|  |
| --- |
| **OVERVIEW OF THE OUTPUT & RESULT INDICATORS OF THE GREECE-BULGARIA PROGRAMME 2021-2027** |
| **Priorities** | **Specific Objective**  | **Output Indicators** | **Result Indicators** |
| 1.A more Resilient and Greener Greece-Bulgaria Cross Border Territory | **RSO2.4.** Promoting climate change adaptation and disaster risk prevention, resilience taking into account ecosystem-based approaches | RCO24 | RCR35 |
| RCO87 | RCR84 |
|  |  |
| **RSO2.6.** Promoting the transition to a circular and resource efficient economy | RCO02 | RCR104 |
| RCO116 | GSR01 |
| RCO01 |  |
| **RSO2.7.** Enhancing protection and preservation of nature, biodiversity and green infrastructure, including in urban areas, and reducing all forms of pollution | RCO39 | RCR95 |
| RCO36 | RCR50 |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Priorities** | **Specific Objective** | **Output Indicators** | **Result Indicators** |
| 2. A more Accessible Greece-Bulgaria Cross Border Territory | **RSO3.2.** Developing and enhancing sustainable, climate resilient, intelligent and intermodal national, regional and local mobility, including improved access to TEN-T and cross-border mobility | GSO001 | RCR56 |
| RCO50 | RCR58 |
| RCO46 |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Priorities** | **Specific Objective** | **Output Indicators** | **Result Indicators** |
| 3. A more Inclusive Greece-Bulgaria Cross Border Territory | **RSO4.2.** Improving equal access to inclusive and quality services in education, training and lifelong learning through developing accessible infrastructure, including by fostering resilience for distance and on-line education and training | RCO84 | RCR81 |
| RCO85 |  |
|  |  |
| **RSO4.6.** Enhancing the role of culture and sustainable tourism in economic development, social inclusion and social innovation | RCO77 | RCR77 |
| RCO02 | RCR03 |
| RCO01 |  |

**OUTPUT INDICATORS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF CF |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCO24** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Investments in new or upgraded disaster monitoring, preparedness, warning and response systems against natural disasters** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCO24 Climate: Investments in disaster management |
| 3 | Measurement unit | euro |
| 4 | Type of indicator | output |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | >=0 |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | Use in all policy objectives, whenever relevant |
| 9 | Specific objective | Use in all specific objectives, whenever relevant |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | Total value of investments in projects supporting the development or upgrading of disaster monitoring, preparedness, warning and response systems linked to climate related natural risks. Upgrading should refer primarily to new functionalities or to upscaling of existing systems at national and regional levels. The indicator covers also cross-border and transnational investments in such measures / actions.The indicator covers interventions at national and regional level which arenot disaster specific or which are not covered by the related common indicators for floods (RCO25, RCO105) or wildfires (RCO28). |
| 11 | Data collection | Supported projects |
| 12 | Time measurementachieved | Upon completion of output in the supported project |
| 13 | Aggregation issues |  |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 3). |
| 15 | References |  |
| 16 | Correspondingcorporate indicator | CCO09 |
| 17 | Notes |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF (Interreg) |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCO87** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Organisations cooperating across borders** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCO87 Interreg: Organisations cooperating across borders |
| 3 | Measurement unit | organisations |
| 4 | Type of indicator | output |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | >=0 |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | Use in all policy objectives, whenever relevant |
| 9 | Specific objective | Use in all specific objectives, whenever relevant |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | The indicator counts the organisations cooperating formally in supported projects. The organisations counted in this indicator are the legal entities including project partners and associated organizations, as mentioned in the financing agreement of the application. Organisations cooperating formally in small projects (for instance under a Small Project Fund) are alsocounted. |
| 11 | Data collection | MA monitoring system |
| 12 | Time measurementachieved | Upon project finalisation |
| 13 | Aggregation issues | At programme level, double counting should be avoided at the level ofproject partners and associated organizations. |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 3). |
| 15 | References |  |
| 16 | Correspondingcorporate indicator |  |
