



**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**

France

Version: Final

**Prof. Michel Lacave
Technopolis - ITD**

**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 | 7 |
| Wider use of indicator..... | 8 |
| 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 |
| Interview..... | 15 |
| Annex..... | 16 |

List of abbreviations

- AIR Annual Implementation Report
- C&E Competitiveness & Employment
- CPER Contrat de Projets Etat-Région
- CRUSE Single Regional Committees for Monitoring and Evaluation
- DATAR Délégation interministérielle à l'aménagement du territoire et à l'attractivité régionale
- FTE Full-time Equivalent
- IEDOM Institut d'émission des départements d'Outre-mer
- ISEE Institut national de la statistique et des études économiques
- MA Managing Authority
- OP Operational Programme
- PACA Region Provence-Alpes-Côte-d'Azur

Executive summary

Jobs created is most widely used as an indicator of outcomes in “Enterprise support” which is the policy area which is largest in terms of both expenditure and the number of jobs created by ERDF programmes. The ‘general’ indicator of jobs created is accompanied by research jobs created in a third of regions and in some cases by the number of jobs resulting from collaborative R&D projects, direct aid to investment in SMEs or financial engineering.

The *Délégation interministérielle à l'aménagement du territoire et à l'attractivité régionale* (DATAR) has published guidelines providing definitions and indicating how the data should be collected and aggregated (latest version 6th April 2011). Only a few regions, however, explain in detail the method used to calculate the indicators. Even the wording of the definition of the indicators jobs is not harmonised between the regions. In general, there is a lack of homogeneity resulting in a poor ‘readability’ of the ‘indicators and insufficient comparability between regions.

DATAR has aggregated the data collected across ERDF Operational Programmes (OPs) for 2007-13 and calculated in 2012 national figures for jobs created as at 31 August 2012, the total being 32,799. Our rough estimate, that around 28,500 jobs were created by the end of 2011, is consistent with this figure.

The cost per job is difficult to estimate due to the highly variable reliability of the data collected. However, for “Enterprise support”, it can be estimated at about EUR 90,000.

One of the main difficulties with the indicator of jobs created concerns the definition of ‘permanent jobs’.

The efforts made to improve the reliability of data have been largely concentrated on calculation and data collection’, but less attention has been paid to checking the declarations made by beneficiaries, which are the main data source, though Managing Authorities (MAs) are aware of the problem. Some regions (i.e. Rhône-Alpes and Languedoc-Roussillon) have started to carry out studies aimed at improving the methods of data collection and assessing the impact of the ERDF (and of the *Contrat de Projets Etat-Région* (CPER) on jobs, in particular through the use of counter-factual analysis and econometric modelling.

DATAR has already circulated information on the common indicators for the 2014-2020 period to all MAs. From the survey carried out of 8 regions, it appears that the degree of familiarity with the new definitions is still variable.

It is questionable whether a general indicator of jobs created in Competitiveness & Employment (C&E) regions where ERDF support is small is useful or appropriate. A focus on the most relevant indicators for “Enterprise support” might be better, an opinion shared by a number of MAs. These regard the job creation indicator as being important, especially in the present crisis where any job created or maintained is of interest, but at the same time they stress that many ERDF co-financed projects create (or maintains) few direct jobs in the short term and that the impact is mainly in the longer-term through economic development.

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

Practically all French regions use (i.e. give figures for) the jobs created as an indicator of outcomes in the “Enterprise support” policy area. A large majority use it in “Territorial Development” and, to a slightly lesser extent in “Environment & Energy”. Some regions (such as Bourgogne, Corse, Ile de France, Limousin, Midi-Pyrénées, Poitou-Charentes, and, among the Convergence regions, Guadeloupe) give detailed figures referring to specific measures, mainly in “Enterprise support” (rarely in the other policy areas): e.g. for the number of jobs which result from collaborative (business-) R&D projects¹, direct aid to investment in SMEs², or financial engineering³. The outcomes in the two other policy areas “Transport” and “Human Resources” are more rarely measured by the number of jobs created.

In the C&E regions, the policy area “Enterprise support” is by far the most important in terms of planned and actual ERDF expenditure. “Enterprise support” is also the policy area in which the targets set for job creation and the outcomes are by far the most important. While “Environment & Energy” comes second in terms of the share of ERDF planned and actual expenditure, “Territorial Development” comes second as regards job creation (followed far behind by “Environment & Energy”). There are therefore fewer jobs created and expected to be created in “Environment & energy” in relation to the scale of funding than in the other two areas.

In the Convergence regions, “Territorial Development” is the most important in terms of planned ERDF expenditure. Job creation, however, as in the C&E regions, is concentrated in “Enterprise support”.

¹ Alsace (only as a target, not documented in the AIR 2011), Franche-Comté, Ile-de-France, Limousin, Nord-Pas-de-Calais, Poitou-Charentes. Collaborative R&D projects are mainly related to support to *‘pôles de compétitivité’*.

