



**Expert evaluation network
delivering policy analysis on the
performance of Cohesion policy 2007-2013
Year 2 – 2012**

**Task 2: Country Report on Achievements of
Cohesion policy**

The Netherlands

Version: Final

V.M.C. Ketelaars MSc. MBA

L.L.W.M. van Raaij MSc.

K.M. Spoor MSc.

European and Regional Affairs Consultants

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

Contents

Executive summary	3
1. The socio-economic context	4
2. The regional development policy pursued, the EU contribution to this and policy achievements over the period	6
The regional development policy pursued	6
Policy implementation	7
Achievements of the programmes so far	10
3. Effects of intervention	18
4. Evaluations and good practice in evaluation	19
5. Further Remarks - New challenges for policy	21
References	23
Interviews	23
Annex 1 - Evaluation grid for examples of good practice in evaluation	24
Annex 2 - Tables	25

List of abbreviations

- AIR Annual Implementation Report
- CBC Cross-Border Cooperation
- FEI Financial Engineering Instrument
- FTE Full-Time Equivalent
- JESSICA Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas
- MA Managing Authority
- OP Operational Programme
- SDE Stimulerend Duurzame Energieproductie (Fostering renewable energy)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The main findings of the 2011 report are mostly still valid.
- In general programmes are recovering from their slow start. Regions are making progress in implementation in terms of allocation of funding and expenditure. The programmes seem to be on schedule, 32% of the funding available having been spent, though much remains to be done.
- According to the indicators, results exceed the targets in respect of priority 1: innovation, entrepreneurship and the knowledge economy. The priority 1 indicators show that much progress has been made, while the indicators for priority 2, attractiveness of regions, and priority 3, urban development, are lagging behind. The targets for the indicators, however, are being reviewed.
- Although indicators show that programmes are reaching their targets, lack of qualitative and quantitative evidence on the effects of the ERDF at regional level in the Annual Implementation Reports (AIRs) makes it hard to draw any conclusions in this respect.
- Despite the fact that ERDF is only 0.1% of Dutch national GDP a year, the various AIRs suggest that outcomes are significant.
- In 2011 an evaluation of the control and management system for the ERDF was carried out, which concluded the system is efficient.
- New challenges for policy are to:
 - develop a project selection system (tendering or “first come, first serve”),
 - improve the quality of indicators,
 - define a clear monitoring and reporting system,
 - highlight the regional effects of the ERDF on the basis of quantitative evidence in AIRs,
 - focus more on specific sectors,
 - simplify the eligibility rules.

1. THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT

Main points from previous country report:

- The Netherlands was severely hit by the global economic crisis in 2008 and 2009. Despite government intervention to support the financial sector and a fiscal stimulus, the Netherlands experienced a deep recession. Due to the crisis, public sector consolidated debt, which had fallen below 50% of GDP in 2006 and 2007, rose again in 2008 and 2009 and reached 63% of GDP in 2010.
- Economic growth resumed in mid-2009. In 2010, the recovery proceeded relatively slowly, led by growth of world trade and the rebuilding of stocks. Industrial production and capacity utilisation in 2011 were close to pre-crisis levels, reviving business investment.
- As in most of the EU, the crisis has severely affected on the country's fiscal position. Fiscal consolidation of government finances is a main priority. The government has the aim of achieving a balanced budget and has adopted a consolidation plan with heavy cutbacks in the current operational expenditure of public administration.
- Contrary to most other European countries, there are no major regional disparities in GDP per head in the Netherlands.
- There have also been no major differences in regional growth rates. In 2010, all regions experienced modest economic recovery. Nevertheless, there were some differences, if small, with not only the more rural and peripheral regions such as Friesland and Drenthe showing regional growth rates below average, but also Zuid-Holland and Utrecht, which are traditionally major engines of growth.
- The economic crisis has not affected the funding available for support of regional development, despite the current policy of fiscal consolidation at national level.

Developments in 2011

Table 1 - Key figures for the Netherlands (annual % change)

	2008	2009	2010	2011
GDP growth (annual %)	1.8	-3.5	1.7	1.2
Public sector balance (% GDP)	0.5	-5.6	-5.0	-4.6
General Government investment	3.5	3.8	3.6	3.5
Productivity growth	-0.2	-2.6		
Employment rate	77.2	77.0	74.7	74.9
Unemployment rate	2.8	3.4	4.5	4.4
Inflation	2.2	1.,0	0.9	2.5

Source: Eurostat

The recovery of the Dutch economy lasted until mid-2011. However, in the fall of 2011 the economy went into recession for several reasons, including lower world trade growth, a reduction in consumer and producer confidence and increased uncertainty in financial markets.

Overall economic growth in 2011 was 1.2%, with particular difficulties in a number of sectors such as construction, retailing and real estate. Proposed cutbacks by the national government reduced consumer confidence and employment and purchasing power were under pressure which resulted in a reduction in aggregate demand and lower investment.

The government tried to alleviate the effects of the crisis by allowing the budget to go into deficit and national debt to rise in 2010. In 2011, however, restrictions were imposed and the aim was to cut back government expenditure in order to adapt to the new economic circumstances and the new EU agreement on debt levels.

In addition, the forecast for the global economic worsened which also affected Dutch exports, which are considered the engine of economic growth. With the prospect of a continuing fall in global trade, uncertainty remains high.

- There are significant differences in growth between at NUTS 2 level. In particular the peripheral regions are lagging behind.
- In 2011, the economic situation barely improved. Growth in 2011 was higher than in 2010 in 6 of the 12 provinces but was still low overall.
- The economic crisis has not affected the funding available for the support of regional development, despite the current policy of fiscal consolidation.

Table 2 - Regional economic growth in the Netherlands 2009 - 2012 (%)

Region	2009	2010	2011 (estimates)
Groningen	-4.7	2.7	-2.8
Friesland	-3.1	0.8	1.1
Drenthe	-3.7	1.1	1.0
Overijssel	-4.4	1.2	2.1
Flevoland	-3.8	2.2	2.4
Gelderland	-3.9	2.0	1.7
Utrecht	-3.2	0.9	1.7
Noord - Holland	-3.7	2.3	1.9
Zuid - Holland	-3.2	1.1	1.7
Zeeland	-2.7	2.2	1.0
Noord - Brabant	-5.2	1.9	2.0
Limburg	-4.4	1.7	1.2
Nederland	-3.9	1.7	1.4

Source: Central Statistical Office, Estimations by ING Economic office

Table 2 shows that in spite of the economic and financial crisis GDP increased in 11 of the 12 Dutch provinces in 2011, growth averaging 1.4%. It also shows that the crisis is affecting the peripheral regions more than others. For instance the provinces of Friesland, Drenthe, Zeeland and Limburg had economic growth of only 1% and in Groningen, it was negative, much less than whereas in more central regions such as Noord-Brabant (2%), Flevoland (2.4%) and Overijssel (2.1%).