| 17 | Notes | RCO87 may be used together with RCO118, where relevant.In terms of links with common result indicators, RCO87 is intended be used together with RCR84. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF JTF |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCO01** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Enterprises supported (of which: micro, small, medium, large)** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCO01 Firms: All firms |
| 3 | Measurement unit | enterprises |
| 4 | Type of indicator | output |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | >=0 |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | Use in all policy objectives, whenever relevant and under JTF |
| 9 | Specific objective | Use in all specific objectives, whenever relevant and under JTF |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | The indicator counts all enterprises that receive monetary or in-kind support from ERDF and Cohesion Fund.The enterprise is the smallest combination of legal units that is an organisational unit producing goods and services, which benefits from a certain degree of autonomy in decision making, especially for the allocation of its current resources. An enterprise carries out one or more activities at one or more locations. An enterprise may be a sole legal unit. Legal units include legal persons whose existence is recognised by law independently of the individuals or institutions which may own them or are members of them, such as general partnerships, private limited partnerships, limited liability companies, incorporated companies etc.Legal units as well include natural persons who are engaged in an economic activity in their own right, such as the owner and operator of a shop or a garage, a lawyer or a self-employed handicrafts-person. (ESTAT in references, based on Council Regulation (EEC) No. 696/93, Section III A of 15.03.1993)For the purpose of this indicator, enterprises are profit-oriented organisations that produce goods and services to satisfy market needs. For Policy Objective 4 (Social EuropeEurope closer to its citizens), the indicator includes also social enterprises defined by the Commission (DG GROW) as follows: “a social enterprise is an operator in the socialeconomy whose main objective is to have a social impact rather than make a profit for their owners or shareholders. It operates by providing goods and services for the market in an entrepreneurial and innovative fashion and uses its profits primarily to achieve social objectives.”Classification of enterprises:**Micro enterprise** (<= 10 employees and annual turnover ≤ EUR 2 million, or balance sheet ≤ EUR 2 million);**Small enterprise** (10-49 employees and annual turnover >EUR 2 million - |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF JTF |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCO02** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Enterprises supported by grants** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCO02 Firms: Grant aided |
| 3 | Measurement unit | enterprises |
| 4 | Type of indicator | output |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | >=0 |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | Use in all policy objectives, whenever relevant and under JTF |
| 9 | Specific objective | Use in all specific objectives, whenever relevant and under JTF |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | Number of enterprises receiving monetary support in the form of grants. For the definition of an enterprise see RCO01. |
| 11 | Data collection | MA monitoring system |
| 12 | Time measurementachieved | Completion of output financed by the grant support. |
| 13 | Aggregation issues | Rule 1: Double counting removed at the level of the specific objective An enterprise is counted once regardless how many times it receivessupport from operations in the same specific objective. |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 3). |
| 15 | References | See RCO01 |
| 16 | Correspondingcorporate indicator |  |
| 17 | Notes | Use together with indicator RCO01. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF (Interreg) |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCO116** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Jointly developed solutions** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCO116 Interreg: Jointly developed solutions |
| 3 | Measurement unit | solutions |
| 4 | Type of indicator | output |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | >=0 |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | Use in all policy objectives, whenever relevant |
| 9 | Specific objective | Use in all specific objectives, whenever relevant |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | The indicator counts the number of jointly developed solutions from joint pilot actions implemented by supported projects. In order to be counted in the indicator, an identified solution should include indications of the actions needed for it to be taken up or to be upscaled.A jointly developed solution implies the involvement of organizations from at least two participating countries (for programmes falling under strands A, B, C as defined in the Interreg Regulation) in the drafting and designprocess of the solution or is developed in the scope of programmes within strands D or E as defined in the Interreg Regulation. |