² Alsace (only as a target, not documented in the AIR 2011), Bourgogne, Languedoc-Roussillon, PACA.

³ Auvergne, Guadeloupe, Nord-Pas-de-Calais.

Table 1 - Jobs and expenditure per policy area**a) C&E Regions**

| | 1. Enterprise support | 2. Human resources | 3. Transport | 4. Environment and energy | 5. Territorial development |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Jobs created: targets | 52,362 | 0 | 1,620 | 2,180 | 6,659 |
| Jobs created: outcomes | 26,129 | 0 | 39 | 446 | 1,209 |
| ERDF Expenditure planned (EUR million) | 2,928.3 | 48.5 | 484.0 | 1,142.5 | 673.9 |
| ERDF Expenditure planned as a % of total ERDF expenditure planned* | 69.7 | 1.2 | 11.5 | 27.2 | 16.0 |
| ERDF Expenditure paid (EUR million) | 571.9 | 7.2 | 118.4 | 221.3 | 118.7 |
| ERDF Expenditure paid as a % of total ERDF expenditure paid* | 39.4 | 5.0 | 8.2 | 15.3 | 8.2 |

b) Convergence Regions

| | 1. Enterprise support | 2. Human resources | 3. Transport | 4. Environment and energy | 5. Territorial development |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Jobs created: targets | 10,120 | 0 | 2,000 | 0 | 330 |
| Jobs created: outcomes | 678 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ERDF Expenditure planned (EUR million) | 350.9 | 1.4 | 368.3 | 424.2 | 843.7 |
| ERDF Expenditure planned as a % of total ERDF expenditure planned* | 22.2 | 0.1 | 23.3 | 26.9 | 53.5 |
| ERDF Expenditure paid (EUR million) | 87.3 | 53.6 | 111.5 | 143.5 | 126.6 |
| ERDF Expenditure paid as a % of total ERDF expenditure paid* | 17.7 | 10.9 | 22.6 | 29.0 | 25.6 |

Note: * as of 1st January 2012, the total of ERDF expenditure planned was EUR 4,203 million for C&E regions and EUR 1,578 million for Convergence regions, while the total of ERDF paid was EUR 1,451 million for C&E regions and EUR 494 million for Convergence regions (Source: DATAR, *Etat d'avancement financier*).

The tables above have been prepared on the basis of the data provided by the 2011 Annual Implementation Reports (AIRs) and the OPs, and the coherence of the data, in particular ERDF-supported outcomes, has been checked with the DATAR *Etat d'avancement au 1er janvier 2012*⁴. However, some points need to be emphasised concerning the reliability of the data: job creation targets are not always presented clearly and there is some uncertainty over the definition of the indicators and the reliability of the information. As indicated in the previous reports for France, it is often difficult to have clear figures regarding expenditure and to make a clear-cut distinction between committed and actual expenditure; indicators are distinguished by priority axis and not policy area and it is not always possible to reconstitute expenditure (planned or actual) by policy area, because of a lack of detailed data on fields of intervention. The priority axes are therefore used to approximate policy areas, though certain areas span a number of axes, such as ICT which is included in "Accessibility" (grouping Transport and ICT) and in

⁴ www.europe-en-france.gouv.fr/Des-programmes-pour-qui-pour-quoi/Avancement-des-programmes/Moteur-de-recherche-sur-l-avancement-des-programmes/2012/Les-etats-d-avancement-2007-2013-situation-au-1er-janvier-2012.

“Territorial Development”. Accordingly, the sum of the percentages for the different policy areas as regards planned and actual ERDF expenditure exceeds 100%.

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

Definition and methodology

DATAR has published guidelines providing definitions and indicating how the data should be collected and aggregated: “*Guide de renseignement des indicateurs nationaux 2007-2013*” both for the ERDF OPs and for the CPERs. The latest updated version is dated 6th April 2011⁵. This Guide addresses the issue of the national indicators ‘jobs’, i.e. gross direct additional jobs created (in Full-time Equivalent (FTE) terms): total, men, women (indicators EU 1, 2 and 3). A distinction is made between what is expected and what is effectively realised. Data come from beneficiaries and are collected by the MAs.

The definition is given as follows: “new additional jobs created within the beneficiary organisation (enterprise, non-profit organisation, local authority, etc.) 3 years after the closure of the project, resulting from the implementation of the project supported and which would have not been created if there had been no subsidy”. This definition is applied by all MAs.

The use of the national ‘transversal’ indicator “Gross direct additional jobs created (FTE)” is general (EU 1, 2 and 3), but this indicator is used sometimes as addressing the overall OP, and sometimes as addressing specific priority axes, and, of course, in particular the priority axis/axes relating to innovation and competitiveness – which corresponds to the “Enterprise support” policy area.

