



A comparative analysis of the regional development agencies projects in European Union countries and Turkey

Evinç Torlak¹, Onur Kulaç¹

¹Pamukkale University Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Turkey

To cite this article: Torlak, E., Kulaç, O. (2016). A comparative analysis of the regional development agencies projects in European Union countries and Turkey. *Lucrările Seminarului Geografic Dimitrie Cantemir*, Vol. 42, pp. 81-92. DOI: 10.15551/lsgdc.v42i0.08

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15551/lsgdc.v42i0.08>





A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES PROJECTS IN EUROPEAN UNION COUNTRIES AND TURKEY

Evinç Torlak, Onur Kulaç¹

Abstract. After the World War II, the significance of the regional development has risen dramatically, and development agencies concept has been mostly used as a development model. Development agencies generally aim to provide and maintain economic, social and cultural development in their regions by supporting new ideas and projects which are overwhelmingly efficient and effective in the development process. In European Union (EU), funds in the joint pool are allocated to the projects through development agencies. Regional development agencies were established in Turkey within the framework of EU cohesion policies. Projects supported by these agencies have begun to create a concrete step for regional development. In this study, firstly, the development projects of 27 EU member states between the years 2000-2011 will be scrutinized. Secondly, a comparative analysis will be conducted within the terms of projects and sectors in partnership by analyzing the (2007-2011) term projects of 26 Turkish regional development agencies. In this study, website of Turkish regional development agencies and European Commission will be taken basis to assess an extensive evaluation for the projects of Turkey and EU. This study reveals that the approaches between EU and Turkey to development agencies are different in case of efficient fund usage, processes, conditions, and experiences. The ability and capability of EU development agencies are considerably sufficient for precise decision-making and joint projects. In the conclusion of the study, suggestions will be offered for Turkish regional development agencies in order to make a contribution for to their development.

Keywords: Development, Regional Development, the Concept of Project, Projects of Development Agencies

Introduction

In contemporary development models, regional policies have come to prominence rather than central planning. In order to expand development across regions, the European Union (EU) Regional Policy has been in the agenda afterwards of the 1975 Rome Act. The EU Regional Policy aims to create a homogenous structure in terms of social, economic and cultural perspectives by minimizing intra- and extra-regional inequalities. The essential purpose of project-based development approach is funds and grant programs used through development agencies (Friedrich Nauman Vakfi, 2009: 8). Regional development agencies which have been started to be established in Turkey since 2006 commenced project calls and project-based development process was progressed.

¹ Pamukkale University Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Turkey, e-mail: onurkulac@yahoo.com

In this paper, the preliminary studies of project-based development approach of Turkey were evaluated. The main purpose is to take advantage of successful country cases in this process and to develop suggestions in terms of Turkey which is currently at the beginning stage. Thus, projects of development agencies from 27 EU countries and 26 development regions in Turkey were taken into consideration. Furthermore, this paper is the first phase of the ongoing study and put forth the analysis of development agencies of EU and Turkey covers the period until 2011. The projects between the years 2011 and 2016 will be scrutinized in the future papers. The EU project examples were evaluated on the basis of “country”, projects from Turkey were evaluated based on “region”. The European projects conducted by their development agencies supported by the European Commission were considered in this study. These projects were accessed through internet, while the EU projects were acquired through the official website of the European Commission; projects from Turkey were acquired through the official website of the agencies.

