



**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**

Italy

Version: Final

Andrea Ciffolilli

with the assistance of Ilia Gaglio

Ismeri Europa

**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	7
Definition and methodology.....	7
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.....	11
6. Further remarks	12
References.....	13
Interviews.....	13
Annex.....	14

List of abbreviations

- AIR Annual Implementation Report
- CONV Convergence objective
- DPS Department for Development and Economic Cohesion – Ministry of Economic Development
- EC European Commission
- FTE Full-time Equivalent
- MA Managing Authority
- N/A not applicable
- NOP National Operational Programme
- OP Operational Programme
- REC Regional Employment and Competitiveness objective
- ROP Regional Operational Programme
- SFC system System for fund management of DG Regio
- PAC Action Plan for Cohesion policy
- UVAL Evaluation Unit of the DPS
- WD Working Document

Executive summary

In Italy Managing Authorities (MAs) started using the indicators on jobs created only after the recommendations on Core Indicators were issued by the European Commission (EC) (Working Document (WD) no. 7, 2009), well after the start of the current programming period. When the strategies were designed, unemployment was not as severe as now, creating new jobs or safeguarding existing positions was not a direct objective of the Operational Programmes (OPs) and indicators on jobs created were not foreseen in the majority of the programmes. In this context, the use of the Core Indicators in general - and jobs created in particular - was perceived as an obligation but the linkage between these and the programmes' objectives is very weak. With the outbreak of the financial and economic crisis, addressing unemployment became urgent but programmes have not been adjusted to a relevant extent in order to pursue this objective.

The number of jobs created is mostly used as an indicator of overall impact of the OPs. It is also used in relation to specific policy areas such as RTDI and enterprise support, territorial development (especially tourism). On the basis of the monitoring systems fed by the beneficiaries of the interventions, 12,370 total jobs were created as overall outcome of Cohesion policy at the end of 2011, 8,295 in Convergence (4 OPs reported data on jobs from beneficiaries) and 4,076 in Competitiveness (13 OPs reported data on jobs). These figures mostly consist of new permanent jobs, directly resulting from completed projects. The definition and methodologies used to collect data are often vague, they mainly refer to the EC WD which is rather general and not binding. Moreover, there is no systematic quality check. As a consequence, there is little consistency in the figures, it is difficult to carry out comparisons across regions, programmes and instruments, and overall, national totals must be treated with considerable caution.

The unit cost per job created can be estimated only in relation to selected interventions for which reliable data are available (mostly SME grants). The results of the calculations range between EUR 27,000 and EUR 64,000 per job. A robust counterfactual evaluation carried out in Piedmont and focused on all the interventions supporting the craft sector in 2008-2009 estimated an average cost per job created in the range of EUR 10,130-13,070. This is considerably lower than our rough estimate despite the initiatives considered are similar and it is based on net rather than gross jobs. The differences between the methods certainly affect the results. In any case, the variation suggests that the rough calculations must be treated with considerable caution and cannot replace more sophisticated assessments. Since the attempts to estimate net jobs created exist but are sporadic, they do not allow to adjust the figures resulting from the monitoring systems.

As regards the Common Indicators 2014-2020, these seem to be marred by similar shortcomings which prevented the core indicators to be sound and useful. The definitions are only recommendations and are not binding, hence the consistence is not guaranteed; there is confusion between outputs and outcomes; guidance on an effective and standard procedure to properly collect data and verify their quality is missing. Data quality is indeed the key issue. If this is not adequately addressed, any endeavour to generate indicators of achievements would be unproductive and any attempt to sum them across programmes and countries is vain.

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

The number of jobs created is used as both an indicator of overall impact of programmes and as an indicator of outcome in relation to RTDI, enterprise support, and territorial development. In very few cases the indicator is used in relation to environmental projects (e.g. Lazio). Among the policy areas in which jobs created are used as an outcome indicator, RTDI and enterprise support is by far the most important in terms of allocated resources in the current programming period: EUR 4,064 million (EUR 3,430.9 million in Convergence and EUR 633.1 million in Competitiveness; see Annex Table A). In Convergence, the ERDF resources allocated to this area are approximately 35% of the total and in Competitiveness the amount allotted to RTDI and enterprise support is 50% of total ERDF. If we distinguish between research and enterprise support, in Convergence there is a prevalence of the latter, while in Competitiveness, RTDI initiatives prevail. Territorial development, an area quite heterogeneous by construction, gathered approximately 20% of total ERDF in Convergence and 16% in Competitiveness (EUR 4,127.8 million in total).

