

Policy Objective 1 ERDF/CF Indicators

#CohesionPolicy #EUinmyRegion #ESIFOpendata





PO1 A smarter Europe by promoting innovative and smart economic transformation

Specific Objective	Outputs	Results
1.i Enhancing research and innovation capacities and the uptake of advanced technologies	RCO 02 - Enterprises supported by grants RCO 03 - Enterprises supported by Fis RCO 04 - Enterprises with non-financial support RCO 05 - Start-ups supported RCO 06 - Researchers working in supported research facilities RCO 07 - Research institutions participating in joint research projects	RCR 01 - Jobs created in supported entities RCR 02 - Private investments matching public support (of which: grants, Fls) RCR 03 - SMEs introducing product or process innovation RCR 04 - SMEs introducing marketing or organisational innovation RCR 05 - SMEs innovating in-house RCR 06 - Patent applications submitted to EPO RCR 07 - Trademark and design applications RCR 08 - Public-private co-publications
1.ii Reaping the benefits of digitisation for citizens, companies and governments	RCO 13 - Digital services and products developed for enterprises RCO 14 - Public institutions supported to develop digital	RCR 11 - Users of new public digital services and applications RCR 12 - Users of new digital products, services and applications developed by enterprises RCR 13 - Enterprises reaching high digital intensity RCR 14 - Enterprises using public digital services
1.iii Enhancing growth and competitiveness of SMEs	RCO 15 - Capacity of incubation created	RCR 16 - High growth enterprises supported RCR 17 - 3-year old enterprises surviving in the market RCR 18 - SMEs using incubator services one year after the incubator creation RCR 19 - Enterprises with higher turnover RCR 25 - Value added per employee in supported SMEs
1.iv Developing skills for smart specialisation, industrial transition and entrepreneurship	RCO 16 - Stakeholders participating in entrepreneurial discovery process RCO 17 - Investments in regional/ local ecosystems for skills development RCO 101 - SMEs investing in skills development RCO 102 - SMEs investing in training management systems	RCR 24 - SMEs benefiting from activities for skills development delivered by a local / regional ecosystem RCR 97 - Apprenticeships supported in SMEs RCR 98 - SMEs staff completing Continuing Vocational Education and Training (CVET) (by type of skill: technical, management, entrepreneurship, green, other) RCR 99 - SMEs staff completing alternative training for knowledge intensive service activities (KISA) (by type of skills: technical, management, entrepreneurship, green, other) RCR 100 - SMEs staff completing formal training for skills development (KISA) (by type of skills: technical, management, entrepreneurship, green, other)





RCO01 - Enterprises supported (of which: micro, small, medium, large)

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
88%	100%	100%	81%	94%

- Name: number of, ERDF, CF
- Disaggregation: administrative burden
- Use in specific objectives
- Use with other enterprise indicators (RCO02 etc)
- Definition of enterprise: state aid, non-profit
- Double counting: SO and OP levels
- Time measurement: what is completion?

RCO02 - Enterprises supported by grants

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
88%	94%	94%	81%	94%

- Disaggregation: none!
- Definition:
 - □ conditional upon completion?
 - □ add partner enterprises?
- Double counting: OP level?
- Time measurement: link to final payment?



RCO03 - Enterprises supported by financial instruments

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
88%	88%	88%	69%	88%

- Use with other common indicators (RCO01 etc)
- Data collection: bank confidentiality?
- Definition: list types of FIs?
- Double counting: time-consuming?
- Time measurement: moment of payment?



RCO04 - Enterprises with non-financial support

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
88%	81%	81%	44%	81%

- Use with other common indicators (RCO01 etc)
- Definition:
 - ☐ list of activities? one-off contacts, phone calls?
 - □ counts partners in projects?
 - □ too broad as enterprises not beneficiaries?
- Double counting: more difficult
- Time measurement: what is completion here?



RC005 - Start-ups supported

RELEVAN [*]	Г (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
94%)	81%	63%	69%	69%

- Name: start-ups, new, or young?
- Brief definition: created by ERDF?
- Use with other common indicators (RCO01, RCO04?)
- Definition:
 - □ up to 3 years old when?
 - □ Flexibility: lower time limits?
- Data source: public registries?



RCO06 – Researchers working in supported research facilities

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
75%	81%	63%	50%	63%

- Definition:
 - □ new jobs included? overlap with RCR01?
 - □ temporary positions, permanent?
 - □ researchers or R&D personnel?
 - □ what is research facility?
 - □ calculation of FTEs
- Type of indicator: output or result?
- Double counting: does not make sense (FTEs)
- Time measurement: what is project completion?
- Examples: would be useful



RCO07 - Research institutions participating in joint research projects

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
94%	88%	88%	69%	75%

- Use with other common indicators: RCO06?
- Definition:
 - □ why research institutions?
 - □ cooperation shorter than project duration?
 - □ contracting/ sub-contracting?
- Double counting:
 - □ at project level (for partners)?
 - □ trans-regional cooperation?
- Time measurement: what is project completion?

RCO08 - Nominal value of research and innovation equipment

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
63%	88%	94%	88%	81%

- Use: when should the indicator be used?
- Definition:
 - □ what is nominal value?
 - □ new equipment?
 - □ exchange rate?
 - □ *eligible costs?*
- Double counting: does not make sense
- Time measurement: when procured and in operation?

RCO10 – Enterprises cooperating with research institutions

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
88%	88%	81%	75%	75%

- Definition:
 - count partners in projects?
 - cooperation for project duration?
- Double counting: not all enterprises are beneficiaries
- Time measurement: exit from project?



RCO96 – Interregional investments in EU projects

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
53%	40%	33%	53%	40%

- Code: same as ETC RCO96
- Name:
 - □ value of interregional investments?
 - □ investments in EU innovation projects?
- Definition
 - □ define relevance at EU level?
 - □ eligibility rules? type of projects?
 - □ projects within or across countries?
 - □ ETC specific of interregional investments not in ERDF?
- Double counting: does not make sense



RCR01 – Jobs created in supported entities

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
75%	69%	63%	56%	69%

- Definition:
 - □ line of activity?
 - □ new jobs in supported projects?
 - □ direct link to support?
 - □ different for R&I?
 - □ method of calculation?
- Time measurement:
 - □ 2-3 years after project completion?
 - □ different for R&I
- Data source: surveys, registries
- Examples: for R&I



RCR02 – Private investments matching public support (of which: grants, financial instruments)

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
100%	100%	87%	53%	93%

- Disaggregation: separate indicators?
- Definition: non-eligible costs? VAT?
- Time measurement:
 - one year after project completion?
 - for financial instruments?
- Examples: non-eligible co-financing and how to verify it



RCR03 – SMEs introducing product or process innovation

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
87%	80%	60%	60%	60%

- State aid: not allowed if close to market?
- Name: SMEs or enterprises? add services?
- Definition:
 - □ why distinguish innovation types (RCR04)?
 - □ how is innovation proved?
- Double counting: several innovations?
- Time measurement: one year not enough? project completion?

RCR04 – SMEs introducing marketing or organizational innovation

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
87%	87%	60%	53%	53%

- Definition:
 - □ marketing and organisational same as process innovation (RCR03)?
 - □ explain distinction from RCR05 (external dimension)



RCR05 - SMEs innovating in-house

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
73%	73%	67%	60%	67%

- Definition:
 - □ innovation activities instead of R&I (mismatch between message and definition)



RCR06 - Patent applications submitted to European Patent Office

RELE	VANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
	56%	63%	75%	63%	69%

- Name: why just EPO?
- Definition:
 - □ all patent offices considered?
 - □ submission of application or registration?
- Double counting: not applicable?
- Time measurement:
 - □ lag in patent submission? earlier submission?
 - □ difficult to follow



RCR07 - Trademarks and design applications

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
60%	67%	67%	67%	67%

- Definition:
 - □ D&T approved or submitted?
 - □ intended D&T?
- Double counting: not applicable?
- Time measurement: more than one year?



RCR08 - Public-private co-publications

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
47%	60%	67%	40%	53%

- Projects market oriented: occasional publications
- Name: why only public-private? co-publications?
- Double counting: difficult?







RCO12 – Enterprises supported to digitise their products and services

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
93%	87%	93%	80%	93%

- How does it differ from RCO01?
- Definition:
 - □ does digitisation imply innovation?
 - □ what is digital innovation?



RCO13 – Digital services and products developed for enterprises

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
93%	73%	53%	53%	60%

- Name: processes should be included
- Measurement unit: not robust? stand-alone digital applications?
- Type indicator: result?
- Definition:
 - □ what are digital processes?
 - □ third parties?
 - □ improved or updated digital applications?
- Double counting: not applicable



RCO14 - Public institutions supported to develop digital services and applications

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
87%	93%	80%	80%	93%

- Name: digital processes, services and applications?
- Alternatives:
 - □ value of digital services and applications
 - □ Number of new services and digital applications
 - ... by public institutions
- Definition:
 - □ include subordinate organisational units such as municipal companies?
 - □ updated applications?
 - □ uptake or innovation?
- Double counting: not applicable



RCR11 – Users of new public digital services and applications

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
87%	80%	73%	60%	67%

- Name: new or upgraded (i.e. substantially modified)?
- Definition:
 - □ substantial improvements not counted?
 - □ users: citizens or staff of public institutions? cannot distinguish individuals from enterprises?
 - □ different types of users: internal/ external?
 - □ calculation per year?
- Double counting: for users, close to impossible? for services and applications?
- Time measurement: over one year from completion?

RCR12 – Users of new digital products, services and applications developed by enterprises

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
73%	53%	73%	40%	60%

- Name: new or upgraded (i.e. substantially modified)?
- Definition:
 - □ include users of mobile applications?
 - □ new or upgraded?
 - □ users: individual and enterprises?
- Double counting: for users, close to impossible? for services and applications?
- Time measurement: over one year from completion?



RCR13 – Enterprises reaching high digital intensity

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
60%	40%	53%	33%	53%

- Definition:
 - □ target quite modest for advanced economies
 - □ too many conditions to comply with
 - □ difficult to follow up
 - □ only for enterprises which do not meet the criteria a priori
- Double counting: low risk?
- Time measurement: all results one year after completion?
- Data source: surveys?



RCR14 – Enterprises using public digital services

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
71%	50%	64%	36%	57%

- Name: services and applications?
- Replace by an indicator for all end users (individuals and businesses)?
- Definition:
 - ☐ new or upgraded?
 - □ users: individuals and businesses?
- Double counting: for users, close to impossible?
- Time measurement: over one year after completion?
- Data source: surveys?







RCO15 - Capacity of incubation created

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
73%	73%	73%	60%	60%

- Name:
 - □ capacity created or improved?
- Alternatives:
 - □ number enterprises using the incubator?
 - □ work stations?
- Measurement unit: discrepancy with the name?
- Definition:
 - □ mismatch with title (enterprises that can or are supported? see structured relationship?)
 - □ distinction from RCO04?
- Double counting: not applicable (potential capacity)

 Commission

 Commiss

RCR16 - High growth enterprises supported

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
53%	27%	40%	13%	40%

- Definition: high growth before or after implementation?
- Target: difficult to estimate?
- Time measurement:
 - □ why one year after? expected impact on growth?
 - □ consistent with 3-year period for high growth?
- Data source: surveys, registries?



RCR17 – 3-year old enterprises surviving in the market

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
87%	53%	47%	33%	33%

- Name: start-ups, new, young (RCO05)?
- Definition:
 - □ when is enterprise age established? (max 3 years when submitting an application, after project completion?)
 - □ "on their own" no more grant or support?
 - □ "still active" more than just registered? minimum turnover?
- Target: difficult to estimate
- Time measurement: three years after support?

RCR18 – SMEs using incubator services one year after the incubator creation

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
80%	80%	67%	53%	60%

- Name: why include duration?
- Definition:
 - □ RCO15 compared with RCR18?
 - □ new or upgraded incubator capacity?
 - □ annual number?
- Double counting: difficult to eliminate?



RCR19 – Enterprises with higher turnover

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
67%	53%	60%	33%	53%

- Definition:
 - □ include minimum level of turnover growth?
 - □ *RCR16 vs RCR19?*
 - □ remove "sustain"?
- Time measurement: data in public registries later than one year? two years?



RCR25 - Value added per employee in supported SMEs

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
33%	20%	13%	13%	20%

- Definition:
 - averaging not suitable for aggregation
 - □ No reference (what is "sufficient" added value?)
- Time measurement: three years?







RCO16 – Stakeholders participating in entrepreneurial discovery process

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
63%	50%	50%	38%	25%

- Name: institutional stakeholders?
- Definition
 - □ who is institutional stakeholder? businesses included?
 - □ how much involvement?
 - □ entrepreneurial discovery?
 - □ *subjective, difficult to control?*
- Double counting: filter duplication?
- Time measurement: when exactly?



RCO17 – Investments in regional / local ecosystems for skills development

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
60%	60%	47%	47%	27%

- Definition:
 - □ what is an ecosystem?
 - □ what type of projects?
 - □ total investments (public, private, ERDF, national etc)?
 - □ skills /knowledge/ training ?
 - □ enterprises included?
 - □ *ESF*+ *cross-financing?*
 - Double counting: applicable?



RCO101 – SMEs investing in skills development

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
87%	80%	53%	67%	60%

- Name:
 - □ why SMEs?
 - □ skills for smart specialization?
- Use with other common indicators: RCO01?
- Definition:
 - □ link with ERDF and eligible costs?
 - □ delimitation with ESF?



RCO102 – SMEs investing training management systems

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
86%	71%	36%	57%	36%

- Distinction: RCO101 vs RCO102?
- Definition:
 - □ training management systems?
 - □ which training eligible?
- Double counting: projects or SMEs?



RCR24 – SMEs benefiting from activities for skills development delivered by local/regional ecosystems

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
73%	67%	53%	53%	47%

- Type indicator: why a result?
- Target: difficult to estimate if ecosystems unknown?
- Definition:
 - □ scope?
 - □ annual users of the ecosystem?
- Double counting: include SMEs?
- Data source: surveys?



RCR97 - Apprenticeships supported in SMEs

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
64%	71%	64%	64%	57%

- Type indicator: why a result?
- Definition:
 - □ duration of apprenticeship?
 - □ which domain eligible?
 - □ minimum duration for apprenticeship?
- Double counting: add?
- Time measurement: when apprenticeship over?



RCR98 – SMEs staff completing Continuing Vocational Education and Training (CVET) (by type of skills: technical, management, entrepreneurship, green, other)

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
79%	79%	71%	64%	64%

- Combine indicators RCR98, RCR99, RCR100?
- Definition:
 - □ ESF data collection applicable?
 - □ why annual number of SME staff?
 - □ participation or completion?
- Double counting: unique participants?
- Time measurement:
 - □ one year after completion?
 - □ when training completed?



RCR99 – SMEs staff completing alternative training for knowledge intensive service activities (KISA) (by type of skills: technical, management, entrepreneurship, green, other)

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
71%	71%	71%	64%	64%

Number MS: 14

RCR100 – SMEs staff completing formal training for skills development (KISA) (by type of skills: technical, management, entrepreneurship, green, other)

RELEVANT (3,4)	ACCEPTED (3,4)	CREDIBLE (3,4)	EASY (3,4)	ROBUST (3,4)
71%	79%	71%	64%	64%







ERDF and CF Indicators proposed for 2021+

Note: Interreg specific indicators with Interact expert group (20 Feb 2019)

Policy objective	Specific objectives	Outputs	Results
PO1 Smart Europe	(i) R&D capacities	10	8
	(ii) Digitisation	3	4
	(iii) SMEs	1	5
	(iv) Skills for smart specialisation	4	5
Total PO1		18	22
PO2 Green Europe	(i) Energy efficiency	3	5
	(ii) Renewable energy	2	2
	(iii) Smart grids	2	2
	(iv) Climate change	5	5
	(v) Water management	3	4
	(vi) Circular economy	1	4
	(vii) Biodiversity	5	4
Total PO2		21	26
PO3 Connected Europe	(i) Digital connectivity	2	2
	(ii) TEN-T	4	3
	(iii) Other than TEN-T	9	4
	(iv) Multimodal urban mobility	6	3
Total PO3		21	12
PO4 Social Europe	(i) Labour markets infrastructure	1	1
	(ii) Inclusive education	3	3
	(iii) Integration - housing and social	2	2
	(iv) Health infrastructure	2	4
Total PO4		8	10
PO5 Closer Europe	(i) Integrated urban	4	3
	(ii) Integrated territorial and CLLDs	1	
Total PO5		5	3
	Horizontal	1	4
T	otal for Eval Net	74	77



Indicators PO2 (Feb-Mar)



