

Evaluation of the Danube Financing Dialogue

Lisa Danzer, Walter Reiter, Barbara Willsberger

IMPRINT

Authors: The report is published by L&R Sozialforschung/L&R Social Research on behalf of the Municipal Department 27

Media owner:

L&R Sozialforschung/L&R Social Research, Liniengasse 2A, 1060 Vienna, Austria

All rights reserved, reprint - even in extracts - only with citation of the source

Vienna, June 2014

Contents

1	Executive Summary	4
2	Introduction	6
3	Evaluation Design and Sample Description	8
3.1	Sample Description	9
4	Target Groups	11
4.1	Target groups by conferences	14
5	Danube Financing Dialogues	17
5.1	Panel Discussions	18
5.2	Face-to-Face Meetings	21
5.3	Project Presentation (Project Market Place)	22
5.4	General satisfaction with the DFD	24
6	Utility and Sustainability	25
7	Need for Improvement	29
8	Abbreviations	34
9	Index of Figures	35
10	Index of Tables	36
11	Appendix	37
11.1	Tables	37
11.2	Questionnaire	48
11.2.1	General satisfaction	48
11.2.2	Networking	48
11.2.3	Utility and sustainability	51
11.2.4	Need for improvement	53

1 Executive Summary

The Danube Financing Dialogue (DFD) provides a platform for stimulating the match-making of SME's and other project promoter's financing needs and financing possibilities offered by financing institutions. Three conferences were held in Vienna, Belgrade and Bucharest in 2012 and 2013 and the DFD will be continued on the base of this evaluation. To evaluate the success of the conferences, a mix of different methods was applied by the evaluation team:

- Analysis of documents and existing data, like mailing lists, participation lists, existing analyses of feedback questionnaires, documentations of the conferences, etc.
- Web-based survey
- face-to-face interviews with members of the organisational team, speakers and participants

All in all, the results show a high degree of satisfaction with the organisation of the conferences and the received information. The organisational team was able to reach the different types of target groups (SMEs/local authorities, financial institutions and representatives of the EUSDR). 43% of the participants were SMEs and 27% EUSDR. The rest (21%) consisted of financial institutions and local authorities (9%). Especially having the National Bank of Austria as a partner for the organization of the venue was an advantage when it came to establishing contacts to commercial banks. Nevertheless, the management of invitation and registration should have a special focus on SMEs and financial institutions, because the analysis shows that their share decreases from the first to the third DFD, while the share of EUSDR-representatives continuously increased.

The results of the evaluation also show that these target groups are quite heterogeneous, with different needs for information. Especially within the target groups of SMEs and financial institutions there should be a stronger distinction, because their needs of project funding and information are quite different.

The structure of each Danube Financing Dialogue includes key note speeches, panel discussions, matchmaking sessions, face-to-face meetings for SMEs and financial institutions and a project market place where selected projects were presented. To sum up the results of the feedback questionnaires, quite a high rate of satisfied participants can be attested. The event provides a platform for networking and exchanging experience and knowledge:

- 56% of the participants benefitted (rather) much from the panel discussions, because of the choice of appropriate topics, a successful knowledge transfer, new contacts and networks.
- 90% of the participants of the face-to-face meetings met the right contact partner, 75% received information about further contact persons and 70% about possible funding sources. All in all, 70% of the participants evaluated their expectations towards the face-to-face meeting as fully or partly fulfilled. Face-to-face meetings are one of the essential tools for the networking of financial institutions with SMEs, and the evaluation provides evidence that this tool was met with much satisfaction and that it was very useful.

- In comparison, only 46% of the participants who made use of their projects or project ideas being presented said that their expectations had been fully or partly met. Especially a lack of information and the participation of too few financiers were criticized.

In general, the reasons for a lacking benefit concentrate on missing information and too few possibilities for establish further contacts. Furthermore the participants criticized that not enough financiers had been available.

But all in all there is quite a high general satisfaction of the participants of the DFD. Especially the venue and the time management during the event are assessed positively. 72% of the participants were very satisfied with the venue and 26% were quite satisfied. The time management was for 59% quite good and for 39% very good. Concerning these two aspects, there is no need for improvement for the next DFDs.

Also the benefit of the conferences for the projects of the participants was evaluated high (64%), because of meeting possible financing partners and receiving information concerning the (further) development of the project. Positive is also that 47% of the participants are still in contact with other participants in the conference.

Nevertheless, the results from the survey point out that the participants mention fields of improvement, especially the reaching of the target groups, the composition of the participants and the possibilities for more informal contacts. Therefore in the future a clear identification of the various target groups and their needs is necessary. In the context of a clarification and distinction like this one also the matchmaking sessions and the face-to-face meetings could be organized more effectively and the widespread information needs of the target groups could be met more precisely.


But in summary the results show a high degree of satisfaction. The following points sum up valuable qualities of the DFDs:

- Unique conference to bring together project owners/project managers and financial institutions,
- broad scope of target groups and participants with various institutional backgrounds,
- the programme includes a range of different tools for networking,
- concrete support for project stakeholders is offered,
- stimulation for SMEs, national funding institutions and commercial banks concerning their sensitisation for financing possibilities, e.g. revolving funds.

2 Introduction

The EU Strategy for the Danube Region (EUSDR) is a macro-regional strategy covering the Danube drainage area, including 14 states and about 115 million inhabitants. The Strategy was jointly developed by the European Commission, the Danube Region countries and affected stakeholders and was endorsed in June 2011 by the European Council. The main objective of the Strategy is a closer cooperation to address common challenges together. Therefore the EUSDR is subdivided into 4 pillars and 11 priority areas (see figure).

Figure 1: Pillars and Priority Areas of the EUSDR



Source: <http://www.danube-region.eu/about/priorities>

The City of Vienna (Austria) and the Centre for Excellence in Finance (Slovenia) have been put in charge of coordinating the Priority Area 10 (PA 10) "To step up institutional capacity and cooperation". The coordinators were instructed by the European Commission to create and implement the Danube Financing Framework to assist project owners - especially small and medium-sized enterprises (SME), NGOs and local authorities - in matters of project funding. For that purpose the Danube Financing Dialogue (DFD) was developed and three conferences were held in Vienna, Belgrade and Bucharest in 2012 and 2013. The Danube Financing Dialogue brings together SMEs, project promoters and local authorities with international financing institutions and national funding sources. The Dialogue provides a platform to merge

SME's funding needs with institutions that provide financing. These conferences will be continued on the base of the results of the evaluation at hand. The present report includes the description of the evaluation design, the structure of the conferences and the results of the survey.

3 Evaluation Design and Sample Description

The main objective of the Danube Financing Dialogue is to establish a dialogue between financing institutions and project owners, and the strengthening of these networks. To evaluate if these aims were reached the following questions has to be answered:

- Was it possible to reach the target groups?
- How are the organisational aspects of the conferences assessed by the participants?
- How are the contents of the conferences assessed?
- How is the benefit assessed?
- How sustainable is the Danube Financing Dialogue?

To answer these questions the evaluation team applied a mix of different methods:

- Analysis of documents and existing data, like mailing lists and participation lists; reviewing existing analysis of feedback questionnaires, documentations of the conferences, etc.
- Web-based survey
- 5 face-to-face interviews with members of the organisational team, speakers and participants

The results of these analysis-steps are described in the following chapters.

For the web-based survey a questionnaire (see annex) was developed and discussed with the contracting body. Each of the 451 participants of one of the three Danube Financing Dialogues received a written invitation to take part in the web-based survey. For different reasons the response was rather low:


- Wrong e-mail addresses, often because of job changes
- Absences (e.g. maternity leave)
- No interest in participating: too many evaluations of the conferences
- Lack of time to join a web-based survey or an interview on the phone
- Too long ago: can't remember the conference(s); can't perform the evaluation appropriately (especially participants of the first conference)
- Communication problems: some e-mails implicate insufficient English or German language skills

Subsequently the evaluation team contacted 95 participants on the phone. But even this approach was not successful, as the contacted persons denied their participation for the same reasons, mainly a lack of time or too many similar surveys. Finally just 47 questionnaires were returned and could be used for the analysis. Thus the return rate is just 10.4%.

