

## REGIO Evaluation Network Meeting –Minutes for sessions on ERDF and CF common indicators

Policy Objective 3 – Connected Europe

Policy Objective 4 – Social Europe

### Agenda

**\* Thursday April 11, 2019 \***

Venue: ALBERT BORSCHETTE Conference Centre, rue Froissart 36, Brussels – CCAB – Room 1A

09.00 - 09.30: Registration\* and coffee

#### 1. MORNING SESSION

9:30-10:00 *Welcome and agenda*

10:00-11:00 *Preparations for the Performance Review*

DG REGIO, Unit B2

11:00-11:15 COFFEE BREAK

11:15-11:30 *Internal audit of the evaluation function of DG REGIO and DG EMPL*

DG REGIO, Unit B2

11:30-12:15 *System of implementation of evaluation recommendations in Poland*

JAKUB JAKALSKI, Chief Specialist, Department for Development Strategy, Ministry of Investment and Economic Development, Poland

12:15-14:00 LUNCH BREAK

#### 2. AFTERNOON SESSION

14:00-15:30 *Indicators Specific Objective 3.ii: TEN-T*

15:30-15:45 COFFEE BREAK

15:45-17:30 *Indicators Specific Objective 3.iii: Access to TEN-T*

*Indicators Specific Objective 3.iv: Urban mobility*

17:30-19:00 DRINKS

**\* Friday April 12, 2019 \***

Venue: ALBERT BORSCHETTE Conference Centre, rue Froissart 36, Brussels – CCAB – Room 1A

09.00 - 09.30: Registration\* and coffee

### 3. MORNING SESSION

9:30-11:00 *Indicators Specific Objective 3.iv (continued): Urban mobility*

*Indicators Specific Objective 3.i: Digital connectivity*

11:00-11:15 COFFEE BREAK

11:15-12:30 *Indicators Specific Objective 4.i: Labour market and access to employment*

*Indicators Specific Objective 4.ii: Education, training, LLL*

12:30-14:00 LUNCH BREAK

### 4. AFTERNOON SESSION

14:00-15:30 *Indicators Specific Objective 4.iii: Socio-economic integration*

*Indicators Specific Objective 4.iv: Access to healthcare*

15:30-15:45 COFFEE BREAK

15:45-17:00 *Discussion of content of next meeting (PO5 + templates on reporting) + AOB*

\* Registration of the persons who confirmed participation as indicated on the invitation letter.

## **REGIO B.2 introduces the agenda for the sessions on ERDF and CF common indicators for the Policy Objective 3 and 4.**

### Objectives of the meeting:

- Agree on the names of the indicators included in Annex I
- Discuss the definitions, measurement, and other metadata included in the indicator fiches – to be included in the guidance for the indicators. On these issues, there will be further opportunities for refinement when the unit and the MS discuss the guidance (after the adoption of the legislative texts).

### Rationale

- Rationale for the extension of the list of common indicators: 1) increase policy coverage by common indicators; 2) introduction of common indicators for direct results, in the same logic as for the EMPL indicators. These will prove useful for the analysis of the effectiveness of the policy. It will enhance our (common) ability to communicate on the achievement of the policy.
- The unit invites a reflection on how these changes proposed will interact with monitoring systems and with the evaluation of the impacts of the future programmes.

### Process:

- The meeting is dedicated to policy objectives 3 and 4.
- By specific objective, the unit takes each indicator at a time and discuss the comments received from MS, and possible solutions (if needed).
- For PO3 – 69 pages of comments received for 33 indicators, from 20 Member States. For PO4 – 44 pages of comments received for 18 indicators, from 18 Member States.
- All comments received from MS are shared via the working group on CIRCABC.
- For the meeting the REGIO B2 groups and synthesizes the key issues from the comments received.
- The unit takes on board the issues discussed during the meeting, and it will discuss them further with colleagues in the Commission.

### Content

- In the discussion, one of the objective is to address the distinction between the usefulness of the indicator and the frequency of reporting. The key question to ask is the following: is the information provided by this indicator relevant, useful, etc. The frequency of measurement is a separate matter which will be discussed in the last meeting.
- Some indicators proposed are generic – they will be relevant for several specific objectives.
- Based on ratings for the RACER criteria received from MS, for each of the indicator the unit calculates the share of respondents (MS) who assigned high and very high scores to each of the criteria.
- The presentation used in the meeting summarizes the issues raised by the MS in the comments sent to the unit. REGIO B.2 explains the meeting starts by presenting the indicators of the specific objectives 3.ii and 3.iii and the respective result indicators. They will correct the indicators list, so the TEN-T indicators will be associated with policy objective 3.ii. Moreover, REGIO B.2 explains that they will present the output indicators related to TEN-T and to non TEN-T together, on the basis of the form of transportation. As to the result indicators, they will present them common for both the specific objectives.

### Legend:

Changes in indicator name

Changes in definitions/ fiche

## Policy Objective 3. A more connected Europe

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 3.ii Developing a sustainable, climate resilient, intelligent, secure and intermodal TEN-T

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 3.iii Developing a sustainable, climate resilient, intelligent, secure and intermodal national, regional and local mobility, including improved access to TEN-T and cross-border mobility

### OUTPUT INDICATORS SO3.ii & 3.iii

#### **RCO43 Length of new roads supported - TEN-T (SO3.ii)**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 88%, Accepted: 100%, Credible: 100%, Easy: 100%, Robust: 94%

#### **RCO44 Length of new roads supported - other (SO3.iii)**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 94%, Accepted: 100%, Credible: 100%, Easy: 100%, Robust: 94%

(The two indicators are discussed together).

Issues raised:

- Indicator name: is “length” necessary? The name is already explicit. Is “supported” necessary? Can we change word order? Are “new and upgraded” both included? The definition implies we can count upgraded roads. Can we insert non-TENT instead of “other” for RCO44?
- Definition for TEN-T: suggestion to reformulate since not all existing roads, upgraded to TEN-T, are TENT-T to begin with. The description of higher classification should be clearer.
- For RCO44: is it possible to calculate the entire length of reconstructed road if on a given project sections run on a new track because of technical and safety reasons, but the road category does not change?
- Target setting: it could be a challenge because of differences between planned and actual costs, planned and realized projects etc.
- Time of measurement: should we take into account physical completion or road in operation?

Unit B2 replies:

As for the specific indicator RCO43

- Concerning the indicator name, “length” would not be needed if the measurement units would be included in the Annex. Otherwise, it is necessary since the indicator can be interpreted as number of roads.
- The unit agrees on the proposal to drop “supported” in the indicator name, because all the indicators refers to the interventions supported. (timing 15:40 2recording)
- The unit proposes to keep length instead of extension, since the latter may generate difficulties for other languages.
- The unit agrees on adding “upgraded” since the definition refers also to upgraded roads. Therefore, it proposes a revised name: “Length of new or upgraded roads” (TEN-T and other)
- The unit could consider using “non-TENT” for the remaining indicators, instead of “other”.
- The unit will reformulate the definition in relation to TEN-T definition. (17:00 2 recording).
- MS should use the national classification of the roads, but also Directive 2008/96/EC on road infrastructure safety management, where there are the definitions of motorways, primary roads, etc. It ensures it will include the reference of the above-mentioned documents.
- With regards to the target setting, the unit explains it is a methodological problem, thus, it will recommend to strengthen the methodology. (timing 19:00 2recording)

- As to the time of measurement, the unit proposes to take into account the road or the section of the road in operation.

As for the specific indicator RCO44

- The unit replies that if this is the case, they should use the indicators RCO45 and RCO46.

**RCO45 Length of roads reconstructed or upgraded – TEN-T (SO 3.ii)**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 88%, Accepted: 100%, Credible: 100%, Easy: 100%, Robust: 94%

**RCO46 Length of roads reconstructed or upgraded – other (SO 3.iii)**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 94%, Accepted: 100%, Credible: 100%, Easy: 100%, Robust: 94%.

(The indicators RCO45 and RCO46 are discussed together).

Issues raised:

- Name: is “length” necessary? Why should we include upgraded?  
Proposal of a new name: Roads reconstructed / rehabilitated or modernised/ improved?
- Method of calculation: does the indicator cover situations where only one line of a road is reconstructed or upgraded ?
- Scope: Does the indicators cover situations where an existing road has been complemented with upgrade traffic management system? Does the indicator include enlargement?
- Definition: clarification on the meaning of upgraded and improved, and reconstruction and maintenance.
- Time of measurement: what should we take into account physical completion or road in operation?

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- Clarification on the inclusion of the terms “upgraded or improved” in all the indicators.
- It is inquired whether and which type of safety systems refer to projects aiming to improve the safety of citizens. In this case, can pedestrian access be considered a safety project? Can we include all the safety systems or only some of them?

Unit B2 replies:

- As to length, the same explanation of RCO43 and RCO44 applied here.
- The unit proposes to drop “upgraded” in order to eliminate the overlap with RCO43 and RCO44. Since these indicators refer to new and upgraded roads, since “upgraded” appears in the definition, in this indicator terms should be changed, otherwise the MA would not know where to put upgraded roads, meaning whether to include in this indicator or in the previous one. Therefore, the unit and the MS propose a new name: Roads reconstructed / rehabilitated or modernised/ improved.
- The unit proposes to keep “improved” in the definition.
- Improved means significant improvement of the roads, rehabilitation of the road or the railway, but without changing the class; it excludes maintenance and repairs. Upgraded roads refers to the change in the classification of roads to higher classes, or when the capacity of the railway or of the road changes.
- As to the method of calculation, the unit assesses that the calculated length of the road cannot be more than the road itself. It is calculated in km of roads. The unit proposes to work with MS to find specific examples.
- As to the possibility to use the indicator to cover situation where an existing road has been complemented with upgrade traffic management system, given that with the railways

indicators it was proposed not to include traffic management systems to not distort the values, the unit would propose to have the same approach here, thus excluding traffic management system. If needed, it could consider introducing a new indicator “Roads with upgraded traffic management systems” (measured in km) as an output indicator. Alternatively, MS could have two options: a) to consider to use a programme specific indicators; b) to consider to introduce a result indicator on safety system specifically for roads. (timing 23:00 2 recording)

- If a project aims at improving the safety of a railway station against any kind of human or natural threat, this could be counted as “improved station”.
- Defining reconstruction and upgrade would imply overspecifying the definition, thereby inadvertently limiting the scope of the measurement. It is clear that maintenance and repairs are not included.
- Enlargement can be included in the definition, if it is part of an improvement.
- The unit proposes to count the roads in operations and the sections of roads completed, provided it is based on achieved values, as in the current period.

#### **RCO47 Length of new rail supported – TEN-T (SO 3.ii)**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 87%, Accepted: 100%, Credible: 100%, Easy: 100%, Robust: 93%

#### **RCO48 Length of new rail supported – other (SO 3.iii)**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 88%, Accepted: 100%, Credible: 94%, Easy: 100%, Robust: 88%

(The indicators are discussed together).

