
AT 	70	29	2
PL 	77	21	2
PT 	67	31	2
RO 	70	29	1
SI 	78	19	3
SK 	68	28	4
FI 	85	15	1
SE 	63	37	1




























Q4A Have you benefitted in your daily life from a project funded by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) or the Cohesion Fund?

	Yes	No	Don't know
EU27 	16	80	4
BE 	5	92	4
BG 	29	66	5
CZ 	39	54	7
DK 	6	75	19
DE 	10	89	2
EE 	34	55	11
IE 	28	68	5
EL 	22	75	4
ES 	11	86	3
FR 	4	93	3
HR 	19	79	1
IT 	12	86	2
CY 	15	82	3
LV 	32	63	5
LT 	24	72	4
LU 	14	81	5
HU 	22	71	6
MT 	23	70	6
NL 	6	80	14
AT 	14	80	6
PL 	58	35	7
PT 	17	80	3
RO 	12	87	1
SI 	32	62	6
SK 	37	58	6
FI 	18	76	6
SE 	8	86	6





























Q4B Do EU funded projects in your area make you feel like an EU citizen?

		Yes, to a large extent	Yes, to some extent	No	Don't know
EU27		21	38	38	4
BE		10	31	53	6
BG		15	38	44	3
CZ		18	50	30	2
DK		8	28	52	12
DE		32	28	37	3
EE		22	45	28	6
IE		24	35	38	3
EL		15	47	36	2
ES		17	45	34	4
FR		10	43	42	4
HR		10	51	36	4
IT		24	35	39	2
CY		15	41	36	9
LV		24	46	27	2
LT		27	46	23	4
LU		30	36	31	3
HU		14	45	38	3
MT		26	43	28	3
NL		5	18	69	9
AT		29	32	37	3
PL		47	36	15	3
PT		17	41	38	4
RO		10	49	39	2
SI		22	49	27	2
SK		19	49	29	3
FI		9	45	44	2
SE		11	41	45	4


Q5A European regional policy supports economic development projects in all regions. In your opinion, should the EU continue to invest in all regions or concentrate exclusively on the poorer ones?

		The EU should invest in all regions	The EU should only invest in the poorer regions	Don't know
EU27		64▲3	33▼-3	4▼-1
BE		61▲3	36▼-1	4▼-2
BG		49▲9	47▼-9	4=
CZ		58▼-4	35▲3	7▲1
DK		55▼-2	32▲1	13▲2
DE		66=	31▲1	3▼-1
EE		60▲7	35▼-4	5▼-3
IE		58▲1	39▲1	3▼-1
EL		65▲5	34▼-3	1▼-2
ES		62▲12	35▼-11	3▼-1
FR		67▲5	30▼-5	4▼-1
HR		60▲4	38▼-4	2▲1
IT		68▲1	30=	2▼-1
CY		61▲5	37▼-4	2▼-1
LV		69▲7	26▼-7	5=
LT		58▲6	37▼-1	5▼-5
LU		65▼-4	32▲5	3▼-1
HU		62▲11	36▼-10	2▼-1
MT		68▲10	29▼-11	4▲1
NL		53▼-3	37=	10▲3
AT		64▼-1	31▲1	5▼-1
PL		71▲5	24▼-6	5▲1
PT		48=	49▼-1	3▲1
RO		58▲1	41▼-2	1=
SI		59▲4	39▼-3	2▼-2
SK		55▲2	42▼-2	2▼-1
FI		70▲5	25▼-2	5▼-2
SE		69▲3	26▲2	6▼-5






















Q5B Which regions would you target for investments under EU regional policy?