| 11 | Data collection | MA monitoring system |
| 12 | Time measurementachieved | Upon project finalisation |
| 13 | Aggregation issues | Exclude overlap with RCO117. See notes for details on how to avoiddouble counting. |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 3). |
| 15 | References |  |
| 16 | Correspondingcorporate indicator |  |
| 17 | Notes | In order to avoid double counting, the solutions relevant for this indicator (i.e. RCO116) should not have the main topics linked to administrative or legal frameworks, as these are counted in indicator RCO117.For all other topics of the solutions, the the indicator used for counting is RCO116.RCO116 may be used together with RCO83 and/or RCO84.In case RCO116 is used together with RCO83 and/or RCO84, the common result indicators which may be used are RCR79 and/or RCR104. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF CF JTF |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCO39** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Area covered by systems for monitoring air pollution installed** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCO39 Env: Area covered by systems for monitoring air pollution |
| 3 | Measurement unit | air quality zones |
| 4 | Type of indicator | output |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | >=0 |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | PO2 Greener Europe and under JTF |
| 9 | Specific objective | RSO2.7 Nature protection and biodiversity and under JTF |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | The indicator measures the number of air quality zones / agglomerations with one or more additional air quality monitoring stations financed through the supported projects.EU Clean Air Policy mandates the assessment of ambient air quality on the basis of common methods and criteria. For this purpose, Member States establish ‘air quality zones and agglomerations’ throughout their territory, and in each of these, air quality monitoring networks are installed. These networks can be further expanded by adding additional sampling points that comply with the methods and criteria defined in, and reported in accordance with, the Ambient Air Quality Directives (Directive 2008/50 and 2004/107). Such sampling points provide both validated and up-to-date assessment data.Maintenance or repair are excluded. |
| 11 | Data collection | Supported projects |
| 12 | Time measurementachieved | Upon completion of output in the supported project |
| 13 | Aggregation issues |  |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 3). |
| 15 | References | Ambient Air Quality Directives 2008/50 and 2004/107. |
| 16 | Correspondingcorporate indicator |  |
| 17 | Notes |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF CF JTF |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCO36** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Green infrastructure supported for other purposes than adaptation to climate change** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCO36 Env: Green infrastructure (not related to climate change) |
| 3 | Measurement unit | hectares |
| 4 | Type of indicator | output |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | >=0 |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | PO2 Greener Europe and under JTF |
| 9 | Specific objective | RSO2.7 Nature protection and biodiversity and under JTF |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | Surface area of green infrastructure newly built or significantly upgraded for other purposes than adaptation to climate change. Upgrades refer to significant improvements in existing green infrastructures eligible for support. Maintenance is excluded.Examples of green infrastructure include biodiversity-rich parks, permeable soil cover, green walls, green roofs, green schoolyards etc. (see EEA 2011 in references)This indicator does not cover green infrastructure supported for adaptation to climate change (covered by indicator RCO26) or investments in Natura2000 (covered by indicator RCO37). |
| 11 | Data collection | Supported projects |
| 12 | Time measurementachieved | Upon completion of output in the supported project |
| 13 | Aggregation issues |  |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 3). |
| 15 | References | EEA (2011) - Green infrastructure and territorial cohesion, Technicalreport 18 |
| 16 | Correspondingcorporate indicator | CCO16 |
| 17 | Notes | This indicator is meant to be used to reflect interventions for green infrastructure supported for other purposes than adaptation to climatechange in order to prevent the overlap with the common indicator RCO26. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF  |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **GSO001**  |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Length of railways with updated technical design** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name (open data name) | GSO001: Length of railways with updated technical design |
