



Monitoring and Evaluation in RIS3 and ERDF

**Pilot exercises: use of result
indicators in ERDF programmes**

Marielle Riché
European Commission
DG REGIO Evaluation Unit
Marielle.riche@ec.europa.eu

Groningen, 25 January 2013

Pilot exercises

- *23 MA in 15 Member States*
- *Half of pilots on Innovation axes*
- *Aim and methodology of pilot exercises*
 - **Exploring how to implement in practice new result orientation: learning from current programmes**
 - **involving volunteering MA: choice of priority axis**
 - **Discussion with Commission: what do you want to change? What result indicator could capture this change? Will outputs contribute to change in result indicator? Could you evaluate the impact? How?**

Pilot exercises

Main learnings

- 1) None of the pilot programmes currently use **result indicators** as requested for 2014-2020 : OPs were not designed to deliver results
- 2) New approach feasible but requires change in practices:
 - Stronger and more explicit **intervention logic**
 - Thematic **concentration** + critical mass of resources on a few actions
 - Should trigger policy debate on choices
- 3) Result orientation to be introduced when designing the OP

Pilot exercises

Result indicators

- Do not capture intended effects of programmes
- Often limited to supported entities
- No baseline: cannot express a change!
- Not rooted in a robust intervention logic

Lessons learnt

- Be closer to policy: statistics only relevant for very large priorities
- Reflect specific objectives (target a specific population/sector).
- Baselines when drafting programmes!

Pilot exercises

Intervention logic

- Objectives expressed in too general terms, not operational (what results?)**
- Sometimes tacit objectives! (i.e. to reduce economic disparities between regions)**
- Indicators are not linked together in a logical way**
- Misuse of core indicators**
- Sometimes OP modified without changing indicators!**

Pilot exercises

Intervention logic : lessons learnt

-No result orientation without:

→ **Clear and specific objectives**

→ **Strong intervention logic (determine choice of actions, of indicators, evaluations)**

-Other factors to be analysed: to verify appropriateness of intervention logic and planned actions

-A "logical framework" may be useful

Pilot exercises

Concentration

- **Many sub-priorities leading to many indicators**
- **This blurs the objectives and logic of intervention**
- **Resources spread thematically and geographically**

Lessons learnt

- **Thematic (Regulation) AND operational concentration: where ERDF can make a difference**
 - ⇒ **Policy choices, clarity and ownership of objectives and indicators**
 - ⇒ **Actions that can influence result indicators**
 - ⇒ **Fewer result indicators**



Pilot exercises

2 examples of current innovation axes

- **A competitiveness regional programme**
- **A convergence regional programme**

1st example: a competitiveness OP

Priority: Knowledge & Innovation Economy (€121 million)

- **Loosely described objectives, too general to be reflected in result indicators, mix of goals and means**
 - Make innovation drive competitiveness of enterprises and territories - Anticipate changes to accompany SMEs)
- **Many sub-objectives (12)**
 - Increase R&D activities/support public research projects /increase funding for SMEs/ support SMEs' growth/creation etc.
- **4 result indicators close to output, limited to direct beneficiary and supported entities:**
 - nb of deliverables supporting technology transfer (activity of agency)
 - nb of patents from the supported enterprises

2nd example: a convergence OP

Priority: Economic Development, Research & Innovation
(118 million)

- **At least 5 different objectives:** support innovation and competitiveness of enterprises, develop strategic clusters, SMEs, lower SMEs mortality, lower regional economic dependancy
- **No explicit intended results: only means of action**
Support TT, develop intermediaries, animation of networks etc.
- **19 result indicators, 19 output indicators**
- **Many "result indicators" measure outputs**
Nb of collaborations supported, nb of companies hosted in incubator...
- **4 context indicators: some could be used as result indicators (Nb of researchers), some useless because too far from actions (economic growth...)**

Indicators for R&I in OPs

- *Specific constraints*
 - MA find it difficult to articulate precisely what they want to change (innovation is a means to an end!)
 - Uncertainty and time lag for results to appear
 - Often distributed, not linear effects, other factors
 - Change in behaviours, in processes: what result indicators?
- *Possible solutions*
 - Qualitative targets (trend, range of values)
 - "Intermediate result" indicators** (number of regional patents, of participation in EU research FP, financial input in R&D activities)
 - Result indicators covering a broader RIS3 objective to which ERDF contribute (+ impact evaluation)**

Indicators for R&I in OPs

- *Data availability: a constraint*
 - **Innovation Union Scoreboard: NUTS1**
 - **Regional Innovation Scoreboard: not all indicators at NUTS 2 level (e.g. DE, NL), gaps for some regions**
 - **Time lag 2-3 years (patents, scientific publications)**
- *Possible solutions to build regional indicators*
 - **Use administrative data, enterprise databases, surveys**
 - **Set up regional observatories (PACA, Languedoc Roussillon, Alsace, West Midlands, Italy); contract with national statistic bodies (use of TA)**



Possible example of results indicators

Use statistics only for large priorities

Selection of indicators depends on logic of intervention!

Economic Results:

- *Labour productivity (GVA per employment), available per sector*
- *% employment in high/medium technology manufacturing sectors*
- *% employment in knowledge intensive services*
- *New-to-market/firm sales of all SMEs (% of turnover)*

Innovation intermediate results

- *Nb of EPO patents/scientific publication/inhabitants*
- *% of patents requested by local companies obtained with researchers from other regions; % of patents resulting from co-invention; % of publications co-written*
- *% Innovative SMEs collaborating with others*
- *%SMEs introducing product/process/marketing/organisational innovations*

Enabling Indicators

- *% Business R&D expenditures (BERD)/ Public R&D expenditure in GDP*
- *% of household with broadband*
- *% broadband access by firms (only NUTS 1)*
- *% Human resources in Science and Technology*



Sources for R&I indicators

- *Regional Innovation Scoreboard 2011 (May 2012)*
<http://www.proinno-europe.eu/page/regional-innovation-scoreboard>
- *Innovation Union Scoreboard 2011 (Feb 2012)*
<http://www.proinno-europe.eu/inno-metrics/page/innovation-union-scoreboard-2011>
- *Regional Innovation Monitor*
<http://www.rim-europa.eu/>
- *Note on research & innovation result indicators (Barca's group)*
http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/impact/evaluation/performance_en.cfm
- *Digital scoreboard: http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/digital-agenda/scoreboard/download/index_en.htm*
- *European Cluster Observatory*
<http://www.clusterobservatory.eu/>
- *Small Business Act:*
http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/facts-figures-analysis/performance-review/index_en.htm#h2-3

Research & innovation in OPs

- *Ex ante evaluation should analyse:*
 - **Intervention logic as compared to the needs analysis and EU 2020 objectives: how planned actions contribute to intended results**
 - **Relevance of result indicators, credibility of targets**
 - **Sources for baseline data for result indicators**
 - **Data necessary for impact evaluations**
- *Guidance document available on Inforegio (EN/DE/FR)*

Summary

- *RIS3: a vision, select the right priorities, macro-indicators, action plan*
- *OP should clarify role of ERDF interventions*
- *OP should explain the intervention logic*
- **Be explicit on what you want to change (specific objectives)**
- **Identify other factors influencing the intended results**
- **Select result indicator, sufficiently close to the policy and reflecting the specific objectives**
- **Explain how planned actions will lead to results**
- **Select output indicators**



Reference documents

Report on Pilot Tests on Result Indicators

Guidance Ex ante evaluation (ERDF, ESF, CF)

http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/information/evaluations/guidance_en.cfm#1