



**European Commission**  
Enterprise and Industry

## **OBJECTIVE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE SBA FACT SHEETS**

SME Performance Review 2008

Objective and methodology of the SBA Fact Sheets

European Commission  
Directorate General Enterprise and Industry

Brussels 2009



## Table of contents

1	Introduction .....	3
1.1	What are the SBA fact sheets? .....	3
1.2	Why is the SBA used as an underlying organising principle? .....	3
1.3	Specific features of the SBA fact sheets .....	3
1.4	Future editions of the SBA fact sheets .....	4
2	Methodology and Design of the SBA fact sheets .....	4
2.1	Identification of relevant policy areas .....	5
2.2	Identification of relevant indicators .....	5
2.2.1	Criteria for selecting the indicators. ....	5
2.2.2	Sources used .....	7
3	Grouping of the indicators according to the SBA principles .....	7
4	The calculation of sector averages and the normalisation process .....	7
5	The definition of benchmarks .....	9
6	Annex: List of indicators used for the SBA fact sheets .....	10



## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 *What are the SBA fact sheets?*

The Small Business Act<sup>1</sup> (SBA) fact sheets are **statistical information tools designed as an input for assessing the business and policy environment for SMEs in Member States** (hereinafter MS). They should be an interesting information source for policy makers in the Commission and in the Member States, as well as for stakeholders and the public at large. The purpose of the fact sheets is to provide a **snapshot of how the SME environment** looks like in a given MS through the prism of statistical data. This is done by grouping together more than 70 indicators measuring a wide variety of different SME policy aspects under the ten principles of the SBA. The information contained in the individual indicators is summed up and visualised in the **SBA radar chart**. This chart encapsulates the main results of this statistical exercise in a concise and user-friendly way. The accompanying text highlights the main findings in each section and explains how the positioning of the MS for a particular area came about. SBA fact sheets have been designed as instruments complementary to the SME Performance Review Annual Report and statistics prepared on a country level in the MS.

### 1.2 *Why is the SBA used as an underlying organising principle?*

The SBA, as adopted by the European Institutions in 2008, is the dominant initiative in the area of EU SME policy for the years to come. A long list of political measures are to be implemented on both national and EU-level, so as to work towards the goals of this initiative. It therefore appears appropriate, that an analytical and statistical tool, such as the fact sheets should organise the information according to the SBA's principles. Hence, each of the axes in the radar chart, corresponding to each of the policy areas, provides an **as objective as possible** indication of the situation in the given policy field in a specific country. Taking all those areas together, **a specific SBA profile** emerges and reveals for a country the strong as well as the weak areas.

### 1.3 *Specific features of the SBA fact sheets*

It is important to take note of the following points, so as to properly interpret the findings in the fact sheets:

Firstly, the fact sheets, in the current form, **are not a full scale monitoring scheme as regards the SBA implementation**. For this, the indicators would have to measure in a precise way almost 100 individual actions proposed in the framework of the SBA. This would be impossible for lack of data. Instead, the compiled information will overtime provide an overview of the changes made in the various policy areas

---

<sup>1</sup> Small Business Act is available at:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/entrepreneurship/sba\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/entrepreneurship/sba_en.htm)



## OBJECTIVE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE SBA FACT SHEETS

that the SBA is targeting. In that sense, this first – pre-SBA implementation – edition of the fact sheets may later on serve as a **base-line scenario**, against which one can assess the changing situation in the relevant areas as the SBA implementation progresses.

Secondly, the fact sheets should **not be interpreted as a comprehensive assessment of policies in MS**. Such an analysis needs to be based on both hard facts, including statistical information, and qualitative information. However, the fact sheets, together with information from other sources, can help to arrive at a rather comprehensive view of a given Member State's SME policy. In the future, the fact sheets may be enriched with other information, which would bring them closer to becoming qualified policy assessments. The fact sheets may then eventually be used as a source of information on the SBA implementation.

Thirdly, the fact sheets do not provide **a real-time reflection of the current situation**. Most of the data in the fact sheet comes with a two -to-three-year delay. This is unavoidable as EU -wide harmonised statistics from public sources are subject to legally determined reporting and production schedules. In most cases, the impact of this is limited, as many indicators are rather slow changing structural indicators without huge and sudden oscillations. Nonetheless, there may be years and periods where such sudden changes occur. Again, this is a qualifying point that has to be taken into account when studying the findings.