The ‘general’ job creation indicator is accompanied by a more specific one, namely the number of researcher jobs created (with sometimes a distinction made between jobs created in the public and the private sector, and the level of researchers – confirmed, PhD, postdocs), in approximately a third of the regions⁶.

Only a very few regions give specific details on the method used for calculating the indicators. Franche-Comté is one of the main exceptions. There seem to be in a few cases uncertainties concerning the use of the ‘job creation’ indicator as an impact indicator or an outcome indicator.

It also appears that even the ‘wording’ describing the indicators relating to jobs is not necessarily harmonised between the regions (see Annex Table A).

Until recently, there had been little control over the consistency of the ‘practical’ definition of the job indicator by the MAs. However, DATAR ordered in 2012 a study on the future steering, monitoring and evaluation system of the Partnership Agreement and of the 2014-2020 OPs,

⁵ http://www.datar.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/110406_guide_indicateurs_po-cper_v_modifiee.pdf

⁶ Bourgogne, Franche-Comté, Haute-Normandie, Ile-de-France, Languedoc-Roussillon, Nord-Pas-de-Calais, Pays de la Loire, Poitou-Charentes, PACA.

which has been made available by February 2013⁷. This study aims at optimising the ERDF OP indicators and the traceability of beneficiary (including indirect ones).

On the other hand, it must be noted that there is a mounting concern among the MAs over what is defined as a 'permanent' job. MAs systematically emphasise their difficulties in this regard (e.g.: Centre, Haute-Normandie, Languedoc-Roussillon, Picardie, etc.). This reflects the official position of DATAR at national level, as expressed in various meetings with MAs, which is that distinguishing permanent jobs from others does not make sense, since the concept of a 'permanent' job has become a little outdated due to the growth of fixed-term contracts of employment. DATAR declares that it is mainly interested in the total number of jobs created by the projects – whether 'permanent' or 'temporary' – which is in line with the multi-annual nature of projects. We consider this position rather sound.

MAs more and more exchange views on this issue and on the difficulties they face (e.g.: the exchange between Regions Centre and Aquitaine which has been transmitted to us). For instance, the MA in the Centre region has raised a question over the definition of the indicator for the 'number of research jobs created' (EU6): in general, in the private sector, research jobs are created for the duration of the project and are not 'permanent'; in the public sector, the issue is even more 'tricky' with the hiring of PhD students or post-docs.

Content of data

17 regions out of 26 use an indicator of job creation defined explicitly in FTE terms, in general referred to as 'gross creation of jobs' or 'gross direct additional jobs created'. With respect to other job creation indicators, it is not always specified that the jobs created are FTE; however, the survey carried out shows that in principle all MAs measure jobs in this way.

No region makes a distinction between 'temporary' and 'permanent' jobs as underlined above. However, two regions only specify in their 2011 AIR at which stage of a project the number of 'permanent' jobs should be documented: Region Provence-Alpes-Côte-d'Azur (PACA) (5 years after the start of the project); Ile-de-France for research and technician jobs (at the closure of the project and 3 years after).

We have found no indication that the jobs created during the construction phase of a project are reported. Jobs created during the implementation of projects are reported, provided that they can be considered as 'permanent', bearing in mind the limitations of the term'.

Some 12 regions make a distinction between expected or planned jobs and actual jobs.

Seven regions use an indicator for the creation of indirect jobs⁸. Bourgogne has made a specific effort to extend the estimation of indirect jobs created to various measures in addition to the creation of business and industrial parks to which it was initially confined.

Problems of double-counting are rarely mentioned explicitly. The Franche-Comté region seems to have taken measures for avoiding double-counting in respect of its indicator of the "of jobs

⁷ « Etude préparatoire à la définition du dispositif de suivi/évaluation/pilotage de l'Accord de Partenariat – dans une approche interfonds – et des PO FEDER post 2013» (<http://www.europe-en-france.gouv.fr/Centre-de-ressources/Etudes-rapports-et-documentation/Etude-de-Prefiguration-du-dispositif-de-pilotage-suivi-et-evaluation-de-l-Accord-de-Partenariat-et-des-programmes-2014-2020/%28language%29/fre-FR>).

⁸ Bourgogne, Haute-Normandie, Limousin, Martinique, Midi-Pyrénées, PACA, Rhône-Alpes.

‘threatened or maintained’. The risk of double-counting was explicitly highlighted by the MAs of two regions (through the survey carried out for the present report), Haute-Normandie and Guyane (the latter because of some overlapping with ‘regional’ indicators relating to crafts, commerce and tourism).

A few regions specify the level of qualification associated with the jobs created (Corse, Guadeloupe, Ile-de-France and Martinique). As already indicated, six regions use a specific indicator for research job creation, which gives information on the type of job, if not directly on the level of qualification. A distinction is often made between men and women, but is rarely documented as such.

Six regions refer to jobs maintained as a result of their OPs: some of them make a clear distinction between jobs created and jobs maintained⁹, while others indicate ‘jobs created or maintained’¹⁰.

