



**EXPERT EVALUATION NETWORK  
DELIVERING POLICY ANALYSIS ON THE  
PERFORMANCE OF COHESION POLICY 2007–2013**

**TASK 2: COUNTRY REPORT ON  
ACHIEVEMENTS OF COHESION POLICY**

**HUNGARY**

**VERSION: FINAL  
DATE: DECEMBER 2010**

**BARTHA, ATTILA – NAGY, KATALIN – GYUKICS, RITA  
KOPINT-TÁRKI**

**A report to the European Commission  
Directorate-General Regional Policy**

**Contents**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	3
SECTION 1 – SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT .....	5
SECTION 2 – THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY PURSUED, THE EU CONTRIBUTION TO THIS AND THE POLICY ACHIEVEMENTS OVER THE PERIOD .....	7
SECTION 3 – EFFECTS OF INTERVENTION .....	20
SECTION 4 – EVALUATIONS AND GOOD PRACTICE IN EVALUATION .....	20
SECTION 5 – CONCLUDING REMARKS – FUTURE CHALLENGES .....	22
REFERENCES.....	24
INTERVIEWS .....	27
TABLES .....	27

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

*Macroeconomic trends* in Hungary and the development of the Hungarian NUTS 2 regions show some particular features when compared to other EU12 Member States. Strong economic growth and consequently rapid convergence characterised the country in the late 1990s and the first half of the last decade; however, signs of a crisis became evident before the global economic recession. Since 2006, the main macroeconomic indicators have revealed a markedly weaker performance than for the Czech Republic, Poland or Slovakia. This has been accompanied by gradually widening territorial inequalities in a period when convergence came to a virtual halt. The crisis did not lead to any change in this tendency.

*Regional policy* interventions were planned along six priority axes: 1) economic development, 2) transport infrastructure, 3) social renewal, 4) the environment and development of energy supplies, 5) regional development and 6) state reform and have been integrated into 7 regional Operational Programmes and 7 comprehensive Operational Programmes. Support to Convergence regions is concentrated on the environment and energy and transport, accounting for 58% of total funding, while around 37% is allocated to the development of the enterprise environment and territorial development. In order to respond to the recession, in 2009 the government initiated a substantial reallocation between the different OPs, with more going to the Economic Development Operational Programme in particular, where most of the funding was allocated to the Complex development of enterprises priority (focused on SMEs), especially to the support of SMEs, with a smaller part going to JEREMIE-type interventions.

There are three broad types of project: 1) major projects, 2) priority projects, i.e. those selected by government and centrally managed and 3) projects resulting from calls for proposals. At the end of 2009, some 26% of the funds were allocated to transport development, 19% to R&D activities, innovation and business promotion, and 18% to environment protection and risk prevention.

First results suggest that *interventions* will probably have more *effect* on growth than on the employment situation which has worsened in the past two years. Although there has been some reallocation of funding to the Economic Development Programme, largely to support SMEs, according to preliminary results, the impact on employment may be smaller than anticipated, and in some cases even negative.

Large scale investment projects are at present in the early stage of implementation. For several programmes, 2007 was a preparatory year, the first calls were launched in 2008 and most of the contracts were signed in 2009. This delay means that there is little data on the effects of the interventions and any analysis of these needs to be made at a later date. This is the aim of

the series of mid-term evaluations which are being conducted at present by the National Development Agency.

In Hungary, the first steps toward a coordinated evaluation strategy of (Cohesion) Policy interventions were taken in 2004, but before 2007, the evaluations were not really focused and were of mixed quality. Since the beginning of the 2007–2013 period, the professional and financial independence of the evaluation unit has become stronger, and there has been a shift from a somewhat *ad-hoc* approach towards a more conceptual planning of evaluations. The present evaluations are focused on four main areas: problematic construction projects, Monitoring Commission discussions, the mid-term achievements of Operational Programmes and the major action plans. In addition, a new initiative involving coordinated ‘twinning’ of evaluations with fellow Central-European Member States has been launched.

Since only qualified evaluation consortia can participate in Hungarian evaluation tenders, the quality of the evaluations produced is relatively high and strong competition reduces their cost. The two points of criticism of the present practice concern the professional independence of evaluators (who are partly recruited from those working previously in Cohesion Policy related areas in different Ministries) and access to reliable data which is necessary to undertake the evaluations. In addition, there is a need for a stronger response from policy-makers to the main evaluation findings, which would entrench the practice in the political system.

## SECTION 1 – SOCIO–ECONOMIC CONTEXT

Macroeconomic trends in Hungary and the development of the Hungarian NUTS 2 regions show some particular features. Strong economic growth and consequently rapid convergence occurred in the late 1990s and the first half of the past decade. However, signs of crisis were evident before the global economic recession. Since 2006, the main macroeconomic indicators have revealed a significant weakening in economic performance as compared with the Czech Republic, Poland and Slovakia. This was accompanied by a persistent fiscal imbalance, the General Government deficit averaging over 7% of GDP between 2003 and 2006 (see Table 2)<sup>1</sup>. The increase in public expenditure occurred in the context of the ‘well-being system change’, which meant a re-allocation of expenditure from development towards public sector wages and pensions. The introduction of the so-called ‘13<sup>th</sup> month’ pension and wages in the public sector was an emblematic feature of this period (this was subsequently withdrawn in the crisis period).

The unsolved problem of a lack of fiscal rigour gave rise to three serious socio-economic consequences. (1) The ‘*social results*’ achieved by the unsustainable fiscal expansion were fragile and disappeared in late-2008 after stabilisation measures were introduced. (2) Instead of concentrating policy efforts on the strategic problems of the Hungarian economic development (a low level of education and high unemployment; insufficient innovation and entrepreneurial capacity in the poorer regions; low internal migration; and problems of financing the health and pension system), the debate took place in a politically populist context. A typical issue in the early 2000s was ‘wage convergence’ and the main achievement of development policy was measured by the ‘length of new motorways’<sup>2</sup>. Most long-term socio-economic challenges remained essentially untackled. In this context, it is not surprising that EU Cohesion Policy resources were mainly targeted at maximising absorption (i.e. ‘no money should be ‘lost’ from the EU transfers’) and the real socio-economic effects of the transfers were of secondary importance (Bartha – Nagy 2009). (3) The third major consequence of persistent fiscal imbalances was that by late 2008 Hungary became one of the few countries in the EU that required financial support of the International Monetary Fund and the EU to avoid financial collapse. The price of this support was that Hungarian economic policy-makers were constrained to apply extreme restrictive fiscal measures during the crisis, while other Central-European Member States were able temporarily to mitigate the adverse consequences of the crisis by implementing counter-cyclical expansionary fiscal measures. Although the restrictive

---

<sup>1</sup> See Excel file for Table 2.

<sup>2</sup> For a typical example see the press conference of Mr. Kóka, the Minister of the Economy in 2005 on the Competitiveness of Hungary: [http://nfm.gov.hu/data/cms1729978/rendk\\_sajt.pdf](http://nfm.gov.hu/data/cms1729978/rendk_sajt.pdf)

measures can be considered successful from the perspective of macroeconomic stabilisation<sup>3</sup>, the long-term socio-economic challenges remain to be tackled, while social inequalities increased further and territorial disparities remained.

