



**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**

**Romania**

**Version: Final**

**Liliana Olivia Lucaciu**

**LIDEEA**

**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 .....	5
Content of data .....	6
Wider use of indicator .....	7
3. Cost per job created .....	7
4. The indicator of job creation in evaluations and AIRs.....	9
5. Looking forward to the 2014-2020 programming period.....	10
6. Further remarks .....	11
References .....	12
Interviews.....	12
Annex.....	13

## List of abbreviations

- AIR           Annual Implementation Report
- ACIS         Authority for Coordination of the Structural Instruments
- CEU         Central Evaluation Unit
- FEI         Financial Engineering Instrument
- FID         Framework Implementation Documents
- FTE         Full-time Equivalent
- IB           Intermediate Body
- KAI         Key Area of Intervention
- MA         Managing Authority
- NGO         Non-Governmental Organisation
- OP         Operational Programme
- PA         Priority Axis
- RES         Renewable Energy Sources
- ROP         Regional Operational Programme
- SMIS        Single Management Information System
- SOP IEC     Sectoral Operational Programme Increase of Economic Competitiveness

## Executive summary

The job creation indicator is used as a result indicator in two Operational Programmes (OPs) funded by ERDF, the Regional OP (ROP) and the Sectoral OP Increase of the Economic Competitiveness (SOP IEC). Enterprise support is the most important policy area using the indicator of jobs created, having the highest ERDF allocation, the highest contribution to the target value of the indicator in 2015 and to the achievements.

The definition and the methodology of the indicator lacked clarity and consistency in the initial design of the OPs. During the implementation, the methodology was continuously improved. The revision of the indicators' definition and methodology improved their coherence with the core indicators and made it possible to aggregate figures across Priority Axes (PAs) and programmes. ,

The job creation indicator is also used in the programmes funded by the Romanian Government, but there is no evidence of an aggregation across programmes, plausibility checks or evaluations of the programmes' achievements.

The cost per job created was calculated on the basis of the expenditure and the achievements reported by the end of 2011 and ranged from EUR 20,000 for microenterprises' support to around EUR 100,000 for tourism infrastructure and business infrastructure.

The number of jobs created by the end of 2011 is estimated at 4,174, slightly less than the value reported in the Annual Implementation Report (AIR). This was adjusted by revising the jobs created during the project implementation phase and by recalculating part-time jobs in Full-time Equivalent terms (FTE).

The jobs created reported in the AIRs are to a large extent reliable. Detailed checks on the justification documents are performed, including verification of the employment contracts, checks in the General Employment Registry<sup>1</sup>.

The experience to date shows that the indicator "jobs created" is not appropriate for all interventions for which it is used.

---

<sup>1</sup> REVISAL Registrul general de evidenta a salariatilor.

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

“Jobs created” is used as a programme result indicator in two OPs funded by ERDF in the programming period 2007-2013: the ROP and the SOP IEC. The indicator is aggregated from several Key Areas of Intervention (KAI), as presented in detail in the Annex Table A. In the ROP, the indicator is used in the enterprise support interventions, including business infrastructure, microenterprises’ support and tourism development. SOP IEC uses the indicator jobs created for direct productive investments in SMEs and large companies, RTDI interventions and energy infrastructure.

Considering the objectives of the interventions, as detailed in Annex Table B, the relevant policy areas are: Enterprise support (including innovation in SMEs and other investments), RTDI and linked activities, Energy Infrastructure, and Territorial development, more precisely tourism and culture.

The enterprise support policy area is characterised by the largest allocation of funds among the policy areas using the indicator jobs created, with 15% of the total ERDF in Romania. The RTDI, the Energy infrastructure and tourism and culture each receive 7% of the total ERDF allocation. Details on allocations, expenditure and the indicators’ targets and achievements by policy area are provided in Annex Table C.

Human Resources, Transport and Technical Assistance do not use the jobs created indicators in any of the interventions that have been funded.

In terms of expenditure<sup>2</sup> incurred by the end of 2011, enterprise support is the most important area with 14.3% of the total certified expenditure in ERDF interventions, followed by tourism and culture with 6.1%, and energy infrastructure with 2.3%. RTDI has an insignificant share of 0.4%.