No mention is made of the ESF in the 2011 AIRs. The survey that we carried out in 8 regions shows that no link is made with jobs created by the ESF.

Globally, there is a lack of homogeneity in definitions and what is reported which has two major consequences:

- The ‘readability’ of the ‘job creation’ indicator is relatively poor.
- Comparability between regions is difficult.

Wider use of indicator

DATAR aggregates the data collected across ERDF OPs and calculated in 2012 national figures for jobs created as of 31 August 2012 (*Rapport stratégique 2012*, pp. 57-8) according to the definition given in the “*Guide des indicateurs nationaux*” used by the MAs.

Table 2 - EU indicators resulting from the aggregation calculated by DATAR

| EU Key indicators | Cumulated figures as of 31/08/2012 | Estimated level of reliability (%) | Target 2007-2015 |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|
| Total number of jobs created | 32,799 | 85.0 | 73,495 |
| Additional direct jobs created (FTE) women | 2,925 | 50.1 | 6,964 |
| Additional direct jobs created (FTE) men | 4,739 | 51.3 | 7,201 |
| Number of new researchers (job creation) | 881 | 62.0 | 6,341 |

The reliability of the indicators is estimated by DATAR by calculating the ratio between the total number of projects and the number of projects for which job creation has been calculated by MAs.

A thorough work was started in 2012 under DATAR to improve the use of quantitative indicators of ERDF OPs and the quality of data collection with the objective of providing the Commission with reliable information on the results of programmes. An analysis has been carried out in order to assess as exhaustively as possible the level of use and the degree of

⁹ Franche-Comté, Midi-Pyrénées, Nord-Pas-de-Calais.

¹⁰ Guadeloupe, Lorraine, Martinique.

quality of the various indicators (EU, national, regional), including those relating to employment.

DATAR nevertheless considers that, in the 2011 AIRs, the reliability of information remains highly variable among the different regions: while the indicators directly calculated in the PRESAGE database from the data relating to projects and their beneficiaries do not raise problems in general, the indicators which are provided by project managers (such as “number of jobs created”, “number of supported start-ups”) often have a lower degree of reliability. The reason lies in the fact that the data come from the beneficiaries themselves which communicate to the MAs the number of jobs actually created or ‘reasonably’ expected within 3 years after the closure of the project¹¹; nobody can be sure that such data are realistic or calculated with total objectivity.

The careful review of 2011 AIRs undertaken confirms such doubts. The MAs use the same indicators for the CPER¹². The survey carried out in 8 regions shows that the ‘job indicator’ is generally used in information meetings on the progress made by OPs and by the CPER and in meetings of ‘Single Regional Committees for Monitoring and Evaluation’ (CRUSE¹³). In Convergence Regions such as Guyane, the ‘job indicator’ is also used in statistical reports (INSEE¹⁴, IEDOM¹⁵).

3. Cost per job created

For the reasons given above in §1, the estimation of the cost per job is, in most cases, highly approximate and has to be considered very cautiously.

Table 3 - Total jobs and total expenditure

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Total jobs created: targets | 76,406 |
| Total jobs created: outcomes | 28,566 |
| Total expenditure: planned (EUR) | 15,180,425,585 |
| Total expenditure: paid (EUR) | 6,139,407,375 |
| Total cost per job (EUR) | 214,665 |
| 1. Enterprise support (EUR) | 106,000 |
| 2. Human resources (EUR) | N/A |
| 3. Transport (EUR) | 2,933,000 |
| 4. Environment and energy (EUR) | 1,280,900 |
| 5. Territorial development (EUR) | 270,500 |

¹¹ *Guide des indicateurs nationaux 2007-2013*, p.7.

¹² *Circulaire du Premier Ministre du 4 mai 2007 (n. 5215/SG), Evaluation des Contrats de Projets et des Programmes européens.*

¹³ *Comités régionaux uniques de suivi et d'évaluation.*

¹⁴ *Institut national de la statistique et des études économiques.*

¹⁵ *Institut d'émission des départements d'Outre-mer.*

Table 4 - Cost per job created on the basis of total expenditure paid (EUR)