Fourthly, the SBA fact sheets **do leave out some policy areas with an either direct or indirect impact on SMEs performances**, such as macro-economic or infrastructure indicators. This focus is deliberately chosen, given the link to the SBA. This approach also ensures that the SBA radar remains at a manageable and user -friendly size. Nonetheless, it needs to be noted that there are policies outside the scope of the SBA that, in some instances, may substantially interfere with the SBA policies and may have a significant bearing on the overall business environment for SMEs (see the current economic and financial crisis).

### 1.4 *Future editions of the SBA fact sheets*

Finally, as has been already implicitly hinted at in some of the previous paragraphs, the **fact sheets are work in progress**. Apart from the rectification of the usual teething problems that such novel exercises come with, future editions will look different. New statistics will become available, while existing ones may cease to exist at some point. Moreover, as mentioned before, there are plans to enlarge the scope of the fact sheets in the future, by also including more qualitative information.

## 2 Methodology and Design of the SBA fact sheets

The fact sheets and the SBA radar charts are constructed in several steps. Each of the steps implied a number of important methodological decisions. In order to fully appreciate the findings of this exercise it is important to explain the different steps one -by-one. Therefore, this methodological section is structured around the steps necessary to arrive at the ultimate results.

2.1 The policy areas relevant for this exercise have to be identified

2.2 Appropriate indicators have to be found



- 2.3 The indicators have to be grouped together under the existing SBA criteria (correlation, balance between areas)
- 2.4 Sector averages have to be formed on the basis of the individual indicators in this section
- 2.5 Finally, to compare the results of the normalisation, benchmarks have to be defined against which individual MS performances can be assessed

These steps are discussed in greater detail below.

A guiding principle for this approach was to make it as simple as possible, so as to ensure maximum transparency as to how the information was “processed” and the results were obtained. This transparency issue was seen as a key principle in ensuring that the fact sheets were of maximum benefit to the interested users, including those that are not statistical experts. It is noted, that the “simplicity”/“transparency” objective is -at times-at odds with the ambition of presenting the data situation with all its nuances. This is clearly a trade-off, where two competing objectives have to be weighed against each other.

### 2.1 *Identification of relevant policy areas*

This step does not require many additional explanations as the most relevant information on this has been already provided in the introduction. The policy areas are based on the ten principles cited in the SBA communication of 25 June 2008 by the Commission.

### 2.2 *Identification of relevant indicators*

#### 2.2.1 *Criteria for selecting the indicators.*

Careful selection of the indicators is one of the most important issues for developing a useful statistical measuring instrument. The principles behind the selection of the indicators are the following:

- Indicators have to have a **direct relevance to the phenomenon they are supposed to describe**. In the case of this particular exercise, this poses a number of challenges. In terms of relevance we have identified three types of indicators; (1) SME-specific indicators, (2) business-specific indicators (3) general indicators (relevant to areas outside business as well). A general challenge across all ten sectors is to find indicators that are SME specific and do not just describe overall business performances or impacts, regardless of size-class distinction. SME-specific indicators were always the first choice and non-size class specific indicators have only been resorted to in the absence of the former. As much as possible, it was avoided to include general indicators with scope broader than exclusive business relevance (e.g. measuring the skills levels of SMEs/ business employees as opposed to skills levels of a society at large).
- On the number of indicators per area, no upper limits have been identified as an increase in the number of indicators should be positively correlated with the accuracy of the picture emerging from the sum of the indicators
- However, it was seen as paramount to avoid duplication and that the chosen indicators were not related to each other so as to avoid that a certain aspect gets undue weights (**avoidance of co-linearity**). Given the substantial amount of indicators, it was impossible to check systematically for



## OBJECTIVE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE SBA FACT SHEETS

co-linearity but a common sense approach has been adopted to minimise co-linearity effects.