Table.1 Development Agencies in Turkey

Abbreviation	Agency	Code	Cities	Center Office	Year of Foundation
AHİKA	Ahiler	TR71	Aksaray, Kırıkkale., Kırşehir. Nevşehir, Niğde	Nevşehir	2009
ANKARAKA	Ankara	TR51	Ankara	Ankara	“
BAKA	Batı Akdeniz	TR61	Antalya, Burdur, Isparta	Isparta	“
BAKKA	Batı Karadeniz	TR81	Bartın, Karabük, Zonguldak	Zonguldak	“
BEBKA	Bursa Eskiş. Bileci	TR41	Bilecik, Bursa, Eskişehir	Bursa	“
ÇKA	Çukurova	TR62	Mersin, Adana	Adana	2006
DAKA	Doğu Anadolu	TRB2	Bitlis, Hakkâri, Muş, Van	Van	2008
DİKA	Dicle	TRC3	Batman, Mardin, Şırnak, Siirt	Mardin	“
DOĞAKA	Doğu Akdeniz	TR63	Hatay, Maraş, Osmaniye	Hatay	2009
DOKA	Doğu Karadeniz	TR90	Artvin, Giresun, Gümüşhane.Ordu, Rize, Trabzon	Trabzon	“
FKA	Fırat	TRB1	Bingöl, Elazığ, Malatya, Tunceli	Malatya	“
GEKA	Güney Ege	TR32	Aydın, Denizli, Muğla	Denizli	“
GMKA	Güney Marmara	TR22	Balıkesir, Çanakkale	Balıkesir	“
İKA	İpekyolu	TRC1	Adıyaman, Gaziantep, Kilis	Gaziantep	2008
İSTKA	İstanbul	TR10	İstanbul	İstanbul	“
İZKA	İzmir	TR31	İzmir	İzmir	2006
KARACADAĞ	Karacadağ	TRC2	Diyarbakır, Şanlıurfa	Diyarbakır	2008
KUDAKA	Kuzey Doğu Anadolu	TRA1	Bayburt, Erzincan, Erzurum	Erzurum	“
KUZKA	Kuzey Anadolu	TR82	Çankırı, Kastamonu, Sinop	Kastamonu	2009
MARKA	Doğu Marmara	TR42	Bolu, Düzce, Kocaeli, Sakarya, Yalova	Kocaeli	“
MEVKA	Mevlana	TR52	Konya, Karaman	Konya	2008
OKA	Orta Karadeniz	TR83	Amasya, Çorum, Samsun, Tokat	Samsun	“
ORAN	Orta Anadolu	TR72	Kayseri, Sivas, Yozgat	Kayseri	2009
SERKA	Serhat	TRA2	Ağrı, Ardahan, Iğdır, Kars	Kars	“
TRAKYAKA	Trakya	TR21	Edirne, Kırklareli, Tekirdağ	Tekirdağ	“
ZEKA	Zafer	TR33	Afyon, Kütahya, Manisa, Uşak	Kütahya	“

2. Regional Policies and Development Agencies

The purpose of the EU Regional policy is to enhance life standards of developing regions without slowing down growth rate of developed regions. It facilitates cooperation and partnerships to improve underdeveloped regions in terms of economic and social aspects and regulates fund management rules. One third of the EU budget was reserved for regional policies. For an effective development institutionalization is required at regional level. Owing to public sympathy in service adopted through the Single European Act and Maastricht Agreement, significances of domesticity and regional institutions have increased. The most significant elements were considered as ‘Development Agencies’. Its foundation had been laid in the continent in 1950s. Today, in all of the regions in the European Countries, these agencies are institutionalized. According to the EURADA (1999: 16)², aforesaid agencies, along with the principles and policies of the national development plan, are the institutions established for effective utilization of resources to accelerate regional development and to ensure sustainability of this development, to moderate development differences between regions. Agencies describe development problems, determine method for opportunities and resolutions and enhance cooperation among public/private sector, civil society organizations, mobilize domestic potential to prepare projects for resolutions. Funds collected in common EU pool are transferred to the development agencies to be used by means of these agencies. Development agencies incent projects with potential to accelerate regional development by means of funds-grants. Small-scale domestic cooperation transforms into large partnerships through fund opportunities.

Development agencies in Turkey were established within the legislative framework of the Law no. 5449 enacted in 2006. While the first agencies were İzmir and Çukurova, eight and sixteen agencies were established in 2008 and 2009, respectively so that all cities across Turkey included in 26 regions (Akpınar et al. 2011: 141). Tasks of these agencies were listed as follows: improving regional economic performance and welfare; developing strategies for regional development and growth; allowing innovative initiatives through new projects; exploring and developing regional internal potential; ensuring participation of domestic residents into developmental activities; enhancing regional competitive strength; expanding employment opportunities and improving productivity of employed workforce; developing physical and human infrastructure; increasing national income per capita; giving advice to government regarding regional development; cooperating and collaborating with other domestic and central organizations; and assisting for efficient energy utilization and provision of utility services (Altun, 2010: 26-27).

