



**Expert evaluation network
delivering policy analysis on the
performance of Cohesion policy 2007-2013
Year 3 – 2013**

**Task 1: Job creation as an indicator of
outcomes in ERDF programmes**

Belgium

Version: Final

Lydia Greunz

with the assistance of Sara Botti

Applica

**A report to the European Commission
Directorate-General Regional and Urban Policy**

Contents

Executive summary	3
1. The use of the indicator to assess outcomes in policy areas.....	4
2. Definition, methodology, data reporting and wider use of the indicator	6
Definition and methodology.....	6
Content of data	8
Wider use of indicator.....	9
3. Cost per job created	9
4. The indicator of job creation in evaluations and AIRs.....	11
5. Looking forward to the 2014-2020 programming period.....	12
6. Further remarks	12
References.....	14
Interviews.....	15
Annex.....	16

List of abbreviations

- AIR Annual Implementation Report
- CEP Competitiveness and Employment Programme
- CP Convergence Programme
- FEI Financial Engineering Instrument
- FTE Full Time Equivalent
- MA Managing Authority
- OP Operational Programme
- PIZ Priority Intervention Zone

Executive summary

There are as many definitions of the indicator as there are managing authorities (MAs) in Belgium and there is no attempt to ensure any comparability or consistency of the data between Operational Programmes (OPs) because the information is not aggregated at national level.

The job creation indicator is used in three of the four Belgian programmes to measure the outcome of interventions at the sub-programme level. A breakdown by broad policy area shows that the indicator is employed in a reasonably comprehensible way in that it is essentially reported for interventions which explicitly pursue the goal of creating jobs. These are mainly in enterprise support and RTDI.

By end-2011 the creation of over 6.5 thousand jobs was reported by measures using the indicator to measure outcomes and 11.1 thousand jobs (2.7 thousand direct and 8.4 thousand indirect jobs) by measures not using the indicator to report outcomes.

The public cost of a job created was on average EUR 71 thousand by loans from risk capital funds, EUR 10 thousand by micro and cash credits and EUR 45 thousand by investment grants to companies. These averages hide significant variations and there are a number of uncertainties regarding the meaningfulness of the estimates.

MAs are familiar with the definition of the proposed common indicators for 2014-2020 and draw attention to a number of shortcomings which deserve consideration.

1. The use of the indicator to assess outcomes in policy areas

The number of jobs created is used as one of the indicators to measure the outcome of intervention at sub-programme level in the Competitiveness and Employment Programmes (CEPs) in Wallonia and Brussels and the Convergence Programme (CP) in Hainaut. It is not used in the Flemish CEP except for reporting at the programme level on the “EU prescribed” core indicator of job creations.

Table 1 gives an overview of the relative importance of the policy areas in which the indicator is used in terms of planned expenditure, outcomes by end-2011 and targets set for 2015.

Table 1 – The use of job creations as indicator of outcomes: planned expenditure 2007-2013, actual expenditure by end-2011, outcomes by 2011 and targets by 2015

	Planned ERDF expenditure 2007-2013			Expenditure by end-2011 in relation of total planned expenditure for the period 2007-2013 (%)		Number of jobs created by measures using job creation ind.		<i>Number of jobs created and maintained by measures not using job creation ind. by end 2011 (2)</i>
	ERDF Measures using job creation ind.			Measures using job creation ind.		Outcome 2011	Target 2015	
	ERDF Total (EUR million)	creation ind. (EUR million)	%	Total	(1)			
RTDI support	182	64	35.2	48.5	47.0	361	352	272
Enterprise support incl. ICT	395	204	51.7	(52.6) 36.1	(78.3) 42.9	6,033	9,928	1,625
Human resources	7	0	0.0	41.0	-	0	0	0
Transport	56	0	0.0	42.5	-	0	0	165
Environment and energy	104	0	0.0	59.6	-	0	0	495
Territorial development	228	115	50.4	23.3	20.4	166	1,040	220
Technical assistance	18	4	22.0	27.1	45.2	20	20	0
Total	990	387	39.1	(40.9) 34.3	(51.5) 35.1	6,580	11,340	<i>direct: 2,777 indirect: 8,407</i>
<i>direct and indirect created and maintained: 11,184</i>								

Source: calculations based on information from the MAs.