- Preferably, indicators should be **policy indicators**, i.e. they should provide a proxy for the degree of policy activity developed in a MS in that area. This is a condition for measuring progress made. Hence preference was given to those indicators that directly measure a given policy action, e.g. Share of Structural Funds dedicated to stimulating entrepreneurship and SMEs (% of total allocation). However, in the absence of such indicators, a second best option may be the use of **performance indicators**. These often **only indirectly** reflect policy measures by revealing the impact of a given policy measure. However, as their values can also be impacted **by other, non-policy, factors** these indicators are more indirect proxies for the policy area in question and have to be treated with caution. Hence, it was decided on a **case-by-case basis** whether the inclusion of a certain performance indicator was adequate or not.
- The indicators should be **reliable** and adhere to specific **quality standards**. The decision to consider or not certain indicators was made involving quality assessments based on those proposed in the paper by Hoffmann, A., Larsen, M. and Oxholm, S. (2006) Quality Assessment of Entrepreneurship Indicators, (FORA, Copenhagen). In short, the paper stakes out a three-way-quality-categorization-scheme of indicators (“A” signifying “good”, “B” signifying “acceptable” and “C” signifying “questionable”) with a view to three main characteristics – relevance, accuracy and availability. A good number of indicators, rated in the paper according to the scheme, were used in the fact sheets. In this case, our guiding principle was to allow only “A”- and “B”- rated indicators to enter the scheme and to allow for “C” -rated ones only under exceptional circumstances. For indicators that were not directly mentioned and rated in that paper, the criteria were applied in the same spirit, and the same aspects were screened (official versus private-sourced information, vetting by impartial authorities, harmonisation according to EU-wide definitions and availability for the vast majority, if not all, MS).
- The choice of indicators preferred those that already **take into account the size differences of member states’ economies**. If that was not the case, the indicator was – before normalisation – adjusted for this factor (by e.g. relating it to the country’s GDP, total value added, etc.).
- In the spirit of consistency with other indicators, the SBA fact sheets strove to **take into account all related indicators or rating schemes that are produced in - and outside DG ENTR**. This included, among others, **the Innovation Scoreboard, the Entrepreneurship scorecards, the work on SME finance indicators by directorate D, the Entrepreneurship Indicator Project (EIP) by the OECD/Eurostat and the Indicators developed by the so-called Lisbon METHodology (LIME) - group**. The aim was not to duplicate those efforts, but to build on this work and extract those indicators and methodologies that fit into this project, also aiming to achieve a maximum of compatibility with those rating schemes.
- In principle with all indicators, **a higher value should represent an improvement**, i.e. on the normalised scale a value closer to 1 (the upper end of the scale) would be better than one close to 0 (the lower end of the scale). In some cases the order might be reversed (i.e. “the fewer the better as with number of days it takes to register a business), in those cases the methodology is adapted in order to ensure that the same logic prevails.



### 2.2.2 Sources used

The **sources of the individual indicators** are included in the separate **master table** containing the relevant data and meta -data regarding all indicators used for this project. The master table is available on the project's web site as soon as it is launched . Please note that for ease of reference, a truncated list of indicators and their sources is annexed to this document).

## 3 Grouping of the indicators according to the SBA principles

All indicators used for the fact sheets have been classified in one of the 10 SBA areas. When composing an individual section, it was tried as much as possible to make the indicator composition in a given area, e.g. "access to finance", resemble those of related indicator or rating schemes by DG ENTR or other services of the Commission (an example is the area of "innovation" where the selected indicators for the respective sub-section on the SBA profile emulate those used in DG ENTR's "Innovation Scoreboard") . This was a key guiding principle for the decision on the precise placement of individual indicators. Obviously, there are indicators that fit into more than one category. For those items case-by-case calls were made, based on a detailed analysis of the nature of the specific indicator and its fit with the other indicators in the respective areas.

## 4 The calculation of sector averages and the normalisation process

For each area an average<sup>2</sup> of all indicators pertaining to that area is calculated. This sector averages were plotted on the SBA radar to represent the MS' performance in this area against the EU average. However, **the minimum number of indicators that would qualify for a sector average was set at four**. Consequently **for a number of areas where only three or less indicators could be identified, no sector average was calculated** . This particular threshold appeared a useful compromise between basing a meaningful average on a minimum number of indicators while at the same time ensuring averages for a sufficient number of areas. In the SBA radar no values are marked on the respective axes pertaining to the areas in question.