Enterprise and RTDI support, including the Information Society, is the policy area characterised by the best performance in terms of actual expenditure (i.e. 26.7% of allocated resources; see Annex Table B), among those in which the indicator on jobs created is used. The expenditure rate is better in Competitiveness regions in all policy areas except for environment and energy where the expenditure as percentage of total allocated ERDF is higher in Convergence.

As shown in the following Table 1, in terms of the target set, enterprise support is the most relevant area since it represents approximately 69% of the total target. The target set in RTDI support (6,206 jobs) is approximately 24.4% of the total, while the target in territorial development (1,767 jobs) is 7% of the total. According to the Annual Implementation Reports (AIRs), outcomes, as at the end of 2011, are concentrated in enterprise support in which 7,308 jobs were created (5,674 in Convergence and 1,634 in Competitiveness), corresponding to 79% of the total. 1,318 jobs were created in RTDI (14% of the total of these policy areas), and 676 in Territorial development (7% of the total). In the programmes that use the indicator on jobs created for one or several policy areas, the total (captured by the EC Core Indicator no. 1) is calculated as sum of the individual components (jobs created in each policy areas). In the regions where no indicator on jobs created was associated to specific policy areas, only the total exists (See Table 2). For these reasons, there is no correspondence between total jobs created in the country as measured by core no. 1 and the sum of the jobs created in each policy area. Overall 12,771 jobs were created as overall outcome of Cohesion policy, 8,998 in Convergence and 3,773 in Competitiveness.

Table 1 - Jobs created: target set and outcomes (31.12.2011)

	CONV**		REC***		Total		
	2011	target	2011	target	2011	target	
A	RTDI support	245	4,000	1,073	2,206	1,318	6,206
B	Enterprise support	5,654	8,860	1,654	8,634	7,308	17,494
C	Territorial development (tourism)	666	1,550	10	217	676	1,767
	<i>Subtotal of policy areas (A+B+C)</i>	<i>6,565</i>	<i>14,410</i>	<i>2,736</i>	<i>11,057</i>	<i>9,301</i>	<i>25,467</i>
D	Overall impact of OPs (core no. 1)*	8,295	189,175	4,076	49,438	12,370	238,613

Source: AIRs 2012.

Notes:

* All available data except for Puglia which uses a different estimating approach.

** Convergence objective.

*** Regional Employment and Competitiveness objective.

While all programmes set a target in terms of jobs, only a number of them registered achievements so far (see Table 2). In some cases this is due to the fact that achievements are registered only when projects are completed.

All monitoring data on jobs created, apart from the case of Puglia, are produced on the basis of the reporting of beneficiaries (see next paragraphs for more details on the monitoring systems). The figure of Puglia has been computed by the MA considering the average cost per job in each intervention sector, estimated on the basis of past experience, and considering the actual expenditure (end of 2011). Regardless of the likelihood of this estimate which might be plausible considering the good performance in terms of expenditure of this region¹, clearly the Puglia's figure cannot be summed with the figures registered in the other OPs.

It is worth noting that the indicator on jobs created is not considered particularly relevant by most of the administrations. Some of the Northern regions of the Competitiveness objective (e.g. Emilia-Romagna) experienced a full employment condition when the programmes were designed and increasing the number of jobs was not a direct objective. With the international crisis, this context has progressively deteriorated but as we have highlighted in previous reports (see Task 2 reports – Expert Evaluation Network 2010-2012), programmes have not been adjusted significantly to address the crisis. Other regions (in both Competitiveness and Convergence) even though did not enjoy full employment before the launch of the programmes they still did not consider creation of jobs as a good indicator of outcome, in relation to the objectives of their OPs, and adopted the indicator passively without a real sense of utility and ownership.