Hungarian development has been characterised by wide and gradually increasing territorial inequalities. There are clear long-term trends in this respect: between 1995 and 2008, GDP per capita increased by 25 percentage points relative to the national average in the most developed region, Central Hungary, to reach a level 66% above average. GDP per head in the two dynamic regions of Central and Western Transdanubia remained much the same in relative terms (at 89% and 97% of the national average, respectively, in 2008) while the relative position of the two Southern regions (Southern Transdanubia and Southern Great Plain) and the two North-eastern regions (Northern Hungary and Northern Great Plain) worsened (to around two-thirds or less of the national average in 2008). These four regions have among the lowest levels of GDP per capita in the EU (around 40% of the EU average) (Table 1)<sup>4</sup>. Moreover, regional disparities have widened in a period when the convergence GDP per head of Hungary towards that in the more developed EU Member States has come to a virtual halt.

The underlying causes of underdevelopment in these regions are structural: besides the low level of employment and the extremely low labour market participation rate of the 55–64 age group, the large share of employment in agriculture and the conspicuous weakness of business services are also clear signs of fundamental problems of growth. Most development policy achievements were in the construction of the motorway network, but not in the general road and railway network, which hampered mobility and did not enable the less developed regions to catch up in this respect.

The crisis had no particular effects on regional disparities. On the one hand, the decline in the export markets had more serious consequences in the regions with stronger export industries (Central Hungary and Central and Western Transdanubia); on the other, the restrictive fiscal policy hit the less developed regions most since local companies tend to be more dependent on the domestic market. The crisis, however, has had general effects across the country, hitting both the public and private sectors as well as all regions. During the crisis, development policy was mainly funded by EU resources.

---

<sup>3</sup> According to the Eurostat News Release (Published 15 November 2010), the Hungarian General Government deficit was 4.4% of the GDP in 2009, while the respective figure was 6.3% in the Euro area and 6.8% in the EU27. (See also Table 2).

<sup>4</sup> See Excel file for Table 1.

## **SECTION 2 – THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY PURSUED, THE EU CONTRIBUTION TO THIS AND THE POLICY ACHIEVEMENTS OVER THE PERIOD**

The two major goals of the Hungarian NSRF (called the New Hungary Development Plan) for 2007–2013 are to support economic growth coupled with a substantial improvement in employment. The latter is especially important, since participation rates are low and there has been little employment growth, especially in the case of the less-qualified, untrained sections of the population. During the transition, the Hungarian economy became fully integrated into the world economy and a successful process of modernisation took place, but regional disparities remained wide. Despite some catching-up at national level, the gap between North-West Hungary and the Eastern and Southern regions of the country has remained persistently wide over the past 20 years, and the predominant economic position of the capital city region as compared with other parts of the country has remained unchanged.

In addition to the development of the economy, strengthening regional and social cohesion is also an important objective of policy. In order to pursue the main aims of the NHDP, planned interventions will be implemented along six priority axes: 1) economic development, 2) transport infrastructure, 3) social renewal, 4) the environment and energy development, 5) regional development and 6) state reform. The above priorities are pursued by 7 regional Operational Programmes and 7 comprehensive Operational Programmes.<sup>5</sup> The initiatives that fall under central responsibility are those that contribute to improving the competitiveness of the economy as a whole, where development covers the entire country, or where intervention affects institutions operating under central control. The initiatives relating to regional development, requiring local accountability or aimed at improving local or regional competitiveness fall under the responsibility of the regions.

### **THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY PURSUED**

Table 3<sup>6</sup> shows the breakdown of funding by main policy area under the different Objectives. In Convergence regions, funding is concentrated on the environment and energy and transport, which account for 58% of total funding. A further 37% of funding is allocated to the development of the enterprise environment and territorial development. Funding under the Competitiveness and employment Objective focuses on improving the enterprise environment and on territorial development. Accordingly the two most strongly supported programmes are

---

<sup>5</sup> According to the NHDP 2007–2013 Hungary is entitled to receive EUR 22.4 billion (at 2004 prices) from the Structural Funds, EUR 3.8 billion from the EARDF and EUR 34.3 million from the EFF.

<sup>6</sup> See Excel file for Table 3.

the Transport OP and the Environment and Energy OP, which absorb more than 40% of the Structural Funds. In order to respond to the effects of the recession, the Government initiated a substantial reallocation of funding between the different OPs in 2009, with more going to the Economic Development OP, where most of the funds were allocated to the Complex Development of Enterprises priority (focused on SMEs), especially to the support of SMEs with a smaller part to JEREMIE-type interventions<sup>7</sup>.

The share of funding allocated to Territorial Cooperation and cross-border activities is relatively small, around EUR 300 million, or 1.5% of total funding. Hungary has formulated bilateral cross-border programmes with neighbouring countries. The programme concerning the Ukrainian border is in this respect an exception, since a four-party programme involving the Hungarian-Slovak-Ukrainian-Romanian border regions will be implemented. These programmes also differ depending on whether the neighbouring partner is an EU Member State or not. Programmes affecting the Hungarian-Romanian, the Hungarian-Slovakian, the Hungarian-Austrian and the Hungarian-Slovenian borders are co-financed from the ERDF, while programmes implemented along the Hungarian-Croatian and the Hungarian-Serbian borders are partly financed out of pre-accession facilities (IPA). In the case of the programme for the Hungarian-Ukrainian border region, Hungarian funding is complemented by finance from the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI). Cross-border cooperation is especially important as Hungarian-speaking minorities live in regions along the border. The aim of these programmes is to support cross-border activities which respond to real needs: the development of transport facilities on both sides of the border, improving the preconditions for communication, pursuing common environmental projects which are of mutual interest, encouraging cross-border business cooperation and joint R&D activities and supporting cooperation in training and education as well as activities contributing to social cohesion.

As noted above, the two major goals of the NHDP are to encourage sustainable growth and support employment. In order to achieve these goals, the allocation of funds for the improvement of the transport network and the environment contributes to both objectives by increasing sustainability and creating new jobs and additional demand. The modernisation of the transport system helps to increase internal (regional and local) and international accessibility and the mobility of labour and to attract direct investments. Improving the enterprise environment and allocating additional resources to this aim may also support these two major objectives.

So far as the regional allocation of funds is concerned, the three less developed regions (North Hungary, the Northern Great Plain and the Southern Great Plain) receive 45.5% of the total

---

<sup>7</sup> Gazdaságfejlesztési Operatív Program Éves Végrehajtási Jelentés – 2009



funding allocated to regional Operational Programmes. Central Hungary receives the largest amount despite being the only region under the Competitiveness and employment objective, because of its population size and absorption capacity. All non-regional OPs give special importance to the group of least developed sub-regions<sup>8</sup> which are supported by special programmes.