| | 1. Enterprise support | 2. Human resources | 3. Transport | 4. Environment and energy | 5. Territorial development |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Alsace | 938,000 | | | 480,700 | 344,950 |
| Aquitaine | 102,800 | | | 430,300 | 624,000 |
| Auvergne | 442,600 | | 4,422,200 | 6,900,000 | |
| Basse-Normandie | | | | | |
| Bourgogne | 18,600 | | | | 8,746,000 |
| Bretagne | | | | | |
| Centre | | | | | |
| Champagne-Ardenne | 108,400 | | | 1,910,500 | 2,472,200 |
| Corse | 104,700 | | | | 3,436,700 |
| Franche-Comté | 524,800 | | | 6,249,400 | 905,200 |
| Haute-Normandie | 969,900 | | | 4,752,700 | |
| Île-de-France | 46,000 | | | 1,820,000 | 71,000 |
| Languedoc-Roussillon | 249,000 | | | 2,057,750 | 216,000 |
| Limousin | 262,700 | | | 11,700,000 | |
| Lorraine | 75,700 | | | | |
| Midi-Pyrénées | 145,600 | | | | 595,000 |
| Nord-Pas-de-Calais | 3,303,700 | | | | |
| Pays de la Loire | 65,600 | | | | 75,300 |
| Picardie | | | | | |
| Poitou-Charentes | 395,800 | | | | |
| Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur | 2,956,500 | | | | 288,000 |
| Rhône-Alpes | 716,400 | | 2,486,700 | 2,433,000 | 948,000 |
| <i>Guadeloupe</i> | <i>352,000</i> | | | | |
| <i>Guyane</i> | | | | | |
| <i>La Réunion</i> | <i>61,600</i> | | | | |
| <i>Martinique</i> | <i>346,000</i> | | | | |

Source: 2011 AIRs.

The least unreliable estimate is likely to be for the cost per job in “Enterprise support” since this policy area contains the largest amount of data.

As already indicated, some regions have carried out specific studies on the impact of ERDF (and CPER) on jobs or paid a particular attention to the issue in their mid-term evaluations.

The study carried out by Languedoc-Roussillon (*Evaluation de l'impact du PO FEDER et du CPER 2007-2013 sur l'emploi en Languedoc-Roussillon*) in 2012 shows a figure of EUR 91,000 per job created¹⁶ (for infrastructure projects, the figure is lower: EUR 41,000 per job, which suggests that jobs created in construction are included). This figure is close to that in the National Recovery Plan adopted after the 2009 crisis.

As it can be seen, our own calculations, resulting from the 2011 AIRs, lead to a higher cost per job, at least for the “Enterprise support” policy area, of about EUR 106,000 per job.

The mid-term evaluation of ERDF OP Poitou-Charentes indicates EUR 190,000 per job for R&D in public laboratories, EUR 153,000 per job for projects to support co-operation between

¹⁶ 10.9 jobs for EUR 1 million.

businesses, research laboratories and technology transfer organisations and about EUR 24,000 per job for support for the creation and development of businesses. The cost per job is significantly higher for Axis 2 Environment, as would be expected. According to the Poitou-Charentes MA, the calculations are somewhat uncertain since the data come from the beneficiaries and are of highly variable reliability, for the reasons mentioned above.

4. The indicator of job creation in evaluations and AIRs

There are no indicators of net jobs created in the OPs or the 2011 AIRs. Some regions, however, have started to carry out studies aimed at improving the methods of data collection and of assessing of the impact of ERDF (and CPER) on jobs, such as Rhône-Alpes and Languedoc-Roussillon, in particular through the use of counter-factual analysis and econometric modelling.

The Rhône-Alpes study was aimed, among other things, at measuring the difference between the situation of supported enterprises, on one hand, and that of non-beneficiary enterprises, on the other, over the period 2007-2011, though the report and results are not yet available. It is thus impossible to have an opinion on this study.

The Languedoc-Roussillon study, referred to above, combined surveys carried out by questionnaires, case studies and a counterfactual evaluation. The last was used for assessing the outcomes and impacts of measures supporting business and industrial parks, direct aid to investment of SMEs, and collective measures¹⁷. The study was 'experimental' and its authors emphasise the 'variable reliability' of the results. However, we consider that the methodological efforts made are valuable, and rather original in the French context.

The results are that:

- in the short term, the 'material' implementation of the projects supported has generated about 2,000 jobs a year (i.e. about 0.5% of total regional employment in the private sector) mainly in the construction industry; the impact of the crisis has accordingly been moderated as a result (particularly in the construction sector), with a concentration in the major urban areas (rather than the areas lagging behind);
- in the medium-term, the results of the counter-factual analysis suggests the creation of 3,500 to 5,000 jobs within 3 years (0.7% to 1.1% of the regional total), from first business incubators and industrial and business parks (which encourage the development of enterprises) and secondly environmental and other infrastructure;
- in the long-term, it has proved difficult to generate quantitative estimates; however, the econometric model used focuses on private R&D and transport infrastructure as key factors of regional economic development.

In conclusion, our rough estimate of the total number of job created up to the end of 2011 in France as a result of ERDF support is 28,500 which is consistent with the DATAR estimate up to the end of August 2012 (32,799).

¹⁷ *Préfecture de région Languedoc Roussillon – EVALUATION DE L'IMPACT DU PO FEDER ET DU CPER 2007 / 2013 SUR L'EMPLOI EN REGION LANGUEDOC-ROUSSILLON – Projet de rapport final – juin 2012, pp. 12s.*

5. Looking forward to the 2014-2020 programming period

DATAR has already circulated information on the common indicators for 2014-2020 (Annex 2 of “Guidance document on monitoring and evaluation – ERDF and Cohesion Fund – Programming Period 2004-2010, Concepts and recommendations, December 20) to all MAs.