The most important strategic change in the regional development policy pursued with the support of EU funds was introduced in December 2011, when the Italian government approved the so called “Action Plan for Cohesion policy” (or PAC)². This aims at reprogramming interventions - in particular the national share of resources - within Convergence regions which

¹ The certified expenditure was 22.7% of planned resources at the end of 2011, and increased to 41.8% as of 31.12.2012. This is much better than the other Convergence regions where the rate of expenditure is still around 20% (Calabria) or lower (Campania and Sicily).

² The PAC pulls together funds (approximately EUR 10,000 million) coming from a reduction of national co-financing and re-programming of EU resources but it is only financed by domestic resources and follows national rules. The PAC concentrates on four main objectives: digital agenda, education, employment and railways. The employment priority aims at increasing the number of employed people through a special tax credit.

experienced substantial implementation delays. Even though the indicator on jobs created is used to monitor the outcomes of the PAC (in particular the initiatives aiming at increasing employment), only targets have been set so far but no monitoring data on achievement is available. Furthermore, it is worth noting that most of the projects launched by the PAC will be completed well beyond the current programming period.

Table 2 - Jobs created: targets and achievements by programme (31.12.2011)

OP North-centre	Available indicators	Target	Out-come 2011	OP South	Available indicators	Target	Out-come 2011
Bolzano	• total jobs • jobs in SMEs	100	49	Abruzzi	• total jobs • jobs in tourism	1,400	180
Emilia-Romagna	• total jobs • research jobs	2,268	885	Molise	• total jobs • research jobs	2,200	0
Friuli VG	• total jobs • research jobs • jobs in tourism	535	1	Sardinia	• total jobs • research jobs	23,033	0
Lazio	• total jobs • research jobs • jobs in tourism	1,500	45	Basilicata	• total jobs	8,000	1,477
Liguria	• research jobs • jobs in SMEs • jobs in tourism	5,675	465	Calabria	• total jobs	43,500	0
Lombardy	• total jobs • research jobs	1,800	6	Campania*	• total jobs • jobs in SMEs	105,000	63
Marche	• total jobs • research jobs • jobs in SMEs • jobs in tourism	1,000	248	Puglia**	• total jobs	65,499	32,997
Piedmont	• total jobs • research jobs	5,000	993	Sicily	• total jobs • jobs in tourism	15,000	197
Trento	• total jobs	584	0	NOP^ Networks and mobility	• total jobs	1,875	0
Tuscany	• total jobs • research jobs • jobs in SMEs • jobs in tourism	2,858	629	NOP Research	• research jobs • jobs in SMEs • jobs in tourism	15,200	6,558
Umbria	• total jobs • research jobs • jobs in SMEs	600	257	NOP Security	• total jobs	600	0
V. d'Aosta	• total jobs	85	116	NOP Education	N/A^^	0	0
Veneto	• total jobs • jobs in SMEs	800	202	NOP Energy	N/A	0	0
				TOTAL		304,112	46,245
				TOTAL (excluding Puglia)		238,613	12,370

Source: AIRs 2012 and questionnaires sent to the MAs.

Notes:

* "non-core" indicators are used: these are defined differently from what suggested in the WD no. 9; core indicators are also foreseen in the Campania OP but they have not been yet quantified.

** estimated with a different approach as explained in the text which precedes the table.

^ NOP: National OP.

^^ not applicable.

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

Definition and methodology

In most cases, the definition of the indicator and the methodology to be used in collecting data are not clearly documented even though, in all cases, the EC WD on core indicators³ is the most relevant mentioned reference. The widespread lack of documentation and guidance does not allow to say whether the same definition and methodology are used in each OP.

Some administrations (e.g. Piedmont, Umbria) have prepared written guidance on how the data on jobs created, as well as other indicators, should be collected and aggregated. These guidelines, in terms of definition and methodology, majorly draw upon the EC directions:

- Total jobs created (core no. 1) should include new working positions created as a direct result of project completion, without counting workers employed to implement the project. Seasonal and part time jobs are to be converted to Full-time Equivalents (FTEs). Jobs are expected to be permanent and gross: not counting the origin of the jobholder as long as it directly contributes to the increase of total jobs in the organisation.
- Research jobs (core no. 6) are defined as gross positions created to directly perform R&D activities, in FTE terms, as a result of a finished or on-going R&D project. Support staff for R&D (i.e. jobs not directly involved in R&D activities) is not counted.
- Jobs resulting from enterprise support (core no. 9) are gross direct positions created in an SME, in FTE terms, as a direct outcome of a finished project.
- Jobs in tourism (core no. 35) are gross direct positions, in FTEs, created by tourism projects.