This growth differential might be due to the persistent disparities in regional economic performance which have historic roots and arise from locational and other factors (e.g. accessibility, physical-geographical conditions, innovation and knowledge creation capacity, the education of the population, and the business climate). In general, it is assumed that peripheral areas are more disadvantaged in these terms and are therefore more vulnerable in times of economic crisis.

Overall, the start of 2011 was promising, but at the end of the year the economic situation deteriorated.

2. THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY PURSUED, THE EU CONTRIBUTION TO THIS AND POLICY ACHIEVEMENTS OVER THE PERIOD

THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY PURSUED

Main points from previous country report:

- The main focus in regionally-based programmes shifted from supporting regions in decline to stimulating economic opportunities in 2006. The intention is for each region to focus on economic clusters in which they excel. The national aim of Cohesion policy is to strengthen national competitiveness (National Strategic Reference Framework, 2007).
- In total EUR 830 million of the ERDF was allocated for the period 2007-2013. Half the ERDF is allocated to priority axe 1 – ‘innovation, entrepreneurship and the knowledge economy’, and a quarter to each of the other two priorities – ‘increasing attractiveness of regions’ (priority 2) and ‘urban development’ (priority 3). This division roughly applies to all the regions.
- Each region receives a budget according to its relative size in terms of population, and the division of funding is in line with the overall emphasis on innovation, entrepreneurship and the knowledge economy, half of it going to this priority in each programme. There are different emphases between regions in the division of funding between ‘increasing attractiveness of regions’ and ‘urban development’, though this largely reflects the degree of urbanisation of regions.
- The Netherlands participates in four European Cross-Border Cooperation (CBC) programmes, with a total budget of EUR 463 million from the ERDF. In these programmes the first priority, as for other programmes, is the knowledge economy, technology and innovation. Annex Table C shows that over half of the total ERDF is allocated to this priority. Other priorities are related to the environment (priority 2) and social facilities (priority 3).

Main developments in 2011

The economic and financial crisis has not led to a change of ERDF project selection criteria. There were no shifts in priorities or in the allocation of EU funding in 2011 - programmes overcommitted the funding available so much that there was no room for shifts.

In the South region, the programme contains specific measures aimed at supporting SMEs and in particular at stimulating innovation in SMEs. The reason is that SMEs in the start-up phase and without a track record have limited possibilities to obtain the funding they need on the capital market. Because SMEs are important for the realisation of innovation, the advice from an expert committee¹ was to increase the financing available to SMEs through, among other measures, Financial Engineering Instruments (FEIs) such as equity participation and loans). These measures were also prompted by SMEs being unable to obtain finance because of the credit crunch. However, although SMEs are supported via various projects, regions did not

¹ Expert committee installed by the Dutch State Secretary of Economic Affairs (April 2007)

introduce any specific measures to stimulate them although this remains a broader objective in all OPs.

Many regions carried out feasibility studies on the implementation of FEIs in ERDF programmes, but this did not result in them actually being implemented. Only in the West region is running a pilot JESSICA²-type initiative in operation.

Although youth employment is a growing problem because of the economic crisis, ERDF programmes in the Netherlands have not put in place measures to deal with this, mainly because it is an issue covered by the ESF.

Overall because of the financial and economic crisis, national and regional budgets are being cut back, but this has not affected the ERDF because the funding available was already committed.

POLICY IMPLEMENTATION³

Main points from previous country report:

- With respect to both finance and content, the various ERDF programmes are on schedule. Of total funding (ERDF and national) of EUR 1,970 million, 113% had been committed to projects by end-2010⁴, due to the large number of projects in the North and South programmes, particularly under priority 1 and 2. Priority 3 lagged behind with a commitment rate of 77%, but was still on schedule. However, the implementation rate calculated on the basis of certified expenditure shows a different picture. The rate was only 13% well below the commitment rate. This was partly a consequence of the economic crisis.
- The four CBC programmes had a slow start. By end-2010 70% of the ERDF allocation was committed⁵. In the course of 2011, there was progress in implementing the programmes but certified expenditure was still lagging behind. Because of the economic crisis and cutbacks in transfers to local authorities, cities are more cautious with respect to long-term investment projects. Several investment projects have been postponed because of this.
- 40.1% of the total ERDF allocated to projects was committed to the enterprise environment, all OPs devoting a major share of funding to supporting enterprises, in line with the policy focus on innovation, entrepreneurship and the knowledge economy. Support for innovation in SMEs is particularly important. The mid-term review concluded that 60% of the budget was committed to the Lisbon goals (earmarking categories).

Main developments in 2011

² Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas

³ The indicators used in this section come mainly from the AIR for 2011, which relate to the situation up to the end of 2011. A more up-to-date view of the aggregate position (though not of the situation in the different policy areas) is presented in the Synthesis Report for 2012 of the Expert evaluation network delivering policy analysis on the performance of Cohesion policy 2007-2013 which is based on data for payments from the ERDF and Cohesion Fund up to the end of 2012, i.e. after the present report was completed.

⁴ See Annex Table B.

⁵ See Annex Table C.

In 2011, the number of approved projects increased in all programmes. In total 206 projects were approved. In the East region, 32% of all projects were approved in 2011, reflecting the efforts made to allocate the budgets available. In the CBC programmes, the amount going to approved projects in 2011 was increased by 41%.

Although the overall implementation rate was still relatively low in terms of expenditure on projects, certified expenditure in relation to the total funding available increased from 13% by end-2010 to 32% by end-2011 (Annex Table B).

The Southern region made most progress in implementation and increased total certified expenditure to EUR 201 million, which means an implementation rate of 44%. The West region is lagging behind with certified expenditure amounting to EUR 182 million and an implementation rate of only 24%.

The implementation of Priority 1 (economy, technology, innovation) was particularly swift, the implementation rate increasing by 22 percentage points between end-2010 and end-2011. The North and South regions were especially well performing (implementation rates of respectively 52% and 53%). But there was equally good progress in implementing priority 2. On average, certified expenditure in relation to the total funding available (national and ERDF) passed from 6% by end-2010 to 24% by end-2011 but there are significant differences between programmes. In the West region the rate was just 7.5% while it was 35% in the East region.

Overall, the main conclusion is that the various ERDF programmes are on schedule and there was progress in implementing them with respect to both finance and content though the implementation rate in terms of certified eligible expenditure is still relatively low.

As shown in Annex Table B, about 90% of the ERDF and 137% of the total funding (national and ERDF) was committed by end-2011. Over-commitments relate essentially to national funding and not to the ERDF.

When these implementation rates are examined more closely, the North region is seen to have over-committed ERDF resources (108%), the main reason being that actual costs of previously committed projects are expected to be lower than budgeted.

On the other hand commitments were just 77% of the ERDF available in the East region which had the lowest commitment rate mainly because of delays in implementing priority 3 (commitment rate of just 47%).

The effect of the economic and financial crisis in 2011

The crisis has had a negative impact on implementing the programmes and largely explains the relatively low implementation rate in terms of eligible expenditure. Because of budget cut backs, investment in the public and private sector has been postponed and some projects have been suspended. The negative effect of the economic and financial crisis on programme implementation increased during 2011.