		Regions with high unemployment	Border regions	Deprived urban areas	Developed regions, in order to maintain or improve their competitiveness	Remote rural or mountain areas	Other	Don't know
EU27		69▲1	23▲2	55▲3	22▲2	54=	1=	3=
BE		74▲10	23▼-2	66▲9	29▲1	45▲3	1▼-1	4▼-1
BG		58▼-17	18▼-7	23▼-12	8▼-5	52▼-11	5▲3	4▲1
CZ		73▲8	43▲3	59▲7	19=	58=	1=	3▼-2
DK		60▼-1	20▲2	44▲1	20▼-1	37▲1	3▲1	12▲1
DE		69▼-4	29▲1	50▲2	26▼-3	58▼-7	1=	2▲1
EE		71▲4	47▲3	39▲8	18▲3	60▼-3	2▲1	3▼-1
IE		62▼-4	29▲3	55▼-12	19▼-2	54▼-2	1=	3=
EL		76▲9	57▲11	52▲5	17▲5	66▲14	0▼-1	1▼-2
ES		81▲4	30▲8	69▲12	23▲7	64▲7	0▼-1	2▼-1
FR		62▼-6	12▼-4	59▲2	20▼-2	59▼-10	1=	2=
HR		74▼-4	18▼-4	41▲2	19▲5	66▲2	2=	2▲1
IT		72▲4	13▲3	51▲7	21▲2	35▲10	2=	3=
CY		73▲13	24▲7	61▲14	17▲7	79▲10	1▼-2	3▲1
LV		56=	37▼-3	41▼-3	24▼-1	44▼-3	1▼-1	2▼-1
LT		69▲13	36▲28	53▲20	17▲4	48▲8	1▼-6	2▼-4
LU		61▼-10	29▲1	58▼-2	24▼-1	39▼-3	2▼-1	2▼-2
HU		80▲7	27▲5	64▲3	20▲2	45▲7	0▼-1	2▼-1
MT		62▲11	27▲12	43▲3	26▲5	38▲19	2▼-1	6▼-4
NL		65▼-9	23▼-7	56▼-3	16▼-5	39▼-6	1=	10▲6
AT		66▼-8	36▲2	41=	20▼-1	62▼-9	1=	3▲1
PL		66▲2	21▲1	53▼-4	28▲8	53▼-2	3=	3=
PT		68▼-5	12▼-1	59▼-4	15▲1	55▼-7	0▼-1	3=
RO		62▲7	18▲6	68▼-5	18▲8	66▲2	1▼-1	2▲1
SI		75▲3	34▲1	36▲2	16▲3	71▲4	1▼-1	3▼-1
SK		84▲26	27▲15	58▲17	28▲18	64▲28	1▼-3	1▼-4
FI		67▲2	28▼-1	50▲1	27▲3	54▼-1	0▼-1	2=
SE		72▲11	23▲1	42▲6	23▲7	51▲1	1=	4▼-3





























Q6A_1 EU regional policy can invest in many different domains. Which of the following examples do you consider among the more important or less important for your city or region? Research and innovation

	More important	Less important	Don't know
EU27 	85▲3	14▼-3	1▼-1
BE 	81▲5	18▼-5	1=
BG 	78▲7	19▼-4	3▼-3
CZ 	81▲6	19▼-4	1▼-2
DK 	79▼-1	16▼-1	5▲2
DE 	87▲5	13▼-5	1=
EE 	78▲1	18▲2	4▼-3
IE 	76▲7	23▼-7	1▼-1
EL 	75▼-2	23▲3	1▼-2
ES 	92▲4	8▼-3	1▼-1
FR 	79▲2	20▼-2	1=
HR 	77▼-3	22▲3	1=
IT 	95▲2	5▼-2	0=
CY 	76▲4	20▼-5	4▲1
LV 	69▲7	29▼-4	3▼-4
LT 	83▲4	14▼-3	3▼-1
LU 	85▲6	14▼-6	1=
HU 	82▼-3	17▲4	1▼-1
MT 	87=	12▲1	1▼-1
NL 	79▲4	18▼-5	3▲1
AT 	87▲6	13▼-5	0▼-1
PL 	83▲1	15▼-2	2▲1
PT 	89▲5	10▼-4	2▼-1
RO 	79▲8	20▼-7	1▼-1
SI 	84▲6	15▼-5	1▼-1
SK 	83▲3	16▼-1	1▼-1
FI 	80▲3	19▼-1	1▼-1
SE 	85▲4	14▼-3	1▼-1





























Q6A_2 EU regional policy can invest in many different domains. Which of the following examples do you consider among the more important or less important for your city or region? Support for small and medium-sized businesses

