ESF+ Data Support Centre – Steering note to support the preparation of methodological documents for ESF+ programmes

May 2022

Table of content

1   Introduction

This note aims at assisting the managing authorities in the preparation of the methodological documents of their ESF+ programmes for 2021-2027. According to the Common Provisions Regulation 2021/1060 (Article 17), the methodology for the establishment of the performance framework shall include:

a) the criteria applied by the Member State to select indicators;

b) data or evidence used, data quality assurance and the calculation method;

c) factors that may influence the achievement of the milestones and targets and how they were taken into account.

The Data Support Centre (DSC) has been asked by the European Commission to assess:

- the selection of indicators, and in particular the link between the selected indicators and the intervention logic, and

- the methodology used for setting the targets (and reference values) associated with the selected indicators.

With a view to making the methodological assessment timely and relevant, the note sets out the necessary elements in the methodological document. The text below is by default valid for all SOs, but when there are specific rules applying for SO(l) operations targeting the most deprived or SO(m) on material deprivation (both SOs were previously under FEAD OPs), these are highlighted in text boxes.

The DSC review will be based on the following documents submitted by the managing authorities:

- the methodological document itself,

- the draft ESF+ programme (which is useful to understand the intervention logic and to have a clear overview of the selected output and result indicators as well as their targets),

- any other supporting documents (e.g. separate files with the calculation of targets).

A checklist highlighting the key issues that need to be covered in the methodological document is provided below.

Useful documents
- ✓ Common indicators toolbox published in October 2021 on SFC2021
- ✓ The background note on target setting method published in July 2021 on SFC2021
- ✓ The schematic examples on ESF+ target setting published in July 2021 on SFC2021
- ✓ The background note on programme-specific indicators published in July 2021 on SFC2021

2   Data requirements

Justification of selected indicators for target setting under each SO	
Intervention logic	
Type and nature of the supported operations	
Main target groups	
Main expected changes	
Selected indicators under each SO	
Overview of output and result indicators used for target setting under each SO	
Comprehensive definitions of the selected indicators, including:	
- Indicator's code (official codes for common indicators)	
- Clear and informative name	
- Definition	
- Measurement unit (CI in absolute values)	
Data collection method	
Frequency of data collection	
Data quality assurance procedures	
Overlap of programme-specific indicators with common indicators	
Overlap of programme-specific indicators with programme-specific reserved output indicators	
Overlap between non-mutually exclusive indicators	
Clear link between result indicators and output indicators used as a basis	
Unit costs	
Total financial allocation (EU budget + national budget)	
Assumptions used to calculate the average unit cost, including:	
- Inflation	
- Variation of other costs	
- Comparability with the operations from which data is taken	
Milestones (for output indicators)	
Milestone values to be achieved by end-2024	
Assumptions used to set milestones, including:	
- Start and end year of implementation for supported operations under each	
- Pace of implementation	
- Differences by categories of regions (if any)	
- Other underlying assumptions used	
Explicit calculations (that can be reproduced easily by any third party)	
Reference values (for result indicators) [2]	
Reference values (cannot be zero)	
Reference years	
Reference values adjusted to the expected output	
Assumptions used to set the reference values, including:	
- Comparability with the operations from which the reference value is taken	
- Differences by categories of regions (if any)	
- Other underlying assumptions used	
Explicit calculations (that can be reproduced easily by any third party)	
Targets (for output and result indicators) [3]	
Target values for selected output and result indicators to be achieved by end-2029	
Measurement unit (same as for selected indicators?)	
Assumptions used to set the targets, including:	
- Internal/design factors affecting achievement of targets	
- External factors affecting achievement of targets	
- How internal/external factors are reflected in the calculations	
- Differences by categories of regions (if any)	
- Comparability with operations from which data is taken	
- Other underlying assumptions used	
Explicit calculations (that can be reproduced easily by any third party)	
Target revisions	
Statement on what it is intended to do in terms of target revision	

3   Selection of indicators

- Intervention logic: the selected indicators should capture the main deliverables (outputs) and expected achievements (results) of the interventions under the relevant specific objectives. They should reflect the expected contribution to the specific objective.