The development of regional policy is closely linked to the process of Hungary acceding to the EU. The legal background of the territorial-spatial development policy in Hungary was regarded as one of the most advanced in Central Europe in the mid-1990s. However, the regions (NUTS 2) remained weak without any real political or economic power. The traditional territorial units of the Hungarian state administration, the counties (NUTS 3 regions), survived and remained significant actors in territorial development policy-making. The structure of the regional Operational Programmes follow very similar patterns, the share of funds allocated to these OPs is about 23% of the total Structural Funds.

## **POLICY IMPLEMENTATION**

The data on policy implementation shows that NHDP commitments had made substantial progress by the end of 2009, around 74% of total funding being committed by the end of 2009. There are, however, large differences between the different Operational Programmes (see Table 4)<sup>9</sup>, e.g. commitments in the case of human resource development were modest as compared with the average, while they were above the average in the case of economic development. Commitments increased further in 2010, so that at present only around 23% of total funding remains uncommitted.<sup>10</sup> Expenditure, on the other, has been slow, but has accelerated during 2010. At the end of 2009, some 70% of total payments to beneficiaries went to cover actual expenditure (i.e. invoices submitted) and about 30% to pre-financing.

There are three broad types of project: 1) major projects, 2) priority projects, i.e. those decided by Government and centrally managed and 3) projects resulting from calls for proposal. The NHDP contained 35 major projects in its indicative list, 27 approved by the government, and 16 by the Commission at the end of 2009. These are focused on improving transport infrastructure (road construction, the development of railways, water transport and urban transport), supporting environmental projects (waste water treatment, improvement of the quality of drinking water in the two Great Plain regions, flood protection, development in the Danube-Tisza region, and waste management in Western and Central Hungary).

---

<sup>8</sup> 33 regions selected on the basis of composite indicators the development of which is supported by a priority programme.

<sup>9</sup> See Excel file for Table 4.

<sup>10</sup> Presentation by the Nemzeti Fejlesztési Ügynökség, 04.08.2010.

By the end of 2009, 358 priority projects had been approved by the Government. However, real progress, i.e. the beginning of physical implementation, only took place in transport, ESF funding and some regional programmes. Projects contracted as a result of calls for proposal showed most progress, especially in the last quarter of 2009. Almost half of the contracted funding falls on projects supported under the Economic Development OP, the Social Infrastructure OP and the Environment and Energy OP. The implementation of the Jeremie scheme, the micro-credit programme supporting SMEs, seems to be the most advanced intervention.

The implementation of policy is in line with the initial plan. Some 26% of funding was allocated to transport development, 19% to R&D activities, innovation and business promotion and 18% to environment protection and risk prevention, i.e. 63% of the total altogether. The data confirm that these priority areas are able to absorb funding and projects are being generated.

**Table A – Commitments, contracted projects and payments as % of total allocated funds**

	Commitments	Contracted projects	Payments
State reform OP	39	33	10.8
Electronic Public Administration OP	57	43	11.5
Economic Development OP	71	44	12.9
Environment and Energy OP	100	17	2.1
Transport OP	90	63	12.7
Social Renewal OP	39	25	7.7
Social Infrastructure OP	58	34	3.2
Implementation OP	43	43	26.7
Central Hungary OP	69	43	14.7
West Pannon OP	67	27	9.2
Central Transdanubia OP	78	25	7.9
South Transdanubia OP	80	34	10.6
North Great Plain OP	61	23	7.6
South Great Plain OP	66	28	11.3
North Hungary OP	60	23	8.4
<b>NHDP</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>9.2</b>

Source: Data based on the different AIRs, as at 31.12. 2009.

**Table B – Data on expenditure by beneficiaries on the basis of the AIR 2009 (EUR million)**

Country	Fund	Expenditure paid out by the beneficiaries included in payment claims sent to the managing authority	Corresponding public Contribution	Private Expenditure	Expenditure paid by the body responsible for making payments to the beneficiaries	Total payments received from the Commission
HU	CF	586.2	547.2		441.7	500.1
	ERDF	1,855.0	1,064.7		873	1,262.4
	ESF	194.9	194.9		172.1	432.9
<b>HU</b>		<b>2,636.1</b>	<b>1,806.7</b>		<b>1,486.9</b>	<b>2,195.5</b>

Source: European Commission

**Table C – Total amount of certified eligible expenditure (EUR million)**

Country	Fund	Total funding of the OP (Union and national)	Total amount of certified eligible expenditure paid by beneficiaries	Corresponding public contribution
HU	CF	10,167.4	338.1	327.4
	ERDF	14,882.1	1,025.7	626.7
	ESF	4,269.5	139.1	137.4
<b>HU</b>		<b>29,319.0</b>	<b>1,502.8</b>	<b>1,091.5</b>

Source: European Commission

According to calculations in the AIRs, 44.7% of committed resources was earmarked for Lisbon objectives. This share is even larger for approved projects. In this respect, funding in particular for transport, economic development and human resource development is of importance.

### **ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE PROGRAMMES SO FAR**

So far indicators suggest that the programmes have made only modest achievements. The consequences of the recession 2008–2009 have also had adverse effects on implementation and achievements. A restrictive fiscal policy and exchange rate fluctuations have had a negative influence on the business climate. The economic forecasts and assumptions of the NHDP were based on a different business climate and a more favourable labour market situation. The first results indicate that interventions will probably have more positive effects on growth than on the employment situation which has worsened during the past two years. As already noted, some funding was reallocated by the Government with the aim of encouraging development and supporting SMEs under the Economic Development OP. The preconditions for the reallocation was that the cut in funds should not have any adverse effects on the future implementation of individual OPs, and that funds should be reduced in areas where the demand for funding was less than expected, where possible risks in implementation might occur and where problems with eligibility criteria are most likely. Reallocation was aimed at giving support to the most vulnerable groups, on the one hand (SMEs, the less qualified groups on the labour market and those needing to adapt to new job requirements), and to preserve the competitiveness of the economy, on the other (to improve the business climate and to pursue sustainable development). As a result of reallocation, the priority 2 axis of the Economic Development OP (Complex Development of enterprises) became more important.

According to a model simulation in the Strategic Report, as a result of interventions, economic growth might be up to 0.5% higher than without interventions over the 2007–2015 period. However, the effect on employment might be less than anticipated and, in some cases, interventions could have an adverse effect on employment. Another problem is that – according to international experience – while there may be positive effects from intervention during the period of support, there may be problems of sustainability afterwards. According to

projections, therefore, the largest effect on employment is forecast for 2015 (a growth in the number of employees of up to 2% above what it otherwise would be, but after then this effect will diminish. The effect on investment may be similar – up until 2015, rapid growth may be expected relative to a non-intervention scenario, but after, the effect is reduced and multiplier effects are modest.