The target of all ERDF interventions for the indicator on jobs created amounts to 33,900 in 2015; 24,400 of these jobs are to be created by the SOP IEC and 9,500 by the ROP. By the end of 2011, the achievement<sup>3</sup> was 4,360 jobs created, representing 12.8% of the initial target<sup>4</sup>.

The enterprise support policy area is by far the most important contributor to the expected and actually achieved results. It represented 93.7% of the total target and 87% of the total achievements by the end of 2011. RTDI’s contribution to the jobs’ outcome is 8.1%, despite it represents only 1.8% of the target. The other policy areas have small contributions of less than 3% both in targets and achievements.

Tourism and culture policy area accounts for 2.9% of the target and 1.9% of the reported achievement. Energy infrastructure’s contribution to the target is very low (0.6%) although, in terms of achievements, it accounts for 3.0% of the total jobs created.

---

<sup>2</sup> Certified expenditure at 31.12.2011.

<sup>3</sup> According to the Annual Implementation Reports (AIRs) 2011.

<sup>4</sup> The achievement rate is lower than the implementation rates of the two OPs, calculated based on payments to beneficiaries: 25% for ROP and 15.9% for SOP IEC.

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

### Definition and methodology

The ROP and SOP IEC programme documents reveal a lack of clarity and consistency in the definition and the methodology of the indicator “jobs created” across programmes and across the PAs. During the first years of implementation, in the absence of a definition and methodology, the meaning of the indicators was only explained by the little information included in the OPs, including the name, the unit of measure and the source.

In the ROP, several job creation indicators are used: jobs created/maintained for the general objective of ROP, jobs created/safeguarded in urban action zones, new jobs created in business infrastructure, new jobs created in assisted microenterprises, new jobs created/maintained at the end of the project implementation. SOP IEC is using three different jobs created indicators at programme level: jobs created/maintained in assisted enterprises, jobs created maintained in the supported beneficiaries, jobs created in the Renewable Energy Sources (RES) projects through assisted projects.

The Framework Implementation Documents (FID) introduce additional job creation indicators that capture specific features of the interventions, monitored at KAI level, and not aggregated across PAs and OPs, such as: new jobs created in business infrastructure, new jobs created in polluted and unused industrial sites, new jobs created in tourism accommodation, as result of investments in the productive sector, jobs created for roma people.

The guidelines for applicants during the calls for proposals provided additional details about the definition of the indicators, so that the beneficiaries could use the indicator adequately. Thus, in the ROP grant scheme “Support to microenterprises development”, the indicator “new jobs created” is defined as new jobs, permanent, full-time, hence any part-time job has to be calculated in FTE terms. The SOP IEC defined for the SMEs’ grant schemes - small and large investments - the jobs created as the difference between the average number of employees at the end of the project implementation and the average number of employees at the time of the grant’s application. These are some examples, but not all grant schemes clearly explained the definitions and the methodology.

In 2009, in order to ensure the consistency of the indicators, the Authority for Coordination of the Structural Instruments (ACIS) launched a technical assistance project called “Improving the system of indicators used in monitoring and evaluation”; this involved all the OPs. The project made recommendations regarding the indicator “new jobs created”, to be reformulated for all relevant KAIs, so that aggregation would be possible, while other indicators, capturing the specific features of the jobs created in interventions, were to be maintained as result indicators at project level and aggregated only at the KAI level.

The Working Document 7<sup>5</sup> brought more clarity and consistency in reporting the jobs created. The Managing Authorities (MAs) have adopted the definitions from Annex 1 of the working document and reviewed the methodology, in order to make it possible to aggregate the jobs

---

<sup>5</sup> Indicative Guidelines on Evaluation Methods: Reporting on core indicators for the ERDF and the Cohesion Fund, EC, 2009.

created indicators from all relevant KAIs. The indicators jobs created in tourism (core no. 35), research jobs created (core no. 06) and jobs created (gross full-time, core no. 09) are feeding the indicator “jobs created” (core no. 01), which provides in the AIRs the total achievement on the programme.

The Single Management Information System (SMIS) has been reviewed to ensure that the new jobs indicator with a gender breakdown<sup>6</sup>, could be reported from the project level, and aggregated up to the programme. SMIS is functional and able to record and aggregate the indicator, but the system is not fully used due to the delays and gaps in introducing the data at project level. The MAs use other tools, i.e. excel spread sheets<sup>7</sup> for calculating and aggregating the data.