Through the survey we have carried out in 8 regions, it appears that the degree of familiarity with the new definitions is variable. Three MAs confess that their awareness is still limited while the others consider that they have a generally satisfactory level of information and knowledge, but at the same time all express some concern about potential difficulties.

This, once again, relates to the definition of ‘permanent’ jobs as well as to the importance of going beyond immediate outputs and measuring so far as possible the creation of indirect jobs, together with making a distinction between jobs created and jobs maintained (Bourgogne, Languedoc-Roussillon and Picardie). Indicators 8 – “Employment increase in supported enterprises” – and 24 – “Number of new researchers in supported entities” – are in general considered to be still too vague in respect of the dates to which the data should refer, and the methods of data collection as well the definition of ‘permanent’ jobs. Indicator 24 is however viewed by Bourgogne MAs as allowing for a clearer distinction between research jobs and those for technicians. The Guyane MA insists on the importance of taking account of the regional context for the figures collected to be meaningful.

6. Further remarks

There is often a significant important difference between the outputs in terms of jobs created and the targets which had been initially set in the OPs. The survey that was carried out in 8 regions shows that the initial estimate of targets is in many cases questionable: either it has been exceeded because it was set too low (Languedoc-Roussillon and Poitou-Charentes, for Axis 1 on innovation) or the jobs taken into account have been extended (Bourgogne); or it has proved too ambitious because of the crisis (Centre) or the specific features of the regional context (Guyane). (However, mid-term revisions have in some cases led to the modification of targets: e.g. Poitou-Charentes and Guyane).

A basic reason for the difference is that fewer projects have been completed than the projects committed, and accordingly, the number of jobs which can be calculated still remains low. Some beneficiaries may also wait for a project to be fully developed before hiring new employees. In addition, in the case of research jobs, the increase in the research work force is probably larger in the medium- term than in the short, because of the delayed employment of PhD students and post-doctorate researchers.

We consider, accordingly, that, in spite of the recent efforts made at national level by DATAR, and by some regions which have devoted more attention to the issue, data collection has remained difficult and the data collected are of a limited reliability.

In our view, the question of maintaining a general ‘job creation’ indicator in C&E regions where the ERDF contribution is relatively small is an open one. Support to innovation may well have a positive impact on net job creation, but more in the medium and longer-term than the short. It would be better to concentrate efforts on more targeted outcome indicators, such as research job creation or indicators related to a specific measure such as gross and net job creation

resulting from direct support of investment in SMEs, collaborative R&D projects or industrial real estate (such as business incubators and industrial parks) as in the examples given in Languedoc-Roussillon. It would be less ambitious, but more realistic – and efficient¹⁸.

This opinion seems to be shared by some regional authorities (e.g. Centre and Poitou-Charentes), which would support a focus on the most relevant indicators for “Enterprise support”, particularly as regards innovation and aid to firms. In general, MAs understand the importance of the job creation indicator, especially in the crisis where any job created or maintained is of interest, but at the same time they stress that a number of ERDF co-financed projects create (or maintain) only few direct jobs in the short term, and that the impact is mainly in the medium or long-term in the form of the jobs indirectly created through economic development.

¹⁸ It must be noted that the already cited « Etude préparatoire à la définition du dispositif de suivi/évaluation/pilotage de l'Accord de Partenariat – dans une approche interfonds – et des PO FEDER post 2013 » considers that there are too many indicators, some of them being too ‘demanding’ for being used at project level, such as the job indicators.

References

DATAR, Etude préparatoire à la définition du dispositif de suivi/évaluation/pilotage de l'Accord de Partenariat - dans une approche interfonds - et des PO FEDER post 2013 (<http://www.europe-en-france.gouv.fr/Centre-de-ressources/Etudes-rapports-et-documentation/Etude-de-Prefiguration-du-dispositif-de-pilotage-suivi-et-evaluation-de-l-Accord-de-Partenariat-et-des-programmes-2014-2020/%28language%29/fre-FR>)

DATAR, « Rapport stratégique 2012 sur la mise en oeuvre du cadre de référence stratégique national et des programmes opérationnels, juillet 2012 ».

(<http://www.europe-en-france.gouv.fr/Centre-de-ressources/Etudes-rapports-et-documentation/Rapport-strategique-2012-sur-la-mise-en-oeuvre-du-cadre-de-referenc-strategique-national-et-des-programmes-operationnels-2007-20132>)

Préfecture Languedoc-Roussillon et SGAR Languedoc-Roussillon, « Evaluation de l'impact du PO FEDER et du CPER 2007-2013 sur l'emploi en Languedoc-Roussillon », EDATER, synthèse novembre 2012 (Rapport Partie A, juin 2012).