Table 3 - Implementation rate by priority, 2009, 2010 & 2011 (%)

Total	Total	North	West	South	East
Implementation rate (Certified ex./Op. budget) 2009	6.2	8.4	6.2	4.3	6.0
Implementation rate (Certified ex./Op. budget) 2010	13.0	14.0	13.0	15.0	10.0
Implementation rate (Certified ex./Op. budget) 2011	32.0	38.6	23.6	43.5	28.4
Priority 1	Total	North	West	South	East
Implementation rate (Certified ex./Op. budget) 2009	6.8	8.4	6.8	3.5	8.9
Implementation rate (Certified ex./Op. budget) 2010	16.0	17.0	14.0	18.0	17.0
Implementation rate (Certified ex./Op. budget) 2011	38.0	52.1	29.0	53.0	24.5
Priority 2	Total	North	West	South	East
Implementation rate (Certified ex./Op. budget) 2009	1.8	6.2	0.4	1.7	-
Implementation rate (Certified ex./Op. budget) 2010	6.0	8.0	5.0	12.0	0.0
Implementation rate (Certified ex./Op. budget) 2011	24.0	23.5	7.5	33.3	35.0
Priority 3	Total	North	West	South	East
Implementation rate (Certified ex./Op. budget) 2009	9.0	11.1	9.0	7.5	8.4
Implementation rate (Certified ex./Op. budget) 2010	15.0	14.0	17.0	16.0	8.0
Implementation rate (Certified ex./Op. budget) 2011	26.0	27.1	23.1	31.0	31.6

Source: Various AIRs of the Competitiveness and employment programmes 2012.

Table 3 shows an increase in the implementation rate in 2011 compared to 2009 and 2010. In particular priority 1 increased strongly. The South region shows the highest figures (53%).

It might be a consequence of the economic crisis that the implementation rate is lower than foreseen. Compared to 2010, there have been budget cutbacks at national and regional level. Therefore regions and cities have become more cautious with regard to long-term investment projects. Several investment projects have been postponed for several years because of uncertainty and so as to avoid risk. This has resulted in postponing projects to which funding had already been committed.

Postponement or cancellation of projects has occurred especially in respect of priorities 2 and 3, which include many public infrastructure projects, while priority 1 is more concerned with R&D (staff costs).

Changes in regulations also resulted in a lengthening of implementation time. As a consequence priorities 2 and 3 are lagging behind compared to priority 1 with respect to the implementation rate (based on certified expenditure). More than half way through the programming period, the implementation rate, based on certified expenditure, is low but accelerated in comparison to 2009 and 2010. Nevertheless, there is a need for a further acceleration to occur if the funding available is to be absorbed in the period remaining.

One of the reasons that certified expenditure increased when compared to earlier years is that overall there were many issues concerning the eligibility of costs which national authorities provided guidance (answered questions) which led to expenditure increasing.

In addition, all Managing Authorities (MAs) are aware of the automatic de-commitment rule, which is why initiatives were taken to increase expenditure. Actions to accelerate implementation mainly involved certifying costs. Because of questions over the interpretation of the eligibility of expenditure in several respects, reported costs of projects were previously not included in payment claims (and therefore not in the AIRs). By agreeing these issues with

MAs, Certification Authorities and Audit Authorities, large amounts of cost incurred before 2011 were certified during 2011.

Cross-border Cooperation programmes

The four CBC programmes had a slow start. During 2010 the implementation rate increased significantly (see Annex Table C). The implementation rate in terms of commitments is highest for the 2 Seas Programme (97%) and lowest for the Netherlands-Germany Programme (89%).

As noted above, the crisis encourages risk-avoidance behaviour especially in the private sector. For CBC programmes on technology and innovation, the perceived risk is even higher because the partners do not have a common background (culture, language etc.). As a consequence private partners tend to postpone projects, R&D projects in particular. In the Flanders-Netherlands programme, where partners share more or less the same language and cultural background, the implementation rate with regard to priority 1 is much higher (52%) than in the other CBC programmes.

More than half way through the programming period, the implementation rate, based on certified expenditure, seems to be low, but accelerated in 2011 in comparison with 2009 and 2010 (see Annex Table C). The overall ERDF implementation rate (budget committed relative to the total available) increased from 70% in 2010 to 93% in 2011. In priority 3 it rose by 27 percentage points.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE PROGRAMMES SO FAR

Main points from previous country report:

- The overall picture that emerged was that in general, after a slow start of the programmes at the beginning of the period, achievements began to become evident in 2010 though in many cases what was reported was based on expected output from the projects underway and not on output actually achieved.
- For several indicators, achievements exceeded targets to a large extent, especially in respect of priority 1. Projects under the priorities 2 and 3 were lagging behind. As a result of the economic and financial crisis, projects were postponed for several years.
- As regards CBC-programmes, there is a lack of a clear qualitative description of the programme outcomes (in terms of regional impact) in the AIRs. Moreover, there is no quantitative evidence available elsewhere which could have been used to identify the achievements of programmes.
- The effect of the ERDF on public finances is very small (around 0.1% of Dutch GDP).
- Because in 2010 only a few projects had been finished, it was difficult to indicate their outcome and results.

Table 4 - Allocated ERDF budget in committed projects by policy area (EUR million) by end 2011

	Total 2010	Total 2011	North	West	South	East
Total ERDF allocated	830.0	830.0	169.4	310.6	185.9	164.1
Total ERDF committed	637.8	750.0	183.0	265.0	176.0	126.0
Total ERDF committed in projects (%)	94.5	90.0	108	85.5	95.0	77.0
Enterprise environment (%)	40.1	45.8	48.0	44.2	36.4	59.0
RTDI and linked activities	104.8	112.2	38.0	8.9	23.8	41.5
Support for innovation in SMEs	205.5	170.2	38.6	82.5	19.1	30.1
Other investment in firms	17.3	20.6	1.2	8.1	8.4	2.8
ICT and related services	4.8	48.3	9.9	25.6	12.7	0
Human Resources (%)	2.1	2.3	3.2	2.0	3.0	0.4
Education and training	11.2	14.9	5.3	3.9	5.2	0.5
Labour market policies	5.8	1.9	0.6	1.3	0	0
Transport (%)	5.5	2.8	0.9	0.8	0.0	14.0
Rail	1.0	1.0	1.0	0	0	0
Road	18.5	16.3	0	0	0	16.3
Other	26.1	3.8	0.6	2.0	0	1.2
Environment and energy (%)	5.8	9.0	10.2	10.9	7.6	5.2
Energy infrastructure	26.1	42.7	8.9	20.2	10.3	3.1
Environmental infrastructure	21.8	24.5	9.6	8.4	3.0	3.3
Territorial development (%)	19.3	29.0	31.2	31.5	33.3	14.3
Tourism and culture	95.9	90.9	44.1	37.4	0	9.3
Planning and rehabilitation	1.4	119.2	12.6	40.9	58.6	6.9
Social infrastructure	2.6	7.0	0.2	5.1	0	1.6
Other	60.7	0	0	0	0	0
Technical assistance (%)	3.5	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.3
Technical assistance	28.8	29.5	6.7	12.4	7.4	2.9

Source: Various AIRs of the Competitiveness and employment programmes 2012.