3.1 Sample Description

The evaluation sample includes participants of all three conferences. Figure 2 shows their distribution: more than half of them (53%) attended the first conference, around one third (36%) the second and 30% the third conference. Most of the respondents attended just one conference (83%) (see table 10 appendix).


Figure 2: Participation in one or more DFD conferences (multiple answers)



Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=47

Figure 3 shows that the respondents' countries of origin were mainly Austria (34%), Serbia (19%), Romania (17%) and Germany (13%). Other countries are represented by less than 10%. This result is not surprising, as the distribution reflects the locations of the conferences: Vienna, Belgrade and Bucharest.


Figure 3: Country of origin of the participants of one or more DFD conferences



Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=47

The gender distribution of the conferences is illustrated in figure 4. Evidently the first conference had in comparison the highest gender balance with nearly one third (32%) women. The overall women rate is 28% on average.


Figure 4: Participation in one or more DFD conferences (multiple answers) by gender



Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=47

Most of the interviewed persons (43%) represent organizations that are registered as SME/project promoters. 39% are registered as EUSDR stakeholders, 13% as financial institutions and 4% as local authorities.

Figure 5: Organization type of the participants of one or more DFD conferences



Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=47, n miss=1

All in all the distribution within the sample correlates relatively high with the distribution in the group of participants, as proven by the results in the following.

4 Target Groups

Four different categories were defined as target groups of the DFD:

- Representatives of financial institutions and funding agencies that offer loans, grants and guarantees (e.g. European Investment Bank (EIB), European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), European Investment Fund (EIF), commercial banks)
- Project promoters/owners, particularly small and medium-sized enterprises, NGOs, whose projects should be of relevance to the priorities for the EUSDR.
- Local authorities
- Public actors involved in the EUSDR

As already shown by former surveys and noticed by the interviewees, the group of project owners is quite heterogeneous. A study from Metis¹ distinguishes three different groups of project owners:

- Public-private partnerships
- Public bodies, particularly local authorities
- SMEs and NGOs, which also includes civil society as well as the social, cultural and educational sectors.

An analysis of project owners in the EUSDR, carried out by the consulting company metis, reveals that each of the above mentioned groups represents about one third of the then implemented EUSDR-projects, but that none of the lead partners is a private enterprise (metis 2011). The set-up of the DFD is meant to be a pilot project with the aim to reach this target group.

One of the first steps of the evaluation was the analysis of the composition of the participants of the conferences in order to assess the degree by which the target groups have been reached. The lists of participants of each conference are published on the homepage of the PA 10 (<http://www.danube-capacitycooperation.eu/>) and provided the basis for the analysis. For two reasons the calculations differ substantially from these lists:

1. All Persons who have not been marked as “attendant” for at least one day participation by the organisers have been excluded.
2. All persons who attended the conferences but were not properly registered in advance have also been excluded. This is because those participants just wrote their names by hand (partly illegible) on the attendants’ lists and no further information about for example country of origin, profession or kind of organization can be retrieved.

Figure 6 depicts the distribution of all registered participants of one or more DFD conferences by type of organization: 43% were SMEs, 27% representatives of EUSDR, 21% financial institutions and 9% were local authorities. It has to be noted that these categories were self-assessed by the participants and could therefore include impreciseness within the categories because of different self-classifications of participants.

¹ Metis: Analysis of needs for financial instruments in the EU Strategy for the Danube Region (EUSDR). Final Report 2011.


The results of the evaluation prove that the organisation team was basically able to reach the main types of target groups. Concerning the objective to reach especially SMEs and financial institutions the analysis reveals difficulties to reach the financial institutions. The number of participants of this target group was comparatively low few and further analysis shows that especially within this group many preregistered persons did finally not attend the conferences. For further conferences it is recommended to find ways to stronger oblige the participation after registration.

The experience of the first three dialogues shows that the partnership with the National Bank of Austria was an advantage for acquiring representatives of commercial banks. But it takes time to convince them of the advantage of their participation. At present there are some commercial banks, which see the DFD as a useful instrument and fixed their participation for the next conferences already.

More than one third of the participants were representatives of institutions which are involved in the EUSDR. Although this group is a relevant multiplier, they are not the primary target group and it is recommended to find ways that fewer participants from this group attend the conferences in future.

SMEs and local authorities are a quite heterogeneous and therefore difficult target group (including enterprises, NGOs with cultural, social or educational background as well as consultants, public private partnerships, public bodies and local authorities). This results in a broad spectrum of demands, ranging from investment projects of private enterprises to small social projects with no own capital that have to be exclusively financed by public funds. EIB, EBRD, EIF etc. or commercial banks are potential financiers for big investment projects. Accordingly, the needs for information are also within a wide range, from information about funding within the context of structural funds in general to precise questions about opportunities concerning loans and investing institutions. Overall it is recommended that the special focus on the target group of SMEs, private project owners and local authorities should be maintained.

Figure 6: Organization type of all registered participants in one or more DFD conferences




Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=597, n miss=18

Concerning the countries of origin figure 7 shows that registrations from Romania (34%), Serbia (24%) and Austria (18%) dominate. This result is not surprising, as the three DFD were held in Bucharest (Romania), Belgrade (Serbia) and Vienna (Austria). It is planned that each DFD will take place in another capital of the EUSDR-countries to reach as many participants as possible. Favoured are countries from South East Europe. Therefore the next conference is planned in Zagreb (Croatia).

Participants from these countries have quite a low travelling budget, so for that reason alone it is recommended to maintain this strategy.


Figure 7: Country distribution of all registered participants in one or more DFD conferences



Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=597, n miss=9; *Others includes: Luxembourg, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Czech Republic, Italy, Spain, Poland, Slovakia, Belgium, Ukraine, France, Moldavia, Montenegro und Canada

Out of almost 600 registered participants at least 450 persons really attended one or more DFD conferences (see Table 2). The distribution of organization types of all participants is similar to that of all registered persons (compare figure 8 with figure 6): almost half (45%) of the participants were SMEs, more than one quarter (28%) EUSDR's, 19% financial institutions and 8% were local authorities.


Figure 8: Organization type of all participants in one or more DFD conferences



Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=451, n miss=17

Also the leading countries of origin stay the same and reflect the event venues: most participants are from Romania (27%), Serbia (24%) and Austria (21%) (compare figure 9 to figure 7).

Figure 9: Country distribution of all participants in one or more DFD conferences



Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=451, n miss=9


4.1 Target groups by conferences

Analysing each conference separately, figure 10 reveals that the first one had the most participants and that most of the registered persons really showed up. 98% of all registered persons (around 220 out of 233) really attended the conference. Concerning the second (around 125 out of 200 persons) and the third conference (130 out of around 210 persons) it can be summarized that just 60% of all registered persons actually attended. A reason for the lower degree of participation could be the problem of financing travel costs for participants in these countries and some persons possibly just registered to get information material and the documentation of the conference. In comparison with conferences with similar focus, the result is nevertheless satisfying.

Figure 10 differentiates the organization types of the participants by each conference. Obviously SMEs (48%) dominated the first conference, followed by representatives of the EUSDR (25%), financial institutions (22%) and local authorities (5%). The second conference was also dominated by SME representatives (48%) again followed by EUSDR representatives (27%). Moreover the second conference showed special ratios concerning financial institutions and local authorities in comparison to the other conferences: whereas 13% were local authorities the rate of financial institutions decreased to 13% as well. In contrast, at the third event the biggest group were the EUSDR representatives (40%). This means that the rate of representatives of the EUSDR increased from 25% at the first conference to 40% at the third conference; meanwhile the rate of SMEs has decreased.

As already mentioned, it is recommended to invite primarily representatives of financial institutions, local authorities and SMEs to prospective Danube Financing Dialogues to reach the primary target group.


Figure 10: Organization type of all participants by DFD conferences



Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, 1st DFD: n=228, n miss=17, 2nd DFD: n=126, 3rd DFD: n=130

Most of the participants of the second conference, held in Belgrade, were from Serbia (61%), followed by participants from Romania and Hungary (10% each), shown by figure 11. The third conference, held in Bucharest, was dominated by visitors from Romania (71%), followed by Austrians (10%). The first conference had the broadest distribution of all countries of origin. Indeed most of the participants were Austrians, but just with a rate of 35%, followed by 17% Serbs. The broad distribution of countries of origin at this conference could be ascribed to Vienna as an event venue or could simply be a result of the fact, that it was the first event in this series of conferences.