| 3 | Measurement unit | km |
| 4 | Type of indicator | output |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | >=0 |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | PO3 Connected Europe |
| 9 | Specific objective | RSO3.2. Developing and enhancing sustainable, climate resilient, intelligent and intermodal national, regional and local mobility, including improved access to TEN-T and cross-border mobility. |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | Total length of rail sections with studied / technical design or implemented upgraded security, inclusiveness, and sustainability status. Such interventions could cover rail features such as electrification, speed and safety. The indicator measures the length of tracks. |
| 11 | Data collection | Supported projects |
| 12 | Time measurement achieved | Upon completion of output in the supported project. |
| 13 | Aggregation issues | Double counting should be removed at the level of the specific objective |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 3). |
| 15 | References | - |
| 16 | Corresponding corporate indicator | - |
| 17 | Notes | - |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCO50** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Length of rail reconstructed or modernised - non-TEN-T** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCO50 Rail: Length of rail - non-TEN-T |
| 3 | Measurement unit | km |
| 4 | Type of indicator | output |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | >=0 |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | PO3 Connected Europe |
| 9 | Specific objective | RSO3.2 Sustainable Transport |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | Total length of non-TENT rail sections reconstructed or modernised. Suchinterventions could cover rail features such as electrification, speed and safety. The indicator measures the length of tracks. |
| 11 | Data collection | Supported projects |
| 12 | Time measurementachieved | Upon completion of output in the supported project |
| 13 | Aggregation issues | Double counting should be removed at the level of the specific objective |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 3). |
| 15 | References |  |
| 16 | Correspondingcorporate indicator | CCO23 |
| 17 | Notes | Urban and suburban train lines are covered by indicator RCO56. New or upgraded non-TENT are included in indicator RCO48. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCO46** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Length of roads reconstructed or modernised - non-TEN-T** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCO46 Road: Length of roads- non-TEN-T |
| 3 | Measurement unit | km |
| 4 | Type of indicator | output |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | >=0 |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | PO3 Connected Europe |
| 9 | Specific objective | RSO3.2 Sustainable TEN-T |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | Total length of non-TEN-T road sections reconstructed or modernised due to the supported projects. Interventions could include construction works such as rebuilding, resurfacing, realignment etc.Roads are generally bi-directional (at least one lane in each direction. Road length shall be measured as the length of a bi-directional road (lane kilometres shall not be reported).The indicator does not cover interventions for traffic management systems (which are included in RCO109 for non-TEN-T). Furthermore, maintenance and repair (e.g. road patches, road markings) are excluded. |
| 11 | Data collection | Supported projects |
| 12 | Time measurementachieved | Upon completion of output in the supported project |
| 13 | Aggregation issues | Double counting should be removed at the level of the specific objective |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 3). |
| 15 | References |  |
| 16 | Correspondingcorporate indicator | CCO22 |
| 17 | Notes | Newly constructed and upgraded non-TENT roads are included in RCO44. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF (Interreg) |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCO84** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCO84 Interreg: Pilot actions developed and implemented jointly |
| 3 | Measurement unit | pilot action |
| 4 | Type of indicator | output |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | >=0 |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | Use in all policy objectives, whenever relevant |
| 9 | Specific objective | Use in all specific objectives, whenever relevant |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | The indicator counts the pilot actions developed jointly and implemented by supported projects. The scope of a jointly developed pilot action could be to test procedures, new instruments, tools, experimentation or the transfer of practices. In order to be counted by this indicator,* the pilot action needs not only to be developed, but also implemented within the project

and* the implementation of the pilot action should be finalised by the end of the project.