Table 4 shows that 46% of the total budget is allocated to projects on the enterprise environment. In the East region this percentage amounts to 59%. All programmes have allocated a major share to supporting enterprises. This is in line with the focus on innovation, entrepreneurship and the knowledge economy. Support for innovation in SMEs is particularly important. The mid-term review concluded that 60% of the budget was committed to the Lisbon goals (earmarking categories).

Almost 30% is committed to territorial development which includes tourism and culture, planning and rehabilitation and social infrastructure. Only the East region committed much less (14%). 9% of commitments goes to the environment and energy. Since only a few projects have been finalised, information is reported for expected outcomes rather than actual ones.

Compared to the situation at the end of 2010, the highest increases in commitments were to territorial development, the environment and energy and the enterprise environment. Within these policy sectors planning and rehabilitation (mainly involving cultural activities), energy infrastructure and ICT and related services increased markedly.

There was also a reduction in support for innovation in SMEs and in 'other' areas. For instance in transport, there was a reduction from EUR 26.1 million to EUR 3.8 million and in territorial development from EUR 60.7 million to zero. This, however, might be a result of more careful categorisation of activities in specific policy areas, though this could also perhaps of the economic and financial crisis.

It should be pointed out that the overall ERDF budget amounts to only around 0.1% of total Dutch GDP, which inevitably means that the effects at national level are limited.

Enterprise environment and support to RTDI

The main focus of regionally-based programmes shifted at the beginning of the period from reducing economic disparities to stimulating economic opportunities, the national strategy being for each region to focus on economic clusters in which they excel.

The four regional Competitiveness and Employment programmes have the same overall priorities and because of their focus on the Lisbon-agenda they are perfectly in line with the national agenda of improving the climate for innovation. Half the ERDF budget is allocated to priority 1: innovation, entrepreneurship and the knowledge economy. This is evidence from the amounts of funding involved.

45.8% of the total ERDF committed (of EUR 750 million), or EUR 343 million, is committed to the enterprise environment and support to RTDI, with EUR 112.2 million going to RTDI and linked activities and EUR 170.2 million to support for innovation in SMEs.

There is a focus in the West region in particular on support for innovation in SMEs (EUR 82.5 million), with EUR 125.1 million committed to enterprise environment, significantly more than in the other regions.

This is very small, however, in relation to overall public and private expenditure on R&D (EUR 11 billion a year).

Some 1,827 business start-ups were supported by the ERDF as compared with a total number of 134,000⁶.

Transport

Only EUR 21.1 million, less than 3% of the total ERDF committed, is allocated to transport (rail EUR 1 million, road EUR 16.3 million and other EUR 3.8 million), mainly in the East region which accounts for all the funding for road.

Environment and energy

The *Stimulerende Duurzame Energieproductie* (SDE – fostering renewable energy) budget amounts to about EUR 8.5 billion in the period 2008-2011.⁷ The ERDF funding going to the environment and energy amounts to EUR 67.2 million.

⁶ Source: Chamber of commerce (2011)

⁷ Source: Annual Report 2010 SDE and Milieukwaliteit van de Elektriciteitsproductie (MEP) (Jaarbericht 2010 SDE en MEP), NL Agency, 2011

Territorial development

Territorial development is an important area for ERDF support. Under In priorities 2 and 3, around 30% of the overall amount of ERDF committed goes to this, mainly to planning and rehabilitation and tourism and culture. There are no data available to compare this with national expenditure.

Table 5 - Aims and outcomes of output indicators, by priority and region end 2011*

	Total			North			West			South			East		
	Total target 2011	Total com 2011	Total achiev. 2011	Target	Comm.	Achiev.	Target	Comm.	Achiev.	Target	Comm.	Achiev.	Target	Comm.	Achiev.
Priority 1															
No. of R&D projects	506	563	333	20	41	5	121	59	30	350	375	232	15	88	66
R&D investments (private) (EUR million)	178	358	122	20	91	15	48		20	100	160	87	10	107	9.8
R&D investments (public) (EUR million)	50	379	55	20	176	38				20	43	17	10	160	9.4
Induced private inv.(EUR million)	56	494	69		133	4	31	303	43				25	58	22
Support of start-ups (No.)	758	5,336	1,827	60	372	175	268	1,496	881	250	2,756	156	180	712	615
Support of SME (No.)	4,765	20,542	9,704	1,000	5,158	1,921	535	10,347	6,549	1,200	3,887	528	2,030	1,150	706
No. of collaborations	469	368	373	6	70	52	88	67	42	275	154	95	100	77	184
Gross employment creation (FTE**)	7,305	22,996	4,740	1,500	7,359	978	3,120	5,750	2,354	510	5,932	739	2,175	3,955	669
Priority 2	0	0	0												
Induced private inv.(EUR million)	0	25	0	-	25	0.6									
Support of start-ups (No.)	0	0	0												
No. of projects Nature/landscape	88	36	13	3	13	1	41		3	30	13	8	14	10	1
No. of projects Liveability	0	0	0												
No. of projects Tourism	91	67	27	6	15	1	35	16	4	40	23	18	10	13	4
No. of projects Accessibility	36	38	9	6	11	1				20	12	5	10	15	3
Restructuring industrial sites (ha.)	950	1,118	187	150	225	91	88		0	600	735	56	200	158	40
No. of projects environment	117	15	8	3	4	1	104		5	10	11	2			
No. of projects alternative transport	10	12	2										10	12	2
No. of projects renovation urban fac.	25	16	3										25	16	3
Gross employment creation (FTE)	2,090	4,218	699	500	2,163	70	1,340	965	12	250	1,090	617			
Priority 3	0	0	0												
Support of start-ups (No.)	30	135	0										30	135	
Support of SME (No.)	30	101	0										30	101	
Induced private inv.(EUR million)	0	8.3	1.8	-	8	2									

No. of projects Tourism	0	0	0												
Restructuring industrial area's (ha.)	36	16	0							36	16	0			
Restructuring industrial loc. (sq. m.)	316	363	13	150	308	0	146	55	13				20	0.48	0.42
No. of project Entrepreneurship	110	62	27				35	39	19	50	18	6	25	5	2
No. of projects Liveability	149	66	31				84	40	21	40	14	6	25	12	4
No. of projects renovation urban fac.	93	93	31	5	9	0	40	56	19	48	28	12			
Gross employment creation (FTE)	3,165	3,501	1,060	500	452	17	2,420	2,532	842	220	494	178	25	23	23

Source: Various AIRs of the Competitiveness and employment programmes 2012. Only the indicators from the Competitiveness and Employment programmes were taken on board, because the CBC programmes do not report at the national level.