	More important	Less important	Don't know
EU27 	85▲3	15▼-2	1▼-1
BE 	77▲3	22▼-3	1=
BG 	90▲1	9=	1▼-1
CZ 	84▲3	16▼-2	1▼-2
DK 	62▲5	31▼-6	7▲1
DE 	80▲1	19▼-1	1▼-1
EE 	77▲4	19▼-3	4▼-1
IE 	89▲5	11▼-4	0▼-1
EL 	87=	12=	1=
ES 	93▲5	7▼-4	0▼-1
FR 	86▲5	13▼-5	1=
HR 	89▼-1	10▲1	1=
IT 	90▲1	10=	0▼-1
CY 	91▲4	8▼-3	1▼-1
LV 	89▲4	9▼-4	2▲1
LT 	80▲1	18▲3	2▼-4
LU 	84▲6	15▼-6	1=
HU 	84▼-1	15▲2	1▼-1
MT 	88▲2	11▼-1	1▼-1
NL 	70▲10	27▼-9	3=
AT 	88▼-2	11▲2	1=
PL 	87▲3	12▼-2	1▼-1
PT 	93▲4	6▼-3	1▼-1
RO 	85▲6	14▼-5	1▼-2
SI 	85▲3	13▼-3	3=
SK 	83▲8	16▼-7	1▼-1
FI 	77▲3	21▼-2	2▼-1
SE 	65▲6	34▼-4	1▼-2






Q6A_3 EU regional policy can invest in many different domains. Which of the following examples do you consider among the more important or less important for your city or region? Renewable and clean energy

	More important	Less important	Don't know
EU27 	87=	12▲1	1▼-1
BE 	85▼-2	15▲3	1▼-1
BG 	80▲9	16▼-6	4▼-3
CZ 	78▲4	21▼-1	1▼-3
DK 	86▼-5	10▲3	3▲2
DE 	90▲3	10▼-2	0=
EE 	71▼-5	23▲6	6=
IE 	91▲2	8▼-2	1▼-1
EL 	83▼-1	17▲3	1▼-2
ES 	87▼-3	13▲4	1▼-1
FR 	81▼-4	18▲5	1▼-1
HR 	88▼-1	10▲1	2▲1
IT 	92▲1	7=	0▼-1
CY 	91▲1	8▲1	1▼-1
LV 	67▲3	29=	4▼-3
LT 	80▼-7	17▲8	3▼-1
LU 	94▲1	6=	0▼-1
HU 	87▼-4	12▲4	1=
MT 	95▼-3	4▲2	1▲1
NL 	84▲5	14▼-5	2=
AT 	91▼-1	8▲1	1=
PL 	88▲1	11=	1▼-1
PT 	93▲2	6▼-1	2▼-1
RO 	89▼-2	11▲4	0▼-2
SI 	93▲2	7▼-1	1=
SK 	83=	16▲2	2▼-2
FI 	87▼-1	12▲1	1▼-1
SE 	87▲2	12▼-1	1▼-1






















Q6A_4 EU regional policy can invest in many different domains. Which of the following examples do you consider among the more important or less important for your city or region? Broadband Internet access

	More important	Less important	Don't know
EU27 	59▲7	38▼-6	3▼-1
BE 	42▲1	56=	2▼-1
BG 	58▲8	37▼-3	5▼-5
CZ 	40▲3	59▲1	1▼-4
DK 	47=	47▼-2	5▲2
DE 	77▲11	22▼-10	1▼-1
EE 	53=	43▲3	4▼-3
IE 	73▲3	25▼-3	2=
EL 	52▲6	45▼-1	3▼-5
ES 	48▲13	48▼-11	4▼-2
FR 	50▲1	47▼-1	3=
HR 	63▼-3	36▲3	2=
IT 	62▲8	34▼-6	4▼-2
CY 	46=	47▼-1	8▲1
LV 	51▲13	44▼-9	5▼-4
LT 	44▼-3	48▲4	8▼-1
LU 	45▲4	54▼-2	1▼-2
HU 	60▲2	39▼-2	1=
MT 	71▲5	27▼-1	2▼-3
NL 	44▲6	50▼-7	6▲2
AT 	60▲8	38▼-7	2▼-1
PL 	65▲6	34▼-5	1▼-1
PT 	55▲13	39▼-11	6▼-1
RO 	66▲14	33▼-10	1▼-4
SI 	62▲5	37▼-4	1▼-2
SK 	46▲2	52=	2▼-2
FI 	50▲5	49▼-4	2▼-1
SE 	63▲7	36▼-5	1▼-2