Notes:

(1) The expenditure has been adjusted for the amount of funding paid into financial engineering instruments (FEIs) but which remained unspent by end-2011. Non-adjusted figures are indicated in brackets.

(2) It is not possible for job creations by measures not using the indicator to assess outcomes at sub-programme level (CEP of Flemish programme) to distinguish between created and maintained jobs. A comparison as such of the data in the last column of Table 1 (in italic) with the data of preceding columns is therefore not meaningful because maintained jobs are excluded from the indicator in the CEPs of Wallonia and of Brussels and the CP of Hainaut.

On average about 39% of the ERDF amount for Belgian programmes in the period 2007-2013 has been allocated to measures using job creation as an indicator of outcome though there is significant variation in this share between policy areas (Table 1). While in the RTDI policy area the share of funding for interventions measuring outcomes in terms of new jobs created is below this average (35%), it represents half of the funding for enterprise support (52%) and territorial development (50%). On the other hand, the indicator is not used to measure outcomes of interventions in transport, human resources, environment and energy where the main purpose is to support physical infrastructure and less to create jobs. The overall picture

which emerges from the breakdown is that, if employed, the indicator is used in a reasonably comprehensible way in that it is essentially reported for interventions which explicitly pursue the goal of creating jobs and not for interventions which mainly pursue other aims. A question mark however remains over the reason for not using the indicator in the Flemish programme at sub-programme level unless none of the interventions are aimed at job creation as such.

As regards the pace of policy implementation by end-2011, there was no significant difference between policy areas using the indicator of new jobs and those not using it. This at least is implied by the amount of expenditure carried out in relation to the funding available for the period 2007-2013 (Table 1). Just over 35% of the funding for measures using the job creation indicator had been absorbed, about the same share as the overall rate of expenditure for the programmes as a whole (34%). For enterprise support, absorption was higher for measures using the job creation indicator (43%) than for those not using it (36%) but it was equally higher than average expenditure in relation to total funding available for the programmes. It should be noted that the expenditure data in Table 1 have been adjusted for the amount of funding paid into FEIs but which remained unspent at end-2011. In other words the funding that had not reached final beneficiaries by end-2011 has been excluded here because there was no spending *stricto sensu*.

At end-2011, 6,580 jobs were reported to have been created by measures using the indicator. This number represents 58% of the end-target by 2015 (11,340 jobs). Over 91% come from enterprise support and half of these are jobs (so-called “expected”)¹ from investment grants in the Walloon region and in Hainaut for which creating jobs is a legal requirement for support.

Because the indicator is not used in the Flemish CEP to assess outcomes of intervention at sub-programme level and because the content of the data is not the same as in the other Belgian programmes the breakdown by policy area is indicated for completeness only (the last column of Table 1) but not aggregated with the other data. The global number of 11,184 jobs reported under the core indicator “jobs created” (no. 1) is a mix of new, maintained, direct and indirect jobs without additional information in the AIR on how to interpret the figure. According to the MA, this number can be broken down into 2,777 direct and 8,407 indirect jobs (by end-2011)² but a question mark remains over the share of maintained jobs³.

¹ It is important to note that the number is said to be “expected” in that the actual number of jobs created is only assessed after a period of 16 quarters following project approval, the time it takes, according to the MA, for investment to produce effects on employment. By end-2011 the number of expected jobs from investment grants to companies was estimated at 2,958. This estimate corresponds to the minimum number of jobs that “legally” need to be created by the companies which had received ERDF co-financed investment grants up to the end of 2011 according to the regulation for obtaining support (e.g. the minimum is 5 to 10 new jobs depending on the size of the company). This number is not reported in the 2011-AIRs because for most projects the period of 16 quarters had not elapsed at the time the reports were prepared.

² This information was kindly prepared by the MA for the purpose of this note but it is not published in any official document. A breakdown between new and maintained jobs could not be obtained.

³ The mid-term evaluation (IDA Consult, 2011) estimates that 82% of the reported jobs are maintained ones. Applying this share leads to an estimated number of 487 direct jobs created (e.g. excluding maintained) by end-2011 in the Flemish region. See Annex Table A.

