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I. Objectives of the study

*To assess*

- *the possibility of improving the current list of common output indicators and*
- *the feasibility of developing a list of common direct result indicators for post 2020 ERDF and CF interventions*
II. Methodological challenges

Ensuring:

- further harmonization with other ESI funds
- higher capacity of the common output indicators to address monitoring needs of ERDF/CF programmes
- higher comparability of the results at EU level (with direct result indicators) and also “common definitions”
- increased programme effects accountability
- simplified framework
III. Proposed glossary

*Output* refers to what is produced and “bought” by the programme expenditure and investments through the projects.

*Output indicator* measures the core products of the projects and programmes and what is “bought” through programme resources.

*Direct result* refers to the immediate benefit of the interventions.

*Direct result indicator* is measured through (reinforced) project monitoring and / or other sources (e.g. existing statistics at national level as registers, or newly created sources as surveys).
IV. Organisation of the study

Thematic tasks
- T1 (OT 1, 3)
- T2 (OT 4, 5, 6)
- T5 (OT 2, 7)
- T6 (OT 8, 9, 10, 11)
- T7 (ETC, other themes)
  - Literature review
  - Analysis of the existing ERDF / ETC list of common output indicators
  - Consultation activities
  - Report
  - Consultation meeting with DG Regio desk officers
V. Elements for discussion (1)

*What is the «relevance» of the current set of ERDF/CF common output indicators? (at TO level)*

- Use of *common* output indicators in the ERDF/CF programmes
- Use of *all* output indicators in the ERDF/CF programmes

![Diagram showing the use of output indicators in the performance framework](image)
V. Elements for discussion (2)

**What are the common indicators used in TO 1 and TO 3?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IP</th>
<th>CO01</th>
<th>CO02</th>
<th>CO03</th>
<th>CO04</th>
<th>CO05</th>
<th>CO06</th>
<th>CO07</th>
<th>CO08</th>
<th>CO09</th>
<th>CO22</th>
<th>CO24</th>
<th>CO25</th>
<th>CO26</th>
<th>CO27</th>
<th>CO28</th>
<th>CO29</th>
<th>CO32</th>
<th>CO34</th>
<th>CO37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus on them
V. Elements for discussion (3)

Some 2014-2020 common output indicators

Focus more on the procedural aspects and on the main stakeholders (e.g. number of enterprises receiving support)

Relate to the direct results (e.g. jobs created)

What can be improved?

Option 1 – Provide more details on the type of beneficiary

Option 2 – Focus on the type of support

Option 3 – Mix 1 and 2

Any other ideas?
V. Elements for discussion (4)

Option - 1: Provide “more details” on the type of beneficiary

Example

1. **Number of enterprises receiving support**
   1.1 Number of micro-enterprises receiving support
   1.2 Number of small enterprises receiving support
   1.3 Number of medium enterprises receiving support
   1.4 Number of large enterprises receiving support
   1.5 Number of social enterprises receiving support
   1.6 Number of new enterprises receiving support (including spin-offs, start-ups…)

Challenge
V. Elements for discussion (5)

**Option - 2: Focus on the type of support**
... we would need an indicator as “Number of XXX (e.g. buses) purchased”... some ideas for discussion (to get your inputs / remarks):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Type of support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market value of the acquired ICT and advanced services (euro)</td>
<td>ICT and advanced services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market value of the acquired assets, infrastructure and equipment (euro)</td>
<td>Investments in enterprises assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market value of the support for clustering and networking activities (euro)</td>
<td>Support for clustering and networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of clusters / networks supported (number)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprises cooperating with research institutions (number) – CO26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market value of the investments for research and innovation centers (euro)</td>
<td>Support to research and innovation infrastructure and centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business centers supported (number / square meters)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research infrastructures supported (number / square meters)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new enterprises supported (including spin-offs, start-ups...) – CO05</td>
<td>Support for the process innovation and entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market value of support for process innovation and entrepreneurship [voucher schemes, design, service] (euro)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option - 3: Combine 1 and 2**
V. Elements for discussion (6)

2014-2020 indicators regarding direct results

- CO06 Private investment matching public support to enterprises (also including non eligible expenditure – grants)
- CO07 Private investment matching public support to enterprises (also including non eligible expenditure – non-grant)
- CO27 Private investment matching public support in innovation or R&D projects
- CO08 Employment increase in supported enterprises
- CO24 Number of new researchers in supported entities
- CO25 Number of researchers working in improved research infrastructure facilities
- CO28 Number of enterprises supported to introduce new to the market products
- CO29 Number of enterprises supported to introduce new to the firm products
- CO26 Number of enterprises cooperating with research institutions (output / result)

What is the (expected) direct result?

- Increased investment in the supported unit
- Increased jobs
- Improved research infrastructure
- Increased innovation / innovative products
- Clustering (result or output??)
## Draft proposed list of direct result indicators (TO 1 – 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct result indicator</th>
<th>Direct result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D private investment matching public support to enterprises (euro)</td>
<td>Increased investment in the supported unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased patent applications submitted to the EPO of supported enterprises (number)</td>
<td>Increased innovation / innovative products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased European Union trade mark applications of supported enterprises (number)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of supported enterprises introducing an innovation (new services, products, processes) (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross employment increase of full time equivalents of supported enterprises (number)</td>
<td>Increased jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross employment increase of full time equivalents researchers (people directly involved in R&amp;D activities) of supported units (enterprises, research centers, universities) (number)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity increase of supported enterprises after support (%)</td>
<td>Business growth and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of supported enterprises with increased exports (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival rate of supported newly born enterprises (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Elements for discussion (8)

**MA consultation has started in all the countries for TO 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 .... ...very preliminary messages**

- Do not increase too much the number of indicators
- For some TOs it is more difficult to use common output indicators also for the difficulty of measuring some types of interventions (e.g. TO 5)
- For the future, it will be useful to provide examples with detailed guidelines
- Balance simplification needs with monitoring needs
Thank you for your attention
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