Issues raised:

- Name: is “length” necessary? Is “supported” necessary?
- Method of calculation: is this measured per single track? Should we count track length in stations, length of railway switches, double or triple tracks?
- Peculiarity: how should we count a single track improvement with a parallel new track construction? Which indicator should we use- RCO47 and RCO49 ?
- Scope: in 2014-2020 “developing single track rail into double track” was included in the “reconstructed/ upgraded” rails.
- Definition of realignment
- Proposal to merge new with reconstructed rail.

Unit B2 replies:

- The unit proposes to eliminate “supported”; and it clarified that the term “length” may be necessary, as for the above mentioned indicators.
- There are two options: a) measuring the routes; b) measuring the length of the track. The output should look at the length of the track. Therefore, the measurement unit will be “km of tracks”, and the unit will clarify in the definition. It is consistent with DG MOVE approach.
- Peculiarity: both the indicators can be used.
- Scope: Because the track length is measured, the second track is essentially new, and therefore should be included in RCO47, RCO48. RCO47 can include also upgrades from non-TEN T to TEN-T (i.e. an existing non-TEN-T rail becomes a TEN-T rail). The unit will explain it in the definition. In general, RCO47 should be applied to cases where investments help to achieve compliance with TEN-T standards. All other upgrades (ex: upgrades for a rail which is already TENT) should be included in RCO49.

- As to the additional questions raised by MS about the possibility to count track length in stations, or the length of railway switches, the unit and MS agree to count linear length of the track.
- As to the specific situation when there is a single-track improvement with a parallel new track construction, the unit suggests to consult the MA in order to distinguish TEN-T from others, and the extent of the improvement.
- The unit clarifies the scope of the indicators, replying to the MS comment stating the following: “in 2014-2020 developing single track rail into double track was included in the “reconstructed/ upgraded rails”. Since the MS should measure the track length, the second track is essentially new, and therefore should be included in RCO47 and RCO48.
- The “realignment” refers to “physical realignment” of the rail. The unit will explain in the definition.
- As to the proposal to merge the indicators for new railways with the one for reconstructed railways, the unit explains that the costs are very different; therefore, it would be not useful for evaluation.

#### **RCO49 Length of rail reconstructed or upgraded – TEN-T (SO 3.ii)**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 87%, Accepted: 100%, Credible: 100%, Easy: 100%, Robust: 93%

#### **RCO50 Length of rail reconstructed or upgraded - other (SO 3.iii)**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 80%, Accepted: 100%, Credible: 100%, Easy: 100%, Robust: 87%

(The indicators are discussed together).

Issues raised:

- Similarity of issues raised with indicators targeting railways lines, especially the method of calculation
- Name: is length” necessary? Clarification on the term upgraded.
- Overlap with indicators for new rail
- Scope: do we consider urban or suburban train lines or both of them? In case of a depreciated railway, if the goal of the project is to restore speed to its original speed, will this be covered by the RCO49/50? If the goal of the project is to increase axle load, can this be counted by these indicators?
- Double counting: how can we avoid it? Several activities (ex: construction, safety systems etc) could be carried out on the same sections.

Unit B2 replies:

- Many of the issues mentioned for new rail apply here as well, and especially the method of calculation.
- As to the indicator name, it is necessary to include length. There could be a potential overlapping as with previous indicators, which include “realignment with improved performance”. The unit proposes to include “upgraded” for indicators for new rail, and leave “rail reconstructed and improved/ modernized” for RCO49 and RCO50.
- The unit ensures that the indicators do not cover urban / suburban train lines which are to be measured by RCO56 (tram and metro lines). It will clarify it in the definition based on the terms from the interoperability directive, which refers to “networks that are functionally separate from the rest of the railway system and intended only for the operation of local, urban, or suburban passenger services” (Directive 2008/57/EC on the interoperability of the rail system

within the Community). All these urban and suburban rails, which are not connected to the main network in the country, will be considered in RCO55, and not in this indicator.

- The unit ensures that it will provide a clear definition of upgraded and improved performance. As mentioned, RCO47 will refer to upgrades from non-TENT to TENT. For RCO48 (non TEN-T), upgrades refer to the three cases mentioned in the definition. Therefore, any other improvements (electrification, balance, tracks, etc.) will be included in RCO49 and RCO50.
- The unit clarifies that in the case of a depreciated railway, if the goal of the project is to restore speed to its original speed, these costs will be covered by the RCO49 or RCO50. If the goal of the project is to increase axle load<sup>1</sup>, this can be counted in these indicators. Any improvements which will be relevant for safety, speed or any other aspect should be considered in this indicator.
- The unit agrees it is necessary to include a rule to avoid double counting in the fiche. This means to identify the section where works are conducted.

### **RCO51 Length of new or upgraded inland waterways – TEN-T (SO 3.ii)**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 71%, Accepted: 100%, Credible: 100%, Easy: 100%, Robust: 92%

### **RCO52 Length of new or upgraded inland waterways - other (SO 3.iii)**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 71%, Accepted: 100%, Credible: 100%, Easy: 100%, Robust: 92%

(The indicators are discussed together).

Issues raised:

- Name: is "length" necessary?
- Scope: if the waterway is depreciated and the project aims at restoring its original quality, should this be counted as improved?
- Definition: what is considered improved navigation capacity?
- Time measurement

Unit B2 replies:

- The unit states the term "length" may be necessary.
- The unit ensures that in the case of the waterway is depreciated and the project aims at restoring its original quality, this should be counted as improved. This follows the same rationale of the above mentioned indicators.
- The unit will include the current definition of CO16 to clarify what it is considered improved navigation capacity, meaning transport capacity and safety.
- Time measurement should be considered similarly as to previous indicators.

### **RCO53 Railways stations and facilities – new or upgraded (SO 3.iii)**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 94%, Accepted: 100%, Credible: 88%, Easy: 88%, Robust; 81%

Issues raised:

- Name: should not we include railways stations with new or upgraded facilities?
- Measurement unit: proposal to use infrastructure units; or common metric assets.
- Definition: is maintenance covered?

---

<sup>1</sup> Axle load is an important design consideration in the engineering of roadways and railways, as both are designed to tolerate a maximum weight-per-axle (axle load); exceeding the maximum rated axle load will cause damage to the tracks.



- Scope: demarcation with intermodal connections: does the indicator cover parking areas? There could be several type of interventions in the railway stations, how do we have to consider them? Costs are very different.
- Examples : could you provide more details on the repair and maintenance?

Unit B2 replies:

- The unit wanted to measure both the facilities not part of railway stations and the railway stations supported. Afterwards, it realizes it cannot capture all of them with one indicator. The unit will propose to include only railway stations and stops. Then, one needs to use a programme specific indicator for other facilities, such as depot. **Therefore, the new proposed name would be: New or upgraded / modernized railway stations and stops.**
- The unit will prefer to keep railway stations because there could be different activities supported for their modernization/ construction. This should also address the comment on the measurement unit in common metric assets, since there would be no mix between stations and facilities.
- **As to the measurement unit, the unit would propose to use number of railways station and stop, without going into details, because the variety of interventions is wide.**
- The unit clarifies maintenance is not covered.
- **The unit states that it will provide, in the definition, a clear demarcation between RCO53 and RCO54 for intermodal connection; and the MS should use RCO54 to count new or improved parking areas.**
- The unit assesses that development of railway stations can include upgrading railway tracks (in line with TEN-T requirements) and safety systems. Railway tracks should be included in the previous indicators, as well as safety systems also, to the extent they can be measured in km. Stops should be counted in RCO53.
- The unit clarifies maintenance is not covered, but measures, such as development of railway stations (new facilities, for instance), upgrades of safety systems etc. should be included. However, the unit decided to not provide a comprehensive list of interventions to not limit the scope of the indicator.
- **The unit will include also a rule for double counting, i.e. for investments carried out in the same railways station/ stop should be counted once.**

### **RCO54 Intermodal connections – new or upgraded (SO 3.iii)**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 88%, Accepted: 81%, Credible: 69%, Easy: 69%, Robust: 75%

Issues raised:

- Name: proposal to reformulate the name: New or upgraded intermodal connections. Possibility to use the indicator for other specific objectives.
- Definition: Are the railway stations included?
- Method of calculation: How can we compare 400 P(ark) and R(ide) vs 1 rail-bus platform? Can pedestrian access be included?

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- Further clarification on the methods of calculation of intermodal connections.

Unit B2 replies:

- **The unit agrees with MS to reformulate the indicator name; and to add \* as it might be useful for other specific objectives.**

- The unit clarifies the railway stations are not included, and it will insert it in the definition. It clarifies the meaning of intermodal connections through an example: in case a parking space is built to link nodes of transportation, then the intervention should be included here.
- The definition covers both freight and passenger transport. Finally, the unit proposes to maintain one indicator for all intermodal nodes, not intermodal connections.
- Given the fact the number of connections differs significantly across investments, the unit proposes to measure intermodal nodes, not the connections. The inclusion of pedestrian access carries the risk of distorting the indicator values. Therefore, the unit proposes to exclude it.

### **RCO100 Number of ports supported (SO 3.iii)**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 88%, Accepted: 87%, Credible: 80%, Easy: 80%, Robust: 80%

#### Issues raised:

- Name: proposal to eliminate “number of”; proposal of a new name: New or upgraded ports
- Definition: which type of ports are included: inland ports, sea ports? Are ports for passengers and freight included? Do we include TEN-T or non-TEN-T ports?
- Small values: there is at most one port supported per programme; values will be small.
- Scope
- Do we need for an indicator for airports, since the relevant investments made there?

#### Unit B2 replies:

- The MS and the unit agrees to eliminate “number of” in the indicator name and propose a new name: New or upgraded ports
- The unit states that the indicator is meant to cover all types of ports (sea, inland) meant for transport of passenger and freight. Marinas are not included and it is not necessary to distinguish between TEN-T and non-TENT for the two specific objectives.
- As regards investments in ports, there are also other types of investments such as in fire vessels, rescue ships, safety and environmental equipment (i.e. resources for life rescue and sea pollution combatting). The interventions are very heterogeneous.
- Comments on small values and scope invited a reflection for the unit and the MS on how useful an indicator in terms of number of ports really is. In principle, the number of operations could be sufficiently informative from this perspective. On the other hand, trying to propose a more meaningful indicator is challenging due to the diversity of the investments. Therefore, the unit and MS agree to propose to remove this indicator from the list of common indicator, suggesting also that MS should use programme specific indicators tailored to the type of investments.
- The unit is inclined to not propose an indicator for airports, the MS can use program specific indicator.