Figure 11: Country distribution of all participants by DFD conferences



Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, 1st DFD: n=228, n miss=9, 2nd DFD: n=126, 3rd DFD: n=130

All in all it has to be mentioned positively that the primary target groups of the DFD were reached. Due to the different venues in Austria, Serbia and Romania, the strategy to address SMEs and commercial banks in different countries was especially successful and should be kept in future.

Nevertheless, the analysis shows that the shares of SMEs and financial institutions decreased from the first to the third DFD, while the share of EUSDR-representatives continuously increased. Therefore the management of invitation should have a special focus on these target groups.

Furthermore, especially within the target groups of project owners and financial institutions there should be a stronger distinction between SMEs, local authorities and NGOs, as their needs of projects funding and information are substantially different. Vice versa, also on the level of financial institutions a distinction is necessary (European funding institutions, commercial banks and EU structural funds) to match the needs and possibilities in an optimal way.

5 Danube Financing Dialogues

In March 2012 the first Danube Financing Dialogue was held in Vienna. In April 2013 the second Dialogue followed in Belgrade, and the third one in Bucharest in October 2013. For the organizing team it was important to find quite an apolitical venue and therefore the National Bank of Austria was chosen. The venue seems in principle the right place for such a conference, but due to the security rules at the National Bank of Austria it was not possible that all registered participants, who had come to the venue, were actually able to take part. As a result there was a comparatively high rate of unsatisfied participants: The feedback questionnaires from the conference show an average rating concerning the venue from 2.38 (from 1 to 4) in Vienna in comparison to 1.76 in Belgrade and 1.27 in Bucharest. The survey of the evaluation team shows an average rating of 1.3 with the venue, which is comparatively high. Nevertheless: It is recommended to match the number of possible registrants with the number of places in the venue to prevent unsatisfied participants in future.


It was possible to hold the second and third dialogue at the National Bank of Serbia and the National Bank of Romania. If enough room for all participants can be ensured, it is recommended to choose the National Bank as apolitical venue for the next Dialogues again.

The structure of each Danube Financing Dialogue includes the following focal points:

- Welcome
- Key note speeches
- Panel discussion
- Matchmaking session on different topics of financial issues (small group discussions between representatives of financial institutions, project promoters and public actors)
- Face-to-face meetings (SMEs and financial institutions)
- Project market place (presentation of selected projects)

Analysing the feedback questionnaires from the conference reveals that most of the participants were satisfied with the balance of speeches, discussions and workshops (average rating at the first conference 2.08, at the second conference 2.0 and at the third 1.42). Also the various elements of the programme were rated quite high, as shown in the following figure. At the first and the third DFD the key note speeches got the best assessment, but at the second DFD they got the worst. Overall, the key note speeches and the matchmaking sessions got the best assessment. Contrary to this, the participants were not as satisfied with the face-to-face meetings, because some of them reported that their interview-partners had not been at the conference or the expert had been the wrong choice for their project idea. Especially the face-to-face meetings require a good pre-selection of both partners, and this should be a focus at the next DFDs. The following figure demonstrates also that there was a continuous process of improvement, as shown by a comparison of the assessment of the three DFDs. Also the results of the face-to-face interviews with persons from the organisational team and participants make clear that there was a learning process from DFD to DFD and this ongoing process of improvement has to be mentioned in a positive way.

Figure 12: Assessment of programme elements of DFD



Quelle: Metis Overview of the evaluation of feedback-questionnaires of DFDs


To sum up the results of the feedback questionnaires, quite a high rate of satisfied participants can be attested. The DFD reaches its aims and provides a platform for networking and exchanging of experience and knowledge. The following chapters focus on the individual elements of the DFDs and the results of the evaluation-survey and interviews.

5.1 Panel Discussions

61% participated in moderated panel discussions about possibilities and challenges of project funding (see table 14 appendix). As figure 13 shows, questions and contributions by the participants were answered competently in this part (89%). Furthermore, 82% of those participants were able to establish contacts with other project managers, 68% received useful information about possible funding sources, 64% received inputs for new project ideas and 57% were able to make connections with potential funding sources. On the whole, the expectations of 64% of the participants in panel discussions were completely or at least partly met, which is a quite high rate. Those, whose expectations could not be met, noted that the contents of the panel discussions were too general. The participants did not really know what the discussion was about. They had the impression that the speakers could not meet their needs and interests. For example one person noted in the context of the first conference that they had got no specific information about potential funding sources. So it

seems the panel discussions and the addressed topics were too general at least for some participants.


Figure 13: Experiences with the panel discussions (applies fully/partly) (multiple answers)



Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=28

Those respondents who had been able to make connections with potential funding sources were asked about the kind of the funding institutions. 62% of them made connections with public, international institutions, as it is shown in figure 14. Only one out of four respondents noted that it was a private, international institution. Furthermore, contacts were established with equivalent public bodies.

Figure 14: Funding institutions participants in the panel discussion made connections with (multiple answers)



Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=16

Most of the project managers with whom the participants of the panel discussions got into connection, were transnational ones (70%) (see table 17 appendix). In comparison, 57% of the network partners were from the same Danube-country.

On the whole, the benefit of the panel discussion for their own project has been rated very or quite high by more than the half (56%) of the participants (see figure 15). The reasons for that can be summarized as follows:

- Choice of appropriate topics (with strategic importance) to discuss
- Successful knowledge transfer:
 - Participants got to know different points of view and as a result different kinds of benefits for various networking-partners during the discussions
 - comparison with other projects
 - refreshment of knowledge
 - knowledge gaps were filled, which would not have been that easy without the DFD (easy access)
- Contacts:
 - led to further discussions and contacts after the conference
- networking with international funding sources


The following statement by one participant summarizes these potential benefits:

"My participation in panel discussions was beneficial as we exchanged experiences and discussed possible ways of coping with challenges."

On the other hand, 37% evaluated the benefit of the panel discussions quite low and 7% even very low. The superficial reasons for that are:

- Knowledge:
 - No new information; participants knew already a lot about the focused topics
 - Information referred too much to bank loan than to funding
- Choice of models:
 - The presented projects were not appropriate for private companies; no funding sources for private sector projects
 - Project was a worst practice because of its high administrative efforts and lack of practical implementation

Figure 15: Benefit from panel discussion



Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=28, n miss=1


As a summary it has to be mentioned positively that 56% of the participants benefited (rather) much from the panel discussions. But on the other hand for 44% there was quite a low or very low benefit. The reasons for a lacking benefit concentrate on

the lack of information. This result also proves that the information needs of the participants are very broad and that a distinction within the target groups and the disposal of different workshops could be a meaningful tool.

5.2 Face-to-Face Meetings

The participants had the possibility to schedule meetings with partners of interest to discuss relevant financial issues. 43% of the respondents made use of a face-to-face meeting (see table 19 appendix). 90% of those participants met the right person for their questions during the meeting. 75% received information about further contact persons and 70% about possible funding sources (see figure 16). But only 55% said that all their questions had been answered during the meeting. There seems to be potential for improvement although 70% of the participants evaluated their expectations towards the face-to-face meeting as fully or partly fulfilled. Respondents of the other 30% noted that there was no possibility for further contacts after the meeting and that not enough financiers had been available.

Figure 16: Experiences from the face-to-face meetings (applies fully/partly) (multiple answers)



Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=20


The benefit of the face-to-face meetings was rated very or quite high by 70% of the participants, as it can be seen from figure 17. The participants were especially satisfied with the specific knowledge transfer and the great efforts by some speakers or participants. For example some further working groups were installed as a result of those meetings.

The rest of the participants (30%) assessed the benefit of the meetings quite or very low because

- there were just representatives of big financial institutes.
- there were too few financiers.

- the network of potential project partners could not be maintained afterwards.

Figure 17: Benefit from face-to-face meeting for project



Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=20

Face-to-face meetings are one of the essential tools for the networking of financial institutions with SMEs, and the evaluation provides evidence that this tool was met with much satisfaction and that it was very useful. A high rate of 90% of the participants met the right person for their question. But the results also show, that the wrong choice of conversation partners is a reason for unsatisfied participants: Therefore a careful choice of the respective conversation partners is indispensable for success. The needs of the respective SMEs must be met beforehand and must be adjusted to the possibilities of the participating financial institutions. Furthermore, the number of participating potential financiers should be increased, and those conversation partners, who agree with participating in face-to-face meetings, should take that there are binding agreements to participate.