We can reasonably affirm that an effort is made to convert the number of jobs in FTE across programmes by MAs, but due to poor documentation it is not possible to verify if there are significant differences across regions in this respect.

In some regions (e.g. Campania), technical assistance staff is usually demanded to collect/estimate these data. In other administrations, mostly in the North-Centre, the data are only handled by the officials responsible for specific lines of intervention. In any case, the source of data is the final beneficiary: firms in the case of aid schemes, or local public administrations in the case of infrastructures.

The EC WD provides rather precise directions but it is not binding and therefore it does not foster consistency across administrations. Following the EC's document, in 2010 the Evaluation Unit (UVAL) of the Department for Development and Economic Cohesion provided the MAs with a set of brief and general directions. These focused on: how to select the most suitable subset of core indicators to monitor their programme; what data to be used in the AIRs and to be entered in the SFC 2007⁴ system⁵. This is more a reminder than a real attempt to ensure consistency

³ WD No. 7, "Indicative guidelines on evaluation methods: reporting on core indicators for the ERDF and the Cohesion Fund", July 2009.

⁴ UVAL (2010), "Indicazioni per individuazione e trasmissione dei Core Indicators richiesti dalla Commissione Europea".

⁵ System for fund management of DG Regio.

across administrations within the country. Moreover there is no systematic follow-up aimed at ensuring that these guidelines are applied consistently.

Content of data

The indicator used is defined in FTE terms. In most cases, there is no distinction in the data reported between permanent and temporary jobs. Only some MAs have a definition of temporary jobs, such as those related to contracts lasting less than 4 months (e.g. Bolzano) or project-based contracts (e.g. Emilia-Romagna, Umbria). In Piedmont, the distinction between temporary and permanent is made only in relation to core indicator 6, following the European guidelines.

The concept of jobs created during the construction phase of a project (“occupazione di cantiere”) is used in relation to the outcome of infrastructural interventions and to estimate targets ex-ante. Targets are estimated either by means of a Social Accounting Matrix or bottom up by the MAs and by the officials in charge of implementing specific measures or lines of activity, based on project and sectoral information and on previous experience. They measure jobs expected to be created in the construction phase.

Sometimes, in the calculation of the total jobs created, those created in the construction phase are subtracted (e.g. Emilia-Romagna, Friuli Venezia Giulia, Piedmont). As highlighted by the officials in Piedmont, the jobs created in the construction phase can be traced separately in their database to feed the National Monitoring System.

The available data do not allow to distinguish between jobs safeguarded and jobs created. No attempt is made to capture the quality of jobs either.

In the majority of the programmes, it is clearly specified that only actual jobs are considered (e.g. in Emilia-Romagna and Piedmont). In most cases there is a distinction between jobs created directly and indirectly and only the former are considered in the calculations. In other programmes no distinction is made (e.g. Lazio).

As previously mentioned, data on jobs created are collected from the final beneficiaries who submit their implementation reports to the administrations or enter the figures into the monitoring systems directly. Beneficiaries are usually obliged to quantify the number of jobs when they request the payment balance and hence when projects are concluded. In most cases, the MAs do not assess the quality of data in depth, moreover they have little room for intervening in the process. For example, if some figures are considered implausible or dubious, the MA has the only option to go back to the beneficiary, verify the data and then ask them to re-enter it correctly. This can be an expensive and time consuming activity if it is not properly organised, hence it is rarely carried out. Often, even when checks are done, there is no follow-up aiming at correcting mistakes.

In some cases there is an effort made to ensure the accuracy of the data entered by the beneficiaries into the system, especially in the regions where the monitoring system is better organised, mostly in North-Centre. For instance in Umbria, a sample-based verification is carried out on funded projects. In any case, no particular effort is made to avoid double-counting.

Jobs created by the ERDF and those created by the ESF are collected and reported separately.

Wider use of indicator

The central government provides (on demand) assistance to MAs in target setting but does not carry out plausibility checks or calculates a national figure on jobs created.