3. Project-Based Development Model

Projects which indicate how to use funds to reach determined targets in certain time frame have now become development model. A project emerges from need or problem; they are originated from cost-benefit analysis. It was first introduced in the U.S. in 1930 at the stage of development of public investments to fight against high unemployment rate; then, these public investments necessitated relevant analyses. Difficulties experienced with the planned development models, failure to acquire targets and to relieve problems, desire to obtain immediate results, limits of problems exceeding scope of single country have allowed “project-based development” approach pace. Whereas project approach was harnessed intensively in 1970s, as it was realized that accelerated growth did not mean development, “social dimension” was added into the project concept. Environmental Impact Assessment organizational analysis and project cycle methods have been developed. Project cycle

² European Association of Development Agencies

employed in development projects, holistic approach, logical framework project techniques were applied in 1970s; and then, they have evolved into their contemporary forms through improvements in 90s. Project-based development model adopted by fast-track growing countries such as the U.S., Japan, South Korea and Taiwan, played significant role in development process of those countries (Gündüz, 2006: 165). This model has been implemented effectively across the Europe. According to the 2020 European Strategy, “Project-based development will be smart growth and sustainable-comprehensive economic agenda (http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/index_en.cfm). Upon erection of development agencies in Turkey, this development approach was put in action.

Table. 2 Sectoral Distribution of Agencies Projects in Turkey

Years	Agencies	Economic Development	Social Development	Agriculture-Rural Development	Infrastructure	SME	Turkey-Syria	Tourism	Competition	Direct Operating Support	Environment-Energy	Industry	Innovation	Other	Total
2008	ÇUKUROVA	44	32	8	5										89
	İZMİR		71			223									294
	KARACADAĞ						29								29
	Total	44	103	8	5	223	29								412
2009	ÇUKUROVA	51	29		23										103
	DAKA					201									201
	İZMİR		65					58							123
	MEVKA			46	12										58
	OKA					160									160
	Total	51	94	46	35	361		58							645
2010	AHİKA			15	8							19			42
	ANKARAKA									17					17
	BAKA											40			40
	BAKKA					56									56
	BEBKA											90			90
	ÇKA	69	59		17										145
	DAKA			70		53									123
	DİKA				20	46	17			13					96
	DOĞAKA	75	49							15					139
	DOKA							15							15
	FKA	67								11					78
	GEKA	174			70										244
	GMKA	67													67
	İKA	71			20		12								103
	İSTKA		14										92		106
	İZKA			46				17							63
	KARACADAĞ	57						23		28					108
	KUDAKA					45				10				32	87
	KUZKA									6					6
	MARKA					109									109
	MEVKA	76	79												155
	OKA									14	41				55
	ORAN	50			10										60
	SERKA	51			8										59
	TRAKYAKA				21				39						60
	ZEKA								77						77
	Total	757	2 201	131	174	309	29	55	116	114	41	149	92	32	2129

Table. 3 Sectoral Distribution of Agencies Projects in Turkey in 2011

AJANSLAR	Economic Development	Social Development	Agriculture-Rural Development	Infrastructure	SME	Tourism	City	Direct Operation Support	Environment-Energy	Industry	Innovation	Other	Total
AHİKA			12			9				22			43
ANKARAKA						45		20			76		141
BAKA						28				27	27		82
BAKKA		40			62			12					114
BEBKA		18						23	29		29		99
ÇKA	18	46			101	19							184
DAKA								6					6
DİKA				9			18	18				39	84
DOĞAKA		127				33		20		37			217
DOKA						24		29		60			113
FKA	51		36			25		6					118
GEKA								13					13
GMKA		48						10			40		98
İKA				17		37					41		95
İSTKA		11						12	21				44
İZKA								18			47		65
KARACADAĞ	64					15		22					101
KUDAKA				14	70			10					94
KUZKA					66				22				88
MARKA					120			43			22		185
MEVKA			49		79			36					164
OKA		34			73			11					118
ORAN						23		10	38		51		122
SERKA	40		11	13				3					67
TRAKYAKA	44	33		21				17					115
ZEKA				77				16				223	316
Total	217	357	108	151	571	258	18	333	110	146	333	262	2810