Jointly developed pilot action implies the involvement of organizations from at least two participating countries (for programmes falling under strands A, B, C as defined in the Interreg Regulation) in its implementation or is implemented in the scope of programmes falling under strands D or Eas defined in the Interreg Regulation. |
| 11 | Data collection | MA monitoring system |
| 12 | Time measurementachieved | Upon project finalisation |
| 13 | Aggregation issues | Should a project foresee over the course of its implementation both the jointly development of strategies or action plans and their implementation through jointly developed pilot actions or jointly developed solutions, indicators RCO84 may be used together with RCO83 and/or RCO116 beused. |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 3). |
| 15 | References |  |
| 16 | Correspondingcorporate indicator |  |
| 17 | Notes | This indicator can also be used in the framework of strand 4 and 5 as defined by the Interreg Regulation.In case RCO84 is used together with RCO83 and/or RCO116, the common result indicators which may be used are RCR79 and/or RCR104. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF (Interreg) |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCO85** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Participations in joint training schemes** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCO85 Interreg: Participations in joint training schemes |
| 3 | Measurement unit | participations |
| 4 | Type of indicator | output |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | >=0 |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | Use in all policy objectives, whenever relevant |
| 9 | Specific objective | Use in all specific objectives, whenever relevant |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | The indicator counts the number of participations in joint training schemes. Participations in a joint training schemes are intended to be counted as registered participants who started the training.A joint training scheme implies:* the involvement of organizations from at least two participating countries (for programmes falling under strands A, B, C as defined in the Interreg Regulation) in the organisation of the training

or* is developed in the scope of programmes falling under strand D or E as defined in the Interreg Regulation.

A joint training scheme requires building knowledge in a certain topic and involves the training of participants over several sessions. A one-offmeeting/event/internal session where information is disseminated should not be considered as a training scheme. |
| 11 | Data collection | MA monitoring system |
| 12 | Time measurementachieved | Upon project finalisation |
| 13 | Aggregation issues | Potential overlap in reporting with RCO81. See notes for further clarification on reporting.Double counting of participants in more than one training schemes organised by the same project should be excluded. |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 3). |
| 15 | References |  |
| 16 | Correspondingcorporate indicator |  |
| 17 | Notes | Values reported under this indicator shall not be reported under RCO81 or RCO82.RCO85 is not counting the number of participants who finalised the joint training schemes - this is done through RCR81.Joint trainings for which the training organisers do not intend to record the confirmed completions / do not intend to issue certificates of completion should be considered under the generic term of "joint actions" - the participations in this case should be counted in RCO81, not in RCO85.In terms of links with common result indicators, RCO85 is intended to be used together with RCR81 and may be used together with RCR85. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCO77** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Number of cultural and tourism sites supported** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCO77 Number of cultural and tourism sites supported |
| 3 | Measurement unit | cultural and tourism sites |
| 4 | Type of indicator | output |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | >=0 |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | Use in all policy objectives, whenever relevant |
| 9 | Specific objective | Use in all policy objectives, whenever relevant |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | Number of cultural and tourism sites supported by the Funds. |
| 11 | Data collection | MA monitoring system |
| 12 | Time measurementachieved | Upon completion of output in supported project |
| 13 | Aggregation issues |  |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 3). |
| 15 | References |  |
| 16 | Correspondingcorporate indicator |  |
| 17 | Notes |  |

**RESULT INDICATORS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF CF |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCR35** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Population benefiting from flood protection measures** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCR35 Climate: Population benefiting from flood protection |
| 3 | Measurement unit | persons |
| 4 | Type of indicator | result |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | not required |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | PO2 Greener Europe |
| 9 | Specific objective | RSO2.4 Climate change adaptation |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | Population living in areas where protection infrastructure (including also green infrastructure for adaptation to climate change) is built or signficantly upgraded in order to reduce vulnerability to flood risks. The indicator counts the resident population at risk of flooding. |
| 11 | Data collection | Supported projects |
| 12 | Time measurementachieved | Upon completion of output in the supported project |