5.3 Project Presentation (Project Market Place)

Participants had the chance to present their projects or project ideas at the project market place. In case of interest it was necessary to send a short project description to the organizers and they selected about 20 projects which were presented at the market place. The selection criteria were quality of the project, geographical access and an even distribution of the pillars of the EUSDR.

30% of the respondents to the survey made use of their projects or project ideas being presented (see table 22 appendix). 62% of them received information for the implementation of their projects. 46% met further contact partners and/or possible funding sources. Furthermore, 38% of the participants found new potential project partners because of their presentation. On the whole, 46% said that their expectations had been fully or partly met, which is in comparison with the other programme elements a low rate. The others, whose expectations were not met, indicated the following reasons:

- lack of information concerning European funding possibilities in Serbia
- participation of too few financiers
- bad timing: new European programmes not foreseeable, old ones not changeable (first conference)


Figure 18: Experiences of the project presentation (applies fully/partly) (multiple answers)



Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=13

For 62% of those participants who presented their project the benefit was very or quite high. Some of them could even find a financial institute for the further planning of their project. The rest struggled with the poor attendance of potential funding sources.

Figure 19: Benefit of the project presentation for project



Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=13


In general, the presentations can be seen as an advertisement for the projects. One participant was able to submit the project to the TEN-T programme afterwards. In the future an option for action is to present also on-going projects for an exchange of information and hints for the project development. It could also be useful to inform the participants about the presented projects in advance, to have an overview of project ideas and ongoing projects as preparation background.

5.4 General satisfaction with the DFD

The following figure shows quite a high general satisfaction of the participants of the DFD. Especially the venue and the time management during the event are assessed positively. 72% of the participants were very satisfied with the venue and 26% were quite satisfied. The time management was for 59% quite good and for 39% very good. Concerning these two aspects there is no need for improvement for the next DFDs.

It is interesting that 40% of the participants evaluated the speakers as very good and another 51% as quite good, but only 27% were very satisfied and 45% were quite satisfied with the information provide on the processes and means of funding in the context of the key note speeches.

Figure 20: General satisfaction



Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=47, n miss between 1 and 4

The participants are not as satisfied with the possibilities of communication between speakers and participants and the handout material as with other topics. But all in all the results document a quite high satisfaction with the DFD, especially the possibility for networking, the venue and the time management are assessed well.

6 Utility and Sustainability

Around half of the respondents benefitted from the conferences by:

- meeting / getting an idea of possible financing partners (57%/49%)
- receiving information concerning the (further) development of their project (57%)
- clarifying their questions and uncertainties during the conference(s) (49%)
- 47% are still in contact with other participants from the conference(s)

In total, 64% recommended their colleagues to participate in the DFD (see figure 20). This finding corresponds with the results of the feedback questionnaires of the organizers, which shows an average rating between 2.17 at the first conference and 1.41 at the last conference.

About 57% reported, that there has been useful information for the development of their project and further 49% mentioned, that their questions concerning the project funding were answered by their participation.


The lowest benefit had been drawn by ensuring actual project funding (17%). In conclusion, participants in the conferences were able to visualize their projects and they got detailed information about further steps to take. Nevertheless, problems occurred when it comes to benefits concerning actual project performance: 57% met possible project partners und 49% possible financing partners, in 30% of the cases an actual project partnership occurred.

„It was useful to meet possible project partners and to hear about other project ideas. Finding a real project partner, who is willing to finance the project, is difficult on the other hand. Overall, the participation was valuable.“

The results show that there is a need for further precise information about project funding, but a rate of 28%, who have already submitted a project proposal, seems quite good for such a series of conferences.

All in all these results prove a high satisfaction with the DFD and should be interpreted as a successful organisation of the first three conferences. In this context it has to be mentioned that this was still the pilot phase of the DFD and with this background the results have to be evaluated positively.

Figure 21: Benefit and sustainability of participation in one or more conferences of the DFD (applies fully/partly) (multiple answers)



Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=47

Those respondents who had been able to submit a project proposal after the conferences were additionally asked about:


- the institutions
- the settings of priorities
- the participating countries
- the project funding
- the priority areas of the EUSDR

The last question is answered in figure 22. Most of these projects can be allocated in the priority field of institutional capacity and cooperation, followed by competitiveness, energy, and mobility. There follows a short description of the named projects alongside the asked aspects from above:

- TEN-T Call 2013: Master plan for LNG as Fuel and Cargo at "Rhein-Main-Donauachse"; 32 partners from 12 countries participate in the project; TEN-T co-financed

- TAF/DRP Consulting: civil society networking through media relations for the Danube region; main topics: Empowerment and Ownership; participating countries: Austria, Germany, Serbia; project funding still open
- SG8: Romania and Bulgaria are partners, CoDCR and SECI; expected countries: at least Bulgaria and Romania, but the project may provoke overall interest of Danube-countries; financed by international sources
- Innovation Norway: Norway, Romania; troublesome project funding due to the lassitude and unreliability of the project partners
- Energy efficiency in the context of an European funding initiative; countries: Germany, Croatia, Hungary, Slovakia, Ukraine, Latvia, Serbia, Romania, Greece
- Digital Business Eco-system in the 7th framework programme

Figure 22: Priority fields of the submitted project proposal (multiple answers)



Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=13


A high rate of 64% of the participants evaluated the benefit of the conferences for their project to be very or quite high. This has different reasons:

- The conferences...
 - are seen as good platforms for networking.
 - are evaluated as an important contribution to the EUSDR implementation.
 - close knowledge gaps.
 - empower the participants.

Just 2% rated the benefit of the participation as very low and 32% as quite low. Reasons in these cases concern the possible funding sources. They were rated as:

- not useful for their organization
- too unspecific
- too few possibilities for the private sector
- too little for SME driven parts of the economy

Figure 23: Evaluation of the benefit of the participation in one or more DFD conferences



Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=47, n miss=7

7 Need for Improvement

The following points are valuable qualities of the DFDs:

- Unique conferences to bring together project owners, project managers and financial institutions,
- broad scope of target groups and participants with various institutional backgrounds,
- the conferences include a range of different tools for networking,
- precise support for project stakeholders is offered,
- stimulation for SMEs, national funding institutions and commercial banks concerning their awareness for financing possibilities, e.g. revolving funds.


All in all, more than half of the participants are satisfied with the organisation of the DFD and the received information, as the following quotation shows:

“The setting seems to be successful, which is underpinned by the high degree of participation in the conferences.”

Nevertheless, there is also need for improvement: Especially the first conference faced a lot of organisational problems, due to the large crowd of people and the security rules of the National Bank of Austria. Some participants reported about the fact that potential participants (even registered ones) had not got access to the event because of the fire protection regulations. Such details have to be checked in advance. But it has to be emphasized that the organizers reacted fast. For example the registration tool was adapted and the number of participants from each organisation was restricted at the following conferences. And the results of the interviews prove that the registration worked well at the second and the third conference. Also the feedback questionnaires and the survey show that the participants were satisfied with the registration and the received information prior to the DFD. The registration was assessed as having been simple and user-friendly, and the analysis documents indicate that the average rating (from 1 to 4) increased from the first DFD (1.96) to the last DFD (1.10).

The results from the survey point out that the participants also mention other fields of improvement, especially the reaching of the target groups, the composition of the participants and the possibilities for more informal contacts. Beyond that the choice of speakers as well as the overall time management were pointed out as improvement areas.

Figure 24: Further need for improvement (applies fully/partly) (multiple answers)



Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=47

As a result of the analysis the following needs for improvement can be summarized:

Reaching of the Target Groups

As shown by the above described results, the primary target groups of the conference (SMEs, local authorities, financial institutions and EUSDR-representatives) were reached, but there should be additional efforts in attracting more financial institutions, SMEs and local authorities. This is also confirmed by the results of the survey, which show a great need for improvement in the fields of the composition of the participants (47%).

The results of the survey also show quite different needs of information. Therefore in the future a clear identification of the various target groups and their needs is necessary: In the field of SMEs there should be a distinction between private companies, NGOs and local authorities and in the field of financial institutions between representatives of EU-structural funds and EU-programmes, national funding, commercial banks and financial institutions like EIB etc.