Despite the inconsistencies in the initial definitions of the jobs created indicator, currently the indicator is aggregated and reported in a consistent manner in the two OPs.

There is still a need for a detailed guidance, with all indicators used in Structural Instruments, including name, definition, sources and methodology, to ensure a common understanding of all the actors involved in implementation, including the beneficiaries.

### Content of data

The “jobs created”, reported as programme outcomes, are defined in FTEs. The achievements reported include the jobs created, filled in on the basis of employment contracts full-time, or part-time employment contracts, and converted to FTEs.

There is a clear distinction between the permanent and temporary work. Permanent is defined, according to the Working Document 7, as a reasonably long period; the MAs accept, as justification, the employment contracts with an unlimited duration or at least over the durability period of 3 or 5 years of the contracts depending on the type of beneficiary. According to the methodology adopted by the two MAs, only permanent jobs are reported for finalised contracts; the temporary work contracts are not included in the data reported.

The indicator jobs created during the project implementation, including the construction phase, is only used for infrastructure, energy and tourism projects. These jobs are not included in the jobs created reported at the programme level; they are only used for cost-benefit analysis purposes. A different case is the indicator 06, research jobs created, which, according to the methodology, includes research jobs during implementation. At OP level, i.e. in the case of the SOP IEC, this indicator is aggregated and counted in the programme indicator jobs created.

The data reported in AIRs mostly relate to actual achievements, based on employment contracts that are expected to be permanent. The achievements reported in AIRs refer to jobs created directly in the beneficiary entity receiving support, except the Business infrastructure interventions within ROP. In this case, the jobs created in the SMEs hosted/located in the infrastructure are reported, as an effect of the investment.

The risk of double counting arises from the beneficiaries who might not understand the definition of the indicator from the project development phase. The main sources of errors are related to confusion between the jobs created and jobs maintained, jobs created during the

---

<sup>6</sup> SMIS indicators 120, 121, 122.

<sup>7</sup> IB for SOP IEC, PA2 has created an excel spread sheet dedicated to jobs created indicators.

project implementation and jobs for operations after implementation. During implementation, MAs and Intermediate Bodies (IBs) require detailed data regarding the employment contracts for the jobs created, in order to avoid such errors. The reporting includes details regarding the employment contract, working time and tasks' relevance for the project operations. The additional requests regarding the jobs created ensure accuracy of data, but create an increased administrative burden.

The inventory of the jobs created indicators does not provide evidence of the features that could capture the quality of jobs, in terms of level of qualification or sector. One exception could be the indicator 'research jobs' that considers research as a qualitative feature.

The methodology applied by the MAs distinguishes between jobs created and jobs maintained. The MAs have confirmed that the jobs maintained are recorded and aggregated separately from jobs created.

Human Resources Development OP report jobs created in ESF interventions. The distinction between the ESF jobs created and ERDF jobs created is made through the type of beneficiaries. The ESF jobs reported are created in the social economy entities, a distinctive category from the ERDF beneficiaries creating jobs. The social economy entities include NGOs, crafts or credit cooperatives and protected units not eligible on the ERDF jobs creation interventions.

### **Wider use of indicator**

In recent years the Romanian Government has funded a number of grant schemes for job creation, most of which were based on three to five years multi-annual plans. The public information available reveal the implementation of three large multi-annual programmes, with allocations ranging from EUR 100 million to EUR 200 million per year and ambitious targets for the indicator jobs created of up to 200 jobs per project. Other schemes have addressed business incubators, with 450 jobs created reported or young entrepreneurs with grants up to EUR 10,000. The programmes' documents show that the jobs created indicators are carefully defined and explained for each scheme.

Nevertheless, there is a scarcity of public information regarding the achievements of the programmes. There is no evidence of any attempt to aggregate the achievements across the programmes and to ensure the consistency of the indicator jobs created. Even at the level of the National Reform Plan, the achievements are not aggregated across interventions. They are reported only at programme level.

