Policy Objective 5
ERDF/CF Indicators

#CohesionPolicy
#EUinmyRegion
#ESIFopendata
Indicators in PO5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY OBJECTIVE 5: A Europe closer to citizens by fostering the sustainable and integrated development of urban, rural and coastal areas and local initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.i Fostering the integrated social, economic and environmental development, cultural heritage and security in urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.ii Fostering the integrated social, economic and environmental local development, cultural heritage and security, including for rural and coastal areas through community-led local development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| RCO74 - Population covered by strategies for integrated urban development |
| RCO75 - Integrated strategies for urban development |
| RCO76 - Collaborative projects |
| RCO77 - Capacity of cultural and tourism infrastructure supported |
| RCO80 - Community-led local development strategies for local development |

| RCR76 - Stakeholders involved in the preparation and implementation of strategies of urban development |
| RCR77 - Tourists/visits to supported sites |
| RCR78 - Users benefiting from cultural infrastructure supported (users/year) |
Specific Objective 5.i
Fostering the integrated social, economic and environmental development, cultural heritage and security in urban areas
RCO 74 – Population covered by strategies for integrated urban development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELEVANT (3,4)</th>
<th>ACCEPTED (3,4)</th>
<th>CREDIBLE (3,4)</th>
<th>EASY (3,4)</th>
<th>ROBUST (3,4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample: 14

- **Scope:** need to use it for urban and rural, inner and coastal area development

- **Name:**
  - integrated territorial development
  - population covered by strategies or by projects?

- **Indicator type:** output or result?

- **Population:** residents? tourists? people benefiting from strategies?

- **Double counting**
RCO 74 – Population covered by strategies for integrated urban development (continued)

- Definition
  - integrated urban development
  - integrated municipal strategies

- Method of calculation

- Data sources

- Time of measurement
RCO 75 - Integrated strategies for urban development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELEVANT (3,4)</th>
<th>ACCEPTED (3,4)</th>
<th>CREDIBLE (3,4)</th>
<th>EASY (3,4)</th>
<th>ROBUST (3,4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample: 14

- Scope:
  - extend beyond PO5
  - extend to PO5.ii

- Target setting - difficult

- Reference document for strategies for integrated territorial development.

- Definition:
  - remove “with projects supported”
  - studies included?

- Double counting
RCO 75 - Integrated strategies for urban development (continued)

- No dynamics, adverse incentives
- Data source
- Time of measurement
RCO 76 – Collaborative projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELEVANT (3,4)</th>
<th>ACCEPTED (3,4)</th>
<th>CREDIBLE (3,4)</th>
<th>EASY (3,4)</th>
<th>ROBUST (3,4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sample: 14*

- **Relevance:**
  - *all projects are collaborative*
  - *not descriptive enough*

- **Scope:**
  - *extend to PO5.ii*

- **Definition:**
  - *stakeholders (same as in RCR76?)*
  - *involvement of stakeholders*
  - *multiple: two or more?*
  - *collaborative projects or partnerships?*

- **Data source**
## RCO 77 - Capacity of cultural and tourism infrastructure supported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELEVANT (3,4)</th>
<th>ACCEPTED (3,4)</th>
<th>CREDIBLE (3,4)</th>
<th>EASY (3,4)</th>
<th>ROBUST (3,4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sample: 14-15*

- Add an *
- Separate indicators for culture and tourism
- **Scope:** *extend to PO5.ii*
- **Alternatives:**
  - “cultural and tourism sites”
  - “number of culture and tourism infrastructure”
  - “cultural heritage artefacts/ attributes with increased attractiveness”
- Target >=0
- **Double counting**
RCR 76 – Stakeholders involved in the preparation and implementation of strategies of urban development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELEVANT (3,4)</th>
<th>ACCEPTED (3,4)</th>
<th>CREDIBLE (3,4)</th>
<th>EASY (3,4)</th>
<th>ROBUST (3,4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample: 14-15

- Indicator type: output or result?
- Scope: extend to PO5.ii
- Definition:
  - share of stakeholders?
  - stakeholders involved in preparation and/or implementation?
  - strategy level indicator
- Double counting
RCR 77 – Tourists/ visits to supported sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELEVANT (3,4)</th>
<th>ACCEPTED (3,4)</th>
<th>CREDIBLE (3,4)</th>
<th>EASY (3,4)</th>
<th>ROBUST (3,4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample: 14

- Add an *
- Scope: extend to PO5.ii
- Demarcation between RCR77 and RCR78
- Name: tourists, visits or users?
- Method of calculation
- Comparison with CO09
- Baseline
- Double counting
RCR 78 – Users benefiting from cultural infrastructure supported (users/year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELEVANT (3,4)</th>
<th>ACCEPTED (3,4)</th>
<th>CREDIBLE (3,4)</th>
<th>EASY (3,4)</th>
<th>ROBUST (3,4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sample: 14*