In the context of a clarification and distinction like this also the matchmaking sessions and the face-to-face meetings could be organized more effectively. Especially the matchmaking of the participants requires this previous clarifying, as one participant noted:

I had a matchmaking session with a funding source. But after five minutes the representative of the bank told him that they don't even promote projects in Serbia.

One additional need for improvement is the registration for the conference and directly at the conference. Although the participants are satisfied with these processes, there should be a controlling of the data of the participants, especially concerning the distinction of target groups to have a better overview about the participating financial institutions, SMEs and local authorities and therefore the possibility of a more effective matchmaking. Also the registration at the venue should have a more formal character, e.g. the enforcement to sign the participant list and asking for exact information from persons who were not registered in advance. Maybe there should also be the possibility for potential participants just to register for selected parts or just for the possibility to get the information material of the conference.

Structure of the Conference

The suggestions of the participants concerning an improvement range from the wishes to have more informal contacts to the suggestions of more involvement of the participants. These results correspond with the need of a better time allotment and venue for informal contacts (45%). This fact raises the question of the structure of the DFD: All in all, the offered tools – reaching from key note speeches to face-to-face meetings – are evaluated quite well and should also be part of the next DFDs. Maybe one additional tool (e.g. instead of the world café) could be to give time for open space – also to meet the need for more informal contacts.

The time structure of two days seems to be adequate, due to the concentration of tools and information. In addition, a two-day event offers more time for informal networking, which is at least as important as formal networking.

Content

The choice of speakers was critically considered by 40% of the respondents.

„The level of the speakers ranged from very good to quite bad.“

In view of the fact that the SMEs as target group are quite heterogeneous it is clear, that they also have widespread information needs. This means there are different suggestions concerning the reduction or expansion of the contents of the speeches. For example one part of the participants suggests a reduction of general information concerning European programmes or information about funding possibilities in the context of the European Central Bank (because the participants were mainly from NGOs or governmental organisations and for them this possibility is not relevant). On the other hand there is a large interest in the following fields:

- Possibilities of project funding in the context of the structural funds and other programmes of the EU, especially links between European funds and projects in the context of the EUSDR
- Information about the Danube Programme and other programmes of the European Territorial Cooperation (ETC) as well as other relevant programmes in the funding period 2014-2020
- Possible connection between structural funds, national funding and funding through EIB, ECB and other institutions
- More emphasis on the micro level; in this sense the contents should be featured more compactly. The following questions should be clarified:
 - Which experiences have already been made?
 - Where do possible sticking points lie?
 - Good practices of transnational projects (with transnational funding)
 - Good practices of cross-border projects based on a regional level

The organizers already tried to react to these specific information needs. Accordingly, for example at the first conference the focus was on quite high level information about the funding possibilities of European Financing Institutions. At the second and the third conference in contrast the emphasis was on speeches about the local possibilities of project financing.

Nevertheless the described distinction within the target groups and the offer of different workshops for these groups could be a helpful tool to meet the respective needs.

A relevant aspect is also the information material, which is put at the participants' disposal. 38% see a need for improvement concerning the supplied information materials. Some noted that there had been problems with incomplete materials during the events.

There is also a need for improvement within the matchmaking sessions. A suggestion is, that the participants should be informed in advance about the projects, which will be discussed in the context of the matchmaking sessions (for example short project descriptions). This would lead to a more structured procedure and the participants could prepare themselves better. Furthermore, the probability that all relevant project partners are at the same table would be higher.

Ongoing Evaluation

In general, participants (especially those from the first conference) noted that a time-related evaluation of each event would be better. Some of the potential respondents were not able to remember the precise contents of the conference they took part in. Due to that fact they were not able to fill in the survey accurately. A further problem responding to the evaluation questions precisely can be seen in the differences between the conferences. Some respondents criticized one overall evaluation for all three conferences:

"The attended events in Vienna (attempt; no access despite registration), Belgrade and Bucharest were totally different. A qualification as it would be demanded in this survey is not possible. "

Therefore the evaluation should be structured in a really short questionnaire about organisational aspects, the content of speeches and network possibilities at each conference and a short survey (web based or on the phone) within three months after each DFD to document the results. Those results should give answers to questions like: How many projects find potential funding resources as a result of the conferences and which one? The results and feedbacks of an ongoing evaluation should be a base for organizing the next DFDs. It is also important that the Priority Area Coordinators of the EUSDR are informed about these evaluation results. This is also a relevant aspect for the control of the targets and project implementations as a result of the DFDs.

Sustainability

Guaranteeing sustainability is always difficult, especially in the chain of information conferences with different target groups and difficult objectives as it is in the field of financing projects with a complex framework. To raise the chances of the DFD in the direction of sustainability the following recommendations in the structural setting could be helpful:

■ Help-check at the conference

The present evaluation as well as other relevant studies (e.g. metis: Analysis of needs for financial instruments in the EUSDR 2011) confirm that there is a strong need for early support of selected project ideas. Therefore it could be useful to install a help-check for project ideas during the DFD conference, which informs about financing, partner structure, project development and grants.

■ One-Stop-shop

The experience shows that mainly projects with social, cultural or educational aspects need further support to be successful. Beside the proposed help-check at

the DFD, it would be useful for project managers in these thematic fields if there is a kind of a One-Stop-Shop which provides all necessary information and support. Such a One-Stop-Shop would necessarily be part of an institution which acts in the area of financing.

8 Abbreviations

CODCR	Council of Danube Cities and Regions
DFD	Danube Financing Dialogue
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
EIB	European Investment Bank
EIF	European Investment Fund
ETC	European Territorial Cooperation
EU	European Union
EUSDR	European Strategy for the Danube Region
LNG	liquefied natural gas
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
PA	Priority Area
SECI	South East European Cooperative Initiative
SME	Small and medium sized-enterprises
TAF-DRP	Technical Assistance Facility for Danube Region Projects
TEN-T	Trans-European Transport

9 Index of Figures

Figure 1:	Pillars and Priority Areas of the EUSDR	6
Figure 2:	Participation in one or more DFD conferences (multiple answers)	9
Figure 3:	Country of origin of the participants of one or more DFD conferences	9
Figure 4:	Participation in one or more DFD conferences (multiple answers) by gender	10
Figure 5:	Organization type of the participants of one or more DFD conferences	10
Figure 6:	Organization type of all registered participants in one or more DFD conferences	12
Figure 7:	Country distribution of all registered participants in one or more DFD conferences	13
Figure 8:	Organization type of all participants in one or more DFD conferences	13
Figure 9:	Country distribution of all participants in one or more DFD conferences	14
Figure 10:	Organization type of all participants by DFD conferences	15
Figure 11:	Country distribution of all participants by DFD conferences	16
Figure 12:	Assessment of programme elements of DFD	18
Figure 13:	Experiences with the panel discussions (applies fully/partly) (multiple answers)	19
Figure 14:	Funding institutions participants in the panel discussion made connections with (multiple answers)	19
Figure 15:	Benefit from panel discussion	20
Figure 16:	Experiences from the face-to-face meetings (applies fully/partly) (multiple answers)	21
Figure 17:	Benefit from face-to-face meeting for project	22
Figure 18:	Experiences of the project presentation (applies fully/partly) (multiple answers)	23
Figure 19:	Benefit of the project presentation for project	23
Figure 20:	General satisfaction	24
Figure 21:	Benefit and sustainability of participation in one or more conferences of the DFD (applies fully/partly) (multiple answers)	26
Figure 22:	Priority fields of the submitted project proposal (multiple answers)	27
Figure 23:	Evaluation of the benefit of the participation in one or more DFD conferences	28
Figure 24:	Further need for improvement (applies fully/partly) (multiple answers)	30