* The total amounts for 2010 are those indicated in the country report 2011. The committed and achieved output by end 2011, can be found in the various AIRs of the OPs.

**Full-time equivalent (FTE)

As Table 5 indicates, almost all targets have been met in priority 1, where there is high demand for funding, though there is still a shortfall in relation to commitments.

With respect to priorities 2 and 3, the situation is different. Neither the targets set at the beginning of the programming period nor the commitment targets have yet been met. Given the economic and financial situation and the risk-avoiding behaviour in the public and private sectors with regard to investment, projects have been postponed which makes it difficult to achieve expected outcomes in time.

The regional situation is as follows:

- The North region is making a lot of progress in priority 1, especially on R&D investment, support of start-ups and SMEs and the number of cases of collaboration. Given the amounts committed, the figures will increase further in the coming years. The situation in priorities 2 and 3 is different. Only the indicator 'induced private investment' is in line with targets set. All others are lagging behind.
- In the West region, in priority 1, induced private investment and support of start-ups and SMEs have already achieved the targets set. Given commitments, the targets set with regard to 'gross employment creation' and 'number of collaborations' will also be realised. However, there is a large difference in priorities 2 and 3 between targets and outcome.
- In the South region, the situation is better. In priority 1, outcomes and commitments are relatively close to the targets set at the beginning of the programming period. This might be a result of many relatively small projects being approved. In priorities 2 and 3, achievements are still lagging behind.
- The same can be concluded for the East region where in priority 1 outcomes exceed targets but where there are improvements in priorities 2 and 3 as well. Given the committed amounts, the number of tourist projects, those involving accessibility, support of start-ups and support of SMEs could well exceed the targets.

Overall, it can be concluded that there are significant outcomes under priority 1, in line with the overcommitted budget. Under priorities 2 and 3, much work remains to be done in order to realise the targets, which given the economic and financial crisis, is a serious challenge for the future.

Table 6 Aims and achievements as regards output indicators, by priority

	Total committed			Total target	Total achieved
	2009	2010	2011		
Priority 1					
No. of R&D projects	765	670	563	506	333
R&D investments (private) EUR million	224	401	359	178	122
R&D investments (public) EUR million	146	304	379	50	55
Induced private inv.(EUR million)	338	454	495	56	69
Support of start-ups (No.)	3,296	5,626	5,336	758	1,827
Support of SME (No.)	10,256	19,377	20,542	4,765	9,704
Number of collaborations	894	961	368	469	373
Gross employment creation (FTE)	15,851	22,286	22,996	7,305	4,740
Priority 2					
Induced private inv.(EUR million)	21	24	25	0	0
Support of start-ups (No.)	318	288	0	0	0
No. of projects Nature/landscape	13	45	36	88	13
No. of projects Livability	7		0	0	0
No. of projects Tourism	33	64	67	91	27
No. of projects Accessibility	158	244	38	36	9
Restructuring industrial sites (ha.)	670	985	1,118	950	187
No. of projects environment	15	32	15	117	8
No. of projects alternative transport	4	6	12	10	2
No. of projects renovation urban fac.	7	12	16	25	3
Gross employment creation (FTE)	3,121	4,270	4,218	2,090	699
Priority 3					
Support of start-ups (No.)	5	35	135	30	0
Support of SME (No.)	20	70	101	30	0
Induced private inv.(EUR million)	4.9	7	8.3	0	1.8
No. of projects Tourism	1		0	0	0
Restructuring industrial area's (ha.)	0	0	16	36	0
Restructuring industrial loc. (sq. m.)	15,800	253	86	316	13
No. of project Entrepreneurship	25	44	62	110	27
No. of projects Livability	17	88	66	149	31
No. of projects renovation urban fac.	44	72	93	93	31
Gross employment creation (FTE)	359	2,556	3,501	3,165	1,060

Source: Various AIRs of the Competitiveness and employment programmes 2012.

Comparing the situation in 2011 with that in 2010, it can be concluded that overall the programmes made progress with respect to commitments. However, the pace is lower than in 2010 which can be explained by the budget for most programmes being already overcommitted in 2011, which means that only a few projects were approved in 2011. This was particular the case in priority 1. Most indicators also already exceeded targets at the end of 2011.

The situation in priorities 2 and 3 is different. Progress with regard to commitments is slow and most targets remain to be achieved.

3. EFFECTS OF INTERVENTION

Main points from previous country report:

- The various AIRs are very positive about the progress made by the various programmes in 2010. However, there is no qualitative description or quantitative evidence given about the regional impact of the programmes. This makes it hard to draw any conclusions in this respect. However, the qualitative information should not be neglected.
- Committed ERDF resources amounted to EUR 617 million in relation to a total committed budget of EUR 2,231 million. This means that every EU-funded euro generates a national public and private contribution of EUR 3.6. Nevertheless the ERDF, as noted, only amounts to around 0.1% of total Dutch GDP.
- It is hard to define the effects of intervention because most projects have (in 2010) not been finalised yet.

Looking at the indicators (Table 5) gives the impression that ERDF financing contributed to strengthening the economic capacity of the regions, in particular in respect RTDI and SMEs. The expectation is, for example, that this will result in gross creation of 22,996 FTE jobs, support of more than 20,000 SMEs and more than 5,000 start-ups. Moreover, it is estimated to induce private investment of EUR 494 million. Because there is no evidence about the effects of intervention, nothing concrete can be concluded from Table 5 except that there was expenditure in various areas.

The effects of ERDF on regional economic developments are very hard to measure scientifically. It is hard to determine whether increased employment in a certain region is caused by ERDF programmes or by other factors. Nevertheless we can draw the conclusion that there is an increasing interest in the programme by both the public and private sectors, certainly in times of economic and financial crisis, the projects in the various programmes resulting in the development and growth of knowledge clusters.

Regions are becoming more aware of the importance of investigating and describing the qualitative and quantitative effects of ERDF programmes. For example the West region has initiated a study to map the regional impact of the ERDF, with the objective of determining the qualitative effects of the ERDF programme. The results will be available in 2012 and will be described in the country report of 2013.

Overall, the AIRs show some improvement in quality. In general the reports demonstrate an increase in awareness of the regional effects of the ERDF. However, it remains impossible to determine the direct effect in quantitative terms since as it is hard to isolate the relevant economic factors from others. Qualitative and quantitative studies and analysis are needed to improve the meaningfulness of programme achievements and effects. Until now, this kind of study has not been undertaken, either in this period or in the previous one.