| 13 | Aggregation issues | Rule 1: Remove double counting at the level of the specific objective.Population in a given area should be counted once even if covered by several projects financed in the same specific objective. |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 3). |
| 15 | References |  |
| 16 | Correspondingcorporate indicator | CCR08 |
| 17 | Notes |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF (Interreg) |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCR84** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCR84 Interreg: Organisations cooperating post-project |
| 3 | Measurement unit | organisations |
| 4 | Type of indicator | result |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | not required |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | Use in all policy objectives, whenever relevant |
| 9 | Specific objective | Use in all specific objectives, whenever relevant |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | The indicator counts the organisations cooperating across borders after the completion of the supported projects. The organisations are legal entities involved in project implementation, counted within RCO87. The cooperation concept should be interpreted as having a statement that the entities have a formal agreement to continue cooperation, after the end of the supported project. The cooperation agreements may be established during the implementation of the project or within one year after the projectcompletion. The sustained cooperation does not have to cover the same topic as addressed by the completed project. |
| 11 | Data collection | MA monitoring system / Survey |
| 12 | Time measurementachieved | During project implementation / up to one year after project completion |
| 13 | Aggregation issues | At programme level, double counting should be avoided at the level ofproject partners and associated organizations. |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 6). |
| 15 | References |  |
| 16 | Correspondingcorporate indicator |  |
| 17 | Notes | In terms of links with common output indicator, RCR84 may be used together with RCO87.The value reported for RCR84 can be equal to or lower than the value of RCO87, but not higher. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF (Interreg) |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCR104** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCR104 Interreg: Solutions taken up or up-scaled |
| 3 | Measurement unit | solutions |
| 4 | Type of indicator | result |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | not required |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | Use in all policy objectives, whenever relevant |
| 9 | Specific objective | Use in all specific objectives, whenever relevant |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | The indicator counts the number of solutions, other than legal or administrative solutions, that are developed by supported projects and are taken up or upscaled during the implementation of the project or within one year after project completion. The organisation adopting the solutions developed by the project may or may not be a participant in the project.The uptake / up-scaling should be documented by the adopting organisations in, for instance, strategies, action plans etc. |
| 11 | Data collection | MA monitoring system / Survey |
| 12 | Time measurementachieved | During project implementation / up to one year after project completion |
| 13 | Aggregation issues |  |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 6). |
| 15 | References |  |
| 16 | Correspondingcorporate indicator |  |
| 17 | Notes | In terms of links with common output indicator, RCR104 may be usedtogether with RCO116 and/or RCO83 and/or RCO84. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF JTF |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **GSR001** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | Enterprises adapting more sustainable processes |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name (open data name) | **GSR001 -** Enterprises adapting more sustainable processes |
| 3 | Measurement unit | enterprises |
| 4 | Type of indicator | result |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | not required |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | 2 |
| 9 | Specific objective | 2.vi |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | Number of enterprises supported which are introducing more sustainable (green) production or orginosational processes . The indicator counts enterprises for which are investing in equipment, services or infrastructures that haves as a result the improvement of the environmental footprint of their activities.  |
| 11 | Data collection | Supported projects |
| 12 | Time measurement achieved | Upon completion of activity for skills development |
| 13 | Aggregation issues |  |
| 14 | Reporting | *Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 3). Disaggregation by type of skills reported only for achieved values.*  |
| 15 | References | - |
| 16 | Corresponding corporate indicator | - |
| 17 | Notes |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF CF |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCR95** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Population having access to new or improved green infrastructure** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCR95 Env: Pop. with access to green infrastructure |
| 3 | Measurement unit | persons |
| 4 | Type of indicator | result |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | not required |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | Use in all policy objectives, whenever relevant |
| 9 | Specific objective | Use in all specific objectives, whenever relevant |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | Estimated population living within a 2 km radius from the public greeninfrastructure built or significantly ugraded in urban areas and supported by the projects (see EC 2012 study in references). |
| 11 | Data collection | Supported projects |