10 Index of Tables

Table 1:	Country and organization type of all registered participants in one or more conferences of the DFD	37
Table 2:	Country and organization type of all participants in one or more conferences of the DFD	37
Table 3:	Country and organization type of all registered participants at the first conference of the DFD	38
Table 4:	Country and organization type of all participants at the first conference of the DFD	38
Table 5:	Country and organization type of all registered participants at the second conference of the DFD	38
Table 6:	Country and organization type of all participants at the second conference of the DFD	39
Table 7:	Country and organization type of all registered participants at the third conference of the DFD	39
Table 8:	Country and organization type of all participants at the third conference of the DFD	39
Table 9:	Participation in one or more conferences of the DFD (multiple answers)	40
Table 10:	Participation in one or more conferences of the DFD	40
Table 11:	Participation in one or more conferences of the DFD (multiple answers) by sex	40
Table 12:	Organization type of the participants of one or more conferences of the DFD	40
Table 13:	General satisfaction	41
Table 14:	Participation in moderated panel discussions	41
Table 15:	Experience with the panel discussions	42
Table 16:	Funding institutions, which participants of the panel discussion have connected with (multiple answers)	42
Table 17:	Project manager's origin, who participants of the panel discussion have connected with (multiple answers)	42
Table 18:	Benefit of panel discussion for project	43
Table 19:	Have you made use of a face-to-face meeting?	43
Table 20:	Experiences from the face-to-face meetings	43
Table 21:	Benefit of the face-to-face meeting for project	43
Table 22:	Have you made use of the presentation of your project or project idea?	44
Table 23:	Experiences of the project presentation	44
Table 24:	Benefit and sustainability of the participation in one or more conferences of the DFD	45
Table 25:	Evaluation of the participation in one or more conferences of the DFD	46
Table 26:	Priority areas of the submitted project proposal (multiple answer)	46
Table 27:	Further need for improvement	47

11 Appendix

11.1 Tables

Table 1: Country and organization type of all registered participants in one or more conferences of the DFD

		count	in %
Organization	SME	250	43%
	Financial institution	119	21%
	EUSDR	159	27%
	Local authorities	51	9%
	Total	579	100%
Country	Austria	105	18%
	Germany	29	5%
	Romania	197	34%
	Hungary	32	5%
	Serbia	141	24%
	Bulgaria	20	3%
	Croat	16	3%
	Slovenia	10	2%
	Others	38	6%
	Total	588	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=597, organization: n miss=18, country: n miss=9

Table 2: Country and organization type of all participants in one or more conferences of the DFD

		count	in %
Organization	SME	195	45%
	Financial institution	84	19%
	EUSDR	122	28%
	Local authorities	33	8%
	Total	434	100%
Country	Austria	94	21%
	Germany	25	6%
	Romania	118	27%
	Hungary	28	6%
	Serbia	108	24%
	Bulgaria	17	4%
	Croat	13	3%
	Slovenia	8	2%
	Others	31	7%
	Total	442	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=451, organization: n miss=17, country: n miss=9

Table 3: Country and organization type of all registered participants at the first conference of the DFD

		count	in %
Organization	SME	102	47%
	Financial institution	47	22%
	EUSDR	57	26%
	Local authorities	10	5%
	Total	216	100%
Country	Austria	81	36%
	Germany	18	8%
	Romania	18	8%
	Hungary	14	6%
	Serbia	38	17%
	Bulgaria	14	6%
	Croat	11	5%
	Slovenia	7	3%
	Others	23	10%
	Total	224	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=233; organization: n miss=17, country: n miss=9

Table 4: Country and organization type of all participants at the first conference of the DFD

		count	in %
Organization	SME	101	48%
	Financial institution	47	22%
	EUSDR	53	25%
	Local authorities	10	5%
	Total	211	100%
Country	Austria	77	35%
	Germany	17	8%
	Romania	18	8%
	Hungary	14	6%
	Serbia	38	17%
	Bulgaria	14	6%
	Croat	11	5%
	Slovenia	7	3%
	Others	23	11%
	Total	219	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=228, organization: n miss=17; country: n miss=9

Table 5: Country and organization type of all registered participants at the second conference of the DFD

		count	in %
Organization	SME	91	46%
	Financial institution	26	13%
	EUSDR	49	25%
	Local authorities	31	16%
	Total	197	100%
Country	Austria	13	7%
	Germany	6	3%
	Romania	31	16%
	Hungary	15	8%
	Serbia	110	56%
	Bulgaria	2	1%
	Croat	6	3%
	Slovenia	6	3%
	Others	9	5%
	Total	198	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=198, n miss=1

Table 6: Country and organization type of all participants at the second conference of the DFD

		count	in %
Organization	SME	60	48%
	Financial institution	16	13%
	EUSDR	34	27%
	Local authorities	16	13%
	Total	126	100%
Country	Austria	8	6%
	Germany	5	4%
	Romania	12	10%
	Hungary	13	10%
	Serbia	77	61%
	Bulgaria	1	1%
	Croat	3	2%
	Slovenia	4	3%
	Others	3	2%
	Total	126	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=126

Table 7: Country and organization type of all registered participants at the third conference of the DFD

		count	in %
Organization	SME	68	33%
	Financial institution	51	25%
	EUSDR	74	36%
	Local authorities	15	7%
	Total	208	100%
Country	Austria	19	9%
	Germany	10	5%
	Romania	157	75%
	Hungary	6	3%
	Serbia	1	0%
	Bulgaria	5	2%
	Croat		
	Slovenia	1	0%
	Others	9	4%
	Total	208	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=208, organization: n miss=1

Table 8: Country and organization type of all participants at the third conference of the DFD

		count	in %
Organization	SME	42	32%
	Financial institution	26	20%
	EUSDR	52	40%
	Local authorities	10	8%
	Total	130	100%
Country	Austria	13	10%
	Germany	8	6%
	Romania	92	71%
	Hungary	4	3%
	Serbia	1	1%
	Bulgaria	3	2%
	Croat		
	Slovenia	1	1%
	Others	8	6%
	Total	130	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=130

Table 9: Participation in one or more conferences of the DFD (multiple answers)

		count	in %
DFD	1 st conference	25	53%
	2 nd conference	17	36%
	3 rd conference	14	30%
	Total	47	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=47

Table 10: Participation in one or more conferences of the DFD

		count	in %
Attendance...	at one conference	39	83%
	at two conferences	7	15%
	at all three conferences	1	2%
	Total	47	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=47

Table 11: Participation in one or more conferences of the DFD (multiple answers) by sex

		sex					
		female		male		total	
		count	in %	count	in %	count	in %
DFD	1 st conference	8	32%	17	68%	25	100%
	2 nd conference	3	18%	14	82%	17	100%
	3 rd conference	3	21%	11	79%	14	100%
	Total	13	27%	34	73%	47	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=47

Table 12: Organization type of the participants of one or more conferences of the DFD

		count	in %
Organization	SME	20	43%
	Financial institution	6	13%
	EUSDR	18	39%
	Local Authorities	2	4%
	Total	46	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=47, n miss=1

Table 13: General satisfaction

		count	in %
the event venue	very good	33	70%
	quite good	12	26%
	quite bad	1	2%
	very bad		
	no answer	1	2%
	Total	47	100%
the time management during the event	very good	18	38%
	quite good	27	57%
	quite bad	1	2%
	very bad		
	no answer	1	2%
	Total	47	100%
the facilitation	very good	23	49%
	quite good	15	32%
	quite bad	5	11%
	very bad		
	no answer	4	9%
	Total	47	100%
the speakers	very good	18	38%
	quite good	23	49%
	quite bad	3	6%
	very bad	1	2%
	no answer	2	4%
	Total	47	100%
the information supplied on ways and means of funding in the context of the Key Note Speeches	very good	12	26%
	quite good	20	43%
	quite bad	11	23%
	very bad	1	2%
	no answer	3	6%
	Total	47	100%
the communication between the participants and the speakers	very good	12	26%
	quite good	24	51%
	quite bad	7	15%
	very bad	1	2%
	no answer	3	6%
	Total	47	100%
the content of handout materials	very good	9	19%
	quite good	29	62%
	quite bad	5	11%
	very bad	1	2%
	no answer	3	6%
	Total	47	100%
the opportunities supplied for potential networking	very good	20	43%
	quite good	21	45%
	quite bad	5	11%
	very bad		
	no answer	1	2%
	Total	47	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=47

Table 14: Participation in moderated panel discussions

		count	in %
Participation	Yes	28	61%
	No	18	39%
	Total	46	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=47, n miss=1