Averages were calculated for areas with four or more indicators. In order to arrive at an average for indicators that come with different scaling/units (euros against absolute numbers or against percentages) **the individual indicators had to be normalised to ensure comparability** :

For each indicator we identified the minimum and maximum values across the 27 countries (the lowest and the highest data points, i.e. the two MS for which the value of the indicator was the lowest and the highest). Then the score for any particular country, was adjusted so that the lowest data point was deducted from the specific data point for the country. The result was divided by the difference between the highest data point and the lowest data point of the series (i.e. the difference between the MS with the highest value of all MS and the MS with the lowest value of all MS for the given indicator ). **Hence, all indicators ended up with values ranging from 0 to 1. This approach amounts to benchmarking a specific MS' performance against that of the "best in class" MS for that particular indicator** .

<sup>2</sup> The average was calculated as an arithmetic average , composed with equal weights; in some cases not all indicators for a given area have been included in the average; please refer to the indicator table for details..



This value was then plotted on the chart on the relevant axis. Once this is repeated for all other dimensions/axis one finally arrives at **the specific SME radar profile** for a given MS.

Finally, if the same calculations are used to calculate the EU -27 averages one can, in a further step, **benchmark a particular MS results against the EU average** or against any other MS for that matter.

To illustrate this process, the following example was calculated:

Indicator: Share of SMEs innovating in-house (in %)

Value for Member State A (for which the profile is to be produced): 15%

Value for Member State Z (best in class): 25%

Value for Member State Y (worst in class): 5%

This results in the following equation:

$$\frac{\text{Value for Member State A} - \text{Value for Member State Y}}{\text{Value for Member State Z} - \text{Value for Member State Y}} = \frac{15\% - 5\%}{25\% - 5\%} = 0.5$$

Hence, the normalised value for this indicator is 0,5.



Example for calculating the average for the “Access to Finance” dimension for MS A

Member State A: SME PROFILE DIMENSION	Normalised values	Actual values	
<b>1) ACCESS TO FINANCE</b>			
1.1 Venture capital – early stage relative to GDP	0,4	2,4%	
1.2 Venture capital – expansion stage relative to GDP	0,4	3,5%	
1.3 Extent of guarantees for SMEs (relative to GDP)	0,2	4,2%	
1.4 Cost to create collateral	1	€3.000	
1.5 Change in Interest rate levels for loan volumes under EUR 1 million	0,9	6,5%	
1.6 Planned share of EAFRD dedicated to measures 312 " Support for business creation and development" in 2007 - 2013 (% of total allocation):	0,3	10%	
1.7 Planned share of Structural Funds dedicated to stimulating entrepreneurship and SMEs in 2007 -2013 (% of total allocation):	0,3	13%	
1.8 Share of late payments (% of total)	0,8	5%	
1.9 Share of lost payments (% of total)	0,8	22%	
1.10 Share of SMEs experiencing problems with access to finance:	0,0	5%	
1.11 Getting credit	0,3	27%	
Average for dimension 1 (i.e. Sum normalised values of 1.1 to 1.10) divided by no. of indicators in dimension 1 (10)	<b>0,49</b>		

The overall average for the “Access to Finance” Dimension for Member State A is, thus, calculated as:  $(0,4+0,4+0,2+1+0,9+0,3+0,3+0,8+0,8+0,0+0,3)/10= 5,4/11 = 0,49$

## 5 The definition of benchmarks

It was decided to assess individual MS averages for given sectors against the non-weighted averages for the EU. In the accompanying text on the individual areas, MS performances have been typically classified as being “above EU-average” (ten percentage points or more above the EU-average value), “below EU-average” (ten percentage points or more below the EU-average value) or “around EU-average” (within ten percentage points above or below the EU-average value).



