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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
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II. The key tasks of the study

Understanding what can be improved (Better Regulation Toolbox)

Analysis of the use of common output indicators

Analysis of the use of programme-specific output indicators

Proposal of potential candidate output and direct result indicators

Consultation with MA and desk analysis
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Consultation - Growth and Jobs OPs

November – January *(66 already consulted)*

**Consultation**

First round
- First group (TO 1 - TO 3)
- Second group (TO 1, 3, 4, 5, 6)

Second round
- Third group (TO 2 - TO 7)
- Forth group (TO 2, 7, 8, 9, 10)

March - April
Description of the consultation

- **90% of the targeted programmes have been consulted successfully.** All targeted TO 1 programmes, except one refusal, have been consulted (94%), and all targeted TO 3 programmes, except two refusals, (92%). 87% of the targeted programmes for TO 4, 80% for TO 5, 86% for TO 6, due to programme refusals and postponements.

- **The programmes were selected based on the EU amount at TO level as indicated in the terms of reference.** These programmes cover 61% of the total EU amount in TO 1, 62% in TO 3, 64% in TO 4, 58% in TO 5 and 45% in TO 6. The relatively low amount of TO 6 is due to the delays of some OPs (postponements).

- **Only 3 programmes refused to participate** in the consultation, one saying that it is in a too early stage of implementation. There are still some opportunities to collect additional information from other programmes. The possibility of postponing interviews is offered to all MAs that have not refused to participate (relevant for TO 4, 5, 6).

- **Other initiatives.** The contractor participated in the Evaluation Network Meeting held in Brussels on 1 December and launched a consultation of some national authorities who have nationally harmonised monitoring systems.
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III. What can be improved? (1/2)

Harmonisation with other ESI Funds

1. Harmonised type of indicators (introduction of direct result indicators for CF / ERDF programmes)
2. Harmonised definitions (Better Regulation Toolbox)
III. What can be improved? (2/2)

**Thematic coverage**

*There is a different use of common output indicators*

1. Across and within TOs (TO 1 and 3 vs TO 2, 5, 11)

2. Between Funds and Goals (in ERDF 59% of the total programme output indicators are from the list of common output; 40% in CF, 35% in ETC only)

3. Across Member States
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IV. Conceptual framework of the study: input -> direct result

**Input indicator:** measures inputs (financial indicators)

**Output indicator:** relates to the specific deliverables of the intervention and measures what is bought by the programme resources

**Process indicator:** provides number and characteristics of beneficiaries, forms of finance and type of support, number of projects

**Direct result indicator:** matches the immediate effects of the intervention with particular reference to the direct addressees
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V. Use of common output indicators – (1/5)

Different use across TOs

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

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

---

Use of **common** output indicators in the **performance framework**

Use of **all** output indicators in the **performance framework**
Focus on some “popular” indicators

- **CO01** “Number of enterprises receiving support” and **CO02** “Number of enterprises receiving grants” show the lowest costs of monitoring.

- **CO04** “Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support” and **CO08** “Employment increase in supported enterprises” show higher costs than the other indicators. For CO04, the reason is definition of “non-financial support” which is sometimes difficult to distinguish from financial support.
Focus on “Research and innovation indicators”

- **CO24** “Number of new researchers in the supported entities”
  - Difficult use of FTE in R&D organisations
  - Difficult attribution of the researchers to the specific supported project

- **CO25** “Number of researchers working in improved research infrastructure facilities” is “ambiguous” (process, output, result??)
V. Use of common output indicators - (4/5)

Focus on “Research and innovation indicators”

- **CO27** “Private investment matching public support in innovation or R&D projects” proves to be the best indicator in terms of coverage and limited difficulty in data collection

- **CO28** “Number of enterprises supported to introduce new to the market products”, **CO29** “Number of enterprises supported to introduce new to the firm products”
  - Difficult to avoid double counting
  - Difficult to know in advance what is new to the market
  - Refer to process rather than an achievement
Focus on “CO34 Estimated annual decrease of GHG (tons of CO2 Equivalent)”

- The indicator is relevant and covers relevant changes
- It is linked with EU policies

BUT

- As formulated it measures an impact / result (and not an output) and seems more appropriate for impact evaluation rather than for monitoring
- It is challenging to establish a causal relationship of “contribution” between the project and the indicator
- 40% of the interviewed MAs experienced difficulty in data collection and higher measurement costs than other indicators
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VI. Use of programme-specific output indicators - (1/3)

General findings on the use of programme-specific indicators

- Overall across all the IPs, about 80% of the programme-specific output indicators measure either outputs or results. This shows that the distinction between direct result indicators and output indicators which is under assessment in this study is not entirely new for MAs.

- Moreover, the introduction of programme-specific output indicator is due to the lack of appropriate common output indicators in about 70% of the cases, rather than to specific requirements of national harmonisation, need of simplification, previous experience and use.
VI. Use of programme-specific output indicators - (2/3)

**TO 1 – Examples of programme-specific indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IP</th>
<th>Measuring a real output</th>
<th>Referring to a direct result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1a | ▪ Renewed / built floor area of supported research infrastructure facilities (square meters and number) | ▪ Publications (number)  
▪ Patents (number)  
▪ Supported Horizon 2020 project applications being evaluated over quality threshold (number / %)  
▪ Indicators on enterprise performance (turnover) |
| 1b | ▪ Value of services provided to small and medium enterprises by higher education institutions (euro) | ▪ Number of applications to protect intellectual property in industry (number)  
▪ Companies starting RDI activity with University and research institutions (number)  
▪ New cluster members (number) |
VI. Use of programme-specific output indicators - (3/3)

**TO 5 – Examples of programme-specific indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IP</th>
<th>Measuring a real output</th>
<th>Referring to a direct result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5a / 5i | • Warning stations installed (number)  
• Length of reconstructed / renovated drains (km)  
• Breakwaters for coastal zone protection / river floods protection (km / number) | • Population benefited by interventions to prevent catastrophes and restore damaged areas (population)  
• Annual average of economic damages caused by adverse hydrological events (euro) |
| 5b / 5ii | • Rescue and emergency vehicles acquired / equipped (number)  
• Centres for increasing the population preparedness for flood response established, reinforced landslide area (square meters)  
• Length of water streams dealt with in project (km)  
• Monitoring stations (number)  
• Extension of the coastal strip covered by interventions to protect people and property (km) | • Population benefiting from hydrogeological risk (population)  
• Average response time to emergency situations (minutes) |
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VII. Towards a proposal for candidate common output and direct result indicators - (1/2)

Possible advantages

- Simplification and streamlining of the system of indicators
- Higher programme accountability
- Greater comparability at EU level
- Better data collection for evaluations
- Greater harmonisation with other ESI Funds
VII. Towards a proposal for candidate common output and direct result indicators - (2/2)

1. “Learning from the past” - Use of common output indicator → Confirm, refine, discard existing indicators

2. “Bottom-up” approach - Use of programme-specific output indicator → Inspiration from concrete examples which might be useful for the post-2020 list and ask MAs for proposals on the direct result indicators

3. “Literature review” in other EC Funds and beyond programmes
Thank you for your attention

Andrea Gramillano