Uncertainties relating to regional effects are greater. In line with the objective of strengthening cohesion, the least developed regions should catch up. However, the absorption capacity of these regions is limited and considerations of efficiency might also hinder their development. Funding in rural areas in most cases does not come from the NHDP, but from the New Rural Development Programme. The NHDP gives special importance to the development of the least developed sub-regions. The regional OPs also focus on those areas where projects are slow to get underway and due to human capacity shortages, the formulation of ideas for projects is more difficult. Absorption in more developed regions, and consequently the effect on growth and employment, is, therefore, likely to be greater in Western and Central Hungary, than in the Eastern regions. Of course, some dynamic urban areas may be an exception. This is also indicated by the regional distribution of commitments as at the end of 2009: according to data from the National Development Agency more than 20% of the funding committed is in Central Hungary.

A brief summary of the main outputs of the OPs is set out below.

### **1) Economic Development OP**

The programme is aimed at supporting R&D activities, business innovation, SMEs, business infrastructure and enterprise development in Convergence regions. The programme seems to be relatively successful, progress in committing funding has been relatively good from the beginning and the implementation of the projects is progressing well. Micro- and small enterprises are the major beneficiaries of the programme (almost half of the funding is allocated to them), in line with initial intentions. Regional allocation of funding is relatively balanced. Some 6,500 project contracts were signed by the end of 2009, almost half (44%), of the 7-year allocation was committed by contracts. Jeremie-type interventions proved to be successful; almost 11,000 enterprises taking advantage of this facility. The creation of new jobs is also an important aim of the Programme, and the evidence suggests that 14,800 new jobs were likely to be created by the end of the financing period. Some 324 research projects had been initiated by end-2009. It is estimated that every HUF invested generates HUF 1.7 of private capital investment, which is a much better result than that achieved in the previous programming period.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Jelentés a Gazdaságfejlesztési Operatív Program 2009 évi megvalósulásáról, 2010. június

## 2) Social Renewal OP

The Social Renewal OP is aimed at improving labour activity by influencing the supply side of the labour market and the development of human resources. It is a multi-objective programme as interventions affect both Convergence and Competitiveness regions. The implementation of the programme is divided into 7 priority axes: 1) Improving employability, promoting entry into the labour market; 2) Improving adaptability; 3) Providing quality education and ensuring access for all; 4) Developing the content and organisation of higher education to create a knowledge-based economy; 5) Strengthening social inclusion and participation; 6) Preserving health and human resource development in the health care system; 7) Implementing the OP's priority axes in the Central Hungary region. The largest amount of funding goes to the priority axis 3, while the first two priorities receive around 40% of the total. About 12% of the total funding of the OP goes to Central Hungary. Reallocation occurred only within the OP, between priorities 1 and 2. Commitments in respect of interventions in Convergence regions amounted to 39% of the total funding, while in the Competitiveness region (i.e. in Central Hungary), it amounted to 72%.

Expenditure was modest since most of the calls for proposals were published in 2008, and in the case of some priorities the first contracts were concluded only in late 2008 or 2009. The most progress was in the first two priorities, where some 8% of total funding allocated was paid to beneficiaries. There are large differences in progress as regards the individual priority axes. In the case of education and health care, the implementation of projects accelerated in 2010. Due to a slow start of the programme, no real assessment of indicators is possible. A special difficulty of the programme lies in its multi-objective character: the absorption capacity of Central Hungary is greater than that of other regions, but due to phasing-in, the time-span for the use of funds is shorter, and consequently not all the funds might be used.<sup>12</sup>

## 3) Social Infrastructure OP

The Social infrastructure OP is closely linked to the Social Renewal OP. The major objective of the OP is also to increase employment, coupled with the specific aims of reducing regional imbalances with respect to social infrastructure and improving the efficiency of public services by improving physical infrastructure. These aims are pursued through 3 priority axes: improving infrastructure for education and training, health care and labour market participation and social inclusion. The programme is limited to Convergence regions. Similar activities are funded in Central Hungary under the OP for the region. The OP showed relatively good progress in terms of commitments, with over 70% of total the funding allocated being committed by the

---

<sup>12</sup> Jelentés a Társadalmi Megújulás Operatív Program 2009. évi megvalósításáról, 2010. Június

end of 2009.<sup>13</sup> Commitments were especially high in education, where due to reallocation, funding was cut by around 12%. The largest amount of funding (more than the half of the OP) is allocated to improving health care infrastructure; where, however, payments to beneficiaries were especially small, as they were for education and training. This slow progress can be explained by the fact that in both areas a number of large scale projects are being implemented which involve lengthy public procurement procedures. Beneficiaries are schools, universities, training institutes, libraries, museums, municipalities, health-care institutions and public service institutions. So far as the territorial allocation of funding is concerned, sub-regions with urban centres were especially effective in obtaining resources. The least developed sub-regions received only minor support, as a consequence, in particular, of being less capable of generating projects. The physical implementation of the programme is very limited so far and results will take sometime to become apparent.

#### **4) State Reform OP**

The main goals of the State Reform OP consist of supporting the renewal of public administration, improving the quality of human resources and supporting certain interventions in respect of public administration in Central Hungary. The Programme is aimed at increasing the quality of the administrative and legal procedures involved, improving the effectiveness of government and the efficiency of administrative, defence and judicial bodies as well as that of non-government organisations performing administrative functions. Interventions cover the whole country. By the end of 2009, 43% of the total funding was contractually committed and about 10% had been paid to beneficiaries to cover expenditure.

#### **5) Electronic Public Administration OP**

The Electronic Public Administration OP is aimed at supporting investment in ICT so as to improve the quality and efficiency of public administration. The indicator showing the increase in the use of e-government services by the business sector and by individuals measures the effectiveness of the programme. According to recent data, the use of such services by individuals has not changed since 2007, but has increased significantly in the case of businesses. However, this is also due to legal changes. 34 ICT projects are supported by the OP (a core indicator). Interventions can be implemented in both Convergence and Competitiveness regions. The OP includes numerous priority projects involving time-consuming public procurement procedures. Beneficiaries of the funding are ministries, public authorities, justice institutions and state owned enterprises. As a result of the OP, 4 new online e-government services have been introduced so far.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Jelentés a Társadalmi Megújulás Operatív Program 2009. évi megvalósításáról, 2010. Június

<sup>14</sup> REPORT on the implementation of the Electronic Administration Operational Programme in 2009, June 2010,

## 6) Transport OP

The Transport OP is aimed at improving the overall transport network in Hungary. It is divided into 5 priority axes: 1) Improving the international accessibility of the country and different regional centres by road and contributing to the construction of the TEN-T network; 2) Improving the international accessibility of the country and different regional centres by rail and waterways; 3) Improving regional accessibility by the construction of public roads; 4) Supporting intermodal transport links and the improvement of the related infrastructure; 5) Supporting the development of urban and sub-urban transport. The OP consists mainly of priority, large-scale projects. A large number of major projects above EUR 50 million will also be implemented. Projects are funded from the Cohesion Fund as well as the ERDF.

The Transport OP is one of the best performing OPs. Already in 2008, calls amounting to 40% of the total funding of the OP were published and contractual commitments represented 25% of the funding allocated. 35 contracts were concluded. In 2009, the OP was modified in response to the recession, but progress continued as these adjustments affected only the first and the third priorities of the programme. At the end 2009, the calls published amounted to 70% of total funding and contractual commitments to 50%. Under priority 3, 61 kms regional roads had been constructed.

