We stimulate, facilitate and connect.

ERDF impact evaluation 2014-2020

a case from the Netherlands
The Netherlands

twelve provinces
ERDF in the Netherlands

four regions
ERDF in the Netherlands

Northern Netherlands Alliance (SNN) – since 1992

We stimulate, facilitate and connect
ERDF in the Netherlands

✔ 4 regions – 4 OP’s – 4 MA’s
✔ Coordinating body: Ministry of Economic Affairs
✔ Operational Programmes:
  ✔ Similarities in content & implementing system
  ✔ Collaboration:
    ✔ Management & control
    ✔ ICT
    ✔ Communication
    ✔ Legal matters / State Aid
    ✔ Evaluation
ERDF in the Netherlands

Investment priorities OP's ERDF 2014-2020 NLs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.B</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.F</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governance OP’s ERDF NLs

✔ Joint set of selection criteria:
  ✔ Contribution to objectives
  ✔ Innovativeness
  ✔ Quality business case
  ✔ Quality application
  ✔ Sustainability

✔ Minimum score: 70 out of 100 points

✔ Project assessment by external experts
  ✔ Committees independent from government
Monitoring & Evaluation

- **Investment priorities**
  - specific objectives → result indicators
    - Issue of responsiveness
    - Indicators regionalized by National Bureau of Statistics
    - Custom built indicators

- **Evaluation Plans**
  - Coordinated plans
  - Agreement to collaborate where effective & efficient
2018 joint Impact Evaluation

Investment priorities OP’s ERDF 2014-2020 NLs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Specific objectives:

- Knowledge development
- Innovation & valorisation SME’s

✓ Approach

- “inherent wish to improve”
  → Information we need ourselves
- Scientific approach
- Projects ongoing → ‘Theory based approach’ (“How & why?”)
Research questions

1. Do MA’s select “the right projects”?  
   → projects that contribute to the specific objectives  
     - ‘strength link project & programme objectives’

2. Does the intervention logic work?  
   - ‘intended vs actual results’
Methodology

Quantitative:

✓ Evaluation scores
  ✓ 600 projects (330 approved; 270 rejected)
  ✓ complex projects, majority by consortia, min € 100.000 ERDF

Qualitative:

✓ Questionnaire research
  ✓ Lead beneficiaries

✓ Comparative case study research
  ✓ 20 cases, large variety in project success
  ✓ In depth interviews
    ✓ Lead beneficiaries selected cases
    ✓ Members expert committee
    ✓ Representatives Managing Authorities
Main Findings

1. Do MA’s select “the right projects”? ✓

“ERDF unique position in Dutch funding landscape”

→ ‘Knowledge and innovation consortia’:

Collaborative initiatives with high degree of complexity
- only few alternative funding possibilities available

Risky projects – ERDF as catalyst (raises enthusiasm and commitment)
Main Findings

1. Do MA’s select “the right projects”? ✓

Challenge: “more projects that make a difference”

Recommendations:
- Encourage awareness about need for ambition
- Generic frameworks
- More financially ambitious calls: ↑% ERDF
1. Do MA’s select “the right projects”? √

Governance system works
→ ‘expert committee as crucial gatekeeper’

Recommendations:
- Guarantee independent role expert committees
  - Potential conflict of interests remains focal point
- More intensive use pitches
  → ‘ability to look initiators in the eyes’
Main Findings

2. Does the intervention logic work? √

Key factors

* Collaboration from outset, within formal frameworks → ↑ relational quality (transparency within consortium, degree of involvement, mutual trust)

**project development phase**

↑ intensity collaboration partners* → ↑ project success
↑ intensity involvement intermediaries → ↓ project success

**project implementation phase**

↑ involvement end users → ↑ project success
↑ agile project management → ↑ project success
↑ informality collaboration → ↓ project success
Main Findings

2. Does the intervention logic work? ✓

Challenge: Administrative overload ↔ context SME’s during application & implementation ('cascade system of auditing') ↔ context SME’s

Recommendations:

- Reduce turnaround time
- Long term effort to control structure based on mutual trust
To conclude

Overall content with evaluation project & outcome

• Impact
• Joint exercise
• Scientific approach

• Identify with main conclusions & recommendations

Follow up process (via Monitoring Committees)
Thank you!
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snn.eu