4. EVALUATIONS AND GOOD PRACTICE IN EVALUATION.

Table 7 - Schematic evaluation plan Operational Programmes (OPs) (Competitiveness and employment) 2007-2013

Evaluation plan	When	Scope	Research questions
Ex ante	2007		
Guidelines indicators	March 2009		1. What are realistic values for a calculation of expected numbers of jobs? 2. What are adjustment factors for calculation of gross versus net jobs?
Program specific (theme) evaluations	From 2010 (when OP is being changed)	Thematic and concrete for foundation for adjustments in OP	1. Are program targets realized? 2. Are there reasons to change the program, and if what will be the changes?
National Strategic Report	End 2009	All four OPs	- Realization of targets and aims (national and regional)? - Commitment partners and industries? - Lisbon earmarking? - Visibility of results?
Evaluation of ERDF	Second half of 2010	All four OPs	Midterm review with the main question if the programs are on schedule? What are the differences between the ex-ante evaluation and the current programs?
Evaluation of organization, control and institutional arrangements Structural funds	July 2011		- Does the audit organization and coordination meet the aims that are set in the beginning? - Are there adjustments necessary? - Are national guidelines and rules sufficient? Are there adjustments necessary?
National Strategic Report	2012	All four OPs	- Realization of targets and aims (national and regional)? - Commitment partners and industries? - Lisbon earmarking? - Visibility of results?

Source: Country report 2010 (and 2011 in interviews confirmed by Dutch Objective 2 MAs)

An overall mid-term evaluation for all programmes has been scheduled in cooperation with the Ministry of Economic Affairs (see 2010 country report).

It has to be said that the evaluations of the Structural Fund programmes are seen as an obligation imposed by the Regulations rather than something which generates added value. In part, this attitude is a result of the minor budgetary impact of the ERDF, but also of the Dutch Parliament's reserved opinion of the Structural Funds (see policy paper Task 1 2011). The evaluations which have been undertaken are not examples of good practice.

Capacity is available, mainly in the form of outside experts for which a budget is foreseen in the Technical Assistance plans.

The main findings concerning the evaluation of the management and control system:

- The management and control system is efficient in terms of the amount of inaccuracies (within the norm).
- Nevertheless there are factors which have a negative effect on this. These are:
 - issues of interpretation with respect to eligibility
 - liability regarding decisions on the interpretation of issues not being clear
 - risk-avoiding behaviour

- The pressure of control (administrative burden) is perceived as being too onerous by MAs and beneficiaries.
- Beneficiaries are positive about the administrative demands, but see audits as a burden (because of the level of detail).
- Lack of harmonisation of ICT systems negatively affects the management system. Because data are recorded differently, it is difficult to compare them. This makes it difficult to draw conclusions.
- The time it takes to provide feed-back on the (progress) report is too long.

Table 8 – Evaluations carried out in The Netherlands

Title and date of completion	Policy area and scope (*)	Main objectives and focus(*)	Method used (*)	Main findings	Full reference or link to publication
Evaluation of control- and management-system ERDF	9	Evaluation of Effectiveness and efficiency of the structure and tasks in the control and management system of ERDF/ 1	Desk research, interviews / 4	The management and control system is efficient in relation to the amount of the inaccuracies.	Evaluation of control and managementsystem ERDF, Ecorys, 2011.
Mid term evaluation Interreg IVA Programme Flanders – The Netherlands	9	Evaluation of progress / 2	3, 4	projects contribute to the objectives of the programme There is balance between maximizing funding for projects needed and legal certainty Cooperation between the partners functions as described in the agreement More attention is needed concerning for the result indicators at programme level	Mid term evaluation Interreg IVA Programme Flanders – The Netherlands, Ecorys, 2011.

Note: (*) Legend:

Policy area and scope: 1. RTDI; 2. Enterprise support and ICT; 3. Human Resources (ERDF only; 4. Transport; 5. Environment; 6. Energy; 7. Territorial development (urban areas, tourism, rural development, cultural heritage, health, public security, local development); 8. Capacity and institution building; 9. Multi-area (e.g. evaluations of programmes, mid-term evaluations); 10. Transversal aspects (e.g. gender or equal opportunities, sustainable development, employment)

Main objective and focus: 1. assess the arrangements and procedures for managing or administering programmes; 2. support monitoring, or check the progress made in implementing programmes, such as many mid-term evaluations; 3. assess the outcome or effects of programmes in terms of the results achieved and their contribution to attaining socio-economic policy objectives

Method used: 1. Counterfactual; 2. Cost-benefit analysis; 3. Other quantitative; 4. Qualitative

The programmes also evaluated progress in 2011. This includes the Flanders–Netherlands programme (mid-term evaluation). An on-going evaluation was undertaken of the Euroregion Meuse-Rhine and the Netherlands–Germany programmes in 2011. There was no evaluation of the 2 Seas programme.

The main findings of the mid-term evaluation of the Interreg IVA programme Flanders–Netherlands are as follows:

- Effectiveness: projects contribute to the objectives of the programme. The result indicators are in general realised. The output indicators (targets) are even exceeded⁸.
- Efficiency: beneficiaries do not complain about the programme regulations. There is a balance between maximising the funding needed for projects and legal certainty. The preparation by the programme secretariat is described as efficient. The procedures are written down clearly. The programme is transparent. Management is adequate.
- Functioning of the partnership: Cooperation between the partners functions as described in the agreement. The programme secretariat organises the preparation of policy. Communication takes place in an open atmosphere.
- Set of indicators: More attention is needed concerning result indicators at programme level. Explanations of the indicators could be better. For the future programming period it is recommended to use experts, SWOT analysis and to relate the budget of the programme to the means needed to realise the targets.

The recommendations in the various evaluation reports have not been immediately implemented. However, the recommendations will be used in preparing for the next programming period 2014-2020.

There are no plans so far to evaluate particular policy areas in the future. The only plans are for the *ex ante* evaluation of the CBC-programmes.

In general, it can be concluded that the evaluations carried out were not examples of best practice. The most relevant evaluation question is missing (i.e. "Do the selected projects contribute to the goals of the OP?").

5. FURTHER REMARKS - NEW CHALLENGES FOR POLICY

Main points from previous country report:

- The main findings of 2010 are still valid.
- The overall picture that emerges is that in general, after a slow start at the beginning of the period, regions are making a lot of progress in implementing programmes. However, this is based on the expected output from committed projects and not the actual output from completed projects. The programmes, however, seem to be on schedule in relation to the financial timeframe for the programming period.
- It is clear that priority 1 is overwhelmed by project applications and that priorities 2 and 3 are lagging behind. A reason for this might be the economic and financial crisis and its influence on the willingness of public authorities to invest in long-term construction projects.
- The data on the indicators in the various programmes seem to suggest that a lot has been achieved. However, the numbers are not always reliable, which has led to a revision of them being launched.
- There has been no economic study on the regional impact of the ERDF in the Netherlands. This makes it hard to draw any conclusions in this respect. Moreover, the AIRs do not report on the regional impact of programmes or on the effects of the ERDF

⁸ There is no evidence on the contribution to the programme objectives.

funded projects in regions. The link between the overall ERDF objectives and the regional impact seems to be missing in the AIRs. Overall, the quality of the AIR is inadequate, lacking both quantitative and qualitative evidence.

- Although the AIRs show that a lot of progress has been made based on the indicators, it should be pointed out that the ERDF budget amounts to only 0.1% of GDP.
- A future challenge for the various programmes is to spend the budget available within the programming period. In addition, there is a clear challenge with regard to reporting. There is a need to report on the regional effect and impact of the ERDF, based on qualitative and quantitative evidence.

