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Experience of Italy for the cohesion policy 2014-2020 cycle in the **effort of coordinating (ex ante) at the national level**: 

- The identification and construction of robust statistical indicators relevant to cohesion policy strategies and programs-OPs ‘objectives’ [context-policy-result indicators] 
- The choice of appropriate **output indicators** for OPs to portray (in monitoring and reporting and PF) what actions-projects do on the ground

**MOTIVATION of the effort**: many different actors involved in OPs building and implementation → risks of divergence in language/interpretation and excessive number of indicators

**GOVERNANCE CONTEXT**: highly decentralized system in policy delivery and program management BUT ALSO central institutional body (Department for development and cohesion policies, since 1998): entrusted with coordination and guidance authority + *internal technical capacity in multi-dimensional measurement* + *established long term relation with the national data producers* + *unified national monitoring system at the project-operation level* [+ *Ex ante conditionality on result indicators* + *EU common I*]
Focus on what done for 2014-2020

... but much longer previous history of investment in the field of measurements for policy diagnostic, orientation and action.

The effort done for Result Indicators in 14-20 should be seen as the natural continuation of a long-term alliance between cohesion policy and statistical measurement for more and better data at various territorial levels.
Cohesion Policy has significantly contributed to an increase in the general availability of territorial statistics to measure the territorial context to support the policy making process to reflect on policies results to encourage civic engagement

Since 2000 significant investments have been made in order to meet the demand of statistical and administrative indicators:

Total amount invested in methodological support and production of territorial statistics (since 2000) $\approx$ 46 M€

1. Regional Public Accounts and open government initiatives with statistical data reuse

2. Formal Agreements with the Italian National Statistical Institute (Istat) and with other data producers

National funds for cohesion $\approx$ 32 M€
EU Programmes $\approx$ 14 M€
STATISTICAL DATA AVAILABILITY AT TERRITORIAL LEVEL

Great boost to statistical measurement of policy relevant dimensions through indicators and proxy variables

Regional Indicators Database for development policy (NUTS2) available on Istat website (www.istat.it/it/archivio/16777)

- More than 300 indicators by sector and by programming priority, time series from 1995, metadata, .xls and .csv format
- Continuous, strong methodological effort to promote the availability of “new” indicators on strategic themes

Sub-regional data (NUTS3, and other territorial entities):

- Atlas of municipalities (more than 8,000 statistical units)
- Atlas of infrastructures (more than 600 indicators)
- Data at the “Optimal Territorial Areas (ATO)” level for water service (approx. 50 statistical units)
- Data at the “Health service districts (ASL)” level (more than 100 statistical units)
THE PROCESS OF IDENTIFICATION AND ADOPTION OF RESULT INDICATOR FOR 2014-2020

• **HOW AND WHEN THE RIs NATIONAL SYSTEM WAS DEFINED:**

  Result Indicators (RI) for Expected Policy Results (within each of the 11 Thematic Objectives - TO) identified during the much participated process of strategic devise and negotiation of the Partnership Agreement (PA)

• **HOW THE PA RIs SYSTEM ENTERED OPs:**

  Operational Programs (OP, both ERDF and ESF) required to refer to the expected policy results and actions types defined in the PA in setting their specific objectives and offered the opportunity to adopt as OP RIs, where appropriate, the RIs of the PA to be made available (calculated) at the relevant territorial level of OPs (national, category of region, regional)
PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT 2014-2020: IR system

What the PA RI system looks like?

114 Result Indicators

Statistical indicators made available by National Statistical System (SISTAN)

Their role defined as quantitative proxy companions of the narrative expected results to orient policy actions and help in setting territorial targets and understanding of development trajectories. AP IRs are “policy indicators, based on official sources”

- Chosen according to relevance to TOs strategies devised in PA and responsiveness (as much as data availability consent) to policy actions.
- Ensure data quality and recognized statistical standard: Help fulfillment of ex ante conditionality on Statistical system and result indicators
- Deal with measurement challenges for some specific new policy themes («new» indicators. EX: on hydro geological and seismic risk, research enterprises networks, etc.)

NOTE THAT PA does not contain targets for result indicators (not required by the Regulation, difficult to negotiate, …)

List of common set of statistical indicators (NUTS2 level, common sources and baselines, metadata and methods) for ERDF, ESF, EARDF
The 114 Statistical Result Indicators defined in the AP

To be used by Managing Authorities in OPs

To meet ex ante conditionality on statistical systems and result indicators

To nurture policy public discussion

Available also outside the policy community: published in a standardized format on the Istat website (http://www.istat.it/it/archivio/16777)

The result indicators identified in the PA played their intended orientation role for the Ops