### **3. Cost per job created**

Six interventions of different types have been selected for the calculation of the unit costs per job created: business infrastructure, direct investments in microenterprises and SMEs/large companies, investments in public and private tourism infrastructures and RDI support in enterprises. It was not possible to select a Financial Engineering Instrument (FEI), because JEREMIE, the only FEI implemented between 2007 and 2013, does not have a job creation indicator defined.

The interventions selected are detailed in Annex Table D, including a short description of the operations, the target value and the achievement of the jobs created indicator, and the

expenditure by the end of 2011, based on the total payments to beneficiaries<sup>8</sup>. As shown in Table 1 below, the cost of the job created varies from EUR 20,000, in the case of direct investments in microenterprises, to EUR 150,000, in the case of tourism infrastructure, i.e. restoration of the cultural heritage.

**Table 1- Selected interventions and the cost per job created**

KAI Operation	Cost of the job created (EUR thousand)
ROP KAI 4.1 Sustainable development of the business support structures of regional and local importance	91
ROP KAI 4.3 Microenterprises' development support	20
ROP KAI 5.1 Restoration and sustainable valorisation of the cultural heritage as well as creation/modernization of the connected infrastructures	150
ROP KAI 5.2 Creation, development, modernization of tourism infrastructure for valorisation of natural resources and increase of tourism services' quality	88
SOP IEC KAI 1.1 Productive and environment friendly investments and preparation for market competition, especially of SMEs	58
SOP IEC KAI 2.3 Access of enterprises to Research Development and Innovation	88

The costs of jobs created are higher in direct investments in SMEs and large enterprises than in microenterprises support interventions, presumably due to the higher complexity of the projects, the larger size and also the focus on competitiveness and modern technology. The microenterprises' support schemes are the most efficient with a unit cost of EUR 20,000. The value is even lower than the threshold used in the appraisal grids for the best score in the jobs created criteria with EUR 33,000. It is also lower than the unit cost calculated on contracts signed<sup>9</sup> with EUR 29,000 in 2011.

Jobs created as result of the intervention "Access to innovation in enterprises" are characterised by a higher cost (approx. EUR 88,000) than other direct investments in enterprises, because of the significant share of the research, development and innovation costs in the project budget.

The unit cost of the job created in relation to the R&D infrastructures in enterprises (EUR 0.9 million) was estimated in the programming phase and used in the appraisal process. Because the unit cost calculated in this section covers three operations and not only the infrastructural part, as detailed in Annex Table D, the value cannot be compared with the estimated cost per job in the R&D infrastructure. The case shows clearly the influence that any infrastructure element of an intervention has on the unit cost of the jobs created.

Another category of interventions creating jobs are the investments in the tourism infrastructure. The difference in the unit costs of the two types of interventions selected for this analysis is very high: EUR 150,000 (KAI 5.1 - restoration of cultural heritage) against EUR 88,000 (KAI 5.2 - valorisation of natural resources). This is explained by the restoration works

<sup>8</sup> ERDF and other public sources.

<sup>9</sup> The evaluation of the implementation of the priorities and projects within ROP 2007-2013, targeted on the business environment, 2011, is a single evaluation making an attempt to calculate unit costs for jobs created. The calculation was based on the value of the contracts signed and the number of jobs assumed by the beneficiary to be created at the end of the project implementation.



for the cultural patrimony that are more complex and expensive than the infrastructure in touristic objectives that are specific for the second type. The leisure time facilities, spa treatment services, hotels and restaurants have a stronger link with the economic activities and create more jobs than the historical monuments' restoration. Moreover, the KAI 5.1 is addressed to public entities that have recently dealt with the restrictions in employment due to the austerity measures imposed by the Government. For this reason, the jobs created and reported for the projects finalised are lower than the real number of jobs that should have been generated. The cost per job created in relation to the tourism infrastructure (around EUR 88,000) indicates, in the opinion of the expert that jobs creation is not an adequate result indicator for these types of investments.

Finally, the jobs created in business infrastructure investments are among the most "expensive". Although the high unit cost is explained by the costs of the infrastructure, it is important to examine the influence of several factors in such interventions. On the one hand, there is the type and the complexity of the business infrastructure, incubator or industrial park or other and the type and the extension of the works in the project. On the other hand, the jobs reported are all jobs that are created in the enterprises hosted in the infrastructure, largely influenced by the profile of the infrastructure as well as by the type and the intensity of labour in the enterprises. A more detailed assessment of the unit costs should consider these factors. The evaluation of the implementation of the priorities and projects within ROP 2007-2013, targeted towards the business environment, indicates as a unit cost, calculated based on the contracts signed, much lower (EUR 17,000).