- Output indicators on participants should match the main target group(s) of the specific objective outlined in the programme (and should not be limited to participants of a specific operation). It is recommended that any discrepancies are justified in the methodological document.

- Result indicators should capture the main achievements and changes expected at the SO level (and not at the operation level) as described in the programme. It is recommended that any discrepancies are justified in the methodological document.

- Details about the type and nature of the supported operations shall be included.

- If programme-specific indicators are selected:
  - their name should be clear, adequate and informative enough (for instance for PSRI, the time of observation for capturing the results should be clearly mentioned);
  - they should not overlap with common indicators;
  - they should not overlap with programme-specific reserved output indicators.

- The common indicators toolbox recommends that '*Targets should be set only for a limited number of common indicators and when necessary a limited number of programme-specific indicators. For each SO, there should be at least 1 target for an output indicator and 1 target for a result indicator. The selection of these indicators should be based on the intervention logic as the selected indicators ought to measure the major changes intended and main deliverables to be achieved in the specific objective. They should not reflect the outputs and results of each individual type of action or measure but the specific objective as a whole*'.
- SFC2021 provides a restricted menu of programme-specific reserved output indicators which consist of indicators combining two or more common output indicators:
  - EECO02+04 Non-employed (unemployed + inactive)
  - EECO02+05 Active (unemployed + employed)
  - EECO03+04 Long-term unemployed and inactive
  - EECO02+04+05 All labour market status (unemployed+inactive+employed)
  - EECO06+07 Children and young people (under 18 + 18-29)
  - EECO09+10 With post-secondary education or less (ISCED 0-2 + 3-4)
  - EECO10+11 With upper secondary education or more (ISCED 3-4 + 5-8)
  - EECO09+10+11 All educational levels (ISCED 0-2 + 3-4 + 5-8)

  (cf. the FAQ page published on SFC and https://ec.europa.eu/sfc/en/2021/quickguides/programme-ijg#2.1.1.1.2-indicators-22).

Material deprivation – SO(m) (ex-FEAD type I OPs)
- Reference values should be set for a limited number of result indicators. The selection of these indicators should be based on the intervention logic as the selected indicators ought to measure the main achievements with the specific objective. For instance, if the SO plans the distribution of food and material assistance, the managing authority shall identify a reference value for both indicators for end recipients of food support and end recipients of material support. Furthermore, if specific target groups are to be reached (e.g. third country nationals), then it may be advisable to set reference values for indicators relevant to these target groups (e.g. EMCR07 in case of food support).

People at risk of poverty or social exclusion – SO(l)
- For SO(l) covering both operations targeting the most deprived (ex-FEAD type II OPs), and not targeting the most deprived, at least one programme-specific result indicator should be set (as there are no common result indicators for this specific objective).

4   Definition of indicators

- Definitions used for the common indicators should be those provided in the common indicators toolbox, except if administrative data with national definitions are used. In that case, the difference should be explained.

- If programme-specific indicators are selected, the methodology should include a comprehensive definition for each of them (see box below).

- Correct indicator codes for all common indicators should be used (see Annexes of the Common indicators toolbox).

- Data collection method should be explained (e.g., direct data collection from projects via questionnaire, data from registers, etc.)

- Information about frequency of data collection should be included.

- Information about data quality assurance procedures should be provided.

> 💡 It is considered good practice to prepare similar fiches to those in the common indicators toolbox (Annex B/C/D) for each selected indicator and to share it with all the beneficiaries from the start of the programme implementation. Managing authorities are free to modify the format to better suit their needs. The fiches in the toolbox are examples of the information to be collected for common indicators with the aim to help managing authorities to prepare their monitoring methodology. Although these fiches do not need to be uploaded in SFC, definitions of each indicator in the programme should be included in the methodological document supporting the programme.

5 Measurement unit

- The values of common indicators are expressed in absolute terms (not in percentage).