Q6A_5 EU regional policy can invest in many different domains. Which of the following examples do you consider among the more important or less important for your city or region? Environment

	More important	Less important	Don't know
EU27 	91=	8=	1=
BE 	91▲2	8▼-2	1=
BG 	92▲1	7▼-1	1=
CZ 	92=	8=	0=
DK 	85▼-5	11▲3	4▲2
DE 	92▲1	8=	0=
EE 	84▼-5	14▲5	3=
IE 	92▲2	8▼-3	1=
EL 	92=	7=	1=
ES 	89▼-2	11▲2	0=
FR 	87▼-1	11▲1	2=
HR 	89▼-1	11▲1	1=
IT 	94▼-1	6▲1	0=
CY 	94▲1	6▼-1	0=
LV 	85▲2	14▼-1	1▼-1
LT 	81▼-1	17▲2	2▼-1
LU 	94=	6▲1	0=
HU 	92▼-2	7▲2	1▲1
MT 	97▼-1	3▲1	0=
NL 	87▲1	11▼-1	2=
AT 	94▼-1	6▲1	0=
PL 	92▲2	7▼-3	0=
PT 	96=	4▲1	1=
RO 	92=	7▼-1	1▲1
SI 	95▲4	4▼-4	1=
SK 	93▼-1	6▲2	0=
FI 	90▲4	10▼-3	0▼-1
SE 	89=	11▲1	1▼-1


Q6A_6 EU regional policy can invest in many different domains. Which of the following examples do you consider among the more important or less important for your city or region? Transport facilities (rail, road or airports)

		More important	Less important	Don't know
EU27	 ---->	75▼-2	24▲2	1=
BE	 ---->	64▼-8	35▲8	1=
BG	 ---->	83▲4	16▼-4	1=
CZ	 ---->	79=	20▲1	1▼-1
DK	 ---->	59▼-3	36▲1	5▲2
DE	 ---->	73▼-3	27▲4	1=
EE	 ---->	73▼-7	25▲8	2▼-1
IE	 ---->	81▲6	18▼-5	1▼-1
EL	 ---->	75▼-4	24▲4	0=
ES	 ---->	64=	36▲1	1▼-1
FR	 ---->	65▲1	33▼-1	2=
HR	 ---->	84▼-3	16▲3	0=
IT	 ---->	87▲1	13▼-1	0=
CY	 ---->	73▲6	25▼-7	1▲1
LV	 ---->	78▼-2	21▲2	2=
LT	 ---->	75▼-2	23▲4	2▼-2
LU	 ---->	79▲6	21▼-6	1=
HU	 ---->	81▼-4	19▲4	1=
MT	 ---->	86=	13▲1	1=
NL	 ---->	61▼-4	36▲3	3▲2
AT	 ---->	74▲3	25▼-3	1=
PL	 ---->	84▼-2	15▲2	1=
PT	 ---->	83▲3	16▼-3	1▼-1
RO	 ---->	92▼-6	7▲6	0=
SI	 ---->	83▼-5	16▲4	1=
SK	 ---->	87▲2	12▼-1	1=
FI	 ---->	81▲3	18▼-2	0▼-1
SE	 ---->	67▼-3	32▲5	1▼-2






















Q6A_7 EU regional policy can invest in many different domains. Which of the following examples do you consider among the more important or less important for your city or region? Vocational training