- Include all cultural sites not just cultural heritage
- “Cultural service” according to the Common International Classification of Ecosystem Services (CICES)?
New indicators proposed by Member States

1. Indicators on status / degree of implementation/fulfilment of the strategy.
2. Indicator on long term sustainability (including environmental, knowledge or other) and diversification of supported activities/projects in the field of tourism and cultural and natural heritage.
3. Indicator on development of sustainable public spaces.
4. Open space created or rehabilitated in urban areas (m2)
5. Public or commercial buildings newly built or renovated in urban areas (m2)
Specific Objective 5.ii

Fostering the integrated social, economic and environmental local development, cultural heritage and security, including for rural and coastal areas through community-led local development
RCO 80 – Community-led local development strategies for local development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELEVANT (3,4)</th>
<th>ACCEPTED (3,4)</th>
<th>CREDIBLE (3,4)</th>
<th>EASY (3,4)</th>
<th>ROBUST (3,4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample: 14

- Overlap with RCO74
- Add a *?
- Definition: strategies with at least one project supported
Horizontal indicators
ERDF/CF Indicators

#CohesionPolicy  
#EUinmyRegion  
#ESIFOpendata
| **Horizontal Indicators: implementation** | RCO95 - Staff financed by ERDF and Cohesion Fund | RCR91 - Average time for launch of calls, selection of projects and signature of contracts  
RCR92 - Average time for tendering  
(from launch of procurement until signature of contracts)  
RCR93 - Average time for project implementation (from signature of contract to last payment)  
RCR94 - Single bidding for ERDF and Cohesion Fund interventions |
General comments

- Use of indicators for average time?
- MS / programmes comparison?
- EC mid-term evaluation or MS mid-term review?
- Administrative burden?
### RCO 95 – Staff financed by ERDF and Cohesion Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELEVANT (3,4)</th>
<th>ACCEPTED (3,4)</th>
<th>CREDIBLE (3,4)</th>
<th>EASY (3,4)</th>
<th>ROBUST (3,4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sample: 13*

- Which staff is to be included?
- Level of reporting
- Target setting
- Use in case of flat rate?
- Method of calculation
RCR 91 - Average time for launch of calls, selection of projects and signature of contracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELEVANT (3,4)</th>
<th>ACCEPTED (3,4)</th>
<th>CREDIBLE (3,4)</th>
<th>EASY (3,4)</th>
<th>ROBUST (3,4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample: 12

- Launch of calls
- Grant assignment
- Intermediate body
- Project assignment
- Project implementation

Phase 0

- Indicator for phase 0
- Measurement unit: months?
- Average or median?
- Constantly running calls? Direct assignment? Retrospective projects?

European Commission
RCR 91 - Average time for launch of calls, selection of projects and signature of contracts 
(continued)

- Adverse incentives?
- Consistency of name with definition
- Selection of projects as starting point?
- Can the phases be adjusted according to internal management system?
- Reference value?
- Reporting
- Source of data
RCR 92 – Average time for tendering (from launch of procurement until signature of contracts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELEVANT (3,4)</th>
<th>ACCEPTED (3,4)</th>
<th>CREDIBLE (3,4)</th>
<th>EASY (3,4)</th>
<th>ROBUST (3,4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample: 11

- ✓ Launch of calls
- ✓ Grant assignment
- ✓ **Intermediate body**
- ✓ **Project assignment**
- ✓ Project implementation

- ❌ Retrospective projects?
- ❌ Forecast values
RCR 93 - Average time for project implementation (from signature of contract to last payment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELEVANT (3,4)</th>
<th>ACCEPTED (3,4)</th>
<th>CREDIBLE (3,4)</th>
<th>EASY (3,4)</th>
<th>ROBUST (3,4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample: 12

- Launch of calls
- Grant assignment
- Intermediate body
- Project assignment
- Project implementation

Phase 0
- Launch of calls
- Grant assignment

Phase 1
- Intermediate body
- Project assignment

Phase 2
- Project implementation

- Long projects?
- Last payment or last payment claim?
- Median time for payment?

Sample: 12
RCR 94 – Single bidding for ERDF and Cohesion Fund interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELEVANT (3,4)</th>
<th>ACCEPTED (3,4)</th>
<th>CREDIBLE (3,4)</th>
<th>EASY (3,4)</th>
<th>ROBUST (3,4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample: 12

- Enabling condition for public procurement
- Indicator monitored at MS level
- Target setting difficult
- Forecast difficult