2. Definition, methodology, data reporting and wider use of the indicator

Definition and methodology

The MAs of Belgian programmes each use their own definition of “job creation” and their own methodology for assessing, measuring and aggregating the numbers. In other words, there are as many definitions of the indicator in Belgium as there are MAs. There is no attempt to ensure consistency or comparability of the data between OPs because the information is not aggregated at national level. The lack of coordination and harmonisation in this regard partly reflects the institutional structure of the country where regions have full autonomy over economic development and where policies are designed, implemented and evaluated in a wholly decentralised way. This applies equally to Cohesion policy programmes.

A definition of the “job creation” indicator is available for all programmes but the clarity and completeness varies and in some degree, there is scope for interpretation in each case. Nonetheless, the interviews carried out and the information collected from the three MAs suggest that these to a large extent have trust in the information provided by reporting bodies (e.g. beneficiaries) and believe that the definition is well understood and correctly applied. If needed, MAs offer guidance for assessing and reporting the numbers and this helps to avoid misinterpretation and errors in the reporting of the data.

What follows summarises the main features in this regard for each of the Belgian programmes:

CEP Walloon region, CP Hainaut: Job creation is used as a result indicator in a number of measures of which most are aimed at business and job creation. The indicator is explained in the so called “*vade-mecum of indicators and quantified objectives*” annexed to the two OPs. Jobs created are defined as new direct (gross) jobs expressed in FTE terms resulting from investment projects supported (by grants and FEIs) or services to companies and entrepreneurs. In the RTDI policy area, the indicator covers the number of research jobs in FTE terms created by research projects supported in research centres and companies. In territorial development, it covers the number of FTE jobs ‘directly’ created by the investment projects in start-up buildings and business space as well as by urban regeneration projects. Although in the latter policy area, the jobs created should actually be considered as indirect according to the MA because the interventions focus mainly on investment in physical infrastructure, they are reported as direct jobs in the Annual Implementation Reports (AIRs) and other official documents. Indirect jobs created are not used as indicators to assess outcomes from intervention in the two programmes.

At project start the MA generally meets the beneficiaries to clarify the indicators on which they need to report and methodical issues in this regard (e.g. on conversion of part time jobs into FTE) and to explain the information system for monitoring Structural Fund interventions. The data are consolidated once a year by the MA at measure level, by priority axis and for the programme as a whole (e.g. core indicator).

CEP of Flemish region: All project promoters irrespective of the nature of the project need to report on jobs created. The definition of the indicator is included in the “*information fiche*” beneficiaries need to fill in when they apply for support. It is very broad and covers “the number

of jobs in FTE terms) directly and indirectly created and maintained as a result of ERDF co-financed support” though there is a distinction in the numbers reported between direct jobs and indirect jobs⁴ and so far as possible between jobs for women and jobs for men. Direct jobs created are defined as additional jobs in companies, organisation and institutions as result of the support. Indirect jobs created are additional jobs outside the entity receiving support through the effect on growth of the latter.

Assessment by beneficiaries of the jobs created and/or maintained by the project is carried out twice: at the start of the project they need to give an estimate of the expected outcome and at the end an assessment of the actual outcome including an estimate of the outcome still to be realised in the two or three years after project closure. In practice, the information collected by the MA is not used to assess the outcome of interventions at sub-programme level but it serves only to report on the “EU-prescribed” core indicator “jobs created” by the programme. The definition adopted by the Flemish MA, however, is not the same as that recommended in EU guidance documents so that the numbers are not comparable and should therefore not be used for any aggregation at EU level.

CEP Brussels region: The MA distributes to each beneficiary a guidance note which explains the indicators they need to report depending on the nature of the project. Direct jobs are defined as jobs created to “deliver a project and to make it work”⁵. Jobs created in childcare and training facilities receiving support from the ERDF for physical investment are equally considered as direct jobs. Indirect jobs are defined as “jobs created by beneficiaries of support” and cover mainly the jobs created by microcredit and other FEIs and by business start-ups supported by ERDF co-financing such as through incubators and business centres⁶.

Project promoters need to report annually on the indicator and provide the main characteristics of the people employed (sex, age, educational attainment level, previous occupation, working time, type and duration of contract, etc.). This information is used by the MA to express the number of jobs in FTE terms and to distinguish between permanent and temporary jobs as well as between direct and indirect jobs.