## 6 Annex: List of indicators used for the SBA fact sheets

TABLE OF INDICATORS Overview	Definition of indicator	Data source & page number	Reference date	Comments/Notes
<b>I. ENTREPRENEURSHIP</b>				
1.1 Desire to become self-employed	the percentage of citizens who find becoming selfemployed very and rather desirable	<a href="http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/enterprise_policy/survey/eurobarometer2007/eb2007report.pdf">http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/enterprise_policy/survey/eurobarometer2007/eb2007report.pdf</a> pg 44	Report: April 2007	Included in section average
1.2 Participation rate in entrepreneurship education	at school or university have you participated in any course or activity about entrepreneurship or setting up a business? Yes	<a href="http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/enterprise_policy/survey/eurobarometer2007/eb2007report.pdf">http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/enterprise_policy/survey/eurobarometer2007/eb2007report.pdf</a> pg 123	Report: April 2007	Included in section average
1.4 Entrepreneurship rate: percentage who have started a business which is still active or currently taking steps to start one	experience in setting up a business, question: have you ever started a business or are you taking steps to start one	Flash EB nr 192 The Gallup organisation pg 58	2007	Included in section average
1.5 Degree to which the school education helped to develop an entrepreneurial attitude (%) [EU -25: 50% total and 56% 15-39 old]	My school education helped me to develop my sense of initiative - a sort of entrepreneurial attitude: strongly agree and agree	<a href="http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/enterprise_policy/survey/eurobarometer2007/eb2007report.pdf">http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/enterprise_policy/survey/eurobarometer2007/eb2007report.pdf</a> pg 125	Report: April 2007	Included in section average
1.6 Prevalence rate of female entrepreneurial activity		GEM indicators	2007	
1.7 Persons growing a successful new business receive high status (%)		GEM indicators	2004	
1.8 Lots of media coverage for new businesses (%)		GEM indicators	2004	
1.9 Enterprise survival rate	% of all real enterprise births of year n which are still active in year n+2	Eurostat Business Demography indicators by size class	2005	
1.10 Enterprise birth rate	Real enterprise births of 2005 as a percentage of the population of active enterprises of 2005	Eurostat Business Demography indicators by size class	2005	
1.11 Share of high-growth enterprises (% of total)	Rate of high growth enterprises – employment	Eurostat indicators on high growth enterprises	2005	
<b>II. SECOND CHANCE</b>				
2.1 Degree of support for allowing for a second chance (% in favour):	People who have started their own business and have failed should be given a second chance: Strongly agree and agree	<a href="http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/enterprise_policy/survey/eurobarometer2007/eb2007report.pdf">http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/enterprise_policy/survey/eurobarometer2007/eb2007report.pdf</a> pg 91	Report: April 2007	-
<b>III. THINK SMALL FIRST</b>				
3.1 Share of support among SMEs for current regulations:	Governments impose various regulations for businesses in order to achieve some goals. Do you think that the regulations that apply to your company are appropriate to achieve their goals, for instance the protection of the environment or the financing of the provision of general public services? SMEs, % by country	p.33 Observatory of European SMEs. Analytical Report. Fieldwork: <b>November 2006 – January 2007</b> Flash Eurobarometer	2006	SMEs, % by country that answer 'yes'. Other options are: "no the regulations go clearly too far /slightly too far / could be more ambitious" ; Eu -27 average given
3.2 Time required to comply with administrative obligations (% of total SME working time):	Estimated relative time-burden due to administrative tasks, % (man-days spent with administration divided by Annual Work Units (number of employees * 255)	p.36, Observatory of European SMEs. Analytical Report. Fieldwork: November 2006 – January 2007 Flash Eurobarometer	2006	