- It is recommended that targets are set in the same measurement unit as the corresponding indicator (see section 3.3 of the Common Indicators Toolbox).

- For programme-specific indicators, the use of absolute values is encouraged especially when focusing on individual results. As mentioned in Annex II of the background note on target setting, if the objective is focused on individual results (e.g. people in employment, in education, etc.), the success rate alone does not say much about the contribution of that intervention to the policy objective. In these cases, the use of a target expressed in absolute values is more adequate and therefore strongly recommended.

Since February 2022, the following additional data fields in Table 3 (result indicators) of the programme template have been added in SFC2021:

- "Term of indicator's measurement unit": absolute number or percentage. Note that for common indicators this is always absolute number (as per Article 17(4) of the ESF+ Regulation), whilst for programme-specific indicators, Member States can choose whether to report indicators values as percentages or as absolute numbers.
- "Term of measurement unit for target": absolute number or percentage. For both common and programme-specific result indicators, targets can be expressed as either absolute numbers or percentages (Article 17(4) of the ESF+ Regulation).

Material deprivation – SO(m)
- As for the other specific objectives, common indicators for SO(m) are all expressed in absolute numbers (in EUR, tons, or number of end recipients), except two common output indicators which are expressed in percentage (EMCO10 Share of food donations, and EMCO11 Proportion of ESF+ in total volume of food distributed).

6 Linking result and output indicators

- Each result indicator should be explicitly linked with the corresponding output indicator(s). This is indeed necessary to identify the relevant participants/entities for which the change is being measured, and for understanding the target value (especially if expressed in percentage). See also the FAQ published on SFC2021 on this issue.

- When the result indicator captures the outcome observed for a reference population covered by the output indicator (e.g. EECR03 with EECO01 used as a basis), it is necessary to make the link explicit so that SFC can automatically calculate the achievement ratio. (If the link is only conceptual, e.g. 'number of informative sessions' as output and 'number of persons benefitting of these sessions' as result, no link should be indicated).

Since February 2022, there is a specific additional data field ("Output indicator used as a basis for target setting") in Table 3 (Result indicators) of the programme template in SFC2021 to indicate the output indicator used as reference for the calculation of the result indicator and the corresponding target. The output indicator is to be selected from the list of the output indicators in the programme template from Table 2 (Output indicators). Thus, in order to select an output indicator as basis, it first needs to be defined under Table 2 for the same priority, specific objective, fund, category of region. MAs will therefore have the possibility to create records for the same result indicator multiple times provided that the 'output indicator used as a basis for target setting' is different for each record. This information will be used in Table 10 of the data transmission for the calculation of the target achievement ratio (where relevant).

7   Unit costs

- Unit costs should refer to the total financial allocation (ESF + national budget) and not only ESF funds.
- Average unit costs per participant/entity observed in the previous programming period are generally used when the ESF+ budget of a given action/SO is known to estimate the expected number of participants/entities to be supported under the given action/SO (i.e. targets for output indicators).
- Assumptions on inflation (especially when using historical costs) or on variation of other costs affecting the total unit cost should be made explicit in the methodological document (e.g. inflation or changes in the cost of services provision can lead to higher unit costs and thus reducing the number of participants). If it is assumed that there will be no such changes, this should also be explicitly mentioned.

8   Milestones

- Milestone values to be reached by end-2024 should be provided for each output indicator for which a target has been set.
- Milestone calculations have to be explicit, and in particular, the following information should be provided for each indicator:
    - Start and end year of implementation of the operations supported (which may/may not coincide with the programming period)
    - Pace of implementation: will it be constant throughout the period or not (e.g. a slow start in the first years expected, e.g. due to COVID and delay in programming)?

Material deprivation – SO(m)
- Milestones are not required (Article 16(2) of the CPR).