As regards the central level's assistance, it is worth mentioning that in the past (2001), the Evaluation Unit (UVAL) of the Department for Development Policy and Cohesion published guidelines for the analysis of employment effects of interventions⁶. These contain recommendations for evaluating effects, as well as indications on sources of employment data and evaluation questions; moreover, issues such as quality of employment are dealt with. Several documents were published concerning the definition and use of monitoring indicators during the past programming period but none was focused on jobs created. The most relevant document produced by the central government in the current programming consists of the mentioned guidelines for applying the core indicators (UVAL 2010).

Apart from these documents, the interviews with officials have highlighted that in the current programming period UVAL provided assistance on indicators (targets and outcomes) on a "voluntary" basis, as a sort of help desk, without intervening in the process or verifying the data.

The regional programmes funded by the national Fund for Development and Cohesion ("Programmi di Attuazione Regionale" - PAR) are the main interventions aiming at fostering regional development which are not co-financed by the European Funds. One of their goals consists of increasing employment. This objective is explicitly mentioned in the programming documents, however, jobs created are not used as an indicator of outcomes hence we do not have information on the contribution of these programmes to employment creation.

3. Cost per job created

In order to estimate the unit cost of a job created, we selected a number of interventions on the basis of the following criteria:

- a) the associated indicator on jobs created is available;
- b) the data are judged as reliable by the interviewed officials;
- c) considering the limits of the data reviewed in the previous paragraphs, based on our assessment, the figures on the selected interventions are produced by relatively sound and transparent regional monitoring systems.

It is worth highlighting that the AIRs do not breakdown data on jobs created by measure or intervention, nor they clearly indicate the amount of resources associated to the reported outcomes. The policy initiatives considered in this paragraph are those for which the MA was able and willing to provide more in depth information than what is available in the official documents. The selected interventions are:

- Support to investments of new SMEs owned by female⁷ and young⁸ entrepreneurs in Veneto. These grants (actions 1.3.1 and 1.3.2 of the ROP) mostly finance a mix of fixed

⁶ UVAL (2001), "Linee guida per l'analisi degli effetti sull'occupazione degli interventi".

⁷http://www.regione.veneto.it/web/bandi-avvisi-concorsi/dettaglio-bando?_spp_detailId=415613&_spp_bLink=%2Fweb%2Fbandi-avvisi-

investments, planning and direction of expansion works, acquisition of software and acquisition/registration of patents/licenses.

- Support to innovative investments of enterprises in Umbria⁹. This activity (a.2 of the Regional OP (ROP)) includes grant schemes supporting innovation projects submitted by individual firms (“PIA Innovazione” – integrated packages which finance both investments and acquisition of services) and networks of enterprises (Re.Sta. – “Reti stabili di imprese”).
- Grant scheme to support restructuring and upgrading of SMEs in terms of ICT, eco-innovation and work safety in Piedmont¹⁰.

The calculations of the cost per job are presented in the following Table 3 which indicates the amount which comes from ERDF and other public funding. The calculated unit costs can be considered rather reliable, however a comparison with similar interventions in other regions is difficult, if at all possible.

Table 3 - Cost per job created in four regional interventions

	A ERDF (payments as of 31.12.2011) (EUR)	B Other public funding (payments as of 31.12.2011) (EUR)	C No. of jobs created (31.12.2011)	D = (A+B)/C Public cost per job (EUR)
Support to investments of new SMEs owned by female entrepreneurs in Veneto.	1,713,374.2	2,016,666.5	126	29,604
Support to investments of new SMEs owned by young entrepreneurs in Veneto.	1,131,327.9	1,331,589.4	73	33,739
Support to innovative investments of enterprises in Umbria	7,031,504.8	9,290,465.5	257	63,510
Grant scheme to support restructuring and upgrading of SMEs in terms of ICT, eco-innovation and work safety in Piedmont	4,041,048.7	6,171,356.4	468	21,810

Source: AIRs 2012 and monitoring data provided by the regional administrations.

The results range between EUR 22,000 in Piedmont and EUR 64,000 per job in Umbria. Individual projects are different and the different features are likely to influence greatly the capacity of them to contribute creating new jobs. Such differences are widened by differences in support schemes and contexts. In conclusion, it is our opinion that an accurate estimate of the unit cost of a job created can be produced only on the basis of ad hoc studies/evaluations which identify comparable instruments and monitoring procedures, and conduct an in depth quality check on the data.