## OBJECTIVE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE SBA FACT SHEETS

TABLE OF INDICATORS Overview	Definition of indicator	Data source & page number	Reference date	Comments/Notes
<b>IV. RESPONSIVE ADMINISTRATION</b>				
4.1 Number of days for starting a business		WB Doing Business book	2008	Included in section average
4.2 Costs required to start a business (% of income per capita)		WB Doing Business book	2008	Included in section average
4.3 Difficulty of hiring index (0-100)		WB Doing Business book	2008	Included in section average
4.4 Difficulty of firing index (0-100)		WB Doing Business book	2008	Included in section average
4.5 Cost (% of estate) to close a business		WB Doing Business book	2008	Included in section average
4.6 Cost (% of property value) to register property		WB Doing Business book	2008	Included in section average
4.7 Enforcing contracts - cost (% of claim)		WB Doing Business book	2008	Included in section average
4.9 Social security costs paid by the employer as % of total labour costs:		Eurostat/SBS	2004	Included in section average
<b>V. PUBLIC PROCUREMENT AND STATE AID</b>				
5.1 Share of SMEs in terms of value of public procurement contracts:		p.48-49, "Evaluation of SMEs' access to public procurement markets in the EU" (Nov 2007)		Figures for Portugal, Greece, Cyprus & Malta omitted because of the low number of companies in the sample
5.2 Proportion of total State aid devoted to SMEs:	State aid for horizontal objectives (e.g. SMEs) etc and sectoral aid as a % of total aid	p.24, State Aid scoreboard Autumn 2007		Only captures aid exclusively earmarked for SMEs. In addition, risk-capital aid which accounts for 0.6% of total aid (included in "other horizontal objectives") is also exclusively directed to SMEs. Total aid granted to SMEs is much higher since most schemes for other horizontal objectives like environment, regional development, R&D are open to companies regardless of their size.
<b>VI. FINANCE</b>				
6.1 Venture capital – early stage relative to GDP		European Private Equity and Venture Capital Association (EVCA)	2007	Included in section average
6.2 Venture capital – expansion stage relative to GDP		European Private Equity and Venture Capital Association (EVCA)	2007	Included in section average
6.3 Extent of guarantees for SMEs (relative to GDP)		<a href="http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/entrepreneurship/financing/enterprise_finance_index/guarantees.htm#">http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/entrepreneurship/financing/enterprise_finance_index/guarantees.htm#</a>	2007	Included in section average
6.4 Getting credit: Strength of legal rights index (0-10)		WB Doing Business book	2008	Included in section average
6.5 Getting credit: Depth of credit information index (0-6)		WB Doing Business book	2008	Included in section average
6.6 Difference in interest rate levels between loans up to EUR 1 million and loans over EUR 1 million		ECB MFI interest rates statistics	June 2008	Floating rate and up to 1 year initial rate fixation
6.7 Planned share of EAFRD dedicated to measures 312 " Support for business creation and development" in 2007-2013 (% of total allocation):		European Commission, DG AGRI	2007-2013	Included in section average
6.8 Planned share of Structural Funds dedicated to stimulating entrepreneurship and SMEs in 2007-2013 (% of total allocation):	Support to SMEs. Programmed allocations by MS. Number of programmes: 343 (332 decided).	Period 2007-2013. Breakdown by category SF Community amount (9 pages) / Commission Communication - "Cohesion Policy 2007-2013: Support to SMEs" (1 page). Contact: Matthias Martens (REGIO, 68590)	2007-2013	Included in section average
6.9 Average delay in payments (% share of average contract days):		Intrum Justitia	2007/2008	Weighted average related to sizeclass breakdown (micro, small and medium). Calculations based on Eurostat SBS data for number of enterprises in 2005 except CZ and LT where 2004 figures were used.; included in section average
6.10 Share of lost payments (% of total)		Intrum Justitia	2007/2008	Weighted average related to sizeclass breakdown (micro, small and medium). Calculations based on Eurostat SBS data for number of enterprises in 2005 except CZ and LT where 2004 figures were used.
6.11 Share of SMEs experiencing problems with access to finance:	Did your enterprise encounter any of these constraints or difficulties in the last two years? a) limited access to finance	p.23, Observatory of European SMEs. Analytical Report. Fieldwork: November 2006 – January 2007 Flash Eurobarometer	2007	Included in section average