---

9   Reference values

- Reference values for result indicators (and the corresponding reference years) should be provided in the methodological document for each result indicator for which a target has been set.
- The reference year is the year related to the reference value. It should not be considered as the implementation period for the supported operations.
- Reference values should not be equal to zero. Relevant data from the previous programming periods (relating to the existing intervention or to similar actions) can indeed be used as reference values to calculate the target values. Other comparable data, including at the international level, can also be used as a reference value for target setting (cf. ESF+ Regulation Article 17(4) and 'Schematic examples on ESF+ target setting'). If no data can be exploited, please note that it is possible to have programme-specific indicators without targets and to report only factual achievements.
- Characteristics of the operation from which the reference value is taken should be provided: is the new ESF+ operation a continuation of what was previously implemented? If not, the methodological document needs to explain to which extent they are similar and comparable (for example in terms of the nature of the supported actions, geographical scope, target groups, business sectors, etc.).
- If the result indicator target is linked to the output and estimated as a success rate, it is good practice to adjust the reference value with the planned volume of the support. (Reference success rate: 50%, estimated success rate: 55%, previous output: 1,000, planned output: 2,000. Reference value: 1,000 (instead of 500) and target: 1,100.)
- Reference values should be broken down by category of region. A simple way to do so is to distribute the target proportionally to the financial allocation in different categories of regions where relevant (cf. Article in CPR 42(2)), provided that the unit costs of support are sufficiently similar.

Material deprivation – SO(m)
- For indicators under SO(m), for which milestones and targets are not required, a reference value may be used to compare the indicators' achieved values with past experience.
- The reference values can be based on historical achievements deemed relevant as comparison, such as the unit (per capita) cost of providing food or material support in the previous programming period. The unit cost is then divided by the estimated yearly budget devoted to the relevant type of support in the new programme. In case the support to be provided is new and there are no relevant historical values, the reference values should be based on a reasoned estimate of such unit costs, such as derived for example from the experience of organisations providing such support in the country or from other countries having a similar cost of living.

10 Target setting

- The target setting methodology shall be clear, all data used shall be explicitly mentioned (e.g. the budget, the unit cost), and calculations shall be detailed enough to be easily replicated.
- All assumptions used for the calculation of targets should be made explicit, and supported by adequate evidence. For all result indicators, it is recommended to include explicitly the assumptions used in relation to the historical success rates, i.e. reasons why no further adjustment has been applied (to account for different target groups or improved efficiency for instance), or on the reverse why the rate is different.
- If there are differences across categories of regions in terms of unit costs, reference values and target values, these should be clearly mentioned. If it is assumed there are no such differences (or they cannot be quantified), such assumption should also be made explicit.
- In case it is assumed that the situation (in terms of nature of the operations, target groups, results) will remain the same as in the previous programming period, such assumption should be clearly explained.
- For simplification, it is recommended that target values are rounded (they can be rounded to the next ten, hundred or thousand, as considered appropriate by the managing authority).
- For additional explanations as well as schematic examples please consult the "Note on target setting and accompanying examples" circulated as background material for the Data Network Meeting and published in SFC2021: https://ec.europa.eu/sfc/en/system/files/2021/ged/esf_data_support_centre_issue_paper_-_schematic_examples_on_esf_target_setting.pdf

---

Material deprivation – SO(m)
- Targets are not required (Article 16(2) of the CPR).

11   Overlap of indicators

- In some cases, targets can be set under the same specific objective for output indicators that are not mutually exclusive, for instance between EECO05 (Employed) and EECO14 (People with foreign background). As participants can be both employed and with foreign background, this should be taken into consideration in the target calculations by adding estimations where possible. If it is not possible to have these estimations, the methodological document should mention it explicitly - for instance under 'Factors that can affect target achievement'). The table below provides an example of how to have these estimations when targets for overlapping indicators have been set for different interventions:

Selected indicators	Targets	Comments
Estimation of EECO05 – Employment, including self-employed (target based on unit costs and available budget for a **given intervention targeting employed**)	10,000	
Estimation of the share of employed among participants of **other actions** for which separate indicators with targets have been set (see EECO14)	200	*Estimation of 10 % of the 2,000 participants with foreign background who are employed*
EECO05	**10,200**	
Estimation of EECO14 – People with foreign background (target based on unit cost and available budget for **a given intervention targeting at people with a foreign background**)	2,000	
Estimation of the share of participants with foreign background among participants of **other actions** for which separate indicators with targets have been set (see EECO05)	500	*Estimation of 5 % of the 10,000 participants employed who have foreign background*
EECO14	**2,500**	