The recent decision of the European Commission in October 2010 to suspend interim payments in respect of the Transport OP is a response to anomalies concerning public procurement procedures in relation to the Metro 4 project. As outlined already in the Annual Implementation Report of 2009<sup>15</sup>, the Managing Authority launched a control procedure to conduct a comprehensive analysis of a series of contracts and submitted financial corrections amounting to EUR 26.8 million. This was not accepted by the Commission, which suggested a revision to the total costs of 11 contracts. The negotiations between the Hungarian government and the Commission did not succeed in reaching an agreement, and at present a revision of 38 contracts is on the agenda. According to the National Development Agency the implementation of other parts of the programme can be continued and the necessary funding will be provided. If negotiations take longer than anticipated, budget resources will be made available to run projects which are not affected by suspension.

## 7) The Environment and Energy OP

The EEOP is multi-objective. Major goals of the programme are strengthening environmental protection, development of environmental infrastructure, the more rational use of natural resources, and the preservation of cultural and natural resources especially in deprived areas. The first results show that calls in respect of projects for clean water supply were not successful

---

<sup>15</sup> Jelentés a KÖZOP 2009. évi megvalósításáról. HU1 7 AIR2007 HU161PO 007, pp. 94.

because there was no satisfactory response to them. In the case of waste management projects, cost-benefit analysis sometimes led to unsatisfactory results and in some cases maintenance problems occurred as well. Projects for sewage collection facilities exceeded the available resources. Around 21% of the total funding available had been committed by end-2009 and only 2.64% had been paid to beneficiaries, much less than average.

#### **8) Western Transdanubia Regional OP**

The Western Transdanubia Regional OP (is focused on the development of environmental and transport infrastructure and tourism as well as on preserving the cultural and historical heritage of the region. As in the case of other programmes, there was a significant acceleration in activities in 2009. Under priorities 1-4 (regional economic development, tourism, regional transport and environmental projects and urban development), 29 calls for proposal had been launched by the end of 2009, 18 during the year 19 projects were identified as priorities and of 587 proposals, some 134 were approved and 124 contracts were signed. Seven projects had been completed at the end of 2009. Priority projects recently decided involve the construction of a wellness bathing facility, regionally important tourist projects in the border region and reconstruction of one of the main regional urban centres (Nagykanizsa).<sup>16</sup>

#### **9) South Great Plain OP**

The main aims of the South Great Plain OP are the same as for all the regional OPs – support of economic development, tourism, transport infrastructure, the development of human resources and urban development. The first two years of the programming period were entirely taken up by preparatory work and projects did not really begin until 2009. By this time, 27 calls had been launched and by the end of the year, 456 contracts had been agreed, 332 during the year. Expenditure amounted to around 10% of the total funding allocated for the period, which is above the Hungarian average, and Contractual commitments to 34% of the total. By the end of 2009, 22 priority projects had been decided, focusing mainly on the construction of roads, environmental infrastructure, the development of tourism and urban regeneration. Projects on economic development showed relatively slow progress and in a number of cases contractors abandoned projects because of financial difficulties or lack of credit guarantees. The inability of enterprises to undertake new investment was apparent during 2009. A further problem is the dramatic financial position of municipalities in the region which might prevent them for responding to future calls.

---

<sup>16</sup> Jelentés a Nyugat-dunántúli Operatív Program 2009. évi megvalósításáról, 2010. június



### **10) Central Transdanubia OP**

The Central Transdanubia OP is focused on the development of local transport infrastructure and the improvement of environmental facilities as well as on improvement in tourist infrastructure and related facilities. Around 53% of the total funding of the OP is allocated to these areas. During the first three years of the period, 48 calls and 9 priority projects were launched. Applications were for funding were over four times as large as the funding committed to projects, which amounted to around 28% of the total available for the period. Payments to beneficiaries amounted to just under 7% of available funding. Administrative problems, such as the shortage of human resources in the regional development, agency, hindered the implementation of the OP. Modest results from implementation are evident: macroeconomic indicators show a mixed picture, in the sense that the employment situation deteriorated, while income increased a little. Job creation arising from intervention is at present modest, but according to plans 600 new jobs should be created, of which 100 will be for women. The demand for support to improve local business facilities proved to be much higher than originally planned. Tourist development projects showed reasonable progress even if tourism suffered from the effects of the recession. Urban rehabilitation projects were less popular and few results from the support provided are evident so far.<sup>17</sup>

### **11) Central Hungary OP**

Since it is a 'phasing-in' region, special regulations were introduced for Central Hungary. The level of funding will fall by 2011, when the region will shift to becoming eligible for support under the Competitiveness Objective. In the meantime, Central Hungary has been entitled to the same type of development support as the Convergence regions. The main aims of the OP are economic development, support of tourism, human resource development, transport, energy and the environment and urban regeneration. In response to the global crisis, there was some reallocation of funding, support for economic development increasing by 23% and that for human resource development by 9%. Progress was especially good in respect of economic development, transport and tourism. In all these areas, there was a high demand for funding which was well in excess of available resources.

A special feature of the region is that it contains the capital, Budapest. Most of the funding went to local municipalities and businesses. The OP indicators show that no real progress has been made in the pursuit of policy objectives as yet.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Jelentés a Közép-Dunántúl Operatív Program 2009. évi megvalósításáról, 2010. június

<sup>18</sup> Jelentés a Közép-Magyarországi Operatív Program 2009. évi megvalósításáról, 2010. június

### **12) North Hungary OP**

The main aims of the North Hungary OP are support of urban development, expansion of the potential for tourism and improvement in human resources. Around 72% of total funding is allocated to these three priorities. Projects were initiated in 517 urban areas and 4,220 new jobs are expected to be created as a result. Major implementation problems stem from a shortage of finance in local municipalities, a rise in VAT and substantial exchange rate fluctuations (beneficiaries relying on imports have experienced severe financial pressure).<sup>19</sup>

### **13) North Great Plain OP**

The main aims of the North Great Plain OP are: developing human resources in the region, urban regeneration, the improvement of transport infrastructure and the development of tourism and the regional economy. Around 45% of total funding is allocated to by the first two priorities. Commitments already made suggest that the target for the number of new jobs (1,700) that it is planned to create will be reached and the gender equality objective will be met. It is too soon to assess the impact of investment on the regional economy. The evidence suggests that absorption capacity is highest in the regional centres and the surrounding urban areas.<sup>20</sup>

### **14) South Transdanubia OP**

The main aim of the South Transdanubia OP is to reduce the development gap in the region as compared to the North-Western or central part of the country, so improving the competitiveness of the region; the quality of human resources; integrating urban regeneration measures and strengthening tourist potential. The OP has shown relatively good progress. Around a third of the total funding for the period had been committed by end-2009 and 10% had been paid to beneficiaries. There is capacity to manage projects and the administration is able to meet growing challenges. The recession and the related financial crisis put pressure on tourist development and health care related development was slowed down by uncertainties resulting from the health reform. Support to integrated cultural centres was less successful than hoped, partly because project proposals did not reflect what planners intended. Some emphasis was given to projects for the development of the local economy in 2010 and will continue in subsequent years. In general, applicants need more assistance to formulate high