⁴ It is worth noting that it is not clear from the official documents and the interview carried out how project promoters actually quantify indirect job creation or safeguarded jobs. No methodological guidance is available in this regard.

⁵ This definition is unusual because these are generally considered as inputs rather than results or outcomes. (The ERDF User Manual, Version 3 states that jobs should be excluded that are regarded as being inputs to the project such as jobs to set-up or deliver the project, e.g. management/administrative staff, consultancies, or temporary contractors and also the construction jobs that are integral to the delivery of the project (e.g. those involved in remediating a site or constructing premises), even if they last for more than a year’).

⁶ Note in this regard that the definition by the Brussels MA is “diametrically” opposite to the definition used by the Walloon MA.

Content of data

Table 2 – Summary on the content of reported data from Belgian programmes in AIRs

	CEP Walloon region and CP Hainaut	CEP Flemish region	CEP Brussels region
FTE or count?	FTE Guidance provided by MA on conversion of part time into FTE.	FTE Guidance provided by MA on conversion of part time into FTE.	FTE Conversion by the MA on basis of information collected on job characteristics.
Distinction between temporary and permanent?	Yes. Reported numbers in AIRs include permanent jobs only ⁷ .	No. Reported numbers in AIR include both and there is no distinction.	Yes, on basis of information collected on job characteristics. Reported numbers in AIR include permanent jobs only.
Jobs created during the construction stage included in data reported? Distinction with jobs which will remain after end of construction phase?	Not included.	Not included.	Included. No distinction.
Data reported relate to actual outcomes or expected ones. Is the basis of the data reported clear?	Only actual outcomes. Job creations by investment grants are only assessed 16 quarters after project approval and are not included in the data reported in the AIRs ⁸ .	Actual outcomes for finished projects. Expected outcomes for on-going projects.	Only actual outcomes.
Data reported include jobs indirectly created or only jobs created directly?	Data reported include direct jobs mainly (over 95%) ⁹ .	Reported data include both.	Reported data include both. Information available to the MA to distinguish.
Effort/control to avoid double-counting?	Beneficiaries are “sensitized” to the issue. Check of listings of beneficiaries by MA.	No specific effort. No control.	Check of listings of beneficiaries by MA. Double counting not a problem in practice because of the small area of the priority intervention zone of the programme.
Efforts to capture quality of job in the data reported?	Not captured. Assessment in ex post evaluation.	Not captured. Assessment in ex post evaluation.	Not captured as such. Some evidence available from information collected on employee’s characteristics. Because most beneficiaries of microcredits were in precarious situations (bank exclusion, unemployment etc.) before support, their social situation is likely to have improved by the support.

⁷ Jobs created for technical assistance to implement the Wallonia CEP and the Hainaut CP are equally considered as permanent jobs but this might not be entirely inconsistent with the fixed term of the programming period.

⁸ But these are included in Table 1. See also footnote 1.

⁹ The remaining 5% are indirect jobs from territorial development projects which are reported as direct jobs but which according to the MA are actually indirect ones.

	CEP Walloon region and CP Hainaut	CEP Flemish region	CEP Brussels region
Are jobs created distinguished from jobs safeguarded or maintained in the data reported?	Yes. Jobs created and jobs maintained are two separate indicators.	No distinction in data reported. Information available for MA to distinguish.	Maintained/safeguarded jobs are not covered by the data reported.
Distinction between jobs created by the ERDF and by the ESF?	Reported data concern ERDF only.	Reported data concern ERDF only.	Reported data concern ERDF only.

Source: interviews with MAs.

The global number of direct (gross) jobs created¹⁰ in Belgium at end-2011 by interventions using the job creation indicator to measure outcome can be estimated to 7,016 in FTE terms.

Wider use of indicator

As noted above, the federal government in Belgium has no competence over regional policy because the institutional setup of the country gives regions full autonomy over this. There is no interest in aggregating the outcomes of regional development policy at national level and this applies equally to Cohesion policy and – as a consequence - to the job creation indicator. Even for the purpose of strategic reporting to the Commission there is no attempt in Belgium to present any aggregated assessment of outcomes, targets or objectives¹¹.

The indicator of jobs created is commonly used to assess outcomes of policy whether of particular measures such as investment grants in the Walloon region where job creation is a precondition for support or of long term development strategies such as the “Flanders in Action Plan” of the Flemish region or the “Marshall Plan 2.Geen” of the Walloon region.