4. Comparative Analysis of the Project of Agencies in EU and Turkey

4.1. Number of Sectors

While number of sectors in the EU was 11 in 2011, there were 45 sectors in Turkey. These figures increased to 12 and 66 in 2012, respectively. Although project proposal calls of development agencies have just started in Turkey, the number of sectors in Turkey is 5 times greater than the Europe. It could be considered that scope of the project sector in Europe must be more diverse. Nevertheless, sectors in Europe have gathered under common titles and main headlines.

4.2. Type of Sectors

EU Countries: In 2011, the most frequently occupied sectors and number of projects conducted in Europe were Innovation Research and Technological Development 262, Social Participation Occupations- Education 199, Environment 172, Border Cooperation 151, Job Support 141, Transportation 88, Urban Development 69, Energy 62, Tourism 62, Rural Development 51, Job 14 and Structural Funds 2 (Table 4).

The least frequently occupied sectors were Human Resources; the highest number of project in this sector was eight and it was observed with Romania which was accepted to the EU membership in 2007. Such high performance in this sector could be considered as an expected result for country in ongoing membership process. In the Human Resources sector, Germany, Denmark, the G.B., Sweden, Cyprus and Poland conducted one project each. Another least frequently occupied sector was Structural Fund (Management-Governance) sector which is a difficult and time-consuming sector. It is in the capacity of strong countries of the EU who became member at the first place (Torlak and Gürsan, 2012: 191).

Turkey: Frequently occupied sectors in Turkey have differed along years. SME Sector has been placed greatest emphasis along years. Social Development was observed as the second sector. On the contrary to general expectation, industry has not been supported much. Since Sectoral and Urban Infrastructure has not been completed, this sector has been supported by all agencies. Additionally, Economic Development and Direct Activity Support have been one of the frequently occupied sectors. On the other hand, less frequently occupied sectors have been Environment and Urban and Rural Development.

Table. 4 Sectoral Distribution of EU Agencies Projects in 2011

2011	Job Support	Energy	Environment	Technical development	Vocational Training	Border Cooperation	Tourism and Culture	Transportation	Urban Development	Rural Development	Business Area	Structural Funds	Total
Germany	15	6	9	21	16	16	5	6	6	1	1	1	103
Austria	6	3	7	14	7	3	2	1	-	-	-	-	43
Belgium	13	1	3	12	13	3	4	2	4	1	-	-	56
Czech Rep.	2	1	1	5	10	3	2	4	2	2	-	-	32
Denmark	6	3	3	3	3	6	1	1	1	1	1	-	29
Estonia	3	2	5	3	1	5	-	2	-	-	-	-	21
Finland	1	2	9	11	8	5	1	1	3	1	-	-	42
France	5	4	16	27	15	8	7	7	7	2	-	-	98
Netherlands	-	1	4	16	5	5	-	3	7	6	-	-	47
Britain	16	3	13	21	17	15	2	6	8	5	1	-	107
Ireland	7	-	4	4	8	9	3	4	3	3	-	1	46
Spain	8	5	18	23	18	6	4	10	6	6	-	-	104
Sweden	9	1	10	21	14	11	1	4	1	2	1	-	75
Italy	3	8	7	8	18	7	6	4	4	4	-	-	69
Cyprus	2	-	-	-	1	-	2	1	2	2	1	-	11
Latvia	3	2	6	5	2	8	3	2	1	2	-	-	34
Lithuanian	3	3	6	8	2	10	2	-	2	2	-	-	38
Luxembourg	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	13

Hungary	7	3	7	7	12	4	3	-	3	3	-	-	49
Malta	-	1	3	2	2	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	11
Poland	10	4	8	16	5	9	4	13	2	-	1	-	72
Portugal	1	3	10	4	2	3	4	2	2	4	-	-	35
Slovakia	3	-	4	11	5	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	26
Slovenia	2	1	3	4	3	1	-	2	1	1	-	-	18
Greece	3	1	5	5	6	5	2	4	1	2	-	-	34
Bulgaria	-	1	4	2	-	2	-	5	-	-	-	-	14
Romania	11	1	5	7	4	3	1	3	1	-	8	-	46
Total	141	62	172	262	199	151	62	88	69	51	14	2	1273

Comparison: Quality of projects conducted by the European Countries has gained progress so far. Now that Innovative, Social Participation and Environment Projects are attached importance. Turkey has just started project-based development process. The SME Sector has been one of the frequently occupied sectors since they were promoted because they lead larger investments and contribute into development. European countries have usually resolved their basic problems, handled their infrastructure problem, developed superstructure and put emphasis on innovations. On the other hand in Turkey, fewer projects have been generated in Turkey especially in the Environment Sector in comparison with Europe. In 2011, a significant progress was observed in Turkey in innovative sectors and projects.

4.3 Number of Projects

EU Countries: The GB (107), Spain (104) and Germany (103) were the countries which created highest number of projects in the EU. The GB is in the first place in the sectors of Innovation Research, Energy, Social Projects, Participation, Tourism, Transportation, and Urban Development in terms of number of project. There are numbers of projects in the sectors of Entrepreneurship, Job Support, Border Cooperation, Environment, and Rural Development as well. Spain follows the GB in terms of its rank based on number of projects; however, it is in the first place with respect to sectoral distribution. Spain has created Environment, Transportation, Energy, Innovation Research, Social Projects, Participation, Tourism, Transportation, Urban Development and Rural Development sectors. Spain finalized more projects in comparison with the GB and Germany in five sectors of Social Participation, Innovation, Environment, Transportation and Rural Development. Germany has conducted project in all sectors; and oriented on Social Participation, Entrepreneurship and Job Support sectors. In terms of number of projects, the GB is ranked before Spain in Energy, Tourism, Structural Fund, and Border Cooperation Sectors. On the other hand Germany comes first in the list in Sustainability, Social and Economic Development, Social Adjustment, Infrastructure Support for Development of Economic Potential, Improvement of Life Quality, Environment, Nature, History and Preservation of Cultural Heritage Sectors.

The countries with the least number of projects were Malta, Cyprus and Luxemburg. While Cyprus has conducted projects in Entrepreneurship, Job Support, Tourism, Urban Development, Transportation, Rural Development and Job Creation sectors, Malta focused on Energy, Environment, Innovation and Participation; Cyprus and Malta were not present in projects from the sector of Border Cooperation since they are island states. A small country Luxemburg has created projects almost in all sectors even though they were in few in number except Transportation, Rural Development and Job Creation sectors owing to its proximity to the EU Capital City Brussels (Torlak and Gürsan, 2012: 200).

Turkey: The only project of 2007, ‘Turkey-Syria Inter-Regional Cooperation Project’ was supported by the Karacadağ Development Agency. In 2008, six development agencies succeeded to make project call and six sectors were supported. Whereas İzmir and Çukurova Development Agencies made a call for Economic, Social, Rural, SME, and Small-scaled Infrastructure Sectors; Karacadağ, Doğu Anadolu, Mevlana Development Agencies called for Tourism and Environment sector besides the mentioned ones. In 2009, number of project increased and sectors differentiated. 26 projects were supported from 7 sectors. Of these, 12 were Infrastructure; 7 were Culture, Tourism; 7 were Technical Cooperation, Capacity Development (<http://www.projekoordinasyon.org/tr/index>). Again, Karacadağ made a call for “Turkey-Syria Inter-Regional Cooperation” project (Karacadağ Development Agency, 2010: 23). In 2010, project calls of agencies intensified. Sectors differentiated; they increased 4 times in terms of number. In the 2010 Development Agencies Activity Report published by the Ministry of Development, it was reported that project calls were made under 11 general titles and 28 sub-titles (The Ministry of Development, 2010: 28-33). The period studied in the present study is 2011, in which highest project variability was observed. The number of sector was determined as 45. The agency which supported highest number of projects was Zafer (316). On the contrary, the agency supported the least number of project was determined as Doğu Anadolu Development Agency (6).

Comparison: In Turkey, number of projects has increased significantly. Founder members of the EU have generated more projects. The member countries which joined the union late conducted fewer projects. The GB, Spain and Germany were more successful. Similarly in Turkey, agencies which completed their establishment first were more active in project creation. Agencies in the developed regions of both Europe and in Turkey were found to be more successful.

Table. 5 Comparison of the Projects Sector

EU		Turkey	
Innovation	262	SME	571
Vocational Training	199	Social Development	357
Environment	172	Innovation	333
Border Cooperation	151	Direct Operation Support	333
Entrepreneurship	141	Sectors	262
Transportation	88	Tourism	258
Urban Development	69	Economic Development	217
Energy	62	Infrastructure	151
Culture and Tourism	62	Industry	147
Rural Development	51	Environment	110
Employment Support	14	Agriculture-Rural Development	108
Structural Funds	2	Urban	18
Total	1273	Total	2811

4.4. Partnerships

EU Countries: EU Countries have established international partnerships in every occasion. Each project has at least 1 partner. Countries affected by the regional problems have succeeded to come together and established 7-8 partnerships. For example, Czech Republic, Germany, Estonia, Spain, France, Hungary, Latvia, Holland, Portugal, Romania and Slovakia were partners in the project with title of “Reverse Tide Projects for the Regions Under Flood Risk”. In addition, Czech Republic, Germany, Estonia, Finland, Holland, Poland, Romania and Slovenia were included in the project called “Meeting Project through Regional Cooperation against Aging and Losing Weight” (http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/index_en.cfm).

The most active countries are Germany and France in terms of partnership. Majority of 27 countries are partners in various projects; they also established partnerships with distant countries. France is rather successful in establishing cooperation. She could establish partnership with almost all countries for projects and take role in all sectors. Holland is ranked just after Germany and France in terms of number of established partnership while Spain Sweden, Czech Republic, Italy and Lithuania was ranked as 4th with their 2 projects. Bulgaria and Romania, which recently participated into the EU (2007), established 1 partnership. In some projects, there are partners as well besides the relevant countries. Sometimes there could even be inter-continental partnerships. Some projects could be structured in association with countries from Africa, Asia, America, Middle East and Balkan Regions. For example, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mozambique, Nepal, Tanzania, Vietnam and Zambia are partner countries of Finland. Joint projects of Finland with these countries necessitate maintenance of active administrative capacity and fund levels (<http://formin.finland.fi/Public/> 2012). In general, partnerships are established with neighbouring countries and intensified at border regions. Since border regions once remained outside of industrial development, they pose more problems. Thus, partnerships are important in terms of regional development.

Turkey: Partnerships in Turkey are at domestic level. Agencies join international cooperation especially during equipment purchase process.

Comparison: In regional issues, 8 countries could come together to perform activity for resolution. Project-based domestic partnerships have just been established in Turkey. Partnerships are limited with domestic, regional and even with cities. No any international partnership has been established except the “Border Cooperation Project” (Turkey-Syria Inter-Regional Cooperation, Cooperation beyond Black Sea Border).

4.5. Funds

EU Countries: There are two types of funds for projects: 1- Funds available for project; and 2- The EU contribution during project execution period. The EU makes certain amount of contribution into each project. In the period between 2000 and 2013, the most frequently utilized fund was the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF); the project periods were in 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6-year sessions according to the funds. The highest number of projects was conducted in the period of 2007- 2013.

Turkey: As a single resource, projects are financed by the development agency fund. The European Union provides technical/financial support to the development projects.

5. Conclusion and suggestions

In Turkey, majority of agencies have started their operation after 2009. Completion of institutional development of agencies, determination of regional needs and preparation for project could take about two years (Ministry of Development, 2010: 18). That is, an agency could commence its project calls at least in two years afterwards of its foundation. It is advantageous for Europe to start the regional project studies long time ago. Turkey is still at the starting phase. It is possible to enumerate determined differences, their causes and relevant suggestions. Sectors in Turkey outnumber the ones in Europe. In Turkey, agencies made calls in similar sectors under different titles. Similar sectors could be consolidated under the same title. Abundance in number of sector results in confusion. Some sectors are referred as if they could be listed under few main titles. It is rather difficult to classify them under the same title. There are changes and increase observed with sectors.