| 12 | Time measurementachieved | Upon completion of output in the supported project. |
| 13 | Aggregation issues |  |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 3). |
| 15 | References | The Multifunctionality of Green Infrastructure, European Commission, DGEnvironment, in-depth study March 2012 |
| 16 | Correspondingcorporate indicator |  |
| 17 | Notes |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF CF JTF |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCR50** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Population benefiting from measures for air quality** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCR50 Env: Population benefiting from measures for air quality |
| 3 | Measurement unit | persons |
| 4 | Type of indicator | result |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | not required |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | Use in all policy objectives, whenever relevant and under JTF |
| 9 | Specific objective | Use in all specific objectives, whenever relevant and under JTF |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | Population living or working in treated areas with an improved air quality. Measures for improving air quality can include, for example, green infrastructure, cleaner public transport, redirection of traffic, etc.The measurement of air quality should be performed over a period of one year. The population can be estimated ex-post based, for example, on maps for air quality.Improved air quality should be interpreted in line with the terms of Directive 2008/50/EC (see references), and it should be documented based on monitoring systems and stations for air quality. |
| 11 | Data collection | Supported projects |
| 12 | Time measurementachieved | One year after the completion of output in the supported project |
| 13 | Aggregation issues | Rule 1: Remove double counting at the level of the specific objective. |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 3). |
| 15 | References | Directive 2008/50/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council onambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe |
| 16 | Correspondingcorporate indicator | CCR11 |
| 17 | Notes | The indicator is meant to be used when the objective of the intervention isto improve air quality in the respective area. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF CF |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCR56** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Time savings due to improved road infrastructures** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCR56 Road: Time savings due to improved road infrastructures |
| 3 | Measurement unit | man-days/year |
| 4 | Type of indicator | result |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | not required |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | PO3 Connected Europe |
| 9 | Specific objective | RSO3.1 Sustainable TEN-T and RSO3.2 – Sustainable |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | Total time savings for transport on road infrastructure improved due tosupported projects. The achieved value is to be estimated ex post over a period of one year after the completion of the intervention. |
| 11 | Data collection | Supported projects |
| 12 | Time measurementachieved | One year after completion of output in the supported project. |
| 13 | Aggregation issues |  |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 3). |
| 15 | References |  |
| 16 | Correspondingcorporate indicator | CCR13 |
| 17 | Notes | See “Methodological support for ERDF and Cohesion Fund result indicators in the field of transport post 2020” JASPERS (2021) : [https://ec.europa.eu/regional\_policy/sources/policy/evaluations/guidance/2021/tr](https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/policy/evaluations/guidance/2021/transport-indicators/methodl_support_indicators_post_2020_en.pdf)[ansport-indicators/methodl\_support\_indicators\_post\_2020\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/policy/evaluations/guidance/2021/transport-indicators/methodl_support_indicators_post_2020_en.pdf) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF CF |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCR58** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Annual users of newly, built, upgraded, reconstructed or modernised railways** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCR58 Road: Annual users railways |
| 3 | Measurement unit | passenger-km/year |
| 4 | Type of indicator | result |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | not required |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | PO3 Connected Europe |
| 9 | Specific objective | RSO3.1 Sustainable TEN-T and RSO3.2 – Sustainable |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | Total number of passenger-km travelled on railways newly built, upgraded, reconstructed or modernised due to the supported project. The achieved value is to be estimated ex-post for the period of one year after the completion of the intervention. The indicator baseline refers to the estimated number of passenger-km travelled on the respective rail line in the year before the intervention starts, and it can be zero for new rail lines. |
| 11 | Data collection | Supported projects |
| 12 | Time measurementachieved | One year after completion of output in the supported project. |
| 13 | Aggregation issues |  |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 3). |
| 15 | References |  |
| 16 | Correspondingcorporate indicator | CCR 14 |