3. Cost per job created

This section is concerned with the calculation of the unit costs of a job created by different kinds of intervention.

It must be noted at the outset that the reliability of the estimates presented here and the meaningfulness of the exercise are uncertain because important information which affect the unit cost of a job created, such as the capital or labour intensity of the activity supported is not available. Even more, basic information such as the private contribution to the investment carried out could not be obtained for all measures presented here so that the calculations are nothing else than estimates of public costs per job created.

With these limitations in mind, the focus in this section is on the most representative initiatives using the job indicator to measure outcomes in terms of the situation at end-2011 and the -

¹⁰ By excluding indirect and maintained jobs from the figures for the Flemish CEP and indirect and construction jobs from the figures reported for the Brussels CEP. See Annex Table A.

¹¹ The strategic report for 2012 is illustrative in this regard. For most Member States this report is a single document. The Belgian strategic report counts no less than 20 separate documents. As well as reflecting the institutional complexity of the country, the lack of any integration in this regard indicates that the authorities concerned wish to “keep things separate”.

targets set to be achieved by 2015. These are investment grants to companies in the Walloon region and in Hainaut and micro credits in the Brussels region.

Investment grants

ERDF co-financed grants for investment in companies are supported by the Hainaut CP and the Walloon region CEP. The aid rate depends on:

1. the size of the company applying;
2. the number of jobs created by the investment;
3. whether or not the investment
 - contributes to poles of competitiveness;
 - is located in specific urban areas;
 - supports a spin-off or a spin out;
 - is particularly innovative;
 - supports eco-innovation and energy efficiency.

The maximum aid rate is 32.3% of the investment by small companies and in large companies it is 30% of the investment carried out under the Convergence Objective and 15% under the Competitiveness and Employment Objective. Total aid per job created is limited to EUR 75 thousand.

Table 3 – Investment grants - cost per job created

	CP Hainaut	CEP Walloon region
jobs created by finished projects	1,194	269
ERDF support/job (EUR thousand)	15	16
total public support/job (EUR thousand)	44	46

Source: calculations based on information from the Walloon MAs

Note: See Annex Table 1 for a more complete version which equally indicates the total cost.

Overall, by April 2013 there were 36 completed projects in Hainaut and 10 in the other part of the Walloon region for which data on the actual number of jobs created have been collected by the MA. The public cost of a job created was on average EUR 44 thousand in Hainaut and EUR 46 thousand in the other parts of the Walloon region, of which 35% came from the ERDF (Table 3). These averages need to be interpreted with much care because they hide significant variations. In reality the public cost per job created varied between EUR 6 thousand and EUR 90 thousand in Hainaut and between EUR 12 thousand and EUR 83 thousand in the rest of the Walloon region¹².

Financial engineering instruments

In the Brussels region, nearly 90% of the jobs created reported came from the so called Brusoc measure. It provides finance to small businesses and people who have difficulty in obtaining a bank loan or the necessary funding from other sources to become self-employed or to initiate a social economy project in the Priority Intervention Zone (PIZ). Depending on the type of business or project, support takes the form of micro-credit, seed capital or cash credit. By end-2012, a total of EUR 4.3 million was disbursed in the form of loans and another EUR 0.8 million in the form of micro credits. These created respectively 406 and 108 jobs. The public cost per

¹² See for more details Annex Table B which equally indicates total costs (public and private) per job created.

job created was therefore EUR 10 thousand and it was exclusively supported by the ERDF (Table 4). According to the Brussels MA the estimate should also take account of the failure rate of the projects supported which by experience is around one out of four but this element is not included.

Table 4 – Financial engineering instruments – cost per job created

	risk capital fund		micro and cash credits
	CP Hainaut	CEP Walloon region	CEP Brussels region
jobs created by finished projects	492	327	514
ERDF support/job (EUR thousand)	39	27	10
total public support/job (EUR thousand)	97	67	10

Source: calculations based on information from the Walloon MAs.

The ERDF co-financed risk capital funds in Hainaut and in the other parts of the Walloon region finance subordinated loans as well as both, unsecured and secured loans to support:

1. investment undertaken by SMEs;
2. SMEs developing projects to protect the environment;
3. R&D and innovation carried out by SMEs.