The analysis highlights the key factors affecting the unit costs of the jobs created which include: the complexity of the projects, sizes, type of investments, the higher project costs in the case of infrastructure, R&D and high technology costs, the type of economic activity and the specific intensity of labour. Some interventions, such as public tourism infrastructure (e.g. cultural heritage), are characterised by a weak potential to create jobs, at least directly. In these cases, jobs creation is an inappropriate result indicator.

#### **4. The indicator of job creation in evaluations and AIRs**

Our research did not identify any evaluation or study that attempted to estimate the net job creation. Only three evaluations<sup>10</sup> to date include an analysis of the actual and potential achievements of the indicator jobs created, but none of them have any approach to net jobs created. Hence, it is not possible to adjust the data reported in the AIRs accordingly.

The lack of information in this area is expected to be addressed by the counterfactual evaluations planned for 2014-2015. These will also focus on aid schemes for SMEs and Large Enterprises.

A distortion of the achievements reported in the AIRs has been identified by the IB for PA2 of the SOP IEC. The achievements reported until 2011 included the jobs created for the implementation of the projects and the part time jobs in the number of jobs created. The revision led to 354 jobs being created instead of 611 reported on 31 December 2011. Even this

---

<sup>9</sup> ROP Interim Evaluation, SOP IEC Interim Evaluation and the Evaluation of the ROP Priorities and Projects addressing the Business Environment.

figure is distorted due to the calculation methodology of the FTE<sup>11</sup>, the reported value being less than the actual achieved. An assessment made by the IB suggested the distortion is around 20%. Our estimation of the achievement for the indicator jobs created is 425 by the end of 2011. This leads to the total number of jobs created in the ERDF interventions in Romania being 4,174 (end of 2011), instead of 4,360 as reported in the AIRs.

Even though it is not possible to do a more detailed adjustment, it is worth highlighting that the achievements reported in the AIRs could be distorted by a number of factors. The beneficiaries propose in their project applications more jobs than required in many cases in order to score high and to be selected for funding. Being bound by contract to achieve the indicator target, the beneficiary will make efforts to prove the job existence, according to the reporting methodology, but the job could not always be a real outcome of the business development, but a job without sustainability, accepted as a cost of receiving the grant. In addition to this, it is not always possible to detect creation of a job in a company at the expense of jobs losses in other units of the company or members of the same group. A better use of the indicator in OPs design and in the appraisal will increase the reliability of the jobs created reported.

## 5. Looking forward to the 2014-2020 programming period

The Central Evaluation Unit (CEU) has closely followed the process of the definition of the common indicators and facilitated the dissemination and the transfer of knowledge towards the institutions involved in the programming process.

In October 2012, the CEU organised a workshop for the institutions contributing to the Partnership Agreement preparation where lessons have been presented regarding the use of the indicators in the current programming period, and the new approach based on the document Concepts and Recommendations for 2014–2020<sup>12</sup>. The workshop included an exercise to identify the appropriate result indicators by thematic objectives.

The first version of the Partnership Agreement is expected to be ready at the beginning of May 2013, and the informal submission to the EC at the end of the same month. According to the current programming roadmap, the official submission of the agreement is planned for November 2013 and its approval expected in January 2014.

The architecture of the institutional framework for the 2014-2020 programming period has not been finalized to date; for this reason, the readiness of the MAs to use the common indicators list cannot be assessed, but it is expected that the knowledge acquired in the Ministry of European Funds, the CEU will be transferred to the designated authorities.

---

<sup>11</sup> The FTE was calculated based on the total working time reported in a year for each person employed in the new jobs created. This approach did not consider the situation when the job was created during the year, and even if it is FTE, do not add up the total working time in a year. So, the number of jobs created resulting from the calculation will be lower than the real jobs created.

<sup>12</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docoffic/2014/working/wd\\_2014\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/2014/working/wd_2014_en.pdf)

## 6. Further remarks

Jobs created represents, in times of economic crisis and high unemployment, an important indicator, mainly for the policy makers, showing that the most painful effects of the crisis on the population are addressed.