- The table below illustrates another example how to set targets for overlapping indicators, based on data at the SO level (or for one single intervention). First, the total number of participants is estimated based on the unit cost and available budget. In the next step, the targets for the overlapping indicators are estimated by using the assumptions on the share of the specific target groups. These assumptions can be based on the experience in the previous period or on the planned type of support/target groups in the new period.

Selected indicators	Targets	Comments
Estimation of EECO01 – Total number of participants (target based on unit costs and available budget for the SO)	12,000	
EECO01	**12,000**	
Estimation of the number of employed based on the assumption about the share of the employed among all participants in the SO (EECO05)	10,200	*Assumption that 85% of the participants of the SO will be employed (12,000*0,85=10,200)*
EECO05	**10,200**	
Estimation of the number of people with foreign background based on the assumption about the share of people with foreign background among the SO participants (EECO14)	2,500	*Assumption that 21% of the participants of the SO will be people with foreign background (12,000*0,21=2,520) (rounded to 2,500)*
EECO14	**2,500**	

12 Factors that may influence the achievement of targets

- Calculation of targets should consider internal/design factors affecting efficiency/efficacy (e.g. a more efficient system for profiling or communicating with participants, online consultations allowing for more participants to be reached, etc.). If this is not the case (e.g. effects are unknown, cannot be quantified), this should be made explicit in the methodological document.
- Calculation of targets should also consider external factors that can potentially influence performance (see the box below). If this is not the case (e.g. effects are unknown or cannot be quantified), this should be made explicit in the methodological document.

External factors that may influence target achievement

Effects and uncertainties linked to COVID-19
- Digitalisation: possible speeding of digitalisation, where presence activities are substituted by online.
- Target groups: potential changes in the target groups (both impacting output/result indicators).

Other factors
- The green and digital transition, and the specific need for re-skilling in certain areas/sectors.
- Delays or overlaps due to the concurrence of different funds (e.g. REACT-EU and ESF+, late adoption of ESF+ regulation and of the related programmes).
- Changes in the regulation, overlaps with national programmes modifying outreach to the target groups.
- Economic changes (inflation rates).

ICF

13 Target revision

- The methodological document should include a statement on what the managing authority intends to do in terms of revising the targets.

Targets can be revised based on:
- Time-related revision (for example, after 2-3 years once the impact of COVID will be clearer).
- Parameter-related revision (for example, if the yearly average unemployment rate in the period 2021-2023 exceeds 3 percentage points the 2018-2020 average).
- Only if deemed necessary (for example, in case of systematic over/under achievement is identified, or major changes/delays in the programme implementation, etc.), or only as part of the mid-term review, as prescribed by Art. 18 of the CPR.

Annex I   Menu of programme-specific indicators by specific objective[1]

SO(a) Improve access to employment

Output indicators	Result indicators
Participants	
• Women • Participants in vocational education/ vocational training • Participants from vulnerable groups • Participants with a difficult labour market situation (job at risk or recently dismissed) • Participants at risk of poverty, material deprivation or similar	• Participants who preserved their job • Participants completing the intervention • Participants gaining a qualification, in employment, education/training or job searching • *Participants improving employability, including basic skills and job search skills* • *Participants re-engaging in job search (activation)*
Entities	
• Companies/enterprises supported • Start-ups supported	• Positive result for entreprises
Other counts	
• Jobs supported	• Jobs created • Companies/businesses created

SO(b) Modernising labour market institutions

Output indicators	Result indicators
Participants	
• Participants from vulnerable groups • Professionals of public administration or judiciary • Individuals/service users	• Participants who improve their skills • Users satisfied with service received • Individuals having/gaining access to health/ social welfare services
Entities	
• Companies/enterprises • Labour market institutions	• Companies benefitting from new services • Positive result for enterprises • Positive result for labour market institutions
Other counts	
• Projects targeting private sector • Projects targeting the PES capacity to support	• Jobs created • Newly introduced services