[concorsi%2Fbandi%3Ftags%3Dattivit%20produttive&cur&p_p_state=normal&detailTitle=A+Sportello+PMI+Femminili+Azioni+131](#)

⁸ http://www.regione.veneto.it/web/bandi-avvisi-concorsi/dettaglio-bando?_spp_detailId=416736

⁹ <http://www.sviluppoeconomico.regione.umbria.it/Mediacenter/FE/CategoriaMedia.aspx?idc=120&explicit=SI>

¹⁰ <http://www.regione.piemonte.it/industria/leggi/lr3.42004.htm>

4. The indicator of job creation in evaluations and AIRs

The attempts to estimate net job creation are not frequent and circumscribed to the analysis of specific interventions. Since these are not systematic and comprehensive, they do not provide a useful benchmark to assess the reliability of the data included in the AIRs.

Some evaluations are underway, for example in Veneto and in Piedmont. In the former an evaluation on the measures for female and youth entrepreneurship is being carried out; this will also focus on the employment effects. Results should be available by the end of the year.

In Piedmont an evaluation of the employment effects of the support granted to the craft sector in the period 2008-2009 was finalised recently (early 2013). All interventions, national and regional, co-financed by state resources and Structural Funds which benefit local firms have been taken into account. As part of this study, a counterfactual analysis was carried out to estimate econometrically the additional jobs created, net of the cyclical variation which would have occurred without the public intervention. In synthesis, EUR 44.8 million¹¹ were granted to approximately 6,200 firms and contributed to create additional jobs in the range of 3,200-4,300. The average cost per job created resulting from the estimate is in the range 10,130-13,070.

Due to the lack of specific evaluations, an assessment of the reliance of the figures included in the AIRs and an adjustment of the total number of jobs is not possible.

In section 1, we highlighted the figures that are calculated in a way which does not reflect actual outcomes (e.g. Puglia) and hence cannot be summed to the rest of the achievements. The 12,770 total jobs reported are likely to be an underestimate, not only due to the subtraction of Puglia, but also because in most regions indicators are quantified and entered in the monitoring system when projects are concluded and, since a large number of projects are still on-going, at the moment many MAs did not produce an estimate of jobs created (as it is evident in Table 2).

5. Looking forward to the 2014-2020 programming period

MAs are familiar with the Common Indicators for 2014-2020. In particular the definitions of indicator 8 “employment increase in supported enterprises” and indicator 24 “number of new researchers in supported entities” are considered clear and understandable. Few doubts have been raised during the interviews; for instance the Veneto officials highlight the necessity to clarify the definition of “durability: jobs are expected to be permanent, i.e. last for a reasonably long period depending on industrial-technological characteristics; seasonal jobs should be recurring”. This definition (indicator 8, page 20) is considered too vague.

The fact that the definitions of these indicators were diffused before the start of the new programming period, unlike in 2007-2013 when the core indicators were “imposed” after the preparation of the programmes, is considered a positive change. Moreover, some regions

¹¹ “Equivalentente sovvenzione lorda” or gross grant in equivalent terms is a method used to sum up subsidies of different nature. For more information on the calculation, please see the evaluation report (Region Piedmont, 2013).

mention their participation in the working group¹² on statistical systems and result indicators coordinated by the Department for Development and Economic Cohesion – Ministry of Economic Development (DPS), and this involvement increases ownership and cooperation (e.g. Basilicata).

However, some of main shortcomings which affected the effectiveness of the 2007-2013 Core Indicators remain valid. On the basis of the analysis and of the interviews with the MAs and UVAL, the main problems foreseen in applying the common indicators are: the EC provides again suggestions rather than binding definitions, this will not ensure consistency across programmes; there is a widespread confusion between output and result indicators; in several regions, data collection procedures are not functioning well at the moment and produce unreliable figures, furthermore there is no quality control mechanism in place, nonetheless there is no clear direction on how to tackle this problem.

6. Further remarks

Job creation can be an important measure of performance because it is well understood, it is relevant for several policy areas and, in theory, it can be summed up across programmes and regions. Moreover, in the current economic context, increasing or safeguarding employment is an urgency.