Table 15: Experience with the panel discussions

		count	in %
Questions and contributions of the participants were answered competently.	fully applies	13	46%
	partly applies	12	43%
	does partly not apply	2	7%
	does not apply at all		
	no answer	1	4%
	Total	28	100%
I received useful information about possible funding sources.	fully applies	8	29%
	partly applies	11	39%
	does partly not apply	7	25%
	does not apply at all	1	4%
	no answer	1	4%
	Total	28	100%
I have been able to connect with potential funding sources myself.	fully applies	6	21%
	partly applies	10	36%
	does partly not apply	8	29%
	does not apply at all	3	11%
	no answer	1	4%
	Total	28	100%
I have established contact with other project managers.	fully applies	11	39%
	partly applies	12	43%
	does partly not apply	4	14%
	does not apply at all		
	no answer	1	4%
	Total	28	100%
I have received input for new ideas.	fully applies	6	21%
	partly applies	12	43%
	does partly not apply	7	25%
	does not apply at all	2	7%
	no answer	1	4%
	Total	28	100%
Overall, my expectations concerning the panel discussion were fulfilled	fully applies	7	25%
	partly applies	11	39%
	does partly not apply	8	29%
	does not apply at all	1	4%
	no answer	1	4%
	Total	28	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=28

Table 16: Funding institutions, which participants of the panel discussion have connected with (multiple answers)

		count	in %
Institutions	public, national institutions	8	50%
	private, national institutions	9	56%
	public, international institutions	10	62%
	private, international institutions	4	25%
	no answer	1	6%
	Total	16	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=16

Table 17: Project manager's origin, who participants of the panel discussion have connected with (multiple answers)

		count	in %
Project manager's origin	from the same Danube-country	13	57%
	transnational project managers	16	70%
	Total	23	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=23

Table 18: Benefit of panel discussion for project

		count	in %
Benefit	very high	5	19%
	quite high	10	37%
	quite low	10	37%
	very low	2	7%
	Total	27	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=28, n miss=1

Table 19: Have you made use of a face-to-face meeting?

		count	in %
Face-to-face meeting	Yes	20	43%
	No	26	57%
	Total	46	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=47, n miss=1

Table 20: Experiences from the face-to-face meetings

		count	in %
I have met the right person for my questions.	fully applies	4	20%
	partly applies	14	70%
	does partly not apply	1	5%
	does not apply at all	1	5%
	no answer		
	Total	20	100%
All my questions concerning possible funding were answered during the meeting.	fully applies	2	10%
	partly applies	9	45%
	does partly not apply	8	40%
	does not apply at all	1	5%
	no answer		
	Total	20	100%
I have received further useful information concerning possible funding.	fully applies	4	20%
	partly applies	10	50%
	does partly not apply	5	25%
	does not apply at all	1	5%
	no answer		
	Total	20	100%
I have received information about further potential contact persons.	fully applies	8	40%
	partly applies	7	35%
	does partly not apply	2	10%
	does not apply at all	3	15%
	no answer		
	Total	20	100%
Overall, my expectations concerning face-to-face meetings have been fulfilled.	fully applies	3	15%
	partly applies	11	55%
	does partly not apply	5	25%
	does not apply at all	1	5%
	no answer		
	Total	20	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=20

Table 21: Benefit of the face-to-face meeting for project

		count	in %
Benefit	very high	4	20%
	quite high	10	50%
	quite low	5	25%
	very low	1	5%
	Total	20	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=20

Table 22: Have you made use of the presentation of your project or project idea?

		count	in %
Project presentation	Yes	13	30%
	No	31	70%
	Total	44	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=47, n miss=3

Table 23: Experiences of the project presentation

		count	in %
I have found possible funding sources for my project.	fully applies		
	partly applies	6	46%
	does partly not apply	2	15%
	does not apply at all	5	38%
	no answer		
	Total	13	100%
I have got to know further contact persons concerning project funding.	fully applies	1	8%
	partly applies	5	38%
	does partly not apply	5	38%
	does not apply at all	2	15%
	no answer		
	Total	13	100%
I have received further useful information for the implementation of the project.	fully applies	2	15%
	partly applies	6	46%
	does partly not apply	2	15%
	does not apply at all	3	23%
	no answer		
	Total	13	100%
I have found new potential project partners.	fully applies	2	15%
	partly applies	3	23%
	does partly not apply	5	38%
	does not apply at all	3	23%
	no answer		
	Total	13	100%
Overall, my expectations have been fulfilled.	fully applies	2	15%
	partly applies	4	31%
	does partly not apply	6	46%
	does not apply at all	1	8%
	no answer		
	Total	13	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=13

Table 24: Benefit and sustainability of the participation in one or more conferences of the DFD

		count	in %
Questions and uncertainties concerning the project funding could have been eliminated by participating in the DFD.	fully applies	7	15%
	partly applies	16	34%
	does partly not apply	14	30%
	does not apply at all	2	4%
	no answer	8	17%
	Total	47	100%
I could have used the given information for the (further) development of my project.	fully applies	8	17%
	partly applies	19	40%
	does partly not apply	10	21%
	does not apply at all	3	6%
	no answer	7	15%
	Total	47	100%
Now I have an idea about who may be a possible project partner for my project.	fully applies	9	19%
	partly applies	14	30%
	does partly not apply	10	21%
	does not apply at all	6	13%
	no answer	8	17%
	Total	47	100%
Due to the supplied information, I have already contacted a funding source to whom I will present my project.	fully applies	4	9%
	partly applies	11	23%
	does partly not apply	9	19%
	does not apply at all	16	34%
	no answer	7	15%
	Total	47	100%
Because of the given information, I could have ensured a project funding.	fully applies	4	9%
	partly applies	4	9%
	does partly not apply	13	28%
	does not apply at all	16	34%
	no answer	10	21%
	Total	47	100%
I have got to know possible project partners.	fully applies	7	15%
	partly applies	20	43%
	does partly not apply	7	15%
	does not apply at all	4	9%
	no answer	9	19%
	Total	47	100%
Out of conversations during the conference, a new project partnership occurred .	fully applies	4	9%
	partly applies	10	21%
	does partly not apply	13	28%
	does not apply at all	11	23%
	no answer	9	19%
	Total	47	100%
I have already submitted a project proposal.	fully applies	7	15%
	partly applies	6	13%
	does partly not apply	7	15%
	does not apply at all	17	36%
	no answer	10	21%
	Total	47	100%
I am still in contact with some persons I got to know during the conference.	fully applies	8	17%
	partly applies	14	30%
	does partly not apply	11	23%
	does not apply at all	5	11%
	no answer	9	19%
	Total	47	100%
I recommended to colleagues that they participate in the DFD.	fully applies	14	30%
	partly applies	16	34%
	does partly not apply	7	15%
	does not apply at all	1	2%
	no answer	9	19%
	Total	47	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=47

Table 25: Evaluation of the participation in one or more conferences of the DFD

		count	in %
Utility and sustainability	very high	5	12%
	quite high	21	52%
	quite low	13	32%
	very low	1	2%
	Total	40	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=47, n miss=7

Table 26: Priority areas of the submitted project proposal (multiple answer)

		count	in %
Priority areas	mobility and multimodality	3	23%
	sustainable energy	3	23%
	culture and tourism, People to People	1	8%
	water quality		
	environmental risks	1	8%
	biodiversity, landscapes, air and soil quality		
	knowledge society	1	8%
	competitiveness	3	23%
	people and skills		
	institutional capacity and cooperation	4	31%
	security		
	no answer	4	31%
	Total	13	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=13

Table 27: Further need for improvement

		count	in %
time manage- ment	fully applies	10	21%
	partly applies	9	19%
	does partly not apply	12	26%
	does not apply at all	6	13%
	no answer	10	21%
	Total	47	100%
choice of speakers	fully applies	8	17%
	partly applies	11	23%
	does partly not apply	9	19%
	does not apply at all	5	11%
	no answer	14	30%
	Total	47	100%
compositions of the partici- pants	fully applies	7	15%
	partly applies	15	32%
	does partly not apply	9	19%
	does not apply at all	6	13%
	no answer	10	21%
	Total	47	100%
time allotment and venue for informal con- tacts	fully applies	3	6%
	partly applies	18	38%
	does partly not apply	11	23%
	does not apply at all	5	11%
	no answer	10	21%
	Total	47	100%
intelligibility of the contents	fully applies	4	9%
	partly applies	11	23%
	does partly not apply	13	28%
	does not apply at all	9	19%
	no answer	10	21%
	Total	47	100%
supplied infor- mation materi- als	fully applies	4	9%
	partly applies	14	30%
	does partly not apply	14	30%
	does not apply at all	5	11%
	no answer	10	21%
	Total	47	100%
others	fully applies	1	2%
	partly applies	1	2%
	does partly not apply	8	17%
	does not apply at all	9	19%
	no answer	28	60%
	Total	47	100%