	More important	Less important	Don't know
EU27 	81▲2	18▼-1	1▼-1
BE 	83=	17▲1	0▼-1
BG 	88▲1	11=	1▼-1
CZ 	57▲6	42▼-3	1▼-3
DK 	64▼-5	29▲2	7▲4
DE 	82▼-1	18=	0=
EE 	77▼-5	20▲6	3▼-1
IE 	76▲7	22▼-8	2▲1
EL 	80▼-4	20▲5	1=
ES 	89▲2	10▼-2	1▼-1
FR 	80=	19▲1	1▼-1
HR 	88▼-1	12▲1	1▼-1
IT 	90▲4	10▼-3	1▼-1
CY 	83▼-3	15▲3	1=
LV 	76▼-4	22▲4	1=
LT 	84▲5	14▼-2	2▼-3
LU 	86▲1	14▼-1	0▼-1
HU 	89▼-4	10▲4	1=
MT 	79▼-1	18▲1	3=
NL 	80▲6	18▼-7	2▲1
AT 	87▲2	13▼-2	1=
PL 	68▼-1	30▲1	2=
PT 	92▲2	8▼-1	1▼-1
RO 	68▲10	31▼-4	2▼-6
SI 	82▲1	17▼-2	1▲1
SK 	79▲6	20▼-1	1▼-5
FI 	83=	16▲1	1▼-1
SE 	71▲7	27▼-7	2=

Q6A_8 EU regional policy can invest in many different domains. Which of the following examples do you consider among the more important or less important for your city or region? Education, health or social infrastructures

	More important	Less important	Don't know
EU27 	92▲1	8▼-1	1=
BE 	92▲2	8▼-2	1=
BG 	96▲1	4▼-1	1▼-1
CZ 	93=	7=	0▼-1
DK 	78▼-7	18▲5	5▲2
DE 	92▼-1	8▲1	0=
EE 	92▼-4	7▲3	1=
IE 	94=	5▲1	0=
EL 	93▼-1	7▲1	1=
ES 	96▲2	4▼-2	0=
FR 	85▲5	14▼-5	1=
HR 	96▼-1	4▲1	0=
IT 	94▼-1	6▲1	0=
CY 	91▲3	7▼-3	2=
LV 	96▲1	3=	1=
LT 	95▲2	4▼-1	1▼-1
LU 	92▲1	9▼-1	0=
HU 	95▼-2	4▲2	0=
MT 	94▼-2	5▲2	1=
NL 	92▲2	7▼-2	1=
AT 	93▲1	6▼-1	1=
PL 	91▲1	8▼-1	1=
PT 	98=	2=	1=
RO 	96▲1	4▼-1	0=
SI 	94▲3	6▼-3	0▼-1
SK 	96▲2	4▼-1	0▼-1
FI 	92▲1	7▼-1	1=
SE 	85▲11	14▼-8	2▼-3





























Q6A_9 EU regional policy can invest in many different domains. Which of the following examples do you consider among the more important or less important for your city or region? Tourism and culture

	More important	Less important	Don't know
EU27 	64▲5	35▼-5	1=
BE 	52▲2	47▼-1	1=
BG 	83▲6	17▼-6	1▼-1
CZ 	52▲5	48▼-3	1▼-2
DK 	46▲6	49▼-8	6▲2
DE 	48▲6	52▼-5	0▼-1
EE 	67▲3	29▼-3	3=
IE 	68▲10	31▼-9	2▼-1
EL 	73▼-7	26▲7	1=
ES 	71▲11	28▼-11	1▼-1
FR 	60▲10	39▼-9	1=
HR 	74▲1	25▼-1	1▲1
IT 	87▲1	13▼-1	1=
CY 	79▼-1	21▲1	1▼-1
LV 	67▲4	33▼-4	1=
LT 	67▼-4	31▲7	2▼-2
LU 	59▲8	41▼-7	0▼-1
HU 	64▼-2	35▲2	1=
MT 	83▼-3	16▲2	1=
NL 	47▲5	51▼-6	2▲1
AT 	60▲11	39▼-10	1▼-1
PL 	65▲7	34▼-7	1=
PT 	80▲5	19▼-5	1▼-1
RO 	81▼-1	19▲2	0▼-1
SI 	78▲4	22▼-3	1▼-1
SK 	71▼-2	28▲3	1▼-1
FI 	52▲14	46▼-13	1▼-1
SE 	44▼-2	54▲2	1=

Q6A_10 EU regional policy can invest in many different domains. Which of the following examples do you consider among the more important or less important for your city or region? Reception and integration of migrants and refugees