At end-2011, EUR 47.8 million had reached beneficiaries in Hainaut and EUR 21.8 million in other parts of the Walloon region and helped to create 492 jobs in the former and 327 in the latter. The estimated public cost of a job created was therefore around EUR 97 thousand in Hainaut and EUR 67 thousand in the rest of Wallonia. It should be emphasised again that these are extremely rough estimates which need to be interpreted with a lot of caution. They should not be used for any comparison. As well as the limitations mentioned earlier (e.g. unknown capital/labour intensity of the activity), no distinction could be made in the calculations between the three kinds of support listed above and no consideration is given to the revolving nature of the funding which affects the public cost per job created.

4. The indicator of job creation in evaluations and AIRs

No attempts have been made to estimate net (rather than gross) job creations in evaluations of Belgian programmes or projects co-financed by the ERDF. Further to the technical complexities and the data requirements (e.g. firm level database linking beneficiary companies to sources of information on firm characteristics), assumptions would need to be made for the displacement rates and the multiplier effects because these are not measurable as such. Given that the programmes carried out in Belgium are relatively small in terms of both the funding they receive and the areas they cover, estimates of net employment effects will most likely never be carried out. MAs consider these as “killing a fly with a hammer”. But so far, there has been no attempt either to assess the (technically less demanding) impacts of ERDF co-financed initiatives (e.g. support to companies for investment or to carry out R&D) on job creation against the counterfactual of no EU funding¹³. This was mentioned by Walloon MA to be the subject of the planned ex post evaluations of CEP and CP.

¹³ Though this kind of investigation is not unusual for national policy initiatives (see for instance Dirk Czarnitzki and Cindy Lopes Bento, (2012), “Value for money? New micro-econometric evidence on public R&D grants in Flanders”, a report to the Agency for Innovation by Science and Technology).

There are two main problems with the number of jobs created as reported in the AIRs. The first is that in some AIRs the information is partial. There are a number of initiatives that surely do create jobs but they are not reported because the outcomes are measured by other indicators which presumably better reflect the purpose of the intervention. Accordingly, in current circumstances, the reported number of (gross) jobs created up to the end of 2011 for these are likely to be a lower bound rather than an over-estimate. The issue here is not a lack of reliability of the information reported but the questionable meaningfulness of attempting to infer from the result indicators of some measures the jobs created by the programme as a whole.

A second problem seen in one of the AIRs is that the job creation indicator is a global measure covering directly created and maintained jobs and those indirectly created. If information is available to distinguish between directly and indirectly created jobs and maintained ones, it is neither mentioned in the AIR nor used to disaggregate the global measure. If it were available, there would still be a question mark over the reliability of the numbers reported by project promoters. As noted above, it could not be clarified how these actually assess the number of jobs maintained from carrying out the project or the number of indirect jobs created.

5. Looking forward to the 2014-2020 programming period

The interviews carried out suggest that MAs are aware of the proposed common indicators for 2014-2020 and their definitions, which were discussed and presented at Evaluation Network Meetings attended by all MAs. They intend to follow the recommendations from the Commission where appropriate and do not anticipate particular problems in applying the definition at least at this stage where the main focus for them is on the preparation of the programmes. This however does not imply that MAs are fully convinced of the framework proposed and, in particular, point to the following issues:

- The indicators need to be defined more carefully so to limit the scope for “interpretation” if the purpose is to aggregate them to assess overall outcomes of the policy at EU level. In the current definition of indicator 8, there is too much room for interpretation.
- The information system put in place to centralise at EU level the information on indicators from Member States needs to be improved and made more user-friendly because at present it is itself source of data misreporting.
- The timing of collecting the data for the job creation indicator is inappropriate for measuring the full outcomes of the expenditure carried out because “lagged” outcomes or effects are not captured at the end of the project, which is the proposed time for reporting the data.

6. Further remarks

Under the current regulation Member States are free to report or not on the core indicators and to apply or not the recommended definitions. This makes it more than problematic to use the information in the monitoring system to assess Cohesion policy achievements because the figures are generally neither comparable nor complete. The (gross) job creation indicator in this

regard is not an exception and its interpretation is difficult for two main reasons. First, it is not clear what the indicator actually covers and second, it gives only a partial picture of the employment effects of the programme.