The common indicators have been already defined but it seems still unclear among the stakeholders what the final goal of using these indicators is. An effort to promote a shared vision and agreed objectives of monitoring among the MAs is as important as the definitions themselves. A strong orientation to results is necessary at all level to make sure that monitoring becomes central in policy management.

Furthermore, as it was pointed out throughout the text, to ensure that the defined common indicators are functioning and useful it is necessary that: definitions are uniformly applied across the EU; the financial data corresponding to the reported outcomes are made available.

These are certainly necessary but not sufficient conditions for using the number of jobs as an indicator of performance. It is equally important that directions on a correct procedure on how to properly organise the monitoring system and manage the information flow are issued. This should foresee compulsory quality checkpoints and assign to central authorities the task to verify and reconcile the data collected at regional level, and to produce a national estimate.

If these issues are not adequately addressed, any endeavour to generate national/European indicators of achievements (not only jobs created) would be unproductive and any attempt to sum them across programmes and countries is vain and misleading.

¹² As part of the preparatory activities for the next programming period, seven working groups involving national and regional officials were created by DPS to meet periodically and discuss relevant themes such as ex-ante conditionalities set out in the Commission's regulation proposal: COM(2012) 496 final.

References

EC (2012), Amended proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down common provisions on the ERDF, the ESF, the CF, the EAFRD and the EMFF, COM(2012) 496 final.

EC (2012), Guidance document on monitoring and evaluation – ERDF and Cohesion Fund – 2014-2020, Concepts and recommendations, December.

EC (2009), WD No. 7, “Indicative guidelines on evaluation methods: reporting on core indicators for the ERDF and the Cohesion Fund”, July 2009.

DPS (2012) “Stato di attuazione del PAC”, December.

DPS (2012), Annual report, June.

Region Piedmont (2012), Evaluation of the employment effects of the support granted to the craft sector in the period 2008-2009, carried out by Bondonio D. et al. (July 2012).

UVAL (2010), “Indicazioni per individuazione e trasmissione dei Core Indicators richiesti dalla Commissione Europea”.

UVAL (2001), “Linee guida per l’analisi degli effetti sull’occupazione degli interventi”.

Interviews

Name	Institution
Oriana Cuccu	UVAL, DPS
Arturo Polese Sara Gaudino	Evaluation Unit of Region Campania
Anna Tavano	MA, Calabria
Clara Merlo	MA, Piedmont
Alessandra Broccatelli	Servizio Programmazione Comunitaria - MA, Umbria
Angelita Luciani	MA, Tuscany
Pasquale Orlando	MA, Puglia

Annex

Tables

Annex Table A - Planned ERDF expenditure and commitments (31.12.2011) (EUR million)

	Planned expenditure			Commitments		
	CONV	REC	Tot	CONV	REC	Tot
RTDI	3,430.9	633.1	4,064.0	1,490.6	602.1	2,385.5
Enterprise support	2,840.2	930.4	3,770.6	1,496.7	444.5	1,941.2
Human resources	123.2	32.7	155.9	23.0	1.7	3,604.5
Transport	3,780.9	125.2	3,906.1	1,522.7	63.5	1,586.1
Environment	2,017.2	366.0	2,383.2	1,108.3	187.2	1,295.5
Energy	1,494.3	455.9	1,950.2	429.6	165.7	595.3
Territorial development	3,623.0	504.9	4,127.8	1,720.5	379.3	2,099.8
Technical assistance	573.3	96.2	669.5	297.5	54.3	550.1
<i>Total</i>	<i>17,882.9</i>	<i>3,144.4</i>	<i>21,027.3</i>	<i>8,088.8</i>	<i>1,898.3</i>	<i>14,058.1</i>

Source: AIRs 2012.

Annex Table B - Actual ERDF expenditure by relevant policy area (31.12.2011)

	CONV		REC		Total	
	expenditure (EUR million)	% of allocated	expenditure (EUR million)	% of allocated	expenditure (EUR million)	% of allocated
Enterprise support and RTDI including ICT	1,477.1	24.3	506.2	37.6	1,983.3	26.7
Environment and energy	828.6	23.1	128.7	21.3	957.2	22.8
Territorial development	397.2	13.9	121.7	17.7	519.0	14.6

Source: AIRs 2012.