Source: L&R Datafile 'DFD', 2014, n=47

11.2 Questionnaire

11.2.1 General satisfaction

Thinking about your participation in one or more conferences of the Danube Financing Dialogue:				
How would you evaluate	Very good	Quite good	Quite bad	Very bad
...the event venue?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...the time management during the event?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...the facilitation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...the speakers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...the information supplied on ways and means of funding in the context of the Key Note Speeches?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...the communication between the participants and the speakers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...the content of handout materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...the opportunities supplied for potential networking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Further comments:				

11.2.2 Networking

Networking: panel-discussion

Have you participated in moderated panel discussions about the possibilities and challenges of the project funding?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

[if "Yes" at question: "Have you participated in moderated panel-discussions about the possibilities and challenges of the project funding?"]				
To what extent do the following statements apply to your experiences of the conference?				
Please choose the appropriate response for each item:	Fully applies	Partly applies	Does partly not apply	Does not apply at all
Questions and contributions of the participants were answered competently.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I received useful information about possible funding sources.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have been able to connect with potential funding sources myself.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have established contact with other project managers.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have received input for new project ideas.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall, my expectations concerning the panel-discussion were fulfilled.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

[if “Does partly not apply” or “Does not apply at all” at question:”Overall, my expectations concerning the panel discussion were fulfilled.”]

Why your expectations have not been or have been only partly fulfilled?

[if “Fully applies” or “Partly applies” at question:”I have been able to connect with potential funding sources myself.”]

You responded that you had been able to make connections with potential funding sources in the context of panel discussions.

What kind of potential funding institutions have you connected with?

Please elaborate.

(Please choose **all** that apply)

public, national institutions	<input type="checkbox"/>
private, national institutions	<input type="checkbox"/>
public, international institutions	<input type="checkbox"/>
private, international institutions	<input type="checkbox"/>
Others:	

[if “Fully applies” or “Partly applies” at question:”I have established contact with other project managers.”]

You said you had been able to establish contacts with other project managers in the context of panel discussions.

Where are those project managers from?

(Please choose **all** that apply)

From the same Danube country.	<input type="checkbox"/>
The project manager is transnational.	<input type="checkbox"/>

[if “Yes” at question: “Have you participated in moderated panel-discussions about the possibilities and challenges of the project funding?”]

Overall, how high was the benefit of participating in panel discussions for your project?

	Very high	Quite high	Quite low	Very low
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your answer:				

Networking: face-to-face meeting

Have you made use of a face-to-face meeting?

Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------	-----------------------------

[if "Yes" at question: "Have you made use of a face-to-face meeting?"] To what extent do the following statements apply to your experiences of the conference?				
Please choose the appropriate response for each item:	Fully applies	Partly applies	Does part-ly not apply	Does not apply at all
I have met the right contact person for my questions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
All my questions concerning possible funding were answered during the meeting.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have got further useful information concerning possible fundings.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have received information about further potential contact persons.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall, my expectations concerning the face-to-face meetings have been fulfilled.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

[if "Does partly not apply" or "Does not apply at all" at question: "Overall, my expectations concerning the face-to-face meetings were fulfilled."] Why your expectations have not been or have been only partly fulfilled?	

[if "Yes" at question: "Have you made use of a face-to-face meeting?"] Overall, how high was the benefit of participating in face-to-face meetings for your project?				
	Very high	Quite high	Quite low	Very low
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your answer:				

Networking: project presentation

Have you made use of the presentation of your project or project idea?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

[if "Yes" at question: "Have you made use of the presentation of your project or project idea?"] To what extent do the following statements apply to your experiences of the conference?				
Please choose the appropriate response for each item:	Fully applies	Partly applies	Does part-ly not apply	Does not apply at all
I have found possible funding sources for my project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have got to know further contact persons concerning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

project funding.				
I have received further useful information for the implementation of the project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have found new potential project partners.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall, my expectations have been fulfilled.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

[if “Does partly not apply” or “Does not apply at all” at question: “Overall, my expectations have been fulfilled.”]
Why your expectations have not been or have been only partly fulfilled?

--

[if “Fully applies” or “Partly applies” at question: “I have found possible funding sources for my project.”]
You said you had found possible funding sources in the context of the presentation of your project or project idea.

What kind of funding institutions have you found?

Please elaborate.

(Please name the funds or the institution)

--

[if “Fully applies” or “Partly applies” at question: “I have found new potential project partners.”]
You said you had found new potential project partners in the context of the presentation of your project or project idea.

What kind of project partners have you found?

Please elaborate.

international project partners	<input type="checkbox"/>
national project partners	<input type="checkbox"/>
both	<input type="checkbox"/>

[if “Yes” at question: “Have you made use of the presentation of your project or project idea?”]
Overall, how high was the benefit of the presentation of your project or project idea?

	Very high	Quite high	Quite low	Very low
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your answer:				

11.2.3 Utility and sustainability

Retrospectively, which personal benefits have you drawn from the conference?
Please rate the following statements.

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:	Fully applies	Partly applies	Does part-ly not apply	Does not apply at all
Questions and uncertainties concerning the project funding could have been eliminated by participating in the Danube Financing Dialogue.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I could have used the given information for the (further) development of my project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Now I have an idea about who may be a possible financing partner for my project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Due to the supplied information, I have already contacted a funding source to whom I will present my project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Because of the given information, I could have ensured a project funding.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have got to know possible project partners.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Out of conversations during the conference, a new project partnership occurred.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have already submitted a project proposal.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am still in contact with some persons I got to know during the conference.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I recommended to my colleagues that they participate in the Danube Financing Dialogue.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

[if "Fully applies" or "Partly applies" at question: "Because of the given information, I could have ensured a project funding."]

You said you had been able to ensure a project funding in the context of the conference.

What kind of funding source did you ensure?

Please elaborate.

(Please name the funds or the institution)

Overall, how high was the benefit of the participation in the conference for your project?

	Very high	Quite high	Quite low	Very low
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please explain your answer:

Utility and sustainability: project proposal

[if "Fully applies" or "Partly applies" at question: "I have already submitted a project proposal."]

You said you had already submitted a project proposal.

Where and with what setting of priorities have you submitted this proposal?

Please elaborate.

--

<p>[if “Fully applies” or “Partly applies” at question:” I have already submitted a project proposal.”]</p> <p>Which countries are participating in the project?</p>

<p>[if “Fully applies” or “Partly applies” at question:” I have already submitted a project proposal.”]</p> <p>From which priority fields of the European Strategy for the Danube Region does your project arise? (Please choose all that apply)</p>	
Mobility and multimodality	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sustainable energy	<input type="checkbox"/>
Culture and tourism, People to People	<input type="checkbox"/>
Water quality	<input type="checkbox"/>
Environmental risks	<input type="checkbox"/>
Biodiversity, landscapes, air and soil quality	<input type="checkbox"/>
Knowledge society	<input type="checkbox"/>
Competitiveness	<input type="checkbox"/>
People and skills	<input type="checkbox"/>
Institutional capacity and cooperation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Security	<input type="checkbox"/>

<p>[if “Fully applies” or “Partly applies” at question:” I have already submitted a project proposal.”]</p> <p>How is the project funding managed?</p>

11.2.4 Need for improvement

Where do you see a need for improvement concerning further events?				
Please choose the appropriate response for each item:	Fully applies	Partly applies	Does part-ly not apply	Does not apply at all
time management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Choice of speakers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
composition of the participants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
time allotment and venue for informal contacts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
intelligibility of the contents	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
supplied information materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Others:				

--	--

Where do you see further need for improvement?

Which contents should be reduced or excluded in future?

In which content are you particularly interested in concerning project funding in the context of the European Strategy for Danube?

Where do you see the need for improvement concerning the realization of conferences of the Danube Financing Dialogue?