New challenges for policy

The MAs at this moment are in general more focussed on the future programming period than the current one. Experience from day-to-day practice, knowledge gained and recommendations from the various evaluations which have taken place in this programming period will be used to develop a framework for the future period. This framework needs to involve:

- a) developing a project selection system (tendering or “first come, first serve”),
- b) improving the quality of indicators,
- c) defining a clear monitoring and reporting system,
- d) highlighting the regional effects of the ERDF and including quantitative evidence on this in the AIRs,
- e) focusing more on specific sectors,
- f) simplifying the eligibility rules more and reducing the administrative burden.

REFERENCES

Experts should list here, giving bibliographical details:

1. Relevant evaluations by type, indicating the coverage and focus, the method used, when they were carried out and the period they relate to:
 - a) Evaluation of control- and management system ERDF, Ecorys, 2011.
 - b) Mid term evaluation of Interreg IVA Flanders – The Netherlands programme 2007-2013
 - c) On going evaluations Euregio Meuse – Rhine (internal)
 - d) On going evaluations The Netherlands – Germany programme (internal)
- OPs Objective 2 Netherlands
 - North 2007NL162PO001
 - South 2007NL162PO003
 - West 2007NL162PO002
 - East 2007NL162PO004
- OPs Objective 3A with Netherlands as partner
 - EMR 2007CB163PO001_NL
 - D-NL 2007CB163PO023_DE
 - 2Seas 2007CB163PO038_FR
 - BE-NL 2007CB163PO065_BE
- AIRs for the (eight) aforementioned programmes (2011)

INTERVIEWS

Managing Authorities – Objective 2 Programmes

- Martijn Panjer, Province of Gelderland, MA East
- Casper Kronenberg, Kansen voor West, MA West,
- Pieter Liebrechts, Province of North-Brabant (Stimulus), MA South,
- Roelof Jansma, SNN, MA North.

Managing Authorities – Objective 3 Programmes

- Peter-Paul Knol & Martijn Spaargaren, MA Germany – The Netherlands
- Björn Koopmans & Isabelle Jeanfils, MA Euregio Meuse – Rhine

ANNEX 1 - EVALUATION GRID FOR EXAMPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE IN EVALUATION

BASIC INFORMATION	
Country:	
Policy area: (Enterprise support, RTDI, Transport, etc.)	
Title of evaluation and full reference:	
Intervention period covered (2000-2006; 2007-2013; specific years):	
Timing of the evaluation (when it was carried out):	
Budget (if known): EUR	
Evaluator: (External evaluator, internal evaluator, EC)	
Method: (counterfactual analysis, process analysis, case study, econometric model, etc. indicate if a mix of methods)	
Main objectives and main findings:(very short description - 3-4 lines)	
Appraisal: (Why you consider the evaluation an example of good practice: - 3-4 lines)	
CHECK LIST	
Score each item listed below from 0 to 2 as follows: 0: No; 1: Yes, but not fully; 2: Yes	
Report	
Are the objectives, methods and findings of the evaluation clearly set out?	
Are the findings and recommendations clearly supported by the analysis?	
Are the methods used suitable given the objectives of the valuation and have they been well applied?	
Are the quantitative and qualitative data used reliable and suitable for the purpose of the evaluation?	
Are the potential effects of other factors (e.g. the economic situation) on the outcome fully taken into account?	
Is a serious attempt made to distinguish the effects of the intervention from these other factors?	

Not applicable for the Netherlands, no examples of good practices available.

ANNEX 2 - TABLES

See Excel Tables 1 -4:

Excel Table 1 – Regional disparities and trends

Excel Table 2 – Macro-economic developments

Excel Table 3 - Financial allocation by main policy area

Excel Table 3cbc - Financial allocation by main policy area – cross border cooperation

Excel Table 4 - Commitments by main policy area (by end-2011)

Excel Table 4cbc - Commitments by main policy area (by end-2011) – cross border cooperation

Annex Table A - Broad policy areas and correspondence with fields of intervention (FOI)

Policy area		Code	Priority themes
1. Enterprise environment	RTDI and linked activities	01	R&TD activities in research centres
		02	R&TD infrastructure and centres of competence in a specific technology
		05	Advanced support services for firms and groups of firms
		07	Investment in firms directly linked to research and innovation (...)
		74	Developing human potential in the field of research and innovation, in particular through post-graduate studies ...
	Innovation support for SMEs	03	Technology transfer and improvement of cooperation networks ...
		04	Assistance to R&TD, particularly in SMEs (including access to R&TD services in research centres)
		06	Assistance to SMEs for the promotion of environmentally-friendly products and production processes (...)
		09	Other measures to stimulate research and innovation and entrepreneurship in SMEs
		14	Services and applications for SMEs (e-commerce, education and training, networking, etc.)
		15	Other measures for improving access to and efficient use of ICT by SMEs
	ICT and related services	11	Information and communication technologies (...)
		12	Information and communication technologies (TEN-ICT)
		13	Services and applications for citizens (e-health, e-government, e-learning, e-inclusion, etc.)
	Other investment in firms	08	Other investment in firms
	2. Human resources	Education and training	62
63			Design and dissemination of innovative and more productive ways of organising work
64			Development of special services for employment, training and support in connection with restructuring of sectors ...
72			Design, introduction and implementing of reforms in education and training systems ...

Policy area		Code	Priority themes
	Labour market policies	73	Measures to increase participation in education and training throughout the life-cycle ...
		65	Modernisation and strengthening labour market institutions
		66	Implementing active and preventive measures on the labour market
		67	Measures encouraging active ageing and prolonging working lives
		68	Support for self-employment and business start-up
		69	Measures to improve access to employment and increase sustainable participation and progress of women ...
		70	Specific action to increase migrants' participation in employment ...
		71	Pathways to integration and re-entry into employment for disadvantaged people ...
		80	Promoting the partnerships, pacts and initiatives through the networking of relevant stakeholders
3. Transport	Rail	16	Railways
		17	Railways (TEN-T)
		18	Mobile rail assets
		19	Mobile rail assets (TEN-T)
	Road	20	Motorways
		21	Motorways (TEN-T)
		22	National roads
		23	Regional/local roads
	Other transport	24	Cycle tracks
		25	Urban transport
		26	Multimodal transport
		27	Multimodal transport (TEN-T)
		28	Intelligent transport systems
		29	Airports
30		Ports	
31		Inland waterways (regional and local)	
32	Inland waterways (TEN-T)		
4. Environment and energy	Energy infrastructure	33	Electricity
		34	Electricity (TEN-E)
		35	Natural gas
		36	Natural gas (TEN-E)
		37	Petroleum products
		38	Petroleum products (TEN-E)
		39	Renewable energy: wind
		40	Renewable energy: solar
		41	Renewable energy: biomass
		42	Renewable energy: hydroelectric, geothermal and other
		43	Energy efficiency, co-generation, energy management
	Environment and risk prevention	44	Management of household and industrial waste
		45	Management and distribution of water (drink water)
		46	Water treatment (waste water)