---

<sup>19</sup> Jelentés az Észak-Magyarországi Operatív Program 2009. évi megvalósításáról, 2010. június

<sup>20</sup> Jelentés az Észak-Alföldi Operatív Program 2009. évi megvalósításáról., 2010. június

quality project proposals especially in respect of urban development. Since projects only started to be implemented in 2009 in most cases, impact indicators are as yet not available.<sup>21</sup>

### **Economic Territorial cooperation**

The Austria–Hungary ETC programme is co-financed by EUR 82 million from the ERDF and covers the following programming area: the NUTS 3 regions of Wien, Wiener Umland–Südteil, Nord–, Mittel– and Südburgenland, Győr–Moson–Sopron, Vas and Zala, and the adjacent regions of Niederösterreich–Süd and Oststeiermark (according to Art. 21, ERDF Regulation).

The aim of the programme is to intensify economic, social, cultural and ecological cross-border cooperation in order to strengthen regional competitiveness and to reduce regional disparities in the Austrian–Hungarian border area. The three priority axes are ‘Innovation, integration and competitiveness’, ‘sustainable development and accessibility’, and ‘technical assistance’. By the end of 2008, however, ERDF contracts had still not been signed, mainly because the Memorandum of Understanding had not been finalised and the ERDF contract template, was agreed in English in September 2008, was finalised in German and Hungarian until the end of 2008. No ERDF financing was, therefore, used in 2008 and data for 2009 were not available at the time the present report was prepared.

In the case of the Hungary–Romania Cross–Border Co–operation Programme, activities in 2008 were concentrated on ensuring a solid base for the start of the implementation process by establishing a joint management structure, preparing the basic documents needed for the proper functioning of this and the implementation of the programme, and launching the first two calls for proposals. In 2009, activities shifted to programme implementation activities, such as project selection, contracting and setting up a monitoring and information system. While some funding was committed in 2009, no payments were made.

The Slovakia Cross–border Co–operation Programme 2007–2013 showed similar progress. For the first three years, there are no achievements to report, since no projects were finalised. Contracts for the projects selected were not signed until autumn 2008 and the first progress reports and completion of some short-term projects occurred in the first half of 2010.

The Slovenia Hungary 2007–2013 OP shows some progress. Under the first Call for Proposals, published in June 2008, half of the funding for the period was made available and over 90% of this was committed. 19 projects were approved. Most of the projects were started in 2009, but none had been completed by the end of 2009 and no payments had been made.

---

<sup>21</sup> Jelentés a Dél–Dunántúli Operatív Program 2009. évi megvalósításáról, 2010. június

## SECTION 3 – EFFECTS OF INTERVENTION

Given the limited progress made in implementing programmes up to end-2009, it is difficult to comment on the effects. In most cases the projects are still at an early stage and indicators show only planned figures. While the effects of intervention can be assessed on the basis of contracts, evidence on actual outcomes is rare. The first direct impact of interventions can be assessed for projects which have been completed, and the closing report has been prepared, but even in these cases, the effects will only become evident after some time.

For a number of projects, beneficiaries have promised to meet the requirement for sustainability. Mid-term monitoring can assess whether this requirement is likely to be met, but only ex-post evaluations can verify it.

For large scale investment projects, at present in the early stages of implementation, the actual effects can only vaguely be assessed, though monitoring can show whether the implementation is proceeding according to plan. This is one of the main aims of the series of mid-term evaluations which are being conducted at present by the National Development Agency.

## SECTION 4 – EVALUATIONS AND GOOD PRACTICE IN EVALUATION<sup>22</sup>

In Hungary, the first steps towards a coordinated evaluation strategy of (Cohesion) Policy were made in 2004, related to EU-accession. However, between 2004 and 2006, the authority responsible, the Central Department of Evaluation, Analysis and Modelling of the National Development Office (later: National Development Agency), had no financial resources specifically for evaluation. During this period, evaluations were occasionally ordered (and financed) by the Managing Authorities, but the focus, the approach and the methods applied were rather heterogeneous. Today, those years are regarded as a period of learning when a professional circle of potential evaluators, as well as a network for sharing knowledge about evaluation practices and results, were formed.

Since the beginning of the 2007–2013 period, the name and the organisational position of the evaluation unit has changed several times. Its professional and financial independence, however, has remained untouched. In 2007–2008, the Managing Authorities launched their own public procurement tenders based on the suggestions of the evaluation unit and since 2009, an ‘evaluation framework system’ has been introduced. This involves a shift from rather ad-hoc evaluation arrangements towards a more conceptual system of planning the evaluations. The

---

<sup>22</sup> In this section, our expert opinion is supported by the main findings of our interview prepared with the administrative leader of the evaluation unit of the Hungarian National Development Agency and our previous research prepared about the History of the New Hungary Development Plan (Bartha – Nagy, 2009).

evaluation framework system sets out a plan of evaluations<sup>23</sup> for the following three years, which is then revised every year.

There are four main topics covered by evaluations: (1) evaluations of the problematic constructions; (2) monitoring Commission discussions; (3) mid-term assessment of the OPs; (4) the action plans. A new idea, a coordinated 'twinning' evaluation arrangement with fellow Central-European EU12 Member States has been launched, and Czech, Hungarian and Polish evaluators are preparing an evaluation of the impact of Cohesion Policy on job-creation and job maintenance using a harmonized methodology. (A synthesis report will be produced at the beginning of 2011 based on the findings of the evaluations in the three countries.)

Experts in the evaluation unit are closely involved in preparing evaluations and are largely responsible for the methods used as well as for the terms of reference for particular tenders. Since according to the framework system only qualified evaluation consortia can participate in the tenders, the quality of the evaluations produced is usually relatively high and strong competition tends to reduce the cost. The methods applied evaluations are varied and include counterfactual approaches, econometric analysis, case studies, focus group interviews and questionnaire-based descriptive statistics.

The expertise of the professionals in the evaluation unit seems to be increasing, which makes quality control of evaluations more possible. The 'short-list' of qualified evaluation consortia includes virtually all major professional institutes and relevant experts in the main socio-economic areas. However, it should be pointed out that the composition of the consortia often implies a hidden conflict of interest. A typical consortium is recruited from academics, private consultants and specific evaluation experts – the last group being usually made up of individuals who previously worked in Cohesion Policy related areas in various Ministries. Although this might be beneficial for the quality of the evaluation, in some cases it can raise doubts about the professional independence of the evaluators.

Another specific problem of present Hungarian evaluations is the lack of a suitable database which is essential for evaluations to be of high quality. Several evaluators have complained about problems of accessing the data necessary for completing the evaluations and about their quality. (In fact, this reflects a more general problem of the availability of public data in Hungary.)