Préfecture Poitou-Charentes, « Evaluation du PO FEDER 2007-2013 à mi-parcours », Technopolis ITD, mars 2012

Région Rhône-Alpes (DGMTRE, Mission évaluation, prospective et développement durable) et SGAR Rhône-Alpes (Mission Europe), « Mesurer et suivre l'effet emploi. Un pari inédit et ambitieux », Euréval, 2013.

DATAR, Etat d'avancement des programmes européens 2007-2013, Etat financier au 1er janvier 2012 (<http://www.europe-en-france.gouv.fr/Des-programmes-pour-qui-pour-quoi/Avancement-des-programmes/Moteur-de-recherche-sur-l-avancement-des-programmes/2012/Les-etats-d-avancement-2007-2013-situation-au-1er-janvier-2012>).

Programmes opérationnels FEDER Compétitivité & Emploi et Convergence et Contrats de Projets Etat-Région - Guide des indicateurs nationaux 2007-2013, DATAR, 6 avril 2011. (http://www.datar.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/110406_guide_indicateurs_po-cper_v_modifiee.pdf).

Interview

A questionnaire was sent to all 26 French regions MAs and interviews were carried out with two of them (Languedoc-Roussillon, Poitou-Charentes).

Interviews (3):

- Mickaël Vaillant, DATAR
- Vincent Arsigny, SGAR Languedoc-Roussillon, Cellule Europe
- Pierre Chauleur, SGAR Poitou-Charentes, and Céline Mommaire, in charge of evaluation

Answers to the questionnaire (6):

- SGAR Bourgogne (Emilie Bordeloup)
- SGAR Centre (Jeanne Lagrange)
- SGAR Guyane (Julia Latidine)
- SGAR Languedoc-Roussillon (Vincent Arsigny)
- SGAR Haute-Normandie (Cristofe Pascal ; Hélène Robert, administrateur Préseage)
- SGAR Picardie (Carine Hélart)
- SGAR Poitou-Charentes (Céline Mommaire)
- SGAR Rhône-Alpes (Nadège Riotte)

Annex

Tables

Annex Table A - Jobs and expenditure by region and policy area

Figures in bold come from a reconstruction of policy areas using aggregated data of FOI codes. The other figures result from an approximation through priority axes.

a) C&E regions

| | | 1. Enterprise support | 2. Human resources | 3. Transport | 4. Environment and energy | 5. Territorial development |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Alsace | Jobs created: targets | 360 | | | | 1,000 |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 26 | | | 99 | 33 |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 38,950,000 | | | 17,600,000 | 8,250,000 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | 8,030,000 | | | 8,000,000 | 2,500,000 |
| Aquitaine | Jobs created: targets | 5,300 | | | 1,600 | 1,100 |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 3,528 | | | 219 | 80 |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 236,310,000 | 390,000 | 20,500,000 | 81,590,000 | 42,220,000 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | 77,880,000 | | 2,470,000 | 17,370,000 | 23,090,000 |
| Auvergne | Jobs created: targets | 1,000 | | 1,500 | 70 | 400 |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 357 | | 9 | 10 | 52 |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 120,500,456 | | 14,400,000 | 30,500,000 | 34,050,000 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | 32,019,613 | | 11,281,700 | 13,828,638 | 7,306,627 |
| Basse-Normandie | Jobs created: targets | | | | | |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | | | | | |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 107,500,000 | | | 21,850,000 | 27,650,000 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | 26,500,000 | | | 5,800,000 | 3,880,000 |
| Bourgogne | Jobs created: targets | 4,000 | | | | 50 |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 3,667 | | | | 5 |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 77,000,000 | | | | 15,400,000 |

| | | 1. Enterprise support | 2. Human resources | 3. Transport | 4. Environment and energy | 5. Territorial development |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | 14,290,000 | | | | 2,370,000 |
| Bretagne | Jobs created: targets | 1,200 | | | 20 | 600 |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | | | | | |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 127,450,000 | | 105,000,000 | 58,070,000 | 2,500,000 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | 14,622,630 | | | 10,837,247 | 18,025,837 |
| Centre | Jobs created: targets | 780 | | | | |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 95 | | | | |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 152,810,000 | | | | 36,500,000 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | 36,970,411 | | | | 940,245 |
| Champagne-Ardenne | Jobs created: targets | 6,416 | | | 10 | 30 |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 962 | | | 21 | 9 |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 97,200,000 | | | 40,500,000 | 42,300,000 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | 24,651,885 | | | 10,213,070 | 4,614,579 |
| Corse | Jobs created: targets | | | | | |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 611 | | | 0 | 3 |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 94,150,000 | | 10,000,000 | 38,200,000 | |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | | | | | |
| Franche-Comté | Jobs created: targets | 818 | | | 230 | 43 |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 288 | | | 4 | 19 |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 105,500,000 | | | 26,500,000 | 9,800,000 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | | | | | |
| Haute-Normandie | Jobs created: targets | | | | | |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 83 | | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 112,221,261 | 4,500,000 | 36,000,000 | 44,790,000 | 16,800,000 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | 25,702,224 | | 8,710,808 | 12,792,856 | 2,745,472 |
| Île-de-France | Jobs created: targets | 1,870 | | | 100 | 600 |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 248 | | | 1 | 92 |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 77,173,000 | 3,150,000 | 9,620,000 | 36,693,394 | 20,379,500 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | 11,408,321 | | | 1,143,038 | 7,204,971 |

