



IDELE

Identification, Dissemination and Exchange of good practice in
Local Employment development and promoting better governance

NETHERLANDS

DUTCH NATIONAL NETWORK RURAL DEVELOPMENT / LEADER+

General details

Address	ETC Netherlands, POBox 64 NL 3830 AB Leusden The Netherlands
Telephone no.	+31-33-4326090
Fax	+31-33-4940791
Email address	h.kieft@etcnl.nl
Name of Contact	Henk Kieft

Details of activity

Background to the case study	<p>Aims and objectives Start up and animate national RD network and integrate it with LEADER+ network. Establish a professional network-team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information exchange • Making people meet • Analyse practices and put issues on relevant agenda's <p>Brief rationale The basic functions of rural areas are changing. Agricultural production alone is complemented by multiple functions for new societal demands (recreation, nature, water management, care, biodiversity). The development game between Governments and farmers is now 'enriched'/'complicated' because many more stakeholders have to participate . This requires a strong communication effort in e free access atmosphere; typically a condition networking can fulfil.</p> <p>Implementing organisation ETC and blooming are two private advisory organisations in RD, having won the tender procedure in 2001 to start uop and run the network. ETC has the lead in the consortium.</p> <p>Funders The implementing organisation ETC is contracted by the Ministry of Agr/Nature/Food Quality. The network activities are</p>
------------------------------	--

	<p>co-funded by the same Ministry of ANFQ, the ministry of Internal Affairs, the ministry of Social Affairs, the 12 provinces, the Innovation Network, and the European Commission.</p> <p>When activity started / end date? Started in the end of 2001 and will finalise by the end of 2006.</p>
Description of activity	<p>Outline of programme / activities and approaches used</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conferences, seminars and workshops • Booklets, website, newsbulletin • Policy initiatives to mainstream Leader in Dutch RD policy • Self-evaluations LEADER+-Local Action Groups (LAG) on their future and quality. • Start up of Subsidiarity Programme: inhabitants and entrepreneurs to gain co-responsibility for their area (with Governmental stakeholders). • Advise on future network <p>Origins – how it came about – bottom up / top down, grew from previous initiative (if so what) Top down: project from state/province level and European Commission. The network-team had to gradually “infiltrate” in the regional and local stakeholders. Next network 2007-13 is advised to be more regionally oriented.</p> <p>Who was involved in the design, management and delivery of the programme The tender was formulated by guidelines of the EC, the coordination point for Rural Renewal of the Min ANFQ and LEADER-2-coordinators. The programme was designed in the tender document by ETC / blooming and delivered.</p> <p>Recognition – has the programme been recognised as good practice? If so, by whom? Yes, over the years the network has been recognised as having added value. This started basically after the network team proposed to focus on subsidiarity. This gave a strong own profile, more then only a delivery organisation for information, conferences and bulletins. By entering the policy-making scene and playing its independent role between civil stakeholders and governmental institutions its relevance was gradually perceived.</p>

<p>Policy context within which the programme operates</p>	<p>The policy context is dominated by two issues:</p> <p>1) the Common Agricultural Policy: the fundamental shift from agricultural production towards broader Rural Development and Innovation</p> <p>2) the Dutch policy to put responsibilities for programmes as much as possible at lower public administration (GO)-levels and to give a stronger responsibility to citizens. This brings the lowest democracy/administrative level (the municipality) and the local initiatives in the front.</p> <p>Is the policy context supportive / prohibitive? The Dutch policy context is supportive, but the administrative context is lagging behind. The European policy context is supportive as well, both in Rural renewal as in subsidiarity.</p> <p>Has the policy context changed during the life of the activity Yes, Dutch RD policy (Agenda Vital Countryside) has substantially increased its attention for local participation, but steps to adapt and update it in practice are marginal and they depend not on ministries but on the provinces and municipalities. Here the LEADER-concept of LAGs is very innovative and challenging the Netherlands in its internal administration.</p> <p>Which came first – local activities or policy priorities (i.e. is activity leading or following policy priorities)? Network activities have followed policy impulses, but are gradually being recognised by local players as very relevant. This is also helped by the independent position of the network team vis-à-vis the GO and the private sectors.</p>
<p>Geographical focus of the case study</p>	<p>Netherlands</p>
<p>Impact</p>	<p>Outcomes: at local level – what difference at local level and at regional and / or national level – what difference made?</p> <p>Self-awareness of local stakeholders is increased.</p> <p>Learning from experiences in enhancing economic initiatives in other regions has increased.</p> <p>Local groups are more seriously involved in preparing the next RD-programme.</p>

	<p>Any impact at European level? Network team is invited to present its initiatives and experiences in other member states.</p>
--	--

Theme-Specific Questions

Which levels of government were involved, informed or consulted?	National (ministries), provincial (authorities and civil servants) and municipalities (authorities and civil servants)
What actions resulted in mainstreaming?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informing provincial economic policy makers to know the LEADER-advantages and constraints. • Putting subsidiarity on the policy agenda of ministries and provinces. • Starting an additional subsidiarity programma with local and regional actors. • Contributing actively to the next RD-policy. <p>The programme has not yet been replicated, but a lot of interest is raised. Some municipalities are preparing to replicate/adapt to their own context.</p>
Sustainability	New initiatives are co-funded by regions themselves (public and private) and by another 'learning' network called Habiforum, working with GO-funds for innovation.
Successes / lessons learned	<p>What contributed to the programme's success? Its great ears (listening capacity), its courage to build a specific profile, and its independent position vis-à-vis the various players/stakeholders.</p> <p>What lessons have been learned</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network-team cannot work top-down, must be embedded in network. • Putting topics on the political agenda's (based on signals from the network) builds position. • Activity in strengthening position of LAGs builds feelings of partnership between network-team and local players. <p>If they had their time again what would they do differently? Starting the network much more bottom-up and taking more time for it.</p>