| 17 | Notes | See “Methodological support for ERDF and Cohesion Fund result indicators in the field of transport post 2020” JASPERS (2021) : [https://ec.europa.eu/regional\_policy/sources/policy/evaluations/guidance/2021/tr](https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/policy/evaluations/guidance/2021/transport-indicators/methodl_support_indicators_post_2020_en.pdf)[ansport-indicators/methodl\_support\_indicators\_post\_2020\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/policy/evaluations/guidance/2021/transport-indicators/methodl_support_indicators_post_2020_en.pdf) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF (Interreg) |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCR81** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Completion of joint training schemes** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCR81 Interreg: Completion of joint training schemes |
| 3 | Measurement unit | participants |
| 4 | Type of indicator | result |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | not required |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | Use in all policy objectives, whenever relevant |
| 9 | Specific objective | Use in all specific objectives, whenever relevant |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | The indicator counts the number of participants completing the joint trainings schemes organised by supported projects. Completion should be documented by the training organisers either through a record of the confirmed completions or by issuing certificates of completion of the training.The certificates of completion do not necessarily require a previous national certification process of the issuing organisation. |
| 11 | Data collection | MA monitoring system |
| 12 | Time measurementachieved | At project completion |
| 13 | Aggregation issues | Double counting of participants in more than one training schemesorganised by the same project should be excluded. |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 6). |
| 15 | References |  |
| 16 | Correspondingcorporate indicator |  |
| 17 | Notes | In terms of links with common output indicators, indicator RCR81 is intended to be used together with RCO85.The value reported for RCR81 can be equal to or lower than the value of RCO85 (for example in case some participants withdraw after the training started or in case not not all participants receive the final certification), but not higher. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCR77** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Visitors of cultural and tourism sites supported** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCR77 Visitors of cultural and tourism sites |
| 3 | Measurement unit | visitors/ year |
| 4 | Type of indicator | result |
| 5 | Baseline | >=0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | not required |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | Use in all policy objectives, whenever relevant |
| 9 | Specific objective | Use in all specific objectives, whenever relevant |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | Estimated number of annual visitors of cultural and tourism sites supported. The estimation of the number of visitors should be carried out ex post one year after the completion of the intervention. The baseline of the indicator refers to the estimated annual number of visitors of the supported sites the year before the intervention starts, and it is zero for new cultural and tourism sites.The indicator does not cover natural sites for which an accurate estimation of number of visitors is not feasible. |
| 11 | Data collection | Supported projects |
| 12 | Time measurementachieved | One year after the completion of output in the supported project. |
| 13 | Aggregation issues |  |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objective*Forecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 3).* |
| 15 | References | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objective*Forecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 3).* |
| 16 | Correspondingcorporate indicator |  |
| 17 | Notes |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row ID** | **Field** | **Indicator metadata** |
| 0 | Fund relevance | ERDF JTF |
| 1 | **Indicator code** | **RCR03** |
| 2 | **Indicator name** | **Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) introducing product or process innovation** |
| 2b | Indicator code and short name(open data name) | RCR03 RTDI: SMEs introducing product or process innovation |
| 3 | Measurement unit | enterprises |
| 4 | Type of indicator | result |
| 5 | Baseline | 0 |
| 6 | Milestone 2024 | not required |
| 7 | Target 2029 | >0 |
| 8 | Policy objective | Use in all policy objectives, whenever relevant and under JTF |
| 9 | Specific objective | Use in all specific objectives, whenever relevant and JTF |
| 10 | Definition and concepts | Number of SMEs introducing product or process innovation due to the support provided. The indicator covers also micro enterprises.Product innovation is the market introduction of a new or significantly improved good or service with respect to its capabilities, user friendliness, components or sub-systems. Process innovation is the implementation of a new or significantly improved production process, distribution method, or supporting activity.Product or process innovations must be new to the enterprise supported, but they do not need to be new to the market. The innovations could have been originally developed by the supported enterprises or by other enterprises or organisations.(see COM 2014 in references)For enterprise definition - see RCO01. |
| 11 | Data collection | Supported projects or enterprise surveys |
| 12 | Time measurement achieved | At most one year after the completion of output in the supported project. |
| 13 | Aggregation issues | Rule 1: Double counting removed at the level of the specific objective An enterprise is counted once regardless how many times it receivessupport from operations in the same specific objective. |
| 14 | Reporting | Rule 1: Reporting by specific objectiveForecast for selected projects and achieved values, both cumulative to date (CPR Annex VII, Table 3). |
| 15 | References | COM (2014) - Community Innovation Survey 2014, harmonised survey questionnaire, ESTAT, version 13, 23 July 2014 online |
| 16 | Correspondingcorporate indicator | CCR01 |
| 17 | Notes |  |