Nevertheless, according to the senior staff in the evaluation unit, almost all of the evaluations produced have been of a satisfactory quality and have met international standards. Indeed, some of them can be considered as examples of 'best practice', such as the evaluation of the operation of the State Employment Service or that of the development of industrial parks.

---

<sup>23</sup> See Annex Table A.

Both Hungarian evaluators and the those in the evaluation units agree, however, that the political response to the evaluations produced has been disappointing. Without stronger legal support and harmonisation of certain core indicators, there is a danger that 'instead of evidence-based policy-making there will be policy-based evidence-making' ( a quote from one of the interviewees).

## SECTION 5 – CONCLUDING REMARKS – FUTURE CHALLENGES

Signs of a crisis in Hungary were evident before the global economic recession. Since 2006, the catching-up of the economy has virtually practically come to a halt and persistently large and gradually increasing territorial inequalities are evident. The long-term socio-economic challenges have remained the same since the fiscal stabilisation of 2008–2010 was implemented – low levels of education, high unemployment, insufficient innovation and entrepreneurial capacity in the less developed regions, low internal migration and structural problems in the health-care and pension systems.

To achieve the major objectives for 2007–2013 (economic growth coupled with a substantial improvement in employment) the New Hungary Development Plan envisaged interventions along six priority axes: 1) economic development, 2) transport infrastructure, 3) social renewal, 4) environmental protection and the development of sources of energy, 5) regional development and 6) state reform. The implementation of NHDP commitments showed substantial progress by the end of 2009, though the different Operational Programmes varied widely. Some 43% of total funding had been committed and 9% paid to beneficiaries. The allocation of funding between policy areas was in line with initial plans: 26% was allocated to transport, 19% to R&D activities, innovation and business promotion and 18% to environmental protection and risk prevention – 63% in total.

So far indicators show that little had been achieved from the programmes. The economic forecasts on which the NHDP were based were much more favourable than the economic and labour market situation has turned out to be. First results suggest that interventions will probably have a more positive effect on growth than on employment. In response to the employment consequences of the recession, some reallocation of funding was initiated by the Government with the aim of encouraging economic development and supporting SMEs.

The *evaluation situation* in Hungary is promising: a professional community of evaluators has been established in the country and there are several examples of good practice in the evaluations undertaken. The main challenge for future evaluations is to ensure a stronger political response to the findings.

The main challenge for policy is to strengthen the growth potential of the 4 least developed regions through deployment of Cohesion Policy resources while maintaining the innovation and

export capacity of the more dynamic regions. An additional challenge is to ensure consistency between the use of EU funding and that of domestic policy resources for development.

## REFERENCES

Bartha A. (2007): Hosszútávú gazdasági növekedési hatások. (Long-term growth impacts.) In: Toth I. Gy.: (ed.): Az Új Magyarország Fejlesztési Terv Operatív Programjainak horizontális ex-ante értékelése. (Horizontal ex-ante evaluation of the New Hungary Development Plan Operational Programmes) National Development Agency, TÁRKI- Kopint-Datorg

Bartha A. – Nagy K. (ed., 2009): Az Új Magyarország Fejlesztési Terv története. A gondolat kísérletektől az operatív programok elfogadásáig. (The History of the New Hungary Development Plan. From Initial Ideas towards the Acceptance of the Operational Programmes.) National Development Agency – Kopint-TÁRKI

Gazdaságfejlesztési Operatív Program Éves Végrehajtási Jelentés – 2009 (Economic Development Operational Programme. Annual Implementation Report, 2009)

Jelentés a Dél-Alföldi Operatív Program 2009. évi megvalósításáról, 2010. június (Southern Great Plain Operational Programme. Annual Implementation Report, June 2010)

Jelentés a Dél-Dunántúli Operatív Program 2009. évi megvalósításáról, 2010. június (Southern Transdanubia Operational Programme. Annual Implementation Report, June 2010)

Jelentés a Közép-Dunántúl Operatív Program 2009. évi megvalósításáról, 2010. június (Central Transdanubia Operational Programme. Annual Implementation Report, June 2010)

Jelentés a Közép-Magyarországi Operatív Program 2009. évi megvalósításáról, 2010. június (Central Hungary Operational Programme. Annual Implementation Report, June 2010)

Jelentés a KÖZOP 2009. évi megvalósításáról. 2010. Június (Transport Operational Programme. Annual Implementation Report, June 2010)

Jelentés a Nyugat-dunántúli Operatív Program 2009. évi megvalósításáról, 2010. június (Western Transdanubia Operational Programme. Annual Implementation Report, June 2010)

Jelentés a Társadalmi Infrastruktúra Operatív Program 2009. évi megvalósításáról, 2010. Június (Social Infrastructure Operational Programme. Annual Implementation Report, June 2010)

Jelentés a Társadalmi Megújulás Operatív Program 2009. évi megvalósításáról, 2010. Június (Social Renewal Operational Programme. Annual Implementation Report, June 2010)

Jelentés az Államreform Operatív Program 2009. évi megvalósításáról, 2010. Június (State Reform Operational Programme. Annual Implementation Report, June 2010)

Jelentés az Észak-Alföldi Operatív Program 2009. évi megvalósításáról., 2010. június (Northern Great Plain Operational Programme. Annual Implementation Report, June 2010)



Jelentés az Észak–Magyarországi Operatív Program 2009. évi megvalósításáról, 2010. június  
(North Hungary Operational Programme. Annual Implementation Report, June 2010)

Ministry of Economy (2005): Press conference of Mr. Kóka, the Minister of the Economy from  
2005 about the Competitiveness of Hungary. (Available from:

[http://nfm.gov.hu/data/cms1729978/rendk\\_sajt.pdf](http://nfm.gov.hu/data/cms1729978/rendk_sajt.pdf) Accessed: 15 October 2010)

Nemzeti Fejlesztési Ügynökség (National Development Agency): Prezentáció az Új Magyarország  
Fejlesztési Tervről (Presentation about the New Hungary Development Plan), 4 August, 2010.

Report on the implementation of the Electronic Administration Operational Programme in 2009,  
June 2010,

### ***Evaluations:***

#### ***1. Programme evaluations 2004–2006***

Evaluation of ROPs

Analysis of the emergence of sustainable development as a horizontal principle in the ROP. The  
methodology is based on analysis of documents and case studies.

#### ***2. Programme evaluations 2007–2013***

Detailed evaluation of SIOP indicators; Review of the human programme indicators of NHDP  
Evaluation report, 2010.