Policy area		Code	Priority themes
		47	Air quality
		48	Integrated prevention and pollution control
		49	Mitigation and adaption to climate change
		50	Rehabilitation of industrial sites and contaminated land
		51	Promotion of biodiversity and nature protection (including Natura 2000)
		52	Promotion of clean urban transport
		53	Risk prevention (...)
		54	Other measures to preserve the environment and prevent risks
5. Territorial development	Social Infrastructure	10	Telephone infrastructure (including broadband networks)
		75	Education infrastructure
		76	Health infrastructure
		77	Childcare infrastructure
		78	Housing infrastructure
		79	Other social infrastructure
	Tourism and culture	55	Promotion of natural assets
		56	Protection and development of natural heritage
		57	Other assistance to improve tourist services
		58	Protection and preservation of the cultural heritage
		59	Development of cultural infrastructure
		60	Other assistance to improve cultural services
	Planning and rehabilitation	61	Integrated projects for urban and rural regeneration
	Other	82	Compensation of any additional costs due to accessibility deficit and territorial fragmentation
		83	Specific action addressed to compensate additional costs due to size market factors
	6. Technical assistance		84
81			Mechanisms for improving good policy and programme design, monitoring and evaluation ...
85			Preparation, implementation, monitoring and inspection
86			Evaluation and studies; information and communication

Annex Table B - Operational and committed overall and ERDF budget, expenditure and implementation rate by priority by end 2011

Total	Total 2010	Total 2011	North	West	South	East
Operational budget (EUR million)	1,969	1,969	373	770	462	363
Total budget committed (EUR million)	2,231	2,706	774	862	648	422
ERDF-budget (EUR million)	830	830	169	311	186	164
Total ERDF-budget committed (EUR million)	617	749	183	265	175	126
Certified eligible expenditure (EUR million)	261	630	144	182	201	103
Implementation rate (Certified ex./Op. budget) (%)	13	32	39	24	44	28
Implementation rate (Committed/Op. budget) (%)	113	137	208	112	140	116
Implementation (Committed ERDF/Budget ERDF) (%)	74	90	108	85	94	77
Priority 1	Total 2010	Total 2011	North	West	South	East
Operational budget (EUR million)	1,003	1,005	190	369	234	212
Total budget committed (EUR million)	1,318	1,598	502	459	345	292
ERDF-budget (EUR million)	431	432	95	148	94	95
Total ERDF-budget committed (EUR million)	347	407	104	124	93	86
Certified eligible expenditure (EUR million)	161	382	99	107	124	52
Implementation rate (Certified ex./Op. budget) (%)	16	38	52	29	53	25
Implementation rate (Committed/Op. budget) (%)	131	159	264	124	147	138
Implementation (Committed ERDF/Budget ERDF) (%)	81	94	109	84	99	91
Priority 2	Total 2010	Total 2011	North	West	South	East
Operational budget (EUR million)	435	433	85	134	114	100
Total budget committed (EUR million)	496	589	172	130	188	99
ERDF-budget (EUR million)	178	177	34	54	44	45
Total ERDF-budget committed (EUR million)	125	150	38	41	43	28
Certified eligible expenditure (EUR million)	28	103	20	10	38	35
Implementation rate (Certified ex./Op. budget) (%)	6	24	24	7	33	35
Implementation rate (Committed/Op. budget) (%)	114	136	202	97	165	99
Implementation (Committed ERDF/Budget ERDF) (%)	70	85	112	76	98	62
Priority 3	Total 2010	Total 2011	North	West	South	East
Operational budget (EUR million)	464	465	85	242	100	38

Total budget committed (EUR million)	357	473	100	249	99	25
ERDF-budget (EUR million)	188	188	34	97	40	17
Total ERDF-budget committed (EUR million)	123	163	34	88	33	8
Certified eligible expenditure (EUR million)	71	122	23	56	31	12
Implementation rate (Certified ex./Op. budget) (%)	15	26	27	23	31	32
Implementation rate (Committed/Op. budget) (%)	77	102	118	103	99	66
Implementation (Committed ERDF/Budget ERDF) (%)	65	87	100	91	83	47

Source: Various AIRs of the Competitiveness and employment programmes 2012.

Annex Table C – CBC programmes - Operational and committed overall and ERDF budget, expenditure and implementation rate by priority by the end of 2011⁹

	Total 2010	Total 2011	Netherlands-Germany	Euregion Meuse – Rhine	Flanders - Netherlands	2 Seas
Operational budget (EUR million)	-	-	294	144	190	-
ERDF-budget (EUR million)	463	463	139	72	95	157
Total ERDF-budget committed (EUR million)	322	431	124	65	89	153
Certified eligible expenditure (EUR million)	126	270	78	36	80	76
Implementation rate (certified exp./operational budget) (%)		-	27	25	42	
Implementation rate ERDF (budget committed/ERDF budget)(%)	70	93	89	90	94	97
Priority 1		Total	Netherlands-Germany	Euregion Meuse - Rhine	Flanders - Netherlands	2 Seas
Operational budget (EUR million)	-	-	176	94	95	-
ERDF-budget (EUR million)	233	233	80	47	47	59
Total ERDF-budget committed (EUR million)	159	218	69	47	43	59
Certified eligible expenditure (EUR million)	63	138	35	17	49	37
Implementation rate (certified exp./operational budget) (%)		-	20	18	52	-
Implementation rate ERDF (budget committed/ERDF budget) (%)	68	94	86	100	91	100
Priority 2		Total	Netherlands-Germany	Euregion Meuse – Rhine	Flanders - Netherlands	2 Seas
Operational budget (EUR million)	-	-	50	26	46	-
ERDF-budget (EUR million)	102	102	25	13	23	41
Total ERDF-budget committed (EUR million)	75	100	23	13	23	41
Certified eligible expenditure (EUR million)	23	60	19	8	18	15
Implementation rate (certified exp./operational budget) (%)		-	38	31	39	-
Implementation rate ERDF (budget committed/ERDF budget) (%)	74	98	92	100	100	100
Priority 3		Total	Netherlands-Germany	Euregion Meuse – Rhine	Flanders - Netherlands	2 Seas

⁹ Because of missing data in the 2 Seas programme regarding the Operational budget it is not possible to calculate the implementation rate based on certified expenditure. Therefore we can not draw conclusions concerning the progress made at total level, but only at programme level.

Operational budget (EUR million)	-	-	50	16	38	-
ERDF-budget (EUR million)	97	97	25	8	19	45
Total ERDF-budget committed (EUR million)	69	95	24	8	18	45
Certified eligible expenditure (EUR million)	25	51	17	8	10	16
Implementation rate (certified exp./operational budget)(%)		-	34	50	26	-
Implementation rate ERDF (budget committed/ERDF budget) (%)	71	98	96	100	95	100

Source: Various AIRs of the Competitiveness and employment and CBC programmes 2012.