---

[1] *Extracted from the 'FGB, Applica/Alphametrics and Ockham, Study on the pathways to enhance the use of PSI in the ESF and ESF+ (2022), for the European Commission, Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion. Text in italics refer to possible soft result indicators.*

SO(c) Gender balanced participation in labour market

Output indicators	Result indicators
Participants	
• Women • Participants with vulnerable family situation • Professionals of healthcare or social services	• Participants with an improved labour market position • Participants who improve their skills • Participants gaining a qualification, in employment, education/training or job searching • Individuals accessing childcare facilities
Entities	
• Companies/entreprises • Start-ups • Institutions • Education providers: childcare/early years education	• Enterprises implementing gender equality measures • Institutions implementing gender equality measures
Other counts	
• Childcare placements/enrolments created/ supported	

SO(d) Adaptation of workers and enterprises

Output indicators	Result indicators
Participants	
• Women • Participants with a difficult labour market situation (job at risk or recently dismissed)	• Participants with improved labour market position • Participants who improve their skills • Participants gaining a qualification, in employment, education/training or job searching • Individuals benefitting from health/social welfare services
Entities	
• Companies/enterprises • Labour market institution	• Positive result for SME • Positive result for enterprises
Other counts	
• Health programmes supported	• Average duration of absence of work in companies (inversed target)

SO(e) Quality of education and training systems

Output indicators	Result indicators
Participants	
• Participants who are in education/training • Participants who are in vocational education/training • Professionals in education organisations (teachers/managers) • Participants with qualifications	• Participants completing the intervention • Participants who improve their skills • Participants gaining a qualification, in employment, education/training or job searching
Entities	
• Companies/enterprises • Education providers • Education providers: vocational education and training • Education providers: primary/secondary	• Positive result for enterprises • Positive result for education providers
Other counts	
• Curricula / education programmes/ qualifications / educational methods, tools, or material developed • IT equipment purchased • Standards/guidelines developed	• Educational programmes improved

SO(f) Equal access to education

Output indicators	Result indicators
Participants	
• Participants who are in education/training • Participants who are in vocational education/training • Participants who are in high education • Professionals in education organisations (teachers/managers)	• Participants who improve their skills • Participants leaving school early (negative target) • Individuals accessing childcare facilities • Individuals benefitting from health/social welfare services • *Participants re-engaging in learning and training*
Entities	
• Education providers • Education providers: vocational education and training • Education providers: primary/secondary	• Positive result for education providers
Other counts	
• Curricula / education programmes/ qualifications / educational methods, tools, or material developed • Jobs supported • Childcare placements/enrolments created/supported	• Educational programmes improved

SO(g) Promoting lifelong learning

Output indicators	Result indicators
Participants	
• Participants who are in vocational education/training • Professionals in healthcare or social services • Professionals in public administration or judiciary • Professionals in education organisations (teachers / managers) • Participants from vulnerable groups	• Participants who improve their skills • Participants completing the intervention • Participants leaving school early (negative target) • Participants in education/training • Participants with improved labour market position • Participant satisfied with the services received • *Participants re-engaging in learning and training*
Entities	
• Education providers • Companies/entreprises	• Positive result for education providers • Positive result for companies/entreprises
Other counts	
• Curricula / education programmes/ qualifications / educational methods, tools, or material developed	• Educational programmes improved

SO(h) Active inclusion / SO(i) integration of 3ʳᵈ country nationals

Output indicators	Result indicators
Participants	
• Women • Participants from vulnerable groups • Participants with vulnerable family situation • Participants at risk of poverty, material deprivation or similar • Participants with criminal background/history • Individuals reached/Service users	• Participants at risk of poverty (negative target) • Participants in employment, education/training or job searching • Individuals benefitting from health / social welfare services • *Participants improving their skills (including basic and personