
EU Cohesion Monitor 2018

An assessment of cohesion in the 28 member states of the European Union



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

RETHINK: EUROPE an initiative of



STIFTUNG MERCATOR

Overall Results

Rankings

Countries



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results



Copyright of this publication is held by the European Council on Foreign Relations. You may not copy, reproduce, republish or circulate in any way the content from this publication except for your own personal and non-commercial use. Any other use requires the prior written permission of the European Council on Foreign Relations.

© ECFR December 2017

ISBN: 978-1-911544-38-8

Published by the European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR), Tennyson House 159-165, Great Portland Street, London, W1W 5PA, United Kingdom

Data visualization and interactive PDF by Dieter Dollacker and Dirk Waldik, Denkbuilder Berlin

Document Version 1.1

ECFR/238

Rankings

Countries



Introduction Rationale

Introduction Rationale

FAQ

Cohesion concept Data and design The 2017 update

Country Groups

Overview **Big Six** Founding Six Affluent Seven Southern Seven Visegrád Four

The EU Cohesion Monitor is an index of the 28 member states of the European Union and their readiness for joint action and cooperation.

The monitor uses ten indicators to conceptualize and illustrate the foundations, national trajectories and future potentials of cohesion in Europe.

This updated edition includes the cohesion ranking and trends of the EU28 from 2007 to 2017.

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

- The EU Cohesion Monitor is part of the Rethink: Europe project by the European Council on Foreign Relations and Stiftung Mercator.
- To learn more about the project please visit ecfr.eu/rethinkeurope and ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor.
- To contact the project team please email berlin.office@ecfr.eu

RETHINK: EUROPE

Team



Josef Janning heads the Berlin office of ECFR and leads the project as Senior Policy Fellow.



Christoph Klavehn manages the project as Project Coordinator at the Berlin office of ECFR.




Christel Zunneberg is **Project Assistant and** supports Rethink: Europe's research.

Rankings











FAQ Cohesion concept

Introduction Rationale

FAQ

Cohesion concept

Data and design The 2017 update

Country Groups

Overview **Big Six** Founding Six Affluent Seven Southern Seven Visegrád Four

What is the EU Cohesion Monitor?

The EU Cohesion Monitor is an index of the 28 member states of the European Union and their readiness for joint action and cooperation.

It measures how strong cohesion is, how it is changing, and how much it differs between the member states of the European Union.

The concept's central assumption is that European cohesion is a precondition for Europe's capacity to act, and that acting together successfully will in turn strengthen cohesion.

Overall, we assume that successful cooperation between individuals as well as societies and countries will strengthen mutual bonds, shared incentives, and common experiences.

Cohesion is broader in that it focuses on the disposition of collective actors to work together.

The EU Cohesion Monitor looks not only at actual cooperation but includes a measurement of the awareness, readiness, and cooperation-mindedness of societies.

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Overall Results

Are cooperation and cohesion different concepts?

What is the difference between individual and structural cohesion?


Individual cohesion describes people's experiences, attitudes, beliefs, and well-being. Structural cohesion is shaped by connections and practices between countries on the macro-level, including the actions of economic, political, and cultural elites.


The two dimensions often complement each other, but this is not necessarily so. The EU Cohesion Monitor displays both dimensions separately to make this differentiation visible.


What recommendations emerge from the EU Cohesion Monitor?

Cohesion is a central resource needed for European cooperation. Strategies to strengthen cohesion need to address both its individual as well as its structural dimension. They should also address each country's distinct cohesion profile.

Cohesion is not subject to swift changes. Measures that can boost cohesion should be pursued with stamina for the long term. The variety in cohesion also means that not only policymakers and governments are encouraged to address it. Cohesion is as much a field of engagement for civil-society organisations as well as EU citizens.









FAQ Data and design

Introduction Rationale

FAQ

Cohesion concept

Data and design The 2017 update

Country Groups

Overview **Big Six** Founding Six Affluent Seven Southern Seven Visegrád Four

How is the EU Cohesion Monitor compiled?

The EU Cohesion Monitor combines a total of 32 factors to a set of ten cohesion indicators for each of the 28 EU member states. Data was gathered for 2007, 2014, and 2016/17.

The monitor presents the cohesion indicators on a scale of 1 to 10 points for ease of analysis and comparability.

A description of how the data is converted is available at ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor.

Each of the EU Cohesion Monitor's ten indicators rests on a cohesion assumption, or hypothesis.

Regarding the indicator Funding, for example, we argue that the inflow of resources through EU funds will strengthen awareness of EU benefits, such as through the presence of EU-funded projects to improve local infrastructure. At the same time, being a net contributor to the EU budget will increase that country's stake in shaping the EU and thus will generally strengthen its engagement with it.

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

What is the reason for choosing these particular indicators and variables?

What are your data sources? How do you deal with data gaps?

The EU Cohesion Monitor relies on datasets that are publicly available. The most prominent sources include Eurostat and Eurobarometer surveys.

Where there are gaps in the primary data we use proxy data to cover them. For example, if a statistic is not available for 2017, we use the closest data available, say 2016. Similarly, when no data is available from other years at all, we use data from proxy countries, e.g. using Cyprus data for Malta.


The EU Cohesion Monitor was compiled with the goal to minimise these approximations.

Do you weigh your data?

We only weigh data where we see a compelling reason. For example, the maximum score in the 'Security' indicator is 7 points rather than 10. The scale ends at seven because stronger cooperation and deeper integration in the area of security and defence is part of ongoing policy debates.

The scaling has to give room for such steps and may need to be adjusted in future editions of the **EU** Cohesion Monitor.







FAQ The 2017 update

Introduction Rationale

FAQ

Cohesion concept Data and design The 2017 update

Country Groups

Overview **Big Six** Founding Six Affluent Seven Southern Seven Visegrád Four

What are the results since the previous edition of the EU Cohesion Monitor?

In the past three years the continued recovery from the financial crisis and long-term EU funding patterns have shaped structural cohesion more than the arrival of migrants in Europe.

Trends in individual cohesion are marked by the substantial turnout for anti-EU and populist parties in several member states that held national elections in the period from 2015 to 2017. While this led to a further plummeting of the Engagement indicator, positive results for the Attitudes, Approval and Experience indicators explain why individual cohesion has grown steadily.

Why do countries still differ so much in their levels of cohesion?

The differences stem from the monitor's combination of cohesion indicators and factors that represent different sources of cohesion and give each country its distinct cohesion profile based on its geography, population, socio-economic resilience, and more.

The EU Cohesion Monitor captures a variety of data points to give a balanced assessment of cohesion. Therefore, the trends it describes tend to change gradually rather than abruptly from one year to the next.

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

What are the methodological changes?

The updated edition includes new data for the period from 2007 to 2017 as well as methodological improvements to make comparisons in a threeyear timeline more consistent.

Some of the primary data had not received an update since the EU Cohesion Monitor's first edition. This includes cases where Eurobarometer questions or Eurostat tables have been discontinued or, in the case of the Engagement indicator, no new elections have taken place. In these cases we used the 2014 data point for 2017. Details at ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor.

Can I use EU Cohesion Monitor scores for my work? Are the data sets available?


Yes. The data underlying and generated by the EU Cohesion Monitor can be accessed in its entirety and free of charge at ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor.

Please cite as follows:

EU Cohesion Monitor, European Council on Foreign Relations, December 2017, available at www.ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor.







Country Groups Overview

Introduction Rationale


FAQ

Cohesion concept Data and design The 2017 update

Country Groups

Overview

Big Six Founding Six Affluent Seven Southern Seven Visegrád Four



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Five Country Groups

Results are not only presented for individual EU member states, but also for five country groups. The illustration shows each group's composition, the overlap between them, and the countries that do not fall into any of the five groups.

The impact of country groups on the politics of the EU and European integration at large has been changing over time and has often depended on the policy issue at stake. Some groups are more formalized or institutionalized than others.

Group data is provided by combining the scores of their respective member countries.







Country Groups Big Six

Introduction

Rationale

FAQ

Cohesion concept Data and design The 2017 update

Country Groups

Overview

Big Six

Founding Six Affluent Seven Southern Seven Visegrád Four

Sources: Eurostat (Population 2015), World Bank (GDP 2015), SIPRI Milex Data (Military Spending 2015), Eurostat (Ratio of employed to unemployed 2015).

The EU Powerhouse

The term "Big Six" refers to France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Poland and the UK. These countries are considered major European powers.

After Brexit, the group will eventually turn into the Big Five. Even without the UK, it will continue to be the EU powerhouse.




ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor


Intro

Design





Share of Military Spending



Employed to Unemployed

10:1

Big Six

UK

Germany

Poland

France

Italy

Spain

10:1	
21:1	
18:1	
13:1	
9:1	
8:1	
5:1	

Rankings

Countries



Country Groups Founding Six

Introduction

Rationale

FAQ

Cohesion concept Data and design The 2017 update

Country Groups

Overview

Big Six

Founding Six

Affluent Seven Southern Seven Visegrád Four

Sources: Eurostat (Population 2015), World Bank (GDP 2015), SIPRI Milex Data (Military Spending 2015), Eurostat (Ratio of employed to unemployed 2015).

The EU Pioneers


The term "Founding Six" refers to Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands. As signatories to the 1957 Rome Treaty they created what has become the European Union.

With the Franco-German partnership at its centre the Founding Six is the oldest group within the EU. It continues to have significant leverage and makes up about half the EU's population, GDP, and defence spending.




ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Design



Share of GDP Total



Employed to Unemployed

12:1

12:1	
12:1	
9:1	
21:1	
8:1	
15:1	
14:1	
	12:1 9:1 21:1 8:1 15:1

RETHINK: EUROPE

Rankings



Country Groups Affluent Seven

Introduction

Rationale

FAQ

Cohesion concept Data and design The 2017 update

Country Groups

Overview Big Six Founding Six

Affluent Seven

Southern Seven Visegrád Four

Sources: Eurostat (Population 2015), World Bank (GDP 2015), SIPRI Milex Data (Military Spending 2015), Eurostat (Ratio of employed to unemployed 2015).

Strength in Numbers

The term "Affluent Seven" refers to the group of seven countries consisting of Austria, the three Nordic EU members of Denmark, Finland, and Sweden, and the Benelux countries.

This group has special economic clout among the EU28. Each one of the seven maintains an employment ratio of at least 10 to 1. In addition, the group's disposable income per capita is significantly above the averages of both the EU and the Big Six.



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Design

Share of Population

Netherlands Austria Belgium Sweden Denmark Finland Luxembourg

Share of GDP Total

Netherlands Belgium Sweden Austria

Denmark Finland Luxembourg

Share of Military Spending

11%

11%



Netherlands Belgium Sweden Austria Denmark Finland Luxembourg

Employed to Unemployed

14:1

16%

Affluent Seven	14:1	
Austria	17:1	
Belgium	12:1	
Denmark	16:1	
Finland	10:1	
Luxembourg	15:1	
Netherlands	14:1	
Sweden	13:1	

RETHINK: EUROPE

Rankings



Introduction

Rationale

FAQ

Cohesion concept Data and design The 2017 update

Country Groups

Overview Big Six Founding Six Affluent Seven

Southern Seven

Visegrád Four

Sources: Eurostat (Population 2015), World Bank (GDP 2015), SIPRI Milex Data (Military Spending 2015), Eurostat (Ratio of employed to unemployed 2015).

Country Groups Southern Seven

Mediterranean Shores


The term "Southern Seven" refers to the group of seven countries consisting of Cyprus, France, Greece, Italy, Malta, Portugal and Spain.

Despite being disparate in size, the countries in this group share socio-economic similarities. In recent years political initiatives have attempted to institutionalize this group. The Southern Seven have been particularly affected by the Eurozone debt crisis and increasing migration to Europe.





ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Design



Share of GDP Total





Employed to Unemployed

7:1

Southern Seven	7:1	
Cyprus	7:1	
France	9:1	
Greece	4:1	
Italy	8:1	
Malta	18:1	
Portugal	8:1	
Spain	5:1	

RETHINK: EUROPE

Rankings



Country Groups Visegrád Four

Introduction

Rationale

FAQ

Cohesion concept Data and design The 2017 update

Country Groups


Overview Big Six Founding Six Affluent Seven Southern Seven Visegrád Four

Sources: Eurostat (Population 2015), World Bank (GDP 2015), SIPRI Milex Data (Military Spending 2015), Eurostat (Ratio of employed to unemployed 2015).

The New East


The term "Visegrad Four" refers to the group of countries consisting of the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia. All four joined the European Union together in 2004.

More frequently than other groups the Visegrád Four act as a political coalition within the European Union. Their cooperation is based on common cultural values, history and a similar outlook on economic and security policy.



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Design



Share of Military Spending

6% Poland Czech Rep. Hungary Slovakia

Employed to Unemployed

13:1

Visegrád Four	13:1	
Czech Rep.	19:1	
Hungary	15:1	
Poland	13:1	
Slovakia	9:1	

Overall Results

Rankings

Countries



EU Cohesion Monitor Design Individual Structural

Individual Cohesion

Citizens of other EU countries % of population **EXPERIENCE** Visited another EU country Socialised with people from other EU country Foreign language skills Turnout in EP elections **ENGAGEMENT** Anti-EU/populist share in EP elections Anti-EU/populist share in national elections **ATTITUDES**

Trust in EU Positive image of EU National interest well taken into account Perception as European

Support for economic and monetary union **APPROVAL** Support for common foreign policy Support for common defence and security policy Euro among most positive results of EU Free movement among most positive results of EU Peace in Europe among most positive results of EU

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Design

Overall Results

Intro

Structural Cohesion

Disposable income per capita RESILIENCE Debt to GDP Social Justice Index



- Inflow of EU funds as % of GDP FUNDING Balance of payments to EU budget
- **NEIGHBOURHOOD** Population (share) living near borders Non-EU neighbours

POLICY INTEGRATION Number of opt outs


- Joint commands and cooperation **SECURITY** Joint development and procurement Multinational deployments

Rankings

Countries



EU Cohesion Monitor Design Individual Structural



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Overall Results

Intro

Individual Cohesion is strengthened by:

+ Citizens' first-hand EU experience, proximity of other EU countries, and foreign language skills

4 Indicators 17 Factors

- + A high turnout in elections to the European Parliament and low voting preferences for anti-EU/populist parties in the EP and national parliaments
- + Positive views on the benefits of integration and on the EU at large

+ Support for and positive views on areas of deeper integration

Rankings









EU Cohesion Monitor Design Individual Structural

Structural Cohesion is strengthened by:

- + A society's resilience in terms of its affluence and equality fostering EU engagement and solidarity
- + High connectedness and integration of a country's economy with other EU economies through trade and investment flows
- + Inflow of resources through EU funds as well as being a net contributor to the EU's budget
- + A high number of regions sharing a border with other EU member states as well as with non-EU countries
- + No or a low number of opt-outs from the generally accepted state of integration
- + Deep multinational cooperation in the area of defence and security

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results

Disposable income per capita RESILIENCE Debt to GDP Social Justice Index

EU trade to total trade **ECONOMIC TIES** EU trade to GDP ratio EU investments to total investments EU investments to GDP ratio

> Inflow of EU funds as % of GDP FUNDING Balance of payments to EU budget

NEIGHBOURHOOD Population (share) living near borders Non-EU neighbours

POLICY INTEGRATION Number of opt outs

Joint commands and cooperation **SECURITY** Joint development and procurement Multinational deployments

Rankings


6 Indicators

15 Factors

Countries



Overall Results 2007 2014 2017



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results Rankings

Countries







Overall Results 2007 **2014** 2017



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Countries





Overall Results 2007 2014 **2017**





ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor


Countries





Country Groups 2007 2017

Attitudes outperform structural ties



Structural Cohesion

Overall Results

Country Groups

Big Six Founding Six Affluent Seven Southern Seven Visegrád Four

Fairly weak cohesion

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results

Countries







Country Groups 2007 2017




ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design



Big Six 2007 2017




ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Design














ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results


Countries








Founding Six 2007 2017



Affluent Seven 2007 2017



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results








2017 Affluent Seven 2007



Southern Seven 2007 2017



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro


Design








Southern Seven 2007 **2017**





Visegrád Four 2007 2017










Visegrád Four 2007 2017




ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor







Individual Cohesion 2007 2017 Trend



INDIVIDUAL COHESION

STRUCTURAL COHESION

Experience Engagement Attitudes Approval


Resilience **Economic Ties** Funding Neighbourhood Policy Integration Security

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro


Design

Overall Results



urg	#1 2
	3
	4
	4
	6
nds	7
	9
	10
	12
	14
	15
	18
	20
	21
	23
	24
	25
	26
	27
р.	28

Individual Cohesion 2007 2017 Trend



INDIVIDUAL COHESION

STRUCTURAL COHESION

Experience Engagement Attitudes Approval


Resilience **Economic Ties** Funding Neighbourhood Policy Integration Security

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results



urg	#1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
	10
	12
	14 15 16
	17 18
	20 21 22
p.	23 24 25 26 27 28

Individual Cohesion 2007 2017 Trend

Gains No Change Losses

INDIVIDUAL COHESION

STRUCTURAL COHESION

Experience Engagement Attitudes Approval

Resilience **Economic Ties** Funding Neighbourhood Policy Integration Security


ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

 \bigcirc

Overall Results





Structural Cohesion 2007 2017 Trend



INDIVIDUAL COHESION

Experience Engagement Attitudes Approval


STRUCTURAL COHESION

Resilience **Economic Ties** Funding Neighbourhood **Policy Integration** Security

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor


Intro

Design



1	3
1	4
1	6
	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	4

Structural Cohesion 2007 2017 Trend



INDIVIDUAL COHESION

Experience Engagement Attitudes Approval

STRUCTURAL COHESION


Resilience **Economic Ties** Funding Neighbourhood **Policy Integration** Security

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results



urg	#1 2 3
р.	5
	7 8
	11 12
	13
nds	15
	16
	18 19 20 21
	23 24 25 26
	28

Structural Cohesion 2007 2017 Trend

Gains No Change Losses



INDIVIDUAL COHESION

Experience Engagement Attitudes Approval

STRUCTURAL COHESION


Resilience **Economic Ties** Funding Neighbourhood Policy Integration Security

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor


Intro

Design


Overall Results



Austria 2017 vs. Austria 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings


Countries




Austria 2017 vs. Austria 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxemboui
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherland
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK





ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro


Design

Rankings


Countries



Austria 2017 vs. Austria 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



6.5 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results




STRUCTURAL COHESION 5.4

Rankings


Countries



Belgium 2017 vs. Belgium 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings


Countries




Belgium 2017 vs. **Belgium 2007** EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxemboui
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherland
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK





ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor


Intro

Design


Countries



Belgium 2017 vs. Belgium 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



7.9 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results




STRUCTURAL COHESION 5.9

Rankings


Countries



Bulgaria 2017 vs. Bulgaria 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembour
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherland
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results


Rankings

Countries






Bulgaria 2017 vs. Bulgaria 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembou
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherland
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro


Design

Rankings Overall Results


Countries



Bulgaria 2017 vs. Bulgaria 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembour
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherland
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



5.5 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results




STRUCTURAL COHESION 5.8

Rankings


Countries



Croatia 2017 vs. Croatia 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembou
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherland
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings

Countries



Croatia 2017 vs. Croatia 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembo
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherla
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings


Countries



Croatia 2017 vs. Croatia 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembou
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlan
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



5.7 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results




STRUCTURAL COHESION 4.4

Rankings


Countries



Cyprus 2017 vs. Cyprus 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembou
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherland
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



6.8 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results


STRUCTURAL COHESION 3.6

Rankings

Countries



Cyprus 2017 vs. **Cyprus 2007** EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembo
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherla
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK





ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor


Intro

Design

Countries



Cyprus 2017 vs. Cyprus 2007 **EU 2017**



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK

ATTITUDES

RESILIENCE EXPERIENCE **ECONOMIC TIES** FUNDING -**NEIGHBOURHOOD** ***** **POLICY INTEGRATION** APPROVAL **SECURITY**

6.8 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results




STRUCTURAL COHESION 3.6

Rankings

Countries



Czech Rep. 2017 vs. Czech Rep. 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembour
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherland
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings


Countries



Czech Rep. 2017 vs. Czech Rep. 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



0.0

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design




RESILIENCE 0.2 **ECONOMIC TIES** • 0.1 FUNDING **•** 5.2 **NEIGHBOURHOOD** 0.0 **POLICY INTEGRATION 1**.0 **SECURITY** • 0.2 **STRUCTURAL COHESION 6.4 1**.0

Rankings

Countries



Czech Rep. 2017 vs. Czech Rep. 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembour
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherland
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK

4.2 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results



RESILIENCE


STRUCTURAL COHESION 6.4

Rankings


Countries



Denmark 2017 vs. Denmark 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembou
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherland
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



6.1 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings


Countries



Denmark 2017 vs. **Denmark 2007** EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembo
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlar
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings


Countries



Denmark 2017 vs. Denmark 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembour
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherland
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



6.1 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results



SECURITY


STRUCTURAL COHESION 4.1

Rankings


Countries



Estonia 2017 vs. Estonia 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



6.7 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results


STRUCTURAL COHESION 5.8

Rankings


Countries



Estonia 2017 vs. **Estonia 2007** EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Estonia Finland	Portugal Romania
	0
Finland	Romania
Finland France	Romania Slovakia
Finland France Germany	Romania Slovakia Slovenia
Finland France Germany Greece	Romania Slovakia Slovenia Spain





6.7 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

• 0.6

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results


RESILIENCE 0.0 **ECONOMIC TIES** 0.2 FUNDING **2**.6 8 **NEIGHBOURHOOD** 0.0 **POLICY INTEGRATION 2**.0 **SECURITY** 0.1 **STRUCTURAL COHESION 5.8** • 0.7

Rankings


Countries



Estonia 2017 vs. Estonia 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Estonia Finland	Portugal Romania
	9
Finland	Romania
Finland France	Romania Slovakia
Finland France Germany	Romania Slovakia Slovenia
Finland France Germany Greece	Romania Slovakia Slovenia Spain



6.7 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results




STRUCTURAL COHESION 5.8

Rankings


Countries



Finland 2017 vs. Finland 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



6.3 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results


STRUCTURAL COHESION 4.9

Rankings


Countries



Finland 2017 vs. **Finland 2007** EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembou
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherland
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK




ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro


Design



Finland 2017 vs. Finland 2007 **EU 2017**



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembour
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



6.3 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results


STRUCTURAL COHESION 4.9

Rankings


Countries



France 2017 vs. France 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



5.3 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results


STRUCTURAL COHESION 4.8

Rankings


Countries



France 2017 vs. France 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings


Countries



France 2017 vs. France 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



5.3 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results




STRUCTURAL COHESION 4.8

Rankings


Countries



Germany 2017 vs. Germany 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings


Countries




Germany 2017 vs. Germany 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK





ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


RESILIENCE

Rankings


Countries



Germany 2017 vs. Germany 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



7.5 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results




STRUCTURAL COHESION 5.4

Rankings


Countries



Greece 2017 vs. Greece 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings

Countries



Greece 2017 vs. Greece 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results


Rankings

Countries



Greece 2017 vs. Greece 2007 EU 2017





Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



RESILIENCE EXPERIENCE **ECONOMIC TIES** FUNDING **NEIGHBOURHOOD** **POLICY INTEGRATION** APPROVAL **SECURITY**

4.5 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results


STRUCTURAL COHESION 4.9

Rankings

Countries



Hungary 2017 vs. Hungary 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings


Countries



Hungary 2017 vs. Hungary 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK





4.0 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

• 0.4

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results


RESILIENCE 0.5 **ECONOMIC TIES** • 0.2 +****** FUNDING *** **7**.3 **NEIGHBOURHOOD** 0.0 **POLICY INTEGRATION** • 0.5 **SECURITY** 0.0 **STRUCTURAL COHESION 6.5 1**.2

Rankings


Countries



Hungary 2017 vs. Hungary 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



4.0 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results




STRUCTURAL COHESION 6.5

Rankings


Countries



Ireland 2017 vs. Ireland 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



8.0 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results


STRUCTURAL COHESION 3.7

Rankings


Countries



Ireland 2017 vs. Ireland 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro


Design

Rankings


Countries



Ireland 2017 vs. Ireland 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



8.0 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results




STRUCTURAL COHESION 3.7

Rankings


Countries



Italy 2017 vs. Italy 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



5.1 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings


Countries



Italy 2017 vs. **Italy 2007** EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembou
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlan
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor


Intro

Rankings


Countries



Italy 2017 vs. Italy 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



5.1 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results

STRUCTURAL COHESION 4.0


Rankings

Countries






Latvia 2017 vs. Latvia 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro


Design

Overall Results


Countries




Latvia 2017 vs. Latvia 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembour
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK





ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings

Countries



Latvia 2017 vs. Latvia 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK

ATTITUDES

RESILIENCE EXPERIENCE **ECONOMIC TIES** FUNDING **NEIGHBOURHOOD APPROVAL POLICY INTEGRATION SECURITY**

5.8 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results


STRUCTURAL COHESION 6.5

Rankings


Countries



Lithuania 2017 vs. Lithuania 2007 EU 2017



Italy
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Netherlands
Poland
Portugal
Romania
Slovakia
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden
UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings


Countries



Lithuania 2017 vs. Lithuania 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings


Countries



Lithuania 2017 vs. Lithuania 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



6.7 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results




STRUCTURAL COHESION 6.4

Rankings


Countries



Luxembourg 2017 vs. Luxembourg 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings


Countries



Luxembourg 2017 vs. Luxembourg 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results




Rankings

Countries



Luxembourg 2017 vs. Luxembourg 2007



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK

9.1 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results



RESILIENCE


STRUCTURAL COHESION 7.6

Rankings


Countries



Malta 2017 vs. Malta 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
	Latvia
Belgium	Lalvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembo
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlar
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



7.7 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results


STRUCTURAL COHESION 4.6

Rankings


Countries



Malta 2017 vs. Malta 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembo
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherla
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro


Design

Rankings

Countries



Malta 2017 vs. Malta 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembou
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlan
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK

7.7 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results


STRUCTURAL COHESION 4.6

Rankings

Countries



Netherlands 2017 vs. Netherlands 2007 EU 2017



6.9 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

UK

Ireland

Intro

Design

Overall Results


STRUCTURAL COHESION 5.2

Rankings

Countries



Netherlands 2017 vs. Netherlands 2007 EU 2017



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor


Intro

Design






Netherlands 2017 vs. Netherlands 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



6.9 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results



RESILIENCE


STRUCTURAL COHESION 5.2

Rankings


Countries



Poland 2017 vs. Poland 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings


Countries



Poland 2017 vs. **Poland 2007** EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembour
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherland
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor


Intro

Rankings


Countries



Poland 2017 vs. Poland 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



4.6 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results




STRUCTURAL COHESION 5.6

Rankings


Countries



Portugal 2017 vs. Portugal 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Estonia Finland	Portugal Romania
	5
Finland	Romania
Finland France	Romania Slovakia
Finland France Germany	Romania Slovakia Slovenia
Finland France Germany Greece	Romania Slovakia Slovenia Spain



