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></th>
<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>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.F</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.D</td>
<td></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

1. B

North  East  South  West

✓ 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
Main Findings

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’
2. Does the intervention logic work? ✓

Key factors

**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

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

+3150 5224 945
hulsman@snn.eu
snn.eu