## OBJECTIVE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE SBA FACT SHEETS

TABLE OF INDICATORS Overview	Definition of indicator	Data source & page number	Reference date	Comments/Notes
<b>VII. SINGLE MARKET</b>				
7.1 Average transposition delay in months for overdue directives – in months		European Commission, DG MARKT,	July 2008	Included in section average
7.2 Single market directives - % transposed or notified		Internal Market Scoreboard July 2008, p.11-12.	July 2008	Included in section average
7.3 Number of 2 years overdue directives	Number of directives with a deadline for transposition into national law before 1st may 2006, which have not been transposed by 13 May 2008.	Internal Market Scoreboard July 2008, p.16.	July 2008	As Bulgaria & Romania joined the Union on 1st January 2007, they do not have directives overdue by 2 years or more; included in section average
7.4 Share of intra-EU exporting SMEs to all SMEs (in terms of number of enterprises):		Eurostat External Trade Pilot	2005	Note : this data comes from a pilot project by Eurostat voluntarily supported by MS, linking external trade with information from national business registers; included in section average
<b>VIII. SKILLS AND INNOVATION</b>				
8.1 Percentage of enterprises having purchased on-line over the last calendar year (SME:s between 10-250 employees)		Eurostat Science & Technology indicator	2007	Included in section average
8.2 Percentage of enterprises having received orders on-line over the last calendar year (SME:s between 10-250 employees)		Eurostat Science & Technology indicator		Included in section average
8.3 SMEs innovating in-house (% total SMEs)		Fourth Community Innovation Survey	2007	Included in section average
8.4 Enterprises introduced marketing innovation (Average in % among SME:s 10-250 employees).		Community Innovation Survey 4	2004	
8.5 Innovative SMEs co-operating with others, as a percentage of all SMEs		Community Innovation Survey 4	2007	Included in section average
8.6 SMEs using organisational innovation, as a percentage of all SMEs:		Community Innovation Survey 4	2007	
8.7 Share of SMEs that have new products or income from new products:	1 - Revenue from innovation (percentage of their turnover that can be attributed to innovation or that the company has <i>not</i> had any new or improved products or services in the past two years).	p.75, Observatory of European SMEs. Analytical Report. Fieldwork: November 2006 – January 2007 Flash Eurobarometer	2007	Included in section average
8.8 Share of SMEs' turnover from new or significantly improved products and services:	The percent of turnover (annual sales) coming from new or significantly improved products or services in the last two years?	p.76, Observatory of European SMEs. Analytical Report. Fieldwork: November 2006 – January 2007 Flash Eurobarometer	2007	Lack of improved products are treated as 0%; included in section average
8.9 Share of SME staff that have tertiary education:	Tertiary education means diploma from a university or another higher education institution + postgraduate exam such as a doctorate	p.85, Observatory of European SMEs. Analytical Report. Fieldwork: November 2006 – January 2007 Flash Eurobarometer	2007	Included in section average
8.10 Training provided by employer (% of all employers):	training paid for or provided by your employer, or by yourself if you are self-employed	Fourth European Working Conditions Survey, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions	2005	Included in section average
8.11 Participants in continuing vocational training (CVT) courses as percentage of employees in all enterprises:		European Commission, DG EAC, Progress Towards the Lisbon Objectives in Education and Training, chapter 3 pg 5	2005	results for 2005; included in section average
8.12 Average hours spent in CVT courses per employee:		European Commission, DG EAC, Progress Towards the Lisbon Objectives in Education and Training, chapter 3 pg 6 table 2	2005	results for 2005; included in section average
8.13 Participation rate in any learning activities in micro enterprises:		Eurostat Labour Force Survey	2005	Included in section average
8.14 Training small and medium-sized enterprises as % of all small and medium-sized enterprises (average % for SME:s with 10-250 employees):		Eurostat Labour Force Survey	2005 provisional data	Included in section average



## OBJECTIVE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE SBA FACT SHEETS

TABLE OF INDICATORS Overview	Definition of indicator	Data source & page number	Reference date	Comments/Notes
<b>IX. ENVIRONMENT</b>				
9.1 % Share of SMEs having comprehensive systems for energy efficiency:		p.81, Observatory of European SMEs. Analytical Report. Fieldwork: November 2006 – January 2007 Flash Eurobarometer	2007	
9.2 % Share of SMEs applying simple measures to save energy:	Does the SME use an environmental management system or any other measures to save energy and resources? % yes, simple rules or devices to save energy	p.81, Observatory of European SMEs. Analytical Report. Fieldwork: November 2006 – January 2007 Flash Eurobarometer	2007	
9.3 Average expenditure on environmental protection:		Eurostat	2004	

<b>X. INTERNATIONALISATION</b>				
10.1 Share of turnover from export (% of total)	Export's share in the revenue	p. 45 Flash eb nr 196 Observatory of European SME's	2005	Included in section average
10.2 Share of SMEs gaining any income from subsidiaries and/or joint ventures abroad (%):		p. 55 Flash eb nr 196 Observatory of European SME's	2005	Included in section average
10.3 Percent of input purchased abroad:		p. 54 Flash eb nr 196 Observatory of European SME's	2006	Included in section average
10.4 Number of days required to export:		WB Doing Business	2007	Included in section average
10.5 Number of days required to import:		WB Doing Business	2007	Included in section average
10.6 Share of SMEs exporting outside the EU-27 to all SMEs (in terms of number of enterprises):		Eurostat External Trade Pilot	2005	Note : this data comes from a pilot project by Eurostat voluntarily supported by MS, linking external trade with information from national business registers