As job creation is high on the political agenda nowadays, the expectations from the Structural Funds in this regard might be changing. The question here is not so much of whether or not the main objective pursued with the Funds is still appropriate (e.g. structural adjustments with possible job losses at least in the short run) but of the accountability of policy outcomes. If the aim in the next programming period is to improve the information and the system in place to collect the indicators from the Member States there is a need for very (!) clear definitions¹⁴ and precise rules for reporting the data. If, furthermore, the aim is to use the indicators for assessing aggregate achievements, the use of the indicators should not be optional. This would call for even greater care in framing definitions and rules.

¹⁴ In the current proposal the common core indicator 8 is ambiguous. (The definition refers to SME's. Is it the European definition of SME's or the national definitions that should be applied? Why does the indicator concern SME's only? Does this mean that companies other than SMEs should be ruled out? etc.)

References

Evaluations and studies

SEE, Comase (2010), Analyse de la plus-value générée par les portefeuilles de projets et projets uniques dans le cadre des Programmes Opérationnels FEDER 2007-2013 Convergence, Compétitivité régionale et emploi - Part 1, Evaluation carried out for the Public Service of the Walloon region, DG de l'Animation et de l'Evaluation des Programmes du Département de la Coordination des Fonds structurels.

SEE, Comase (2011), Evaluation des résultats des actions co-financées par le FEDER 2007-2013 en matière de stimulation de l'entrepreneuriat, de la création, de développement et de transmission d'entreprises dans le cadre des programmes opérationnels "Convergence" et "Compétitivité régionale et emploi" - Part 1, Part 1, Evaluation carried out for the Public Service of the Walloon region, DG de l'Animation et de l'Evaluation des Programmes du Département de la Coordination des Fonds structurels.

SEE, Comase (2012), Evaluation des résultats des actions co-financées par le FEDER 2007-2013 en matière de stimulation de l'entrepreneuriat, de création, de développement et de transmission d'entreprises dans le cadre des Programmes Opérationnels "Convergence" et "Compétitivité régionale et emploi" – Final report.

IDEA Consult (2011), "Tussentijdse evaluatie van het Doelstelling 2-programma 'Regionaal concurrentievermogen en werkgelegenheid 2007-2013" report on behalf of Agentschap Ondernemen Afdeling Europa Economie.

IDEA Consult (2011), Evaluation à mi-parcours du programme opérationnel Compétitivité régionale et emploi de la Région de Bruxelles-Capitale intitulé "Objectif 2013: Investissons ensemble dans le développement urbain" report on behalf of the Ministère de la Région de Bruxelles-Capitale, Cellule de Coordination et Gestion du FEDER 2007-2013.

Dirk Czarnitzki and Cindy Lopes Bento (2012) "Value for money? New micro-econometric evidence on public R&D grants in Flanders", a report to IWT.

Rapport Stratégique National de la Belgique (2012).

Official planning and evaluation documents

Programme opérationnel "Convergence Hainaut", Intervention FEDER 2007-2013, (2011).

Complément de programmation, "Convergence Hainaut", Intervention FEDER 2007-2013, (2007).

Rapport annuel d'exécution, Programme opérationnel "Convergence Hainaut", Intervention FEDER 2007-2013, (2008), (2009), (2010), (2011).

Programme opérationnel "Compétitivité régionale et emploi Wallonie", Intervention FEDER 2007-2013, (2007).

Complément de programmation, "Compétitivité régionale et emploi Wallonie", Intervention FEDER 2007-2013, (2007).

Rapport annuel d'exécution, Programme opérationnel "Compétitivité régionale et emploi Wallonie", Intervention FEDER 2007-2013, (2008), (2009), (2010), (2011).

Programme opérationnel "Compétitivité régionale et emploi Bruxelles Capitale", Intervention FEDER 2007-2013, (2007).

Rapport annuel d'exécution, Programme opérationnel "Compétitivité régionale et emploi Bruxelles Capitale", Intervention FEDER 2007-2013, (2008), (2009), (2010), (2011).

Operationeel Programma, Doelstelling « Regionaal Concurrentievermogen en Werkgelegenheid Vlaanderen », EFRO 2007-2013, (2007).