Moreover, the jobs created are the most prominent recorded achievements of Cohesion in Romania as at the end of 2011. Nevertheless, the reported figures look very modest compared to the targets. Some targets have been evidently unrealistic from the beginning of the programming period, and they are even more now, under the pressures of the economic crisis.

The importance of the achievements of the Cohesion policy, including the jobs created, continues to be shadowed in Romania by the low absorption of funds. Absorption remains the key objective in the implementation of the OPs, publicly stated and monitored by the authorities and the public.

## References

Annual Implementation Report, 2011, ROP.

Annual Implementation Report, 2011, SOP IEC.

Interim Evaluation of the SOP Increase Economic Competitiveness, 2010.

Interim Evaluation of the Regional Operational Programme, 2009.

Evaluation of the implementation of the priorities and projects within ROP 2007-2013, targeted at the business environment, 2011.

Framework Implementation Document, SOP IEC – version 2007 and revised version 2011.

Framework Implementation Document ROP – version 2007.

ROP, 2007.

SOP IEC, 2007; 2012 (proposed revision)

## Interviews

Ms Claudia Magdalena - Ministry of European Funds, Directorate for Analysis, Programming and Evaluation.

Ms Angelica Vladescu - Ministry of European Funds, Directorate for Analysis, Programming and Evaluation.

Ms Dorina Muntean - MA for SOP IEC.

Ms Irina Roman, Marioara Stanescu – National Agency for Scientific Research, IB for Priority Axis 2 of SOP IEC.

Marioara Stanescu - National Agency for Scientific Research, IB for Priority Axis 2 of SOP IEC

Mr Stefan Oachesu – MA for ROP<sup>13</sup>.

Mr Viorel Dobrescu – Ministry of External Affairs.

---

<sup>13</sup> Information provided by email.

## Annex

### Tables

**Annex Table A - Priority Axis and Key Areas of Intervention using job creation as result indicator**

<b>ROP</b>
<b>Priority Axis 1 - Support for urban development</b>
KAI 1.1 Integrated plans for urban development <sup>14</sup> , of which operation 3 “Development of the business” support structures and entrepreneurship
<b>Priority Axis 4 - Strengthening the regional and local business environment</b>
KAI 4.1 Sustainable development of the business supports structures of regional and local importance KAI 4.2 Rehabilitation of industrial polluted unused sites and preparation for new activities KAI 4.3 Microenterprises’ development support
<b>Priority Axis 5 - Sustainable development and promotion of tourism</b>
KAI 5.1 Restoration and sustainable valorisation of the cultural patrimony as well as creation/modernization of the connected infrastructures KAI 5.2 Creation, development, modernization of tourism infrastructure for valorisation of natural resources and increase of tourism services’ quality
<b>SOP IEC</b>
<b>Priority Axis 1. An eco-efficient productive system in one of the three Key Areas of Intervention</b>
KAI 1.1. Productive and environmentally friendly investments and preparation for market competition, especially of SMEs
<b>Priority Axis 2. Competitiveness through research technological development and innovation</b>
KA 2.1 R&D partnerships between universities/research institutes, and enterprises for generating results directly applicable in the economy KA 2.2. Investments in RDI infrastructure and related administrative capacity KA 2.3 Investments in RDI infrastructure and related administrative capacity
<b>Priority Axis 4. Increase of energy efficiency and of the security of energy supply in the context of climate change, in all three Key Areas of Intervention</b>
KAI 4.1 Efficient and sustainable energy (improving energy efficiency and environmental sustainability of the energy system) KAI 4.2 Valorisation of renewable energy resources for producing green energy KAI 4.3 Diversification of interconnection networks in view of strengthening security of energy supply

<sup>14</sup>PA 1: Sustainable development of towns, urban growth poles.

**Annex Table B - The job creation indicators by OP, KAI and policy area according to ROP and SOP IEC 2007**

No.	Result indicator	OP and relevant KAI	Policy area
1	Jobs created/maintained (no.) Target <sup>15</sup> : 9,500 Achieved 2011: 1,647	ROP	Enterprise environment (Enterprise support) Territorial Development (Tourism and culture)
1.1	Jobs created/safeguarded in "action urban zones" (no.) Target: 1,500 Source: Monitoring reports/ROP SMIS Achieved 2011:0	ROP KAI 1.1. Integrated plans for urban development	Enterprise environment (Enterprise support)
1.2	New jobs created in created: business infrastructure, (no.) Target: 4,000 Source: surveys Achieved 2011: 93	ROP KAI 4.1 Sustainable development of the business support structures of regional and local importance. KAI 4.2 Rehabilitation of industrial polluted, unused sites and preparation for new activities	Enterprise environment (Enterprise support)
1.3	New jobs created in assisted microenterprises (no.) Target: 3,000 Source: surveys Achieved 2011: 1,470	ROP KAI 4.3 Microenterprises' development support	Enterprise environment (Enterprise support)
1.4	New jobs created/maintained at the end of the project implementation (no.) Target: 1,000 Source: surveys Achieved 2011: 84	ROP KAI 5.1. Restoration and sustainable valorisation of the cultural patrimony as well as creation/modernization of the connected infrastructures ROP KAI 5.2. Creation, development, modernization of tourism infrastructure for valorisation of natural resources and increase of tourism services' quality	Territorial development (Tourism and culture)
2	Jobs created/maintained in assisted enterprises (no./FTE) Target 2015: 23,000 Source: SMIS Achieved 2011: 1,593 <sup>16</sup>	SOP IEC PA1 KAI 1.1. Productive and environmentally friendly investments and preparation for market competition, especially of SMEs	Enterprise environment (Enterprise support)
3	Jobs created maintained in the supported beneficiaries (no./FTE) Target: 1,200 SOP IEC Source: SMIS beneficiaries Achieved 2011: 611	SOPIEC PA2	Enterprise environment (RTDI and Support for innovation in SMEs)
3.1	Jobs created/maintained in the supported beneficiaries (no.) Target 2015: 400	SOP IEC KAI 2.1. R&D partnerships between universities/research institutes, and enterprises for generating results directly applicable in economy	Enterprise environment (RTDI)
3.2	New jobs created: (men, women) (no.) Target 2015: 200	SOP IEC KAI 2.2. Investments in RDI infrastructure and related administrative capacity	(RTDI)

<sup>15</sup> Aggregated targets of all ROP PAs.

<sup>16</sup> Note: in FID 2011 the definition of the indicator is "New jobs created in investments in SMEs in the productive sector".

No.	Result indicator	OP and relevant KAI	Policy area
3.3	New jobs created: (men, women) (no.) Target 2015: 600	SOP IEC KAI 2.3 RDI support for enterprises	Enterprise environment (partially RTDI (code 07))
4	Jobs created in the RES projects through assisted projects (no.) Target: 200-400 Source: SMIS Achieved 2011: 129	SOP IEC PA4	Environment and energy  (Energy infrastructure)
4.1	New jobs created: (men, women) (no.)  Target: 70-140 Achieved 2011: available only for the overall PA  Target: 70-140 Achieved 2011: available only for the overall PA  Target: 60-120 Achieved 2011: available only for the overall PA	SOP IEC KAI 4.1 Efficient and sustainable energy (improving energy efficiency and environmental sustainability of the energy system) KAI 4.2 Valorisation of renewable energy resources for producing green energy KAI 4.3 Diversification of interconnection networks in view of strengthening security of energy supply	Environment and energy  (Energy infrastructure)