| | | 1. Enterprise support | 2. Human resources | 3. Transport | 4. Environment and energy | 5. Territorial development |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Languedoc-Roussillon | Jobs created: targets | 1,000 | | | | |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 333 | | | 57 | 101 |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 134,000,000 | | 15,000,000 | 97,420,000 | 18,000,000 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | 31,428,482 | | | 26,936,548 | 11,475,916 |
| Limousin | Jobs created: targets | | | | | |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 675 | | | 2 | |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 67,000,000 | 8,000,000 | 10,300,000 | 16,340,000 | 20,000,000 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | 26,100,000 | | | 4,000,000 | 11,200,000 |
| Lorraine | Jobs created: targets | 8,612 | | | | |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 3,117 | | | | |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 178,950,000 | | 31,450,000 | 69,080,000 | 35,150,000 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | 42,168,042 | | | 9,831,030 | 19,306,155 |
| Midi-Pyrénées | Jobs created: targets | 5,000 | | | | 200 |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 2,374 | | | | 72 |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 239,157,084 | 29,973,823 | 35,728,367 | 70,693,533 | 41,494,832 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | 55,467,005 | 7,200,040 | 17,484,190 | 22,209,852 | 9,739,417 |
| Nord-Pas-de-Calais | Jobs created: targets | 16 | | | | |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 327 | | | | |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 367,254,854 | | 65,000,000 | 183,000,000 | 69,500,000 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | 52,572,261 | | 38,763,729 | 25,185,982 | 22,550,816 |
| Pays de la Loire | Jobs created: targets | 7,190 | | | | 1,100 |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 2,445 | | | | 643 |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 136,000,000 | | 60,450,000 | 45,850,000 | 54,400,000 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | | | | | |
| Picardie | Jobs created: targets | 1,900 | | | | |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 6,512 | | | | |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 115,201,000 | | | 47,856,000 | 35,000,000 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | | | | | |
| Poitou- | Jobs created: targets | 120 | | | | 16 |

| | | 1. Enterprise support | 2. Human resources | 3. Transport | 4. Environment and energy | 5. Territorial development |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Charentes | Jobs created: outcomes | 158 | | | | 6 |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 90,000,000 | | 34,000,000 | 70,000,000 | |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | 19,265,093 | | 11,404,590 | 24,844,863 | 4,620,363 |
| Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur | Jobs created: targets | 5,200 | | | | 1,400 |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 43 | | | 2 | 79 |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 165,000,000 | | 23,000,000 | 63,000,000 | 41,000,000 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | | | | | |
| Rhône-Alpes | Jobs created: targets | 2,500 | | 120 | 150 | 120 |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 280 | | 30 | 20 | 15 |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 189,000,000 | 2,500,000 | 13,500,000 | 73,000,000 | 53,500,000 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | 72,800,000 | | 28,300,000 | 28,300,000 | 3,900,000 |

b) Convergence Regions

| | | 1. Enterprise support | 2. Human resources | 3. Transport | 4. Environment and energy | 5. Territorial development |
|------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Guadeloupe | Jobs created: targets | 370 | | | | |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 227 | | | | |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 147,171,000 | | 21,511,000 | 154,361,000 | 135,749,000 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | 37,486,777 | 10,436,956 | 9,123,400 | 22,158,105 | 24,353,123 |
| Guyane | Jobs created: targets | | | | | |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | | | | | 2.5 |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 91,000,000 | | | 10,000,000 | 191,870,000 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | 19,208,944 | | | 2,409,425 | 43,764,208 |
| La Réunion | Jobs created: targets | 1,500 | | 2,000 | | 330 |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 296 | | 0 | | 0 |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 137,700,000 | 1,400,000 | 271,800,000 | 203,500,000 | 364,400,000 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | 9,999,008 | 43,173,000 | 83,475,000 | 104,640,000 | 7,035,000 |
| Martinique | Jobs created: targets | 8,250 | | | | |
| | Jobs created: outcomes | 155 | | | | |
| | ERDF expenditure: planned (EUR) | 75,000,000 | | 75,000,000 | 56,317,132 | 151,634,132 |
| | ERDF expenditure: paid (EUR) | 20,606,065 | | 18,897,612 | 14,259,642 | 51,489,504 |