Jaarverslag, Operationeel Programma, Doelstelling « Regionaal Concurrentievermogen en Werkgelegenheid Vlaanderen », EFRO 2007-2013, (2008), (2009), (2010), (2011).

Interviews

The authors are most grateful for information from:

- Borm Sylvie, Director i. a. of Département de la Coordination des Fonds structurels, Secrétariat general, Service Public de Wallonie;
- Borremans Wouter, Deputy director of Agentschap Ondernemen Afdeling Europa – EFRO;
- De Frenne Marc, Directeur of Agentschap Ondernemen Afdeling Europa – EFRO;
- Dussart Corentin, Coordinator of Cellule de Coordination et de Gestion du FEDER 2007-2013 Ministère de la Région de Bruxelles-Capitale;
- Jelas Sandra, Attachée at Département de la Coordination des Fonds structurels, Secrétariat general, Service Public de Wallonie;
- Nayani Uzma, Cellule de Coordination et de Gestion du FEDER 2007-2013 Ministère de la Région de Bruxelles-Capitale.

Annex

Annex Table A – The use of job creations as indicator in Belgian programmes – AIRs, Core indicator and adjustments

	Total number of jobs created reported in the 2011-AIRs (including non-core indicator jobs if any)	Do the data under A and B include			Adjusted figures of gross jobs created in FTE terms (i.e. excluding indirect, safeguarded and construction jobs)	Comment (on differences between A and B)
		indirect jobs	safe-guarded jobs	construction jobs		
	A	(Y/N)	(Y/N)	(Y/N)		
Programme opérationnel 'Convergence' Hainaut - FEDER (2007BE161P0001)	2,174	N	N	N	4,868	B=A+ jobs by investment grants (reported after a period of 16 quarters after project approval which is not elapsed in most cases) but which effectively have been created by end-2011
Programme opérationnel 'Compétitivité régionale et emploi' de la Région de Bruxelles-Capitale - FEDER (2007BE162P0001)	722	Y	N	Y	306	A includes indirect and construction jobs. Adjustment on the basis of information contained in the AIR.
EFRO Operationele Programma 'Regionaal concurrentievermogen en Werkgelegenheid' van Vlaanderen (2007BE162P0002)	11,184	Y	Y	N	487	A is direct and indirect created and maintained jobs. F gives an estimate of direct gross jobs created (e.g. excluding indirect and maintained jobs). According to the MA direct created and maintained jobs at end 2011 were 2,777. The mid-term evaluation (IDA, 2011) estimates that around 82% of the figures reported are maintained jobs. Applying this adjustment leads to an estimated number of 487 direct gross job creations.
Programme opérationnel 'Compétitivité régionale et emploi' - Wallonie (hors Hainaut) - FEDER (2007BE162P0003)	1,094	N	N	N	1,355	B=A+ jobs by investment grants (reported after a period of 16 quarters after project approval which is not elapsed in most cases) but which effectively have been created by end-2011
Total Belgium	15,174				7,016	Note: the figures under B are adjustments to the numbers in the AIRs (by excluding in A indirect, safeguarded and construction jobs) but in no way estimates of employment effects.

Annex Table B – Cost per jobs created from investment grants

investment grants to companies: CP Hainaut	total	average	median	min	max
jobs created	1,194	33	18	7	295
investment supported (EUR thousand)	206,137	5,726	4,000	405	49,000
ERDF (EUR thousand)	18,328	509	285	46	5,145
public national (EUR thousand)	34,037	945	530	85	9,555
private (EUR thousand)	153,772	4,271	3,110	274	34,300
number of finished projects	36				
cost/job (EUR thousand)	173			19	444
ERDF support/job (EUR thousand)	15			2	31
public support/job (EUR thousand)	44			6	90
investment grants to companies: CEP Walloon region	total	average	median	min	max
jobs created	269	27	16	3	73
investment supported (EUR thousand)	80,064	8,006	3,042	300	30,107
ERDF (EUR thousand)	4,340	434	165	26	1,618
public national (EUR thousand)	8,060	806	306	47	3,004
private (EUR thousand)	67,663	6,766	2,572	204	25,485
number of finished projects	10				
cost/job (EUR thousand)	297			51	540
ERDF support/job (EUR thousand)	16			4	29
public support/job (EUR thousand)	46			12	83

Source: calculations based on information from the Walloon MA.