	More important	Less important	Don't know
EU27 	54▲6	43▼-5	3▼-1
BE 	64▲6	34▼-4	2▼-2
BG 	17▲6	76▼-1	7▼-5
CZ 	18▲1	81▲7	1▼-8
DK 	63▲1	30▼-2	7▲1
DE 	74▲8	24▼-8	2▼-1
EE 	23▼-1	70▲3	7▼-2
IE 	68▲8	30▼-6	2▼-2
EL 	53▲9	45▼-6	2▼-3
ES 	60▲3	37▼-1	2▼-2
FR 	54▲6	42▼-5	5▼-1
HR 	30▲2	65▼-3	5▲1
IT 	58▲5	40▼-4	2▼-1
CY 	47▼-2	49▲2	3▼-1
LV 	18▲5	77▼-6	5▲2
LT 	34▲11	61▼-7	6▼-4
LU 	80▲10	20▼-8	0▼-3
HU 	21▲7	77▼-3	2▼-5
MT 	71▲4	25▼-1	4▼-3
NL 	65▲5	31▼-8	5▲3
AT 	62▲11	36▼-8	2▼-3
PL 	29▲8	67▼-9	4▲2
PT 	65▲12	30▼-8	4▼-3
RO 	19▼-7	78▲10	3▼-3
SI 	38▲8	58▼-6	4▼-3
SK 	17▼-2	81▲9	2▼-7
FI 	61▲9	37▼-7	2▼-2
SE 	77▲6	22▼-3	1▼-3



Q6B In which domains should the EU invest in the next few years?

		Research and innovation	Support for small and medium-sized businesses	Renewable and clean energy	Broadband Internet access	Environment	Transport facilities (rail, road or airports)	Vocational training	Education, health or social infrastructures	Tourism and culture	Reception and integration of migrants and refugees	Other	Don't know
EU27		28	29	33	12	42	25	22	50	13	17	1	1
BE		24	23	39	8	51	17	27	54	9	27	2	1
BG		14	39	16	6	29	25	28	64	23	2	2	1
CZ		31	34	31	7	52	35	9	69	13	5	1	0
DK		23	14	39	7	50	14	13	33	8	28	2	8
DE		28	19	34	19	46	23	25	48	7	25	1	1
EE		32	26	24	12	33	27	24	64	16	4	1	3
IE		20	26	35	22	40	24	16	38	14	18	2	2
EL		21	40	28	8	52	20	23	51	21	22	0	1
ES		39	45	31	5	33	17	25	62	12	22	1	0
FR		26	32	34	10	44	21	22	45	9	19	1	1
HR		17	38	30	10	30	32	24	59	20	4	2	2
IT		30	28	32	14	39	25	25	36	23	13	1	3
CY		24	35	35	5	56	14	29	48	25	12	1	1
LV		16	46	16	7	27	32	21	73	19	2	0	1
LT		33	31	32	4	20	25	26	72	15	11	1	1
LU		29	32	35	11	41	21	25	30	11	23	1	2
HU		26	32	33	10	30	25	30	74	12	3	1	1
MT		21	20	33	8	56	22	15	49	23	24	1	3
NL		22	17	31	4	55	13	24	61	7	23	1	4
AT		28	25	38	14	47	19	27	43	12	16	1	1
PL		29	33	45	12	43	35	16	46	11	6	0	1
PT		22	30	25	10	31	19	25	51	21	16	4	4
RO		15	27	25	10	31	62	8	62	24	2	1	1
SI		23	28	40	10	45	31	14	59	17	8	0	1
SK		32	34	30	6	54	35	13	67	18	1	1	0
FI		31	25	37	6	40	22	25	61	6	21	1	1
SE		30	18	31	9	52	21	16	39	5	42	1	2





























Q7 At which level should decisions about EU regional policy projects primarily be taken?