#### **New indicators proposed by the member states:**

1. Output indicator for roads: Number vehicles on newly built roads.
  - a. The unit explains this indicator is very close to the estimated number of users of the road (which is based on the number of vehicles). Therefore, there would be a significant overlap between the new one proposed indicator and RCR55. Moreover, the unit states it seemed more a result indicator rather than an output one.
2. Proposed output indicators for new railways:
  - a) Length of platform constructed;
  - b) Length of track assembly.

The unit clarifies that the platform constructed could in principle be captured by the railway stations upgraded. As for track assembly, this could be captured by the existing indicator on railways improved or reconstructed.

3. Output indicator for railways: Number of terminals newly developed, reconstructed or expanded (terminals).

The unit assesses this could be captured by the railway station indicators, and it prefers to call intermodal nodes instead of terminals. In case the investments are primarily made in the railway stations, this should be counted in railways station or stops new or improved. If the investments are made in parking, tram connections, cycling parking facilities, these would be captured in intermodal nodes. If the main objective is to improve the railway stations or stop, the authorities should report them in RCO53; while if the investments are made to improve the intermodal nodes, the indicator RCO54 should be used. If investments are made in the same site, both indicators should be used for the different investments.

4. Output for railways: New/ Modernised environmentally friendly railway rolling stock (vehicles). This does not reflect a priority for the ERDF investments.

5. Proposal to include also an output indicator for signalling systems (ERTMS), since up to now we have only a result indicator. For the ERTMS, the unit agrees with the comments and it proposes to move it from result to output.

## RESULT INDICATORS SO3.ii& 3.iii

### RCR55 Users of newly built, reconstructed or upgraded roads

RACER criteria: Relevant: 63%, Accepted: 80%, Credible: 50%, Easy: 27%, Robust: 38%

Issues raised:

- Measurement unit: the measurement unit is not in line with the indicator name.
- Definition of users: do we count drivers, cargo, passengers?
- Interpretation: in contrast to reduction of traffic?
- Baseline
- Time measurement: do we measure it after a calendar year or two years later? We should consider seasonality in the use of roads. On the other hand, some MS suggest after 2 years.
- Double counting: within and across periods?
- Data source: we would prefer using ad hoc surveys rather than projects.

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- Counting the number of users means having a tool to calculate them, and the beneficiaries or the MA should have this tool for every project, and this will lead to increase the costs of the project. This indicator implies also that every single project should have an ex post counting of users of roads. Single counting after every project is extremely expensive.
- The indicator is useful, but it is hard to verify the results achieved, because it is difficult to calculate the users, it is based on many assumptions and at the end, the indicator could result not SMART (available with a low price). It should be excluded from verifications, since there are changes from a day to another. A possible solution could be to use google data, mobile phone or operators' data, or more broadly, cheaper solutions at the EU level.
- Suggestion to use number of vehicles or number of equivalent vehicles in order to reduce flexibility, and to make comparisons simpler.
- A MS states that in the 2014-2020 programming period, the country has supported the improvement and reconstruction of roads, and it has used the indicator to see the increase of the capacity of passengers and freight on rehabilitated and new roads. The data have been

gathered every 5 years, and the results have evidenced that the road use does not increase in all the roads with supported projects, since its use relates also to other investments the country made in those areas. Therefore, it is decided to use another indicator: “number of people who are living in the localities along the roads rehabilitated”. Finally, it is asked if they should use RCR55 and RCR56 together, and whether the unit could think to change upgraded with improved, or not.

- As measurement unit, it is proposed to use then number of vehicles, or number of equivalent vehicles, to reduce flexibility: if the purpose is to compare, it should be used simpler and more common methods.
- Although counting vehicles can be considered the simplest measurement unit, it is difficult for the authorities, because they are not always the same in charge of works on the roads.

Unit B2 replies:

- This indicator leads to a further reflection on its message since, from the policy perspective, the objective should not be to encourage road traffic, but to build or improve roads to diminish traffic congestion and to increase time saving.
- The unit clarified the term “users” include passengers and all the others who are not passengers, who are using the road, and it would provide a clearer definition of users. Finally, the unit proposed to use users/km or persons/km.
- The indicator could be differently interpreted for new roads and for upgraded or improved roads. For reconstructed/ upgraded roads, the indicator could be challenging, since there will not necessarily be a change in the number of users. Nevertheless, the indicator is informative in terms of the numbers of users which benefit from improved road conditions. Therefore, the unit proposes to keep the indicator, but with a different measurement unit in terms of users of the road.
- Baseline 0 is valid only for new roads and it can be used to communicate new users. When the baseline equal or higher than zero, upgraded or improved roads should be taken into account: in this case the objective is to increase the use of that road, because it has been underutilised; on the other hand, you can use the indicator to communicate the improvement in the road conditions. It can serve different purposes: you can use the achieved value or the change relative to a baseline.
- The unit would recommend maintaining the one year period after the roads become operational. Even though the unit is aware that after one year the situation could be the same as before, two years after project completion is too much and the effectiveness of the policy communication could be lost.
- It is difficult to obtain an exact calculation of the number of users, it proposes to mention the estimated annual users of the road, and to measure them in significant section of supported roads. The unit suggests to reflect together with the MS on possible simplified methodologies for estimating the average number of road users per year, as reliable as possible, in significant stretches. One should think also in terms on the nature of the investments: it is true that having tools to count users for every project supported is costly, but if the investments made have been relevant, it is worthy to invest resources on counting the users.
- This is a new common indicator in this context, but this type of indicator is used regularly by enterprises/ public administration administering the roads (which collect data on road traffic, normally both for freight and passengers). The management of roads relies on this type of data.
- The unit highlights double counting within the period is clearly not desirable, because the MS would know in which section interventions would be done. As regards the phased projects, the unit could consider one of several options:
  - a) Possibility to adjust the number of users by the share of the financing provided in the first phase (for the first period), and report the difference in the second period.

- b) Possibility to ignore double counting since they will not cumulate values across periods.
- As to data source, the unit recommends to use ad hoc surveys rather than projects, but it ensures to include both of them. The problem about the ad hoc survey is related to the people or organisations which conduct the surveys.
- The unit prefers to have users/km to ensure comparability of data, and, since the cohesion policy prefers communicating about people, the unit prefers this measurement unit.
- The country can use RCR55 and RCR56 together or separately, depending on the goal of the intervention. As to the terminology upgrade and improved, the unit will take it on board and ensure consistency in the fiche.

### **RCR56 Time savings due to improved road infrastructures**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 69%, Accepted: 73%, Credible: 63%, Easy: 60%, Robust: n.a.

#### Issues raised:

- Calculation method: difficult to measure since there is no methodology developed. Some MS propose to organise a workshop to develop it. MS suggestion: a) “investment decisions of this type should be based on ex-ante feasibility studies, in which estimated time savings are included.”; b) “this calculation requires a methodology based on a counterfactual of a “without road situation.”
- Measurement unit: days? Years? %? Persons/years?
- Aggregation : not clear how to interpret it
- Use of indicator: For what kind of roads would this indicator be used?
- Type of indicator : result or impact?
- Data source: can we include ad hoc surveys?
- Time of measurement: it may take one year between the completion and entry into service of the road.

#### Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- A MS underlines indicators RCR55 and RCR56 are difficult to measure for estimation and for the methodology to apply, therefore it proposes to eliminate the indicator RCR55 because of the difficulties in calculation; in alternative, it proposes to select one of two the indicators.

#### Unit B2 replies:

- As to the difficulty to measure, the unit favours the proposal of discussing the methodology together in a workshop since: a) the indicator is essential for measuring the results of investments in road infrastructure, and b) there are methodologies for estimating time savings developed in the context of CBA analysis. The unit agrees on the comment stating that investment decisions of this type should be based on ex-ante feasibility studies, in which estimated time savings are included. This could be used as a reference point, and then proceed to check whether the assumptions in the ex-ante feasibility study are verified ex post. As to the comment on the fact that the calculation requires a methodology based on a counterfactual of a “without road situation”, the unit replies that when the objective is to reduce travel time, this is not the best method to use, since there would be a baseline of the initial travel time.
- The unit agrees to include person-year as measurement unit.
- As to the aggregation topic, the unit proposes to consider the indicator in terms of travel time (i.e. with a baseline and the achieved value), and then use it to calculate savings in percentage change at EU level.

- The unit clarifies the indicator should be used when the objective of the intervention is to reduce road congestion and therefore save travel time. Therefore, it could be any kind of road. The unit clarifies the calculation of time saving should be per sections of the roads, and add them up. (timing 2:15:00 2 recording)
- With respect to the type of indicator, it could be considered a result indicator if it reflects the objective of the intervention. It could be an impact if measured over the long term, and also in the context of interventions which have other objectives than strictly the reduction of travel time.
- **The unit agrees to include surveys and projects.**
- The unit stresses the results should be reported after one year the section of the road becomes operational. The partially implemented operations should clearly be an option in this case, such that one can account for results on sections which become operational before the full road is operational.
- If we could find a way to know the users, the RCR55 seems to be more relevant and highly representative for a large number of projects. (John reflection after the MS question to delete RCR55 or RCR56 – 2:47:53 2).

### **RCR101 Time savings due to improved rail infrastructures**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 67%, Accepted: 71%, Credible: 53%, Easy: 20%, Robust: 21%

Issues raised:

- Calculation method: difficult to measure because of lack of methodology
- Use of the indicator: for which infrastructures: TEN-T or not TEN-T?
- Similar comment for RCR56

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- The time of measurement proposed for the indicators RCR56 and RCR101 is problematic and costly. Moreover, a MS underlines that it carried out an evaluation, which demonstrated that roads reconstruction helps to improve their security and to decrease the number of accidents. Therefore, it proposes an output and a result indicator, respectively “Number of reconstructed junctions”, and “Number of personal injured accidents in the developed road junctions”. As one of the European goal is to connect investment with people, it assesses that the indicators proposed help to show these improvements.
- Problems to collect data from beneficiaries after one year of project completion.

Unit B2 replies:

- Given the MS concern to set up a solid methodology for the indicator, **the unit states it will provide a recommended methodology**. The unit agrees to discuss both these indicators together in a workshop. It underlines that indicators on time saving, both for road and rail, are very important as measurement of objectives.
- The unit will recommend using this indicator for any project with the main objective of time saving (for passenger transport).

### **RCR57 Length of European Rail Traffic Management equipped railways in operation**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 75%, Accepted: 75%, Credible: 81%, Easy: 88%, Robust: 88%

Issues raised:

- Type of indicator: is it an output or result indicator?
- Baseline: is it necessary?
- Measurement unit : proposal to use length of tracks
- Time of measurement

Unit B2 replies:

- The unit agrees on the fact that the indicator could be considered an output, and it will explore the possibility to move it to the output list, and it will become length of rail equipped with ERTMs, with no result indicator.
- The EC agrees a baseline is not necessary and it will clarify it in the fiche.
- On the basis of the suggestion provided by the MS to consider the length of tracks, the unit agrees; and it ensures it will harmonise the definition with the similar indicator used by colleagues in DG MOVE. The latter provides the indicator definition as follows: “km of lines in service equipped with ERTMS (linked to TEN-T)”, measured in terms of km of track. The unit is committed to further explore how to account for the double tracks in this context.
- On time of measurement, if the indicator becomes an output indicator, measurement should be carried out when the ERTMS system installed is operational.

### **RCR58 Annual number of passengers on supported railways**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 75%, Accepted: 80%, Credible: 69%, Easy: 53%, Robust: 63%

Issues raised:

- Indicator name: proposal to rename it as “additional number of passengers”.
- Data availability : difficult to obtain these data.
- Measurement unit: proposal to calculate passenger-km / year for the entire rail network for the country.
- Double counting: rule needed for double counting.
- Calculation method: how can we count passengers? Do we count every travel they take?
- Data sources: can we consider also other data sources, such as surveys or data from rail operators?
- Time of measurement

Unit B2 replies:

- The indicator aims to measure the annual number of passengers on supported railways, possibly with a baseline non-zero for existing railways. The additional number of passengers can be calculated making the difference between the two. In case there is no change in the annual number of passengers, the indicator can still be used to communicate on passengers benefiting from improved railway travel. Therefore, the unit ensures it will adjust the definition and clarify the measurement time for baseline values.
- Given the observations made by the MS about the difficulty to obtain these data, the unit proposes to use estimations based on ticket sales. If substantive investments are made in upgrading/ constructing rail, they must be based on estimates of the traffic (passenger and freight) on those lines. Furthermore, this indicator is to be used when relevant (i.e. when the objective is to increase the number of passengers, or to ensure substantial improvements in rail travel for a significant number of passengers).
- The unit assesses that the proposal to calculate passenger-km / year for the entire rail network for the country is a statistic; it is no longer an indicator within the scope of the intervention.
- The unit addresses the double counting issue replying that if several works are done for the same railway, then indeed double counting is relevant. Finally, it ensures it will insert the double counting rule in the fiche.

- The unit ensures it will address the calculation method for more clarity, and it clarifies that all type of passengers and every single travel should be included (i.e. if a passenger travels 5 times per days, s/he should be counted 5 times).
- The unit and the MS agrees to consider also other data sources, such as surveys or data from rail operators.
- The unit clarifies time of measurement should be one year after the railway section becomes operational.

### **RCR59 Freight transport on rail**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 75%, Accepted: 87%, Credible: 75%, Easy: 53%, Robust: 69%

### **RCR60 Freight transport on inland waterways**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 60%, Accepted: 79%, Credible: 64%, Easy: 50%, Robust: 57%

(The indicators are discussed together).

Issues raised:

- Measurement: difficult to calculate.
- Use of Indicator and suggestions for alternatives: a) “transport work on freight at the network level”; b) “Number of additional freight transport on supported rail in one year”. Results can be influenced by neighbouring sections: how to deal with it?
- Proposal to measure the freight in tonnes rather than tonnes-km.
- Data sources
- Time measurement

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- Suggestion to use freight wagons or freight containers per year.
- Proposal to use railways-km per year, because it depends on the use of railways.

Unit B2 replies:

- RCR59 and RCR60 have similar comments: they are perceived as difficult, primarily due to lack of a common methodology of calculation. The unit ensures these should be ex post estimates.
- For the indicator RCR59, the unit assesses the first proposal is an output indicator; as to the second option, it becomes complicated to calculate, as well as for the third proposal.
- The unit recommends the use of the indicator if the objective of the intervention is to increase the transport capacity of the rail, because there is a need for it. In this case, the association with the intervention will be more straightforward, although there is clearly no basis to discuss in terms of causality.
- The unit is aware that the results can be influenced by neighbouring sections, but it would also assume that such interventions are decided upon if there is a clear indication they can achieve their objectives. Otherwise, at least the indicator would not be valid.
- The unit agrees with MS to add surveys and others, in addition to projects, as data sources.
- As to the time of measurement, the unit proposes to count one year after the rail or waterway becomes operational.
- As to the possibility to use freight wagons or freight containers per year, the unit will explore this possibility.



## **New indicators proposed by member states: (timing 2:30:00 2recording)**

Result indicator for railways: Annual operational work in passenger transport (train-km / year)

Result indicator for railways: Annual operational work in freight transport (gross-tonnes-km/year);

Number of rail service interruptions per year: the unit thinks is too much specific, maybe it should be used for program specific objective

Indicators for ports:

- a) Passenger/ freight traffic
- b) Length or surface of improved docks
- c) Increase of berth capacity

As it is proposed to eliminate the indicator for port, this indicator is not considered anymore.

## **SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 3.iv Promoting sustainable multimodal urban mobility**

### **OUTPUT INDICATORS SO 3.iv**

#### **RCO55 Length of tram and metro lines – new**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 88%, Accepted: 100%, Credible: 100%, Easy: 94%, Robust: 94%

#### **RCO56 Length of tram and metro lines – reconstructed/upgraded**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 88%, Accepted: 100%, Credible: 100%, Easy: 94%, Robust: 94%

(The indicators are discussed together).

Issues raised:

- Scope: can we include dedicated lanes for busses (bus-based UPT/ERW)? Can we merge these indicators? Are urban/ suburban lines included? What does “upgraded” mean in RCR56?
- Measurement: do we use track or route, or distance?

Unit B2 replies:

- Including dedicated lines for buses would be useful in programmes, but it would require a separate indicator, since it is not comparable with tram and metro lines. This is why the unit did not include trolley buses in this indicator, and it recommends the use of a programme specific indicator.
- The unit proposes to maintain the two indicators, since costs and issues are significantly different for the two types of investments.
- The unit ensured it will clarify the definition of urban and suburban lines based on the terms from the interoperability directive, which refers to “networks that are functionally separate from the rest of the railway system and intended only for the operation of local, urban, or suburban passenger services” (Directive 2008/57/EC on the interoperability of the rail system within the Community). Therefore, they are included in these indicators.
- For RCO56, the unit states that “upgraded” refers to any significant intervention, which does not amount to maintenance or repairs.
- In terms of measurement, the unit prefers to use distance, since issues are not similar as for rail (ex: marshalling yards).

## RCO57 Environmentally friendly rolling stock for public transport

RACER criteria: Relevant: 94%, Accepted: 88%, Credible: 100%, Easy: 100%, Robust: 94%

Issues raised:

- Use in other specific objective and add \*
- Definition: more clarifications on what is environmentally friendly rolling stock. Proposal to include electric busses, natural gas powered busses, hydrogen busses.
- Measurement: proposal to measure the capacity (number of passengers) of purchased rolling stock.
- Scope: Suggestion to consider upgraded rolling stock, when they are converted to cleaner energy sources. Clarification whether the indicator includes only vehicles under public service obligation.

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- Clarification on the possibility to include the electric buses.
- Clarification on the possibility to count the renovation of existing environmentally friendly rolling stock for public transport.

Unit B2 replies:

- In principle, the unit agrees to insert an asterisk to this indicator, but it is not clear for which other specific objectives it would be useful. The indicator covers tram, metro, busses. Rail, indeed, should not be included, and the unit ensures it will correct the definition. Finally, the unit will explore the possibility to consider the renovation of existing environmentally friendly rolling stock for public transport.
- The unit ensures it will explore whether it would be possible to provide more clarity on the definition of “environmentally friendly rolling stock”, and it will explore the possibility to introduce electric busses, natural gas powered busses, hydrogen busses.
- The unit will take into account the possibility a) to measure capacity (number of passengers) of purchased rolling stock, while for the others, the number of vehicles, and it will propose a new name for the indicator: Capacity of newly purchased rolling stock for sustainable collective public transport.
- The unit will consult other colleagues on the option to consider upgraded rolling stock (ex: converted to a type of energy source cleaner).
- Due to the MS question about the possibility to include only vehicles under public service obligation, the unit replies that this falls under the eligibility matter.
- The unit will align the indicator name with definition.

## RCO58 Dedicated cycling infrastructures

RACER criteria: Relevant: 100%, Accepted: 93%, Credible: 93%, Easy: 93%, Robust: 93%

Issues raised:

- Scope: does the indicator cover pedestrian paths and cycling paths?
- Measurement: do we count one lane, two lanes?

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- In some MS, there are already several initiatives relating to the coexistence of pedestrian and cycling lines, even without much space, and they are proving to be good experiences. In RCO58, we could also explore the possibility to count shared spaces in urban development.

- A MS does not support the proposal to use “persons” as measurement unit for RCO57 and RCO58.
- Proposal to change the name of the indicator, since it does not measure the cycling infrastructures, but the cycling tracks.

Unit B2 replies:

- The unit clarifies that the indicator is meant to measure lanes specifically equipped and dedicated to cycling. Therefore, they are not simple cycle (& pedestrian) lanes, thus the indicator does not cover pedestrian paths and cycling paths.
- As to measurement, the unit replies that if the lanes are separated (on both sides of the road) then the length of the lane should be counted. If in the same location, then the length of the route is more relevant. **The unit ensures to explain it in the definition.**
- In case there are other types of infrastructure for bikes that cannot be measured in km, the use of a programme specific indicator is recommended (or indicator RCO54 for intermodal connections if applicable).
- **The unit will explore the possibility to count shared spaces in urban development.**

### **RCO59 Alternative fuels infrastructures (refuelling/recharging points) supported**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 87%, Accepted: 86%, Credible: 87%, Easy: 93%, Robust: 80%

Issues raised:

- Use in other specific objectives: proposal to move it to the energy sector since it is more relevant: "The aim of the indicator would be to monitor the development of grids dedicated for other than public transport. (...) Charging points for urban buses are not available for individual users, and charging points for passenger cars are not subject to urban transport."
- Measurement unit: recharging points/ terminals or infrastructure?
- Definition: clarifications on the definition of clean vehicles and alternative fuels.

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- Proposal to include the indicator in the specific objective 2.iii, and to add an asterisk.
- Clarification about the possibility to count the number of terminals.

Unit B2 replies:

- **The unit agrees to consider the use of the indicator in other specific objectives: it proposes to list it in this Policy Objective, since it is related to urban mobility also, but to put \*. (timing 3:09:00 2 recording)**
- **As to measurement unit, the unit proposes to use recharging points/ terminals.**
- For the definition, **the unit will include examples of clean vehicles and alternative fuels**, (see also art 6 in ERDF regulation).
- The indicator should count the number of terminals.

### **RCO60 Cities and towns with new or upgraded digitised urban transport system**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 73%, Accepted: 73%, Credible: 73%, Easy: 73%, Robust: 60%

Issues raised:

- Measurement unit: proposal to use population of cities and towns with new or upgraded systems.
- Scope: If we put a digital schedule in one bus stop in a town, will it count? – Would an intervention be limited to a bus stop? What is the scope for digitised transport systems? Does

it include traffic flow regulation, traffic security, user security, ticket sales systems, users information?

- Definition: Why is integrated multi-modal included in the definition?

Unit B2 replies:

- The unit considered the suggestion to use population of cities and towns with new or upgraded systems, but this would lead to an overestimation
- New or significantly upgraded digitised urban transport system can be counted in order to ensure a meaningful coverage.
- Measuring in terms of surface covered (km<sup>2</sup>) would not be relevant, since, for instance, it could not show the amount of the investments made for a small but relevant equipment.
- This indicator should be primarily used to count public transport systems for passengers and other mobility services. However, the unit will reflect on the scope for other aspects related to transport.
- The term "integrated multi-modal" is included in the definition, as it refers to an integrated digitised transport system (common ticketing for bus, metro, for example etc.)

RESULT INDICATORS SO3.iv

12 April 2019

### **RCR62 Annual passengers of public transport**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 80%, Accepted: 86%, Credible: 60%, Easy: 47%, Robust: 60%

Issues raised:

- Name: rename as "Annual passengers of new or improved public transport" to emphasise we refer to new or upgraded public transport.
- Scope: should the indicator refer to buses? Because metro and tram are included in RCO53. What is the minimum level of improvement to be considered?
- Measurement: due to the nature of the urban transport network, it is not possible to count the number of passengers in relation to the infrastructure built.
- Methodology: only tickets sold would not provide an accurate number since some passengers have free tickets (minors, seniors, etc.). Suggestion to remove "each service provider should design its own methodology" since it risks to create confusion. In addition, different methodologies will affect comparability of data (i.e. no aggregation possible), thus it would be useful to have a common methodology.
- Use of indicator: it cannot be considered a direct result, and it can be influenced by external factors.
- Source of data: can we include service providers, surveys, in addition to projects?
- Can the public transport not be collective? Can shared travelling quality be considered as public transport?

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- The demarcation between RCR62 and RCR63 is not clear: which are the main differences, i.e. the perimeter where the transportation circulate or the type of transportation?
- Proposal to merge RCR62 and RCR63.

Unit B2 replies:

- The unit values the proposal to rename the indicator as "Annual passengers of new or improved public transport".

- The indicator can include any other type of public transport, but the ones counted in RCR63. Furthermore, with respect to the minimum level of improvement, it should be linked to the outputs measured (rolling stock, extended lines etc.)
- As to the calculation of passengers, it depends on what is the nature of the intervention: if the intervention would increase transport capacity for a given route, then it is possible to estimate the passengers; the same is valid for new / upgraded metro and tram lines.
- The unit proposes to use the indicator also in terms of its absolute value (number of passengers benefiting from improved conditions for public transport).
- The unit assesses it would like to see the gross number of annual users of public transport, it does not want to see the displacement effect as to transport nodes. In the evaluation, it can be studied.
- The unit agrees with MS on the fact that counting only tickets sold would not provide an accurate number since some passengers have free tickets (minors, seniors). Therefore, it will adjust the definition, emphasizing that it would be an estimated number. The unit will prefer to identify one or two comparable methodologies, solid and robust, which could be used as inspirations for the MS.
- On the use of the indicator, the unit highlights that, as with the other result indicator, it should be chosen only if it reflects the primary objective of the intervention.
- The unit agrees to add data from service providers, surveys, in addition to projects as data sources.
- Other questions: The unit negatively replies to both of the questions. The indicators excludes other forms of not collective public transport, i.e. electric scooters.
- The unit is not inclined to merge RCR62 and RCR63, because one of the main goal is to explore the development on urban transport, and it will lead to a mixture that will be not meaningful. The indicator will help the authorities to conduct the country own evaluation.

### **RCR63 Annual users of new/upgraded tram and metro lines**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 64%, Accepted: 62%, Credible: 50%, Easy: 36%, Robust: 43%

Issues raised:

- Relationship with RCO62.
- Scope: Does it include urban/ suburban lines?

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- Proposal to drop the indicator, also because there is a not clear demarcation between RCR62 and RCR63.

Unit B2 replies:

- There is no overlap with RCO62.
- The unit will clarify that the indicator include urban/ suburban lines in the definition.

### **RCR64 Annual users of dedicated cycling infrastructures**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 87%, Accepted: 73%, Credible: 53%, Easy: 60%, Robust: 40%

Issues raised:

- Measurement: can we include pedestrians, users of cycling infrastructure? Proposal to abandon indicator etc.

- Methodology: need for a methodology, and proposal to have an estimation.
- Data sources: can we use surveys?

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- It is difficult to count the users of dedicated cycling infrastructures, and it would be hard and expensive to find a solid and reliable data source to measure it. Therefore, it is proposed to eliminate the indicator.
- Difficult to gather data for this indicator, proposal to eliminate it.
- Proposal to drop it.

Unit B2 replies:

- The indicator is paired with the output indicator RCO58. Therefore, it covers the users of the supported dedicated cycling infrastructure. Furthermore, it is not meant to measure unique users, but all the users (i.e. if a person uses the cycle path several times a day, it is counted as many times). The unit is inclined to not include pedestrian infrastructures.
- The unit agrees to use a common methodology and it will reflect on it. Moreover, it will clarify that the indicator represents estimated (ex post estimation) number of annual users. If a person uses 10 times the cycling infrastructures, s/he will be counted 10 times. Finally, the unit underlines that in some MS there are sensors and IT systems to count users of dedicated cycling infrastructures.
- On data sources, the unit agrees to use surveys, and it will make compatible with other indicators.
- The unit will prefer to keep the RCR62 and RCR63 due to the volume of investments and the political priority linked to this indicator.
- Even though the indicator is new, the unit and MS should make an effort to find a methodology to calculate it.

**New indicators proposed by the Member States:**

1. Reductions in CO2/NO2/ PM10 due to construction/ reconstruction (for road and rail transport)
  2. Number of ICT systems/ facilities for ICT
1. The unit assesses that there is already an indicator on GHG emission which could be used, thus it proposes to not introduce it. If MS want to measures in a more detailed way, they can use it as program specific objective.
  2. The unit does not understand the proposal of the second indicator.

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 3.i Enhancing digital connectivity**

**OUTPUT INDICATORS SO3.i**

**RCO41 Additional households with broadband access of very high capacity**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 79%, Accepted: 79%, Credible: 86%, Easy: 86%, Robust: 79%.

Issues raised:

- Type of the indicator: output or result?
- Definition of “very high capacity”
- Measurement unit: Households or dwellings ?
- Proposal of an alternative indicator: length of VHC networks constructed.
- Reason for which “additional” is in the indicator name.

- Link to CO10
- Time of measurement

Other questions:

- Possibility to use RCO41 to investments only in middle mile broadband infrastructure
- Possibility to include permanent or temporary living of the household (Ex summer houses)
- Possibility to eliminate “population” in the underlying definition and concepts.

Unit B2 replies:

- The indicator measures the coverage of the broadband access supported, therefore it is an output indicator. The output refers to coverage, and it does not refer to the actual use of VHC broadband. Additional is inserted because we are measuring people who had not access to it before the intervention.
- The definition of very high capacity is laid down in Art. 2 of Directive 2018/1972, and the unit ensures it will include the definition and the reference to the Directive in the fiche. Moreover, work is ongoing on the technical characteristics for networks which could be qualified a VHC with the Body of the European Regulators for Electronic Communication BEREC, who will issue guidelines on common approaches in accordance with the Directive by June - December 2020. The unit will no add specific characteristics because work is still ongoing.
- Given the MS proposal to use dwellings, the unit will explore the possibility to change the measurement unit to dwellings.
- Given the alternative proposal of the MS to name the indicator “length of VHC networks constructed”, the unit replies that the measurement unit could be not very clear, and given the technological specificities of such investments, the measurement of the length of a network could be a challenge.
- The unit explains that the indicator refers only to broadband access of VHC provided due to the ERDF support. Therefore, it proposes to count only the additional households that are covered by the intervention.
- As to the link to CO10, the unit states that RCO41 refers to a different type of broadband, and it represents an upgrade of the current indicator.
- As to the time measurement, the unit recommends taking into account the physical completion of the works.
- The unit would like to propose to drop the term “population” since it would be used dwellings.
- 

**RCO42 Additional enterprises with broadband access of very high capacity**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 79%, Accepted: 71%, Credible: 86%, Easy: 79%, Robust: 71%

Issues raised:

- Similar comment with RCO41
- Scope: given the enterprises can be small, thus the number could be not meaningful. We can count local units of enterprises, instead of enterprises.
- Measurement: difficult to verify the correct number of enterprises benefiting from the intervention, in case the companies are located in the same buildings.
- Source of data: who will be the data providers?

Unit B2 replies:

- As to the broadband access of very high capacity, one of the goal is to provide it to enterprises; this is the reason why the indicator is important.

- As to the scope, based on the experience with programme specific indicators from the current period, the unit assesses that distinguishing between broadband for enterprises and for households is informative.
- The unit ensures it will explore the possibility to use local units of enterprises instead of enterprises.
- Given the MS highlighted the difficulty to verify the correct number of enterprises benefiting from the intervention in case several enterprises are allocated at one building, the unit clarifies that the decision to invest should be based on an ex-ante demand analysis, thus the MA should know how many enterprises could be targeted. The unit explore the possibility to include “estimated number of enterprises” in the definition.
- On the source of data, the operators who execute the works should be in the position to provide the data on how many enterprises / households are covered in the area where the broadband is installed. The unit would recommend projects, but it would lead the list open and flexible.

### RESULT INDICATORS SO3.i

#### **RCR53 Households with broadband subscription to a very high capacity network**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 71%, Accepted: 64%, Credible: 64%, Easy: 29%, Robust: 64%

#### **RCR54 Enterprises with broadband subscription to a very high capacity network**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 80%, Accepted: 73%, Credible: 73%, Easy: 47%, Robust: 67%

(The two indicators are discussed together).

#### Issues raised:

- Measurement unit: dwellings instead of households? Local units of enterprises?
- Source of data: a) the MA will not know which will be the take up rate; b) it takes long time to reach high level of take up rate.
- Demand oriented
- Scope: local unit of enterprises and not enterprises
- Target setting
- Time of measurement: is possible to collect data also during the projects?

#### Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- It is asked whether it could be possible to use a program specific indicator instead of the common result indicator.
- It is inquired about the accountability, feasibility and confidentiality issues: the MS should ask for data to the operators in order to count the enterprises and households with VHC network, and the operators themselves can accept or not to provide data, as the final beneficiaries of the works are not the operators, and the MA cannot oblige them to give these type of information. Moreover, it is pointed out that if the objective of the indicator is to measure to what extent the citizens’ access to Internet is improving, this is not the correct indicator, since it measures the quality of connection. Furthermore, the internet connection depends also on other factors: people can have the access but the possibility to pay for the subscription. For this reason, it is proposed to change the nature of the indicators RCO42 and RCO43 from output to result, since the aimed result is the access.



- It is difficult to obtain data by subscribers of contracts, and it is proposed to look at the current indicator, which is more statistical and easy to use.

Unit B2 replies:

- The unit will explore the possibilities to use as measurement unit local units of enterprises.
- Given the availability of data seems to be a sensitive issue, the unit assess that data should be provided by telecom operators, and there should not be a confidentiality issue, since data on broadband take up rate is public. The MA will not need the personal details of the subscribers, but the number of subscribers to the VHC broadband networks financed from public funds. The same applies for comments on last mile provided by operators. The aim is to show that the broadband supported is actually used.
- Some MS raise the issue that the indicator is demand oriented. When large scale investments are planned, this should be done based on a demand analysis (which should be included in the selection criteria of the projects). Therefore, the interventions will respond to a demand. In any case, the unit is aware that take up rates will differ across Member States, as their practices in incentivising the demand are different. Therefore, as with the other result indicator, the unit explain the values for this indicator in the context of national take up rates based on statistics at regional and national levels.
- For target setting, REGIO B.2 explores the issue with DG CONNECT colleagues and understood that there is data on the evolution of take-up rates of broadband over time in the Member States. This can be used as a basis for setting the targets for ERDF interventions.
- As to the time measurement, MS proposed to collect data also during the project, as separate sections are ready and in use. The unit could agree with this proposal (along the lines of partial implementation with physical completion), and proposes one year after the project completion, and it will explore the possibility to include a requirement for telecom suppliers to provide the data on results (this is an issue best settled by the MA).
- The unit claims it is preferable to use the common result indicators: the main objective is to analyse how the EC is investing the budget and to show the achieved results. In fact, it is important to have these indicators to show how the public budget is spent and which are the achievements reached.
- Trade-offs should be made between accountability and confidentiality to the public. The MAs should have the possibility to have access to minima data, at least for the intervention financed.
- It could be explored the possibility to include survey of telecom operators using the infrastructure supported. Finally, given the opportunity to use statistics, a possibility is to explore to have disaggregating data.

New indicators proposed by the member states

Output indicator: Public buildings with broadband access of very high capacity

The unit would support the introduction of this indicator.

## Policy Objective 4. A More Social Europe

Specific Objective 4.i Ensuring equal access to health care through developing infrastructure, including primary care

OUTPUT INDICATORS SO4.iv

**RCO69 Capacity of supported health care infrastructure**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 86%, Accepted: 86%, Credible: 71%, Easy: 79%, Robust: 71%

Issues raised:

- Terminology: what are the health care centres? Can we use health care providers? A suggestion combines them both by defining a health centre as any institution which provides health care services.
- Measurement unit: Proposals: a) number of healthcare centres; b) number of persons served at the same time; c) square metres. Moreover, it is underlined that the indicator depends also on the number of doctors and professionals working there.
- To avoid overlapping with RCO70, it should be distinguished between social services and medical services.
- Interpretation: the intervention may not necessarily imply an increase in capacity.
- Double counting: how to count one person which can use a bed in the hospital and but also other services supported.

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- It is difficult targeting people benefitting from these services, because it depends on the territory, on the population of the territory. Thus, it is proposed to provide an indicative value and not to count it in the performance exam 2024. In fact, a target could be fixed, but the authorities cannot identify it as “stable” one, as they do not know if an infrastructure would be built and how the local population would perceive and react to it, this is the reason why they can talk about an indicative target.

Unit B2 replies:

- The unit will provide a clearer definition of health care centres and health care providers, and it will include also an indicative list.
- The intention is to estimate the capacity, thus the number of people who can be served by the medical facility. The indicator captures different and several health care services. Given that there is only one indicator, the unit proposes one day as a reference period. Therefore, the indicator should provide an estimate of the number of people that could be scheduled to be served during one working day. The unit will explore also the possibility to calculate the number of persons which can be served per year to make the indicator comparable with the result. This will be an extrapolation with the unit's proposal. Using the number of health care centres could generate overestimation. As to number of persons served at the same time, generally people are served one at time. As to square metres, it will limit the indicator to construction. Yes, the unit is aware that the indicator depends also on the number of professionals working there and it is somehow implied in the estimation of the capacity.
- In order to prevent the overlap with RCO70, the unit will specify that medical centres are included in RCO69.
- As to interpretation, MS can use it only for the achieved values. The same issue of interpretation applies for cases where the intervention does not imply an increase in capacity. This is an output indicator, and therefore it refers to the capacity built or renovated/improved/ upgraded. It will be clarified in the definition.
- The indicator can be used for capacity built or renovated/improved/ upgraded.
- As to double counting, people would be counted every time they use the services supported. Therefore, the unit will reflect whether it is better to use users/ year or per day rather than patients.
- The baseline is zero, as this is an output indicator.

## **RCO70 Capacity of supported social infrastructure (other than housing)**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 79%, Accepted: 71%, Credible: 64%, Easy: 79%, Robust: 71%

Issues raised:

- Scope: What is "other than housing"?
- Measurement unit: proposals: a) persons; b) places.
- Definition: can we align the definition with the indicator name? The definition refers to number of persons planned to be served, while the name concerns number of places (capacity).

Unit B2 replies:

- The term "other than housing" can include day centres for persons with disabilities, for elderly care etc. The unit will provide an indicative list of institutions which can be included.
- As a capacity indicator, the measurement unit should be persons.
- The unit will rephrase the definition in line with the name.
- These are output indicators: the output reached is the number of place which are built. When you finish the intervention, you count what it operational and the potential users of the operational infrastructures.

## **RESULT INDICATORS SO 4.iv**

### **RCR72 People with access to improved health care services**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 80%, Accepted: 67%, Credible: 73%, Easy: 53%, Robust: 67%

Issues raised:

- Overlapping with RCR73: proposal to eliminate it. Another proposal states to dedicate it to e-health, while using RCR73 for infrastructure.
- Name: it should include new or improved health care services.
- Baseline: should it be equal to or higher than zero?
- Targeting setting: difficult to set up because depends on several factors, i.e. territory, population.
- Definition: what does the term "improved" mean? Should we take into account the gravitational area for target population? Does the indicator include e-services?
- Double counting: can it be allowed?
- Time measurement: Is it necessary to wait for one year to measure this result if the target population is known beforehand?

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- Proposal to accept double counting for the indicators where persons are the measurement unit: RCR73, RCR74. It is difficulty to set targets, as they vary on the basis of the territorial peculiarity and on the population specificities. Finally, it is unthinkable to demand IDs.
- In some MS, the national authorities have faced problems to establish a common methodology, as some hospitals take into account the entire population, while others consider only a part of the population. Therefore, it is proposed to keep only the indicator RCR73, as authorities have already registries and they can easily collect the number of people benefitting of the service. Moreover, it is asked for more clarification about the time

measurement, asking whether one year after project completion and 12 months after construction have the same meaning.

- Proposal to use the indicator related to digitalised service to measure e-health services. Moreover, it is raised the issue concerning privacy, as the national authorities could face problems in obtaining information, so it could be better not to use the term “persons”, but number of accesses to the service. Finally, it is proposed to use square metres as measurement unit for indicators RCR72, RCR73, RCR75, as there are various type of infrastructures considered (schools, hospitals, elderly care centres, etc.), they have different standard for capacity. Moreover, organisations in charge of works are not always the final beneficiaries, thus it is also difficult to collect data. This is way it is propose square metres. If at the end capacity is used, there will be not an ex post estimation, but an ex ante.
- Clarification about the relevance of the indicator, and its unit measurement, because it is not coherent with the measurement units of the other indicators.
- The indicator has been used in the current programming period, and the value of the indicators have not changed, because the authorities work with census data, therefore it is not useful. Therefore, it is proposed to drop it. Furthermore, MS inquiries whether it is possible to eliminate double counting with ex post estimate. Finally, it is proposed to introduce an indicator for digitalisation of health services, not just for e-health.
- Clarification about time measurement for indicators RCR72, RCR73 and RCR75, as data could be not available after one year of project completion.
- Proposal to count the number of visits – for all the indicators in this block- and to use the calendar year.

Unit B2 replies:

- In order to prevent the overlap with the indicator RCR73, the unit will consider also dedicating the indicator to e-health, while using RCR73 for infrastructure. Furthermore, it will explore the possibility to include new or improved health care services in the indicator title.
- The baseline can be zero for new services, and non-zero for improved services.
- Target setting is perceived to be challenging since it will depend on the territory where the service is located. The target setting could consider the target (group of) population of the medical service.
- The target may end up equal to the baseline, if there is no expectation of a change. This could happen if increased capacity is not the objective.
- As to the double counting, the unit proposes to take it out, as it is aware of the privacy implication, and to use estimation of the average number of users per year.
- The unit proposes to use “users” as measurement unit, and then double counting will be not a problem. Using square metres as measurement unit would misrepresent the investments made, i.e. a medical equipment can occupy 2sqm but it could be very expensive. Furthermore, the unit would prefer using a measurement unit related to people, since it is more effective in terms of communication. The unit clarifies the estimation is ex post in the following sense: you count the places which are built, and then you count the potential of the capacity.
- The beneficiaries should ask for data about the interventions they have had, and the operators should provide it, since they are using public funding.
- The measurement could be conducted when the service is operational.
- As to the time measurement, the unit proposes one year after the project completion, not the calendar year. We are estimating the average number of users per that year. Using the calendar year could lead to extend of some months the calculation: if you finish the project in July, you have to wait for 5 months, then you will have one year and half.
- Finally, the unit proposes to use the indicator on digitalised services in PO1, open to all other policy objectives, and thus to eliminate RCR72. (timing 2:48:50 3recording )

### **RCR73 Annual number of persons using the health care facilities supported**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 93%, Accepted: 79%, Credible: 93%, Easy: 71%, Robust: 86%

Issues raised:

- Measurement unit: Is it necessary to measure the number of persons using the service per year?
- Baseline
- Measurement: proposal to count the number of cases of improved healthcare services during the first year.
- Double counting

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- It would be difficult to avoid double counting.

Unit B2 replies:

- It is useful to measure the number of persons using the service in a reference period, and the unit will proposed one year for consistency with the other indicators.
- Baseline can be zero for users of new services, and non-zero for users of improved services.
- Counting the number of cases of improved healthcare services during the first year is not useful, since a service can be improved nominally, with no patient using it. It would be difficult to define a robust indicator in this regard.
- Double counting should not be an issue. In addition, there are privacy issues related to fiscal codes of individuals. The unit will reflect on the possibility to consider the number of users per year, estimated ex post.
- The unit will include other sources such as the providers of the medical service.

### **RCR74 Annual number of persons using the social care facilities supported**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 92%, Accepted: 85%, Credible: 85%, Easy: 62%, Robust: 77%

Issues raised:

- Measurement unit: proposal to use users.
- Method of calculation: proposal to calculate the average number of users per month over a period of 12 months.
- Double counting

Unit B2 replies:

- The unit will consider the possibility to use “users” instead of persons, and this would imply users/ year, highlighting that it would not mean to identify people.
- For the calculation, the unit agrees to calculate the average number of users per month over a period of 12 months. It would provide an estimate of the number of users per year.
- As to the double counting, it could be an ex-post estimate, thus double counting based on IDs would not be necessary.

### **RCR75 Average response time for medical emergencies in the area supported**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 57%, Accepted: 57%, Credible: 50%, Easy: 57%, Robust: 50%

Issues raised:

- Measurability at aggregate level

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- Proposal to use minutes as measurement unit, if the purpose is to measure the decrease in average response time, and the baseline should be the average response time of the service in the year before the project implementation.
- Proposal to use number of treatments.

Unit B2 replies:

- The unit would consider the MS suggestion related to the possibility to have available statistics after one year of project completion.
- The unit would be not inclined to use the number of treatments, because it is difficult to communicate it.
- The indicator could be relevant at project level if the objective of the intervention is to reduce the response time, as expressed in % reductions. It would be difficult to aggregate across different projects; therefore, **the unit proposes to remove it from the list and to use it as a specific program indicator.**

Specific Objective 4.ii Ensuring equal access to health care through developing infrastructure, including primary care

OUTPUT INDICATORS SO4.ii

**RCO66 Classroom capacity of supported childcare infrastructure (new or upgraded)**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 92%, Accepted: 92%, Credible: 92%, Easy: 92%, Robust: 85%

Issues raised:

- Measurement: should we count the number of kindergartens or number of infrastructures we are supporting?
- Scope: can we use maximum capacity afforded by the facility supported?
- Measurement unit
- Time of measurement: can we considering school year?
- Clarification on energy efficiency, and repairs and maintenance.

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- Classroom is not necessarily the correct terminology to measure the capacity when children are taken into consideration, since they could use other facilities, other than chairs and tables. If "children" is the measurement unit, it should be clarified the age of children considered. Then there could be differences among member states, therefore, MS propose "persons".

Unit B2 replies:

- Since the indicators is primarily designed for the Policy Objective 4, which refers to Social Europe, clearly the priority is to define measures as much as possible in terms of people served. The aim is to know how many children can be hosted in the kindergartens. Number of facilities, or number of square metres do not resonate with the general public when it comes to Social Europe.

- For education, the use of facilities is much more predictable, especially when it refers to students/ kids enrolled in kindergarten etc. Therefore, the unit will maintain the proposal to measure capacity in terms of people which could be served (and people actually served in results).
- In terms of measurement for this indicator, the unit would prefer to use the real capacity afforded by the facility supported. The indicator should measure the number of kids which could take care of for the facility/ part of the facility which is being supported.
- For time of measurement, given this is a capacity indicator, there is no need to mention a specific period for the measurement.
- The unit will align specifications referring to energy efficiency, maintenance and repair with the other indicators.

### **RCO67 Classroom capacity of supported education infrastructure (new or upgraded)**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 79%, Accepted: 79%, Credible: 79%, Easy: 79%, Robust: 71%

Issues raised:

- Scope: does the indicator measure vocational training? Do we measure spaces for PhD students? gyms, libraries, reading rooms?

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- Proposal to refer to 1-4 ISCED classification, not to 5-8.
- Proposal to have different indicators to observe interventions in different infrastructures taking care for of children and students. Therefore, there would be an output indicator for childcare infrastructures, another one for primary and secondary schools, and another one for university and PhD students.

Unit B2 replies:

- As to the scope, the unit recommends using programme specific indicators for these types of interventions. The indicator is meant to measure the more prevalent types of interventions, such as renovation of schools/ new facilities.
- As for gyms, libraries etc., the unit would like to not include them in the list, but it points out that it does not mean they are not eligible.
- The unit will propose to exclude other common spaces in the scope of the indicator since it may render it less meaningful.
- The unit will align the definition for energy efficiency, maintenance and repair with the other indicators.
- The unit will explore the possibility to have a breakdown of the indicator for childcare infrastructures, for primary and secondary schools, and for university and PhD students.

### **RESULT INDICATORS SO4.ii**

#### **RCR70 Annual number of children using childcare infrastructure supported**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 71%, Accepted: 79%, Credible: 79%, Easy: 79%, Robust: 86%

Issues raised:

- Name: proposal to remove "annual number of"; is supported necessary? Are childcare and child protection included?
- Measurement unit: proposal to adopt children/year
- Definition: can we replace "taken care of" by "attend"? Do we count one year after project physical completion? Can we include "child protection"?
- Baseline
- Interpretation: following a renovation, there may be no change in the annual number of children enrolled in the centre
- Aggregation

#### Unit B2 replies:

- The result indicators refer to the extent to which this capacity is used annually, on average. Moreover, this indicator is also meant to be an estimate to the extent that the measurement implies some assumptions. It works if classrooms are used. The unit is not asking for the attendance.
- The unit will take into consideration to shorten the indicator name, eliminating "annual number of", if the measurement unit "person/year" is included; and it supports the removal of "supported". For this indicator it should be taken into account kindergartens, day care centres which imply the enrolment of children for a given period of time (usually one year). For child protection centres, the occupancy rate is different, and there is no a systematic enrolment. Therefore, a programme specific indicator should be used.
- For the measurement unit, the unit agrees to use persons/year.
- The unit agrees to use "attend" instead of taken care of.
- As to the time of measurement, the unit clarifies that "annual" does not refer to the school year but to one year after completion of intervention.
- Baseline can be zero for a new kindergarten, or non-zero for an existing centre which is being improved/ upgraded. The non-zero baseline will refer to the annual number of children enrolled in the respective centre. If the objective is to see an increase the number of people using the infrastructures, you should have a positive change in the value, if the goal is to improve the condition with the same number of places, the indicator should be used in term of number of people who benefit from the improved infrastructures. This is the same as for the other mentioned indicators.
- Following a renovation, there may be no change in the annual number of children enrolled in the centre. The unit clarifies that in this case it would not be the change in the indicator which would be useful, but the final achieved value (interpreted as children which benefit from improved conditions).
- To avoid double counting, children who take part in several classes in the same supported entity should only be counted once.

#### **RCR71 Annual number of students using education infrastructure supported**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 71%, Accepted: 79%, Credible: 79%, Easy: 79%, Robust: 86%

#### Issues raised:

- Measurement: what do we count if only some classes in the school are renovated?
- Scope: can we include students and participants in seminars/ courses?
- Double counting

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:



- It is assessed that in some cases the schools infrastructures are managed by municipalities or provinces, and they have not direct access to data, they have not the power to ask for schools to make the estimation required for the indicator, unless they sign an agreement with the schools interested in the projects, and it could be expensive.

Unit B2 replies:

- For this indicator, there are similar comments with RCR70 for childcare.
- On measurement, in case only some classes are renovated, there will be an estimation of students benefitting of the renovation based on the size of the class and the frequency of classes held in the classroom. This is calculated based on the school records. It is advisable to count the students enrolled in the school if the entire school is renovated. The unit states the schools can generate data about capacity.
- The Ministry in charge of education has the power to ask the data to the provinces or municipalities, given the public support they receive to renovate or build the schools.
- The unit will explore the possibility to mention in the definition that other people than students can be included when they take part in seminars, workshops, etc., only if they are registered in the school registries.
- As to the double counting, it refers to classes: if the school schedules all courses for a given group in a classroom, then it should be counted once. This is an estimation (based on the class size) and not a direct measurement of actual attendance of courses, but based on the use of the class.
- For time of measurement, the unit will specify the year after the classroom/ facility becomes operational.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 4.iii Increasing the socio-economic integration of marginalised communities, migrants and disadvantaged groups, through integrated measures including housing and social services

OUTPUT INDICATORS SO4.iii

**RCO63 Capacity of temporary reception infrastructure created**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 77%, Accepted: 92%, Credible: 77%, Easy: 69%, Robust: 69%

Issues raised:

- Scope: how relevant is the indicator for ERDF? Since ERDF and ESF are meant to support the long-term integration. Does it refer to new or renovated infrastructures?
- Definition: does the term "maximum" need? Proposal to add in the text also "in accordance with the national legislation."
- Measurement unit: it should refer to persons/year and not persons. Proposal to use places.

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- It is proposed to use square metres as measurement unit, since it considers the Omnibus regulation, and it is proposed to use similar methods to measure these kind of infrastructures. The idea is to measure not-temporary infrastructures in square metres, and to use capacity in person, for temporary infrastructures. It is underlined that sometimes occupancy is higher than capacity. Finally, it is proposed to introduce the term "refugees" in the indicator name.
- Using square meters as unit of measurement would implies difficulties in target setting. Moreover, in some MS the temporary reception infrastructures' occupancy is sometimes

higher than their capacity. It is proposed to introduce the term “asylum seekers” in the indicator name.

Unit B2 replies:

- The unit underlines that the indicator is relevant for ERDF, since ERDF together with AMIF will also support reception of migrants (ERDF for infrastructure). As long as it remain in the regulation, the indicator will remain.
- The unit will explore the possibility to include **New or renovated temporary reception infrastructures**. The unit will adapt the name also for the other indicators.
- The unit and MS agree to propose to eliminate the term "maximum" since the capacity is regulated by construction law.
- The unit clarifies that standards for reception centres are laid down in the Directive 2013/ 33, thus the unit will include these references, with the assumption that in any case the national legislation is aligned with the terms of the directive.
- The unit and MS agree the measurement unit should refer to persons. Nevertheless, it is true we are counting the capacity.
- 4-8 weeks is the average period during which people can be hosted in temporary reception infrastructures, and throughout the year the number of people changes, thus it should find a method to track the number of people, and MS could ultimately know how much the maximum capacity is used and when.

#### **RCO64 Capacity of rehabilitated housing – migrants, refugees and persons under or applying for international protection**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 85%, Accepted: 92%, Credible: 92%, Easy: 85%, Robust: 77%

Issues raised:

- Measurement unit: a) proposal to use dwellings, since it is difficult to calculate person with the rule the unit provides; b) proposal to use surface of the rehabilitated housing.
- Proposal to use marginalised communities instead of migrants.

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- Two MS is not inclined to use square metres because of the difficulty to set a target. Moreover, it is pointed out that occupancy is sometimes higher than the capacity.
- A MS cannot use terms that describe the origin or the type of person, because it is unconstitutional. It can accept terms related to social situations, or type of travels. This applies also to indicators RCO64 and RCR67-68.

Unit B2 replies:

- The unit agrees with the comment about using dwellings. As to the surface of the rehabilitated housing, the advantage is that it gives an idea of the purpose of the works.
- **The unit is exploring the best terminology to use for the name of the indicator; the unit is thinking to use “third country nationals”**. The indicator is not meant to cover marginalized communities in general, which would be captured by RCO65. Moreover, special housing is usually reserved for beneficiaries of international protection. All other categories would benefit from the usual national social housing.
- The unit proposes to MS which cannot use this indicator because of the terminology adopted to take into account the general one.

- The reception centres should have records of how many people have been received in the centre. Starting from that, the MS can appreciate how many times the total capacity is used and which is the influence of seasonality.

### **RCO65 Capacity of rehabilitated housing (other)**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 85%, Accepted: 100%, Credible: 92%, Easy: 85%, Robust: 85%

Issues raised:

- Measurement unit: proposals: a) dwellings; b) households; c) surface
- Scope: what does “other” mean? Does the indicator refer to day care centres for persons with disabilities and other social services?
- Baseline

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- Proposal to merge RCO64 and RCO65. Defining “others” is complicated, even because it is mentioned the urban rehabilitation. Therefore the indicator can be used also in Policy Objective 5. We can have one indicator with \*.
- Proposed to add “social housing” in the name.

Unit B2 replies:

- The indicator refers to social housing for the country nationals; the unit would not be inclined to extend the title to "other than migrants etc.", since then the main focus of social housing is put on third country nationals, which is not the intention. A possibility would be to call RCO65 "Capacity of new or rehabilitated social housing" and clarify in the definition that it does not refer to special social housing for persons under international protection and migrants. The second one would be RCO64.
- The indicator does not include the day care centres for people with disabilities and other social services. It refers to social housing.
- The baseline should also be equal to or higher than zero, as for RCO64. When new infrastructures are built, the baseline will be 0; when the goal is to increase the capacity or improve the existing one, the baseline will be higher than 0.
- The unit would prefer to maintain two separate indicators. Nevertheless, in reality, at the EU level, there are social specific standards for social housing only for persons under international protection. This is why the unit prefers to keep both the indicators.
- The unit would further explore the place to include social housing in the indicator fiche.

## **RESULT INDICATORS SO4.iii**

### **RCR66 Occupancy of temporary reception infrastructure built or renovated**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 85%, Accepted: 85%, Credible: 77%, Easy: 77%, Robust: 77%

Issues raised:

- Name: why do you choose the term “occupancy”? The term occupancy usually refers to the number of people occupying the infrastructure at a certain point in time, while the indicator aims at measuring number of people hosted over a year.
- Scope: does the indicator refer to new or renovated infrastructures?

- Measurement: values will be much higher than for RCO63 since people are hosted temporarily in these centres.
- Measurement unit: proposal to use users/year instead of persons.
- Baseline
- Interpretation: occupancy depends on the actual need and therefore may fluctuate over time.

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- The indicators RCO63 and RCR66 are not comparable, because in one indicator capacity is measured, thus the maximum number of people who can be hosted in an infrastructure; on the other hand, occupancy is taken into account, but it is underlined the occupancy will be much higher than the capacity.

Unit B2 replies:

- Yes, the unit agrees: the indicator aims at measuring the average number of people hosted over a year. Therefore, it could consider the “annual number of users of the temporary reception centres”.
- The unit would like to consider new and renovated temporary reception infrastructures, and it will align the indicator definition with the one of RCO63.
- In terms of measurement, the unit proposes to use an (ex-post) estimate, since it is not expected an exact measurement of the length of stay for each person. A possibility, for instance, is to consider the average number of persons hosted per month multiplied by 12 months.
- For the measurement unit, users per year would be a possibility.
- Baseline could be zero for users of a new reception centre, while it should be non-zero for an existing one.
- The unit agrees on the fact that the occupancy depends on the actual need and therefore may fluctuate over time, and it adds that the construction of a new reception centre, for instance, would be justified if there is a perceived need for it. For existing reception centres, the unit will not necessarily advocate an emphasis on the changes in the values (achieved and baseline) unless the objective of the investment is to increase capacity. Otherwise, the achieved value reflects the number of people benefiting from improved reception conditions.

### **RCR67 Occupancy of rehabilitated housing – migrants, refugees and persons under or applying for international protection**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 92%, Accepted: 77%, Credible: 77%, Easy: 77%, Robust: 77%

### **RCR68 Occupancy of rehabilitated housing (other)**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 69%, Accepted: 85%, Credible: 77%, Easy: 69%, Robust: 69%

(The indicators are discussed together).

Issues raised:

- Almost all comments are the same as for RCO 66.
- Time: Is it necessary for the persons to live in the dwelling for a full year, or it can be also for a shorter period of time?
- Definition as to RCR68: Does it refer to new and rehabilitated houses?

Unit B2 replies:

- The permanence can be shorter than a year. The term "annual" refers to the period of measurement, not to the length of the accommodation for a given person.
- For RCO68, the unit clarifies it refers to new and rehabilitated houses, and the baseline should be equal to or higher than zero, as for RCR67.
- **The unit proposes to change the indicators names to new or rehabilitated housing.**

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 4.i Enhancing the effectiveness of labour markets and access to quality employment through developing social innovation and infrastructure

#### OUTPUT INDICATORS SO4.i

#### **RCO61 Annual unemployed persons served by enhanced facilities for employment services (capacity)**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 58%; Accepted: 58%, Credible: 58%, Easy: 67%, Robust: 67%

Issues raised:

- Measurement: proposals to use square metres, or number of facilities.
- Types of users: Which users are to be considered? There are formal (and different definitions) of unemployed persons, job seekers.
- Scope: is energy efficiency included? What does "enhanced" mean?

Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- This indicator has a clear connection with ESF and it should be avoided double counting.

Unit B2 replies:

- The unit clarifies that the indicator is intended as a proxy measure for the size / capacity of the facilities for employment services supported. The unit is aware that the indicator is challenging due to the diversity and uneven frequency of potential use of these facilities. **The unit proposes to use square metres of the facilities supported as measurement unit, to be consistent with previous decisions made about other indicators.**
- **The unit proposes to use the term "users" not to limit the scope of the indicator.**
- In terms of scope, if the objective of the intervention is improving energy efficiency – then indicator RCO19 (public buildings with improved energy efficiency) should be used.
- The unit will replace the term "enhanced" with new or improved facilities (in line with the other similar indicators). **Therefore, the indicator name could be: "Surface of new or improved facilities for employment services".**
- In this case, double counting will not refer to the persons which could be served by the facility, but to the facility itself. The rule for double counting should aim at avoiding counting the same surface twice.

#### RESULT INDICATORS SO4.i

#### **RCR65 Job seekers using annually the services of the employment services supported**

RACER criteria: Relevant: 67%, Accepted: 75%, Credible: 75%, Easy: 75%, Robust: 75%

#### Issues raised:

- Type of users: Which users (unemployed, jobseekers)?
- Double counting
- Source of data
- Interpretation: "the result is not interpretable against a target value since attendance will be reduced if unemployment decreases."
- Definition aligned with RCO61

#### Additional comments from Member States during the meeting:

- It is difficult to avoid double counting because the employment services provide several services and it is quite hard to categorize people on the basis of the services they receive or request. Furthermore, they cannot ask for their IDs. Therefore, it is proposed to allow double counting.
- It is hard to measure the projects results after one year of project completion, as the period of time is too limited. Moreover, it is inquired to clarify for every indicator of social Europe whether the MS should take into account physical or financial project completion.
- The indicators RCO61 and RCR65 have a clear connection with ESF, in fact, in some cases, ERDF and ESF support the same projects: ERDF supports the infrastructures, while ESF supports people. The risk related concerns double counting and the possibility to obtain completely different numbers in the same project.
- MS ask for more coordination with ESF and DG EMPL in relation to terms and meanings.
- Which is the relevance of the indicator? We are measuring the number of people who use the employment services, and not the people who have access to quality jobs.

#### Unit B2 replies:

- The aim of this indicator is to reflect the average annual use of the facility supported.
- In terms of measurement unit, in order to prevent overspecification of the definition, the unit proposes to rephrase it in terms of estimated registered users per year. In this way, it will prevent double counting of multiple visits of the same registered users during the first year at the level of the facility.
- As to the data sources, the unit proposes to use national registries with records of the services (frequency, timing etc.) provided. It can be rephrased as the records of the administration managing the facility.
- The unit agrees with the comment on the indicator interpretation and it states there are several possibilities to interpret this indicator: a) if the objective is to increase the capacity of these facilities to serve the population, the indicator would most probably reflect an increase in the number of users. B) If the objective is to improve conditions/ services for existing users, the indicator could still be used in terms of people/ users benefiting from improved service facilities.
- The unit will align the definition with RCO61 as discussed (mention energy efficiency in RCO19, maintenance and repair excluded). The unit will also mention new or improved facilities for employment services.
- In the ESF scheme, they are registering people benefitting from these schemes to avoid double counting of participants. The purpose is to know how the authorities are counting the active participants in the labour market. The unit assume that the employment officers know the people because they are conducting this work for DG EMPL, and it is clarified the purpose is not to collect IDs.
- Time measurement is one year after project completion, because on the other side, we will lose the political strength of communication. The unit will clarify for each indicator if it foresees physical or financial project completion in the fiche.

- We are aware that the indicator does not capture the element of social innovation, and we would need a different indicator. We are focusing on a fact that are happening now. It is the beginning of the process.

#### General comments on methodologies

MS assesses there are difficulties to measure the result indicators for rails, roads, urban transport, and more practical information on methodologies to address them are needed. It asks meetings and/or workshops to discuss them with the other MS. Moreover, MS suggests looking at the indicators also in an historical perspective to see how and whether they are proved to be helpful, i.e. considering the indicator “value of time saving”. Does the indicator have ex post studies? What do they show?

REGIO B.2 replies that after these meetings it will explore the possibility to organise future meetings dedicated to specific methodological issues. Moreover, it emphasised the significant work done together with the MS to address and develop further the list of common indicators for the next programming period. As to the indicator on “time saving”, REGIO B.2 assesses that MS used different methodologies; this is the reason why now we are proposing to use a common methodology.

#### Closing remarks

REGIO B.2 will produce the revised list of indicators by the mid of May in order to further present it to the EU Council, the unit presents other relevant deadlines for the production of the guidance, the indicator fiche template and the reporting templates. REGIO B.2 thanks the MS for their participation, the meeting was closed and the audience is informed that the next Evaluation Network is foreseen on the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> of May.