The EU has largely completed its infrastructure projects; now turned to superstructure; Innovation Research - Technological Development have become the most important sector today. In Turkey, SME, Direct Activity Support and Economic Development are prominent sectors. If regional needs are evaluated well and sectors are operated better, then, it would be possible to reach Innovation sector, one of the upper tier sectors; and to compete with the EU Countries in terms of innovation. In the study under title of "Social Harmonization Tools" reported by Reeves (2007), member of Turkey Delegation of the European Commission, two suggestions were drawn for Turkey: "In the first period, basic infrastructure and qualified workforce must be prioritized"; and "In the second period, progress should be gained in information, communication technologies and innovation fields. In the 2011 project calls, it was observed that innovation and research-based sectors have gained significance. Year by year, experiences have increased and different subjects and novelties have been introduced.

In Turkey, number of project has boomed in 2011. Number of projects in Europe was not clear for aforesaid period. In this project, only Fund-Grant programs supported by the European Commission were taken into consideration. When number of projects supported by domestic resources is taken into consideration, it would be possible to see that overall number of project in Europe was greater than the one reported in the study. This fast-paced increment in number of projects in Turkey could be associated with excitement of new transition to the project-based development and delay in introduction of other potential resources. In the meantime, this increment could be considered as an indication of enhancement in financial and technical supports given by agencies. However, high number of sector and project do not yield success rate. The important point is to ensure sustainability of projects, their application rate and efficiency. As long as projects are determined and supported through transparent, fair and impartial methods based on a competitive understanding, their chance to succeed would increase.

Continuity of development depends on cooperation among countries. Both international and regional projects are realized through partnership. In the European Countries, skills for making decision and collaboration in joint projects are highly developed. These countries are advantageous in terms of skills for establishing collaboration and communication. High life standards and strong business discipline allow them to establish strong partnerships. EU Countries and Turkey approach development concept from different angles. Experiences are different. Adoption of participation, effective fund usage, processes and conditions are different. Additionally, advantage provided by collaboration is significant factor.

Finally, a database for the EU project examples could be established so that all projects could be gathered in here. There are individual database at each institution where projects are submitted. However, there is no comprehensive database for overall projects. Holland is considered as a good example in this regard. Each project reflects project program, its contribution into the Europe, communication details in a chronological order. The same issue exists for Turkey as well. Classification of projects in a website in a certain format would contribute into convenient sharing, cooperation, participation, partnership, project sustainability and research.

References

1. Akpınar, R., Taşçı, K., Özsan M.E. 2011. *Teoride ve Uygulamada Bölgesel Kalkınma Politikaları*, Ekin Yayınevi, Bursa.
2. Altun, A. 2010. *Avrupa Birliği'nde Bölgesel Kalkınma Ajansları'nın Başarısı ve Uygulama Örnekleri*, Kentsel Ekonomik Araştırmalar Sempozyumu KEAS 2009, Denizli.
3. Eurada 1999. Creation, Development and Management of RDAs.
4. Friedrich Naumann Vakfı (2009). Yerel Kalkınma Yönetişimi, Yerel Kalkınma Yönetişimi Uluslararası Konferansı.
5. Gündüz, A. Y.(2006. Bölgesel Kalkınma Politikası, Ekin Kitapevi, Bursa
6. Karacadağ Kalkınma Ajansı 2010. 2009 Faaliyet Raporu, http://www.karacadag.org.tr/ContentDownload/2009_Faaliyet_Raporu/default.html
7. Reeves, T. 2007. *AB ve Türkiye'de Bölgesel Kalkınma*, www.tepav.org.tr/sempozyum
8. Torlak, E. ve Gürsan,B. 2012. *Projeye Dayalı Bölgesel Kalkınma*, Sosyo-Kültürel Farklılık ve Alışım Mekanları, Ed. Sam, N., Sam, R., Ezgi Kitabevi Bursa.
9. http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/index_en.cfm
10. <http://www.projekoordinasyon.org/tr/index>
11. <http://formin.finland.fi/Public/default.aspx?nodeid=15359&contentlan=2&cultureUS>