		Local	Regional	National	EU	Don't know
EU27		23▼-1	32=	20▼-1	21▲3	4▼-1
BE		17▲2	27▲3	23▲3	30▼-6	3▼-2
BG		32▼-6	17▼-4	24▲5	22▲5	6▼-1
CZ		32▼-8	38▲6	17▲1	10▲4	3▼-3
DK		17▲1	30▲5	30▼-7	14▼-2	10▲2
DE		18▼-5	40▲1	15▼-1	24▲6	3▼-1
EE		34▲5	19▼-4	30▼-3	11▲3	7▼-1
IE		26▼-2	21▼-1	32▲3	18▼-1	3▲1
EL		29=	24=	23▼-3	22▲5	2▼-2
ES		18▼-2	26▲1	21▼-5	30▲7	4▼-1
FR		24▲1	39▲1	16▼-1	18▼-1	3=
HR		30▼-8	26▲1	19▲1	21▲5	4▲1
IT		18▼-3	32▼-1	23▲2	24▲2	4▼-1
CY		26▼-5	12▼-1	27=	28▲4	6▲2
LV		28▲3	21▲2	31=	17▼-3	4▼-2
LT		29=	17=	27▲6	20=	8▼-6
LU		11▲1	22▼-2	28▼-1	35▲2	4=
HU		34▲4	19▼-1	20▲1	23▼-4	3▼-1
MT		21▼-7	9▼-1	42▲5	23▲4	5▼-1
NL		20▲2	34▼-7	22▼-5	18▲5	7▲5
AT		14▼-5	37▲1	25▲1	19▲4	4=
PL		39▲2	31▼-2	16▼-4	10▲3	4▲1
PT		19▼-1	26▼-2	28▲2	20▲1	7▲1
RO		34▲8	17▼-6	23▼-10	24▲8	3=
SI		27▼-7	31▲7	24▼-3	15▲4	3▼-1
SK		26▲1	37▲6	18▼-1	15▲1	4▼-8
FI		24▲2	22▲1	42▲4	10▼-3	2▼-4
SE		20▲4	31▲1	32▼-1	14=	4▼-3

Q8 Are you aware of cooperation between regions from different countries because of EU regional funding?

	Yes	No	Don't know
EU27  ----->	26▲1	73▼-1	2▼-1
BE  ----->	15▼-5	83▲3	3▲2
BG  ----->	28▼-2	70▲3	2▼-1
CZ  ----->	53▲1	45▼-1	2▼-1
DK  ----->	16▲7	81▼-9	3▲3
DE  ----->	22▲2	77▲1	1▼-2
EE  ----->	25▼-2	71▲5	4▼-4
IE  ----->	33▲3	65▼-3	3▲1
EL  ----->	21▲8	75▼-10	4▲2
ES  ----->	22=	77▼-1	1=
FR  ----->	15▼-1	84▲1	1=
HR  ----->	40▼-3	59▲3	2=
IT  ----->	18▲2	81▼-2	1=
CY  ----->	17▲3	75▼-8	9▲6
LV  ----->	56▼-3	41▲2	3▲1
LT  ----->	34▲5	63▼-6	4▲1
LU  ----->	37▼-8	60▲8	3=
HU  ----->	27▼-2	70▲1	4▲1
MT  ----->	51▼-2	43▲4	7▼-2
NL  ----->	22▲1	76▼-3	3▲2
AT  ----->	30▲4	66▼-5	3▲1
PL  ----->	64▲6	34▼-5	1▼-1
PT  ----->	27=	69▼-1	4▲1
RO  ----->	26▲4	73▼-3	1▼-2
SI  ----->	31▼-2	68▲3	1▼-1
SK  ----->	33=	63▼-1	5=
FI  ----->	28▲8	71▼-6	1▼-2
SE  ----->	18=	81▲2	1▼-2

Q9 Are you aware that there is an EU strategy to promote cooperation between countries in the following areas?