#### ***3. Reports***

**National Strategic Report according to Article 29 of Council Regulation (EC) No. 1083/2006  
Hungary**

Date: 09–30–2009

Programming period: 2007–2013

1. SOCIO-ECONOMIC SITUATION AND TRENDS
2. RESULTS OF NHDP ACHIEVED AND EXPECTED
3. PROGRESS AND CHALLENGES ENCOUNTERED WHEN IMPLEMENTING AGREED
4. PRIORITIES AND STRATEGIES
5. BEST PRACTICES

#### ***4. Impact assessment – modeling***

**The economic effects of EU Community Support Framework interventions**

**An ex-ante impact analysis with EcoRET, a macroeconomic model for Hungary**

Date: 2007

Programming period: 2007–2013

For the programming of these policies (Community Support Framework – CSF) a reliable (ex-ante) assessment of their likely macroeconomic impact on general and specific objectives has to be performed in the context of the development of the Hungarian National Development Plan (NDP). This kind of analysis of the effects on key variables like GDP, investment, employment and unemployment, productivity, competition, the budget deficit and foreign trade is considered by the Commission to be an indispensable prerequisite for the efficient allocation of financial supports from the Structural Funds.

EcoRET (macroEconometric model with Regionally Endogenised Technological change for Hungary) is unique in that it incorporates a spatial structure into a traditional macroeconometric model through a regional Total Factor Productivity (TFP) block which explicitly models changes in technology. This TFP model serves two purposes: First, it creates a bridge between certain Structural Fund support measures (infrastructure investment, education and training, research and development) and the macro-model, thus making it available for ex-ante evaluation of EU funding as well as for this specific evaluation task. Secondly, the model can serve its main purpose of analyzing the long-term supply side effects associated with the various Structural Fund interventions.

### ***5. Ex-ante evaluations***

#### **Ex-ante horizontal evaluation of the NHDP's OPs**

Date : 31th March 2007

Programming period : 2007–2013

The horizontal dimensions examined are public finance, long-term employment and economic growth, disadvantaged social groups and social division.

The method used was the analysis of documents combined with 36 interviews with 15–18 open-ended questions. The aim was to examine whether the social agreement promoted public planning procedures and satisfied expectations about transparency.

### ***6. Strategic environmental assessments***

#### **(1) State Reform Operative Programme**

Date of evaluation: 31th of May, 2007

Programming period: 2007–2013

The ex-ante evaluation is an analysis of the relevance, internal consistency and external coherence of the OP, as well as its feasibility, the indicator system used and the overall strategy and the individual priority axes.

The methods used were:

- analysis of documents;
- interviews;
- workshops;
- personal consultation.

Continuous communication with those responsible for the design of the OP was a central element in the approach.

## **(2) Economic Development Operative Programme (GOP) SEA**

### Evaluation Summary

In order to promote enforcement of sustainability and environmental aspects and to ensure legal compliance, the National Development Agency (NDA) carried out strategic environmental assessment (SEA) of Operational Programmes. The aim is to encourage the integration of environmental sustainability consideration during the preparation of the New Hungary Development Plan (NHDP). In an open public procurement process, the National Development Office (the predecessor of NDA) selected a consortium led by Respect Ltd. for the task. The programme on which the SEA report is based was discussed in June 2010 and was open for review and comment for 30 days. Representatives of civil society, scientific and governmental bodies participated in the consultation.

## **INTERVIEWS**

Interview with the administrative leader of the evaluation unit (National Development Agency), focus group discussion with some members of the evaluation unit and some evaluators.

## **TABLES**

See Excel file for Tables 1, 2 and 3.

Table 1: Regional disparities and trends

Table 2: Macro-economic developments

Table 3: Financial allocation by main policy area

**Annex Table A – Evaluation plan 2010–2012**

OP	Object of evaluation (title)	Beginning of evaluation
EPAD, SROP	OP review	February 2010
EDOP	OP review	February 2010
EDOP	EDOP 4 evaluation	February 2010
EEOP	OP review	February 2010
EPIOP	EPIOP evaluation of logistic projects – ports development	February 2010
TOP	OP review	February 2010
ROPs	OP review	February 2010
SROP, SIOp	OP review	February 2010
IOP	OP review	February 2010
EEOP	Survey measuring the need for the use of special financial means amongst the grantees	March 2010
EPIOP	Effects of the development of the transport system of the agglomeration of Érd.	March 2010
ROPs, SIOp	Evaluation of interventions meaning to lift up barriers	March 2010
SROP	Evaluation of human policy measures of the government	April 2010
SROP	Evaluation of high priority projects and tenders in organisational development from an efficiency and budgetary angle	June 2010
EDOP	Ex-post evaluation of EDOP	April 2010
EPAOP	Real use of informatics developments in EPAOP, expected costs of operation of realized developments	June 2010
SROP	SROP 6. Health preservation and human resources developments in healthcare; SIOp 2. Development of healthcare infrastructure, Lifestyle programmes, teaching health and vision of life	June 2010
NHDP	Evaluation of the Most disadvantaged Regions programme	June 2010
EEOP, ROP	Evaluation of litter management programmes	July 2010
SROP	Evaluation of social integration projects in education, public programmes and employment	July 2010
NHDP	In and outflow of Cohesion funds to other Member States.	August 2010
NHDP	The contribution of the NHDP to the Lisbon goals	August 2010
TOP	Feasibility of the programme for the improvement of the waterway transport on the Danube	September 2010
NDP, NHDP	Effects of Cohesion Policy on equal rights	September 2010
ROPs, EDOP, SIOp	Evaluation of the Pole programme	September 2010
SROP	Evaluation of SROP 1. priority programmes for employment	September 2010
NHDP	Evaluation of NHDP from a horizontal-sustainability angle	September 2010

OP	Object of evaluation (title)	Beginning of evaluation
NHDP	Evaluation of social agreement, orientation and communication on a regional level – good practices	October 2010
SROP	Evaluation of the on-going SROP measure 543	January 2011
NHDP	Evaluation of the developments made towards the execution of the information and knowledge based society	January 2011
STOP	ECC report	2011
EPAOP	Possible co-operation between the developments made during EPAOP and experiences	2011
EDOP	EDOP 1 R&D and innovation programme evaluation	2011
EDOP	EDOP 214 evaluation of subsidies granted for updating environment protecting technologies	2011
EDOP	Institutional evaluation of the MV Inc.	2011
EDOP	Institutional evaluation by SLA of the MAG Inc.	2011
EEOP	Evaluation of interventions of flood-prevention	2011
TOP	Evaluation of TOP indicators and their feasibility	2011
ROPs, SIOP	Evaluation of infrastructural developments of public education	2011
SROP	Development of digital competences	2011
SROP	SROP training programmes	2011
SROP	Evaluation of the execution of SROP public education tenders	2011
SROP	Evaluation of SROP measures supporting cultural institutes	2011
NHDP	Monitoring of the NDA's subsidy system from a climate angle, survey of the present situation	2011
NHDP	Strategic Environmental Study	2011
NHDP	International Institutional Benchmark	2011
NHDP	Evaluation of the sustainable township development	2011
EDOP	Risk capital	2012
CHOP	Evaluation of regional dispersion and effect of CHOP subsidies	2012
ROPs	Evaluation of the effects of business infrastructure development	2012
ROPs	Evaluation of achievements and effect of IVS, Integrated township development	2012
SROP	Evaluation of the execution of SROP higher education tenders; Evaluation of infrastructure development in higher education SIOP	2012