5.7 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings


Countries



Portugal 2017 vs. **Portugal 2007** EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Estonia Finland	Portugal Romania
	3
Finland	Romania
Finland France	Romania Slovakia
Finland France Germany	Romania Slovakia Slovenia
Finland France Germany Greece	Romania Slovakia Slovenia Spain



5.7 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

0.6

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results


RESILIENCE 2.5 **ECONOMIC TIES** • 0.1 FUNDING • 1.1 **NEIGHBOURHOOD** • 0.4 ----**POLICY INTEGRATION** 0.0 **SECURITY** 0.7 **STRUCTURAL COHESION 4.5** 0.6

Rankings


Countries



Portugal 2017 vs. Portugal 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden



5.7 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results




STRUCTURAL COHESION 4.5

Rankings


Countries



Romania 2017 vs. Romania 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro


Design

Overall Results

Countries



Romania 2017 vs. **Romania 2007** EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



5.4 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

• 0.5

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results


RESILIENCE • 0.6 **ECONOMIC TIES •** 0.4 FUNDING **6**.4 **NEIGHBOURHOOD** 0.0 **POLICY INTEGRATION** 0.0 **SECURITY** • 0.2 **STRUCTURAL COHESION 5.7 1**.2

Rankings


Countries



Romania 2017 vs. Romania 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



5.4 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results




STRUCTURAL COHESION 5.7

Rankings


Countries



Slovakia 2017 vs. Slovakia 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings


Countries



Slovakia 2017 vs. **Slovakia 2007** EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings


Countries



Slovakia 2017 vs. Slovakia 2007 EU 2017



Italy
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Netherlands
Poland
Portugal
Romania
Slovakia
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden
UK



5.9 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results




STRUCTURAL COHESION 6.8

Rankings


Countries



Slovenia 2017 vs. Slovenia 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings


Countries



Slovenia 2017 vs. **Slovenia 2007** EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



6.3 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

• 0.1

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results


RESILIENCE • 1.9 **ECONOMIC TIES** 6.0 FUNDING **2**.9 . **NEIGHBOURHOOD** 0.0 -**POLICY INTEGRATION 1**.0 **SECURITY** 0.0 **STRUCTURAL COHESION 5.8 0**.4

Rankings


Countries



Slovenia 2017 vs. Slovenia 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



6.3 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results




STRUCTURAL COHESION 5.8

Rankings


Countries



Spain 2017 vs. Spain 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings


Countries



Spain 2017 vs. Spain 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor


Intro

Design


Countries



Spain 2017 vs. Spain 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



6.2 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results


STRUCTURAL COHESION 4.7

Rankings


Countries



Sweden 2017 vs. Sweden 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



6.5 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results


STRUCTURAL COHESION 4.5

Rankings


Countries




Sweden 2017 vs. **Sweden 2007** EU 2017



Austria Belgium Bulgaria Croatia Cyprus Czech Rep. Denmark Estonia Finland	Italy Latvia Lithuania Luxembourg Malta Netherlands Poland Portugal Romania
Cyprus	
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK





ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design


Overall Results

Rankings


Countries



Sweden 2017 vs. Sweden 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



6.5 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results




STRUCTURAL COHESION 4.5

Rankings

Countries



UK 2017 vs. UK 2007 EU 2017



Italy
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Netherlands
Poland
Portugal
Romania
Slovakia
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden
UK

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro


Design

Overall Results


Countries



UK 2017 vs. **UK 2007** EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK




ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro


Design



UK 2017 vs. UK 2007 EU 2017



Austria	Italy
Belgium	Latvia
Bulgaria	Lithuania
Croatia	Luxembourg
Cyprus	Malta
Czech Rep.	Netherlands
Denmark	Poland
Estonia	Portugal
Finland	Romania
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Ireland	UK



4.9 INDIVIDUAL COHESION

ecfr.eu/eucohesionmonitor

Intro

Design

Overall Results

STRUCTURAL COHESION 3.7

Rankings

Countries