	Yes, I am aware about the Baltic Sea area strategy	Yes, I am aware about the Danube river area strategy	Yes, I am aware about the Adriatic and the Ionian Sea area strategy	Yes, I am aware about the Alpine area strategy	None	Don't know
EU27 	13▼-2	8▼-1	7▼-1	9=	69▲16	6▼-15
BE 	9▼-5	6▼-3	6▼-5	7▼-4	77▲9	5▼-3
BG 	8=	21▼-1	8▲5	7▲3	71▲45	2▼-45
CZ 	11▼-1	18▲2	6▼-1	14▲4	65▲31	4▼-37
DK 	17▼-4	4▲1	4=	4=	75▲3	4▼-1
DE 	17▼-4	8▼-3	4▼-5	12▼-6	74▲27	1▼-18
EE 	45▼-3	4▼-4	4▼-1	4▼-3	51▲12	4▼-9
IE 	12▼-2	7▼-2	7▼-4	8▼-3	75▲1	4▲2
EL 	8▼-1	8▼-1	17▲6	4=	12▼-44	65▲41
ES 	6▲2	5▲3	4▲2	4▲2	88▲20	1▼-24
FR 	5▼-4	4▼-3	5▼-2	12▼-2	80▲11	1▼-7
HR 	19▲6	25▲2	42▲11	17▲5	37▲7	11▼-16
IT 	4▼-2	4▲1	10▲2	9▲4	70▲2	13▼-6
CY 	6▼-1	4▼-2	6▲1	3▼-1	23▼-26	65▲26
LV 	41▲2	5=	6▲2	4=	37▲2	19▼-5
LT 	41▲10	8▼-2	5▼-2	5▼-3	54▼-11	2=
LU 	13▼-4	7▼-4	12▼-3	14▼-4	60▲10	16▼-5
HU 	9▲2	32▲13	10▲3	7▼-2	62▲20	2▼-30
MT 	15▲2	9▲1	12▼-1	12▲2	51▲8	24▼-12
NL 	6▼-8	4▼-2	5▼-5	5▼-2	82▲35	8▼-23
AT 	9=	24▲3	11▼-2	29▲3	46▲6	10▼-10
PL 	39=	7=	6=	6▼-1	57▲36	2▼-36
PT 	4▲1	2▲1	2▲1	2=	70▲3	23▼-3
RO 	8▼-6	26▲1	4▼-2	9▲6	65▲23	2▼-20
SI 	13▲4	17▲3	32▲18	33▲17	41▼-1	10▼-21
SK 	10▼-1	29▲11	9▲2	13▲7	41▲1	19▼-16
FI 	64▲3	6▼-2	5▼-1	7▼-1	32▲4	2▼-9
SE 	44▼-7	5▼-1	6=	6▲1	53▲14	0▼-9

Q10 There are 9 EU outermost regions which are territories or islands located far away from the European continent. Which territories or islands can you name?

		Azores	Canary Islands	French Guyana	Guadeloupe	Madeira	Martinique	Mayotte	Reunion	Saint Martin	Other	None	Don't know
EU27		6	14	8	10	6	10	3	10	2	26	40	17
BE		5	12	8	14	3	12	2	10	2	24	32	23
BG		4	8	3	1	3	1	1	1	1	15	73	2
CZ		4	14	6	1	5	2	0	3	1	22	45	22
DK		4	13	3	1	5	2	0	1	1	9	65	9
DE		6	14	10	3	10	3	2	4	3	20	57	3
EE		6	27	7	3	11	1	1	1	3	15	47	13
IE		3	11	6	3	4	2	0	2	2	14	65	6
EL		4	8	2	2	1	1	0	1	0	31	9	55
ES		12	48	4	1	10	2	0	1	0	38	23	16
FR		1	4	30	56	1	56	18	55	5	51	11	10
HR		3	7	4	1	2	2	0	1	1	14	36	41
IT		3	6	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	20	51	21
CY		3	6	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	11	8	74
LV		3	10	2	1	4	1	1	1	1	18	27	46
LT		2	6	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	18	36	40
LU		8	15	16	18	11	17	4	17	5	19	29	20
HU		3	9	3	1	4	1	0	1	1	24	28	41
MT		2	10	5	2	2	2	2	0	3	10	44	34
NL		6	19	3	1	4	1	1	1	8	16	49	17
AT		7	14	8	3	7	3	2	6	3	10	52	15
PL		6	15	3	1	9	1	2	1	1	24	54	7
PT		29	14	3	2	26	3	1	1	1	4	40	25
RO		1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	24	54
SI		11	23	9	3	11	4	1	3	2	17	41	17
SK		3	9	3	1	3	2	0	1	0	24	29	40
FI		5	18	4	1	9	1	0	1	1	21	53	9
SE		3	16	2	2	3	1	0	1	1	32	56	6

