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The new Environmental and Planning Act in the Netherlands

Before: **26 laws with rules and regulations**

Now: **1 law with rules and regulations**

- Follow-up is explicitly part of the policy process
- How can we use the renewed attention for follow-up to improve implementation?
The research

• Research carried out by Antea Group

• The research consists of three parts:
  - Desk study
  - Case studies and interviews
  - Final report

• Useful insights about follow-up are identified
Case studies – Maasvlakte 2

- To assess if compensation is successful, follow-up measures were implemented
- Broader in scope than the EA obligations
- Follow-up can increase the trust of stakeholders
- Unique and extensive

Maasvlakte 2 concerns the construction, design and use of deep-sea related port industries, sea walls and rail- and road infrastructure.
Case studies – Haven-Stad Amsterdam

• Final image of these type of projects is often unknown

• Follow-up can contribute to timely adjust goals, ambitions and take measures

• Pragmatic approach to data collection

• Executed by a small project team

Long-term urban development project in former industrial area

Picture 2: Gemeente Amsterdam (2017) ontwikkelstrategie Haven-Stad
Case studies – Sand extraction  North Sea (coastline care)

• Because Coastline care is an ongoing project, the follow-up is organized differently

• Focus may also shift to other indicators, due to new insights or at the request of the competent authority

*Coastline care provides sand supplementation to reinforce the ever eroding Dutch coast, which is vital to prevent the country from flooding.*
Experiences

• Legal obligations
• Increase the trust of stakeholders
• Follow-up as a forward-looking tool
• Follow-up seems to have remained relatively unknown
• Used sparingly and implementation not properly arranged
It happens that monitoring and evaluation falls through the cracks during the transition from planning to the realization and management phase.

1. The more changeable the environment, the more value follow-up can have.

2. Follow-up has more added value if it serves multiple purposes.

3. Follow-up needs a careful start phase with a plan of action (MEP).
4. Check the usability of existing data at an early stage

5. Ensure that EA follow-up is embedded in the organization

6. Present follow-up more separately from EA

“A pragmatic approach is desirable. For example, by connecting to existing monitoring programs.”
– senior EA advisor (NLengineers)

View the EIA as an instrument for determining what kind of follow-up is needed, instead of focusing too much on checking the EIA.
Let’s continue the conversation!
Post questions and comments in the IAIA24 app.
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