More than 84% of the indicators directly from the PA IRs system

14-20 ERDF-ESF: 51 OPs of which 8 multi-fund (ERDF-ESF); 22 ERDF; 21 ESF
# IRs IN THE 2014-2020 OPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># and Categories of OPs</th>
<th>AP IR</th>
<th>Specific OP IR</th>
<th>Common EU IR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>18 ERDF Regional Operational Programs</strong></td>
<td>457/530  (86,2%)</td>
<td>73/530 (13,8%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18 ESF Regional Operational Programs</strong></td>
<td>110/326  (33,7%)</td>
<td>57/326 (17,5%)</td>
<td>159/326 (48,8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Multi-fund (ERDF-ESF) Regional Operational Programs</strong></td>
<td>27/189 (14,3%)</td>
<td>130/189 (68,8%)</td>
<td>32/189 (16,9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 (5 Multi-fund, 3 ESF, 4 ERDF) National Operational Programs</strong></td>
<td>95/200 (47,5%)</td>
<td>76/200 (38,0%)</td>
<td>29/200 (14,5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>51 Total Operational Programs</strong></td>
<td>689/1.245 (55,3%)</td>
<td>336/1.245 (27%)</td>
<td>220/1.245 (17,7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table: all RIs present in each OP counted (intentional double counting among OPs to obtain a AP-IRs gross coverage rate).

In ESF OPs (or ESF part of multi-fund OPs) many “direct result” indicators related to OP beneficiaries. Many specific OP IR refer to similar themes, but expressed in different ways.

8 AP IRs not selected by any OP
Accomplishment on IRs possible thanks to the Italian tradition on territorial statistics.
Many statistical result indicators already available at the time the PA was negotiated and adopted.

52 statistical result indicators now available (NUTS 2 level) for the first time thanks to the «PA efforts».

For each IR in the PA system provided:
- Definition (short and extended)
- Method – Data for calculation (numerator and denominator)
- Unit of measurement, update frequency and statistical source
- Quantification at least at regional level (NUTS2)

Some examples:
- Private sector R&D expenditure (as % of GDP), Istat, annual
- Broadband coverage (at least 30 Mbps), Ministry of Economic Development (MISE), annual
- Rate of innovation in enterprises, Istat, annual
- Separate municipal waste collection, Ispra, Annual
- Early (0-3 years) Child care, Istat, annual
- Tourism in non summer months, Istat, annual
### 2014-2020: HOW MUCH FUNDING TO FURTHER IMPROVE DATA AVAILABILITY?

**Key role of NOP Governance and Institutional Capacity ESF-ERDF 2014-2020 in supporting territorial statistics advancement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Status of the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental statistics for cohesion policies 2014-2020</td>
<td>Italian Institute for Environmental Protection and Research, ISPRA</td>
<td>≈2,4 M€ (2018-2023)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics for measuring the phenomenon of corruption at the territorial level</td>
<td>National Authority Anti corruption, ANAC</td>
<td>≈5,0 M€ (2018-2020)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE PROCESS (STILL ONGOING)
FOR COORDINATING CHOICE AND USE
OF COMMON (EU AND NATIONAL) OUTPUT INDICATORS

• A step backward: we all agree on the definition of output indicators (what projects produce/buy with their financial and organizational resources), BUT reality is complex as single projects often produce different things at once and point of views of what and how is important to portray differ + Cohesion policy is multi–thematic and much decentralized in delivery. Most would like to “add up stuff” to portray an aggregate image of what policy does on the ground, but Output Indicators (OI) are about “agreement” on what we measure, how and when as relevant outputs. Common lists (with precise operational definitions) are very useful, but do not deliver agreement per se.

• What we did for 2014-2020: Produced an utility at the time of OP orientation containing for each TO the following sequence expected results/specific objectives (and relevant RI) – Possible useful actions (and pertinent OI) on the basis of what was agreed in the PA and in order to orient OP contents and homogenize the construction of PF tables. In this effort we tried to use EU common OI lists as much as possible.

• In addition we set a specific requirement in Unified national monitoring system (UNM): each project/operation monitored should be always associated to one OI from a previously agreed common list (which includes the EU Regulation Common lists). The UNM is a powerful instrument, but the reality of the policy structure and organization is very challenging for OI.
COHESION POLICIES AND OUTPUT INDICATORS: the role of the national unified monitoring system in the past

2000-2006
- Structural Funds
- National monitoring system of public investment and policies

Start of the National monitoring system at project level
Monitor system of public investment based on CUP code (Unique identifier of the project)

no output indicators, but projects typologies

2007-2013
- Output indicators with:
  - Target values
  - Realized values

CUP system contains some info also on project typologies
Great effort to link projects to output indicators
"Common list" of Output Indicators for ERDF, ESF, EARDF, …

The list includes European common indicators (except ERDF indicators representing results instead of outputs). The list can be augmented for motivated requests by MAs.

Each monitored project required to be associated to at least one OI from the common list and with a target value.

Function: Assure comparability and potentials for adding up and common/comparable way of measurement for the Performance Framework (PF).

Continuous effort to support MAs in appropriate use and reporting into the monitoring system of OIs [with specific focus on some critical issues such as the PF]. Some reflections:

The OI system can improve with time; at the single project level the OI tells always something relevant (even when is not a common OI). BUT in portraying what projects realize on the ground we should much complement OI with other form of representations: maps, videos, photos, … and grasp more the benefit of innovative means available.
Thank You for the attention!
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