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|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Basic info** | **Flevoland** | **Limburg** | **Netherlands** | **Unit** |
| Population [2008] | 378.7 | 1123.7 | 16405.4 | thous. |
| GDP [2008] | 11625 | 35381 | 639163 | mln EUR |
| Population [2014] | 399.9 | 1120.0 | 16829.3 | thous. |
| GDP [2014] | 12042 | 36693 | 662770 | mln EUR |
| ***Total allocation*** |
| Allocation ERDF+CF [2000-2006] | 81.7 | 31.6 | 806.7 | mln EUR |
| Allocation ERDF+CF 2007-2013 | 32.3 | 95.6 | 1052.6 | mln EUR |
| Ratio [period 2007-2013 to 2000-2006] | 0.40 | 3.03 | 1.30 | ratio |
| ***Absorption rates ERDF+CF*** |
| Absorption rate 2000-2006 [final] | 100 | 100 | 100 | per cent |
| Absorption rate 2007-2013 [in 2014] | 69.3 | 96.2 | 81.7 | per cent |

Flevoland and Limburg are comparable with regard to both their GDP per capita and the total allocation of ERDF and CF funds in per capita terms in the 2007-2013 period (totalling around 85 EUR). However, in the previous programming period the distribution of EU Structural Funds was considerably different, due to the fact that Flevoland had been eligible for the transitional support under the Objective 1. After this support ceased, in the course of programming period 2007-2013, the total allocations for Flevoland decreased by 60%, while Limburg experienced a threefold increase of its allocations. Absorption rates for this period also significantly vary, with Flevoland lagging behind Limburg by 27 pp..

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Thematic structure** [NUTS-2, 2007-13, ERDF+CF] | **Flevoland** | **Limburg** | **Netherlands** |
| ***% of allocation*** |
| Category A “Innovative enivironment”: business support, human resources, IT infrastructure and services, research and technology | 50.7% | 51.2% | 54.9% |
| Category B ”Basic infrastructure”: energy, environment and natural resources, transport infrastructure | 10.2% | 0.6% | 16.8% |
| Category C “Quality of life”: social infrastructure, tourism and culture, urban and rural regeneration | 39.1% | 40.9% | 24.6% |
| ***Rate of absorption [in 2014]*** |
| Category A “Innovative enivironment”: business support, human resources, IT infrastructure and services, research and technology | 68.1% | 97.0% | 79.4% |
| Category B ”Basic infrastructure”: energy, environment and natural resources, transport infrastructure | 31.7% | 100% | 76.5% |
| Category C “Quality of life”: social infrastructure, tourism and culture, urban and rural regeneration | 80.3% | 100% | 89.5% |

\* % of allocation does not add to 1, because the “technical assistance” is not included in any of the categories.

The structure of allocation in the analysed regions is dominated by investments in Category A and Category C. The share of funds dedicated to the latter category both in Flevoland and Limburg exceeds the national average by approx. 15 pp. Interestingly, basic infrastructure seems to be of minor importance, especially in Limburg – where it attracted less than 1% of total allocations.

The rate of absorption broken down by thematic categories shows the relative underperformance of Flevoland, especially with regard to investments in basic infrastructure. On the other hand, Limburg outperforms not only Flevoland, but also the national average.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Regional OP** [ERDF] | **Flevoland\*** | **Limburg\*** | **Netherlands** | **Unit** |
| ***Allocations to Regional OPs*** |
| Allocation 2007-2013 | 345.2 | 186.8 | 906.7 | mln EUR |
| Allocation 2014-2020 | 189.8 | 113.6 | 507.3 | mln EUR |
| Ratio [period 2014-2020 to 2007-2013] | 0.55 | 0.61 | 0.56 | ratio |
| ***Reported achievements: period 2007-2013 [as in 2013]*** |
| Jobs created | 5360 | 4026 | 18518 | jobs |
| Start-ups supported | 2597 | 1884 | 6072 | number |
| Area of business parks modernised | 108 | 447 | no data | ha |
| Cooperation projects enterprises-research institutions | 79 | 141 | 519 | projects |
| Direct investment aid projects to SME | 10826 | 3519 | no data | projects |

\* All data at the regional level provided in this table refer to multiregional OPs, i.e. OP West Netherlands and OP South Netherlands. In other words, the values presented here reflect the situation in the whole area (spanning multiple NUTS2 regions) covered by a given OP.

The allocations to Regional OPs in both case study regions has fallen significantly when the last two programming periods are concerned. A similar decline was observed at the country level.

The reported number of created jobs juxtaposed with the programme allocations suggests that OP South Netherlands is more efficient than OP West Netherlands in creating new jobs. Also, the former programme seems to focus more on enhancing the business environment, as indicated by data on modernised business parks and projects supporting cooperation between enterprises and research institutions.