**Annex Table C – Summary of allocation, certified expenditure, jobs created targets and achievements by policy area**

Policy area	ERDF allocation	Share of policy area in total ERDF allocation	Certified expenditure by policy area	Share of policy area in total certified expenditure	Jobs created targets by 2015	Share of policy area in jobs created target	Jobs created achievements by 31.12.2011	Share of policy area in jobs created achieved
	EUR million	%	EUR million	%	no	%	no	%
<b>1. Enterprise environment</b>	<b>2,230.1</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>206.5</b>	<b>17.5</b>				
1.1 RTDI and linked activities	666.5	7	6.3	0.5	600	1.8	352	8.1
1.2 Support for innovation in SMEs	575.7	6	5.0	0.4	600	1.8	259	5.9
1.3 Other investment in firms	818.4	9	164.8	14.0	31,500	92.9	3536	81.1
1.4 ICT and related services	169.5	2	10.2	0.9	0			
<b>2. Human resources</b>	<b>24.2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.1</b>	0			
2.1 Education and training	0.0	0	1.1	0.1	0			
2.2 Labour market policies	24.2	0	0.0	0.0	0			
<b>3. Transport</b>	<b>2,053.7</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>584.3</b>	<b>49.6</b>	0			
3.1 Road	1,431.6	16	274.8	23.3	0			
3.2 Rail			309.5	26.3	0			
3.3 Other	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0			
<b>4. Environment and energy</b>	<b>1,874.1</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>168.9</b>	<b>14.3</b>				
4.1 Energy infrastructure	603.8	7	27.4	2.3	200	0.6	129	3.0
4.2 Environmental infrastructure	1,270.3	14	141.5	12.0	0			
<b>5. Territorial development</b>	<b>2,244.8</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>167.7</b>	<b>14.2</b>				
5.1 Tourism and culture	671.4	7	71.9	6.1	1,000	2.9	84	1.9
5.2 Planning and rehabilitation	894.2	10	14.0	1.2	0			
5.3 Social infrastructure	679.2	8	81.9	7.0	0			
5.4 Other	0.0	0		0.0	0			
<b>6. Technical assistance</b>	<b>558.9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>50.7</b>	<b>4.3</b>	0			
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,985.8</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1,179.2</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>33,900</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4,360</b>	<b>1</b>



**Annex Table D - Cost of the job created for the selected interventions**

KAI	Short description of the operation	Jobs created target 2015 (number)	Payments to beneficiaries, ERDF and public contributions (EUR million)	Jobs created (number)	Cost of job created (EUR thousand/job)
ROP KAI 4.1 Sustainable development of the business support structures of regional and local importance	Investments in business infrastructure: incubators, business centres, industrial parks, including construction, modernisation, extension of buildings to be used by enterprises, mainly SMEs in the production or services sectors Maximum project value: EUR 20 million, public funding between 50 and 70% of the eligible costs	3,000	8.4	93	90.7
ROP KAI 4.3 Microenterprises development support	Direct investments in microenterprises including: buildings, works, equipment, technology Grant value up to EUR 0.2 million	3,000	29.5	1,470	20.1
ROP KAI 5.1. Restoration and sustainable valorisation of the cultural patrimony as well as creation/modernization of the connected infrastructures	Restoration, protection and preservation of the cultural patrimony, historical monuments, modernization of the related infrastructure, support for introduction in the touristic circuit Only public beneficiaries are eligible Maximum project value: EUR 20 million, public funding 85% of the eligible costs	200	0.3	2	150.0
ROP KAI 5.2. Creation, development, modernization of tourism infrastructure for valorisation of natural resources and increase of tourism services quality	Construction rehabilitation, modernisation of public and private touristic infrastructure For public entities: maximum project value is EUR 20 million, public funding is 85% of the eligible costs For private entities the maximum project value is EUR 20 million, public funding is between 50 and 70% of the eligible costs	800	7.2	82	88.2
SOP IEC KAI 1.1. Productive and environmentally friendly investments and preparation for market competition, especially of SMEs	(i) Direct investments in SMEs including: buildings, works, equipment, technology small projects with a grant up to EUR 0.25 million and large projects with a grant up to EUR 1.5 million (ii) Direct investments in large enterprises including buildings, works, equipment, technology, with a grant of up to EUR 5 million	23,000	114.2	1,973	57.9
SOP IEC KAI 2.3 Access of enterprises to Research Development and Innovation	Operation 2.3.1. Spin-offs and start-ups support including funding of research and development costs, prototypes development, transfer of innovation costs, production equipment acquisition, product development and 0 series production Grant value up EUR 0.2 million	600	37.3	425	87.7

	<p>Operation 2.3.2 Research and development infrastructure in enterprise including: construction works, R&amp;D equipment Grant value up to EUR 9.3 million</p> <p>Operation 2.3.3 Promotion of innovation in enterprises including: research and development costs, prototypes development, transfer of innovation costs, production equipment acquisition, product development and 0 series production. grant up to EUR 1 million/EUR 3.5 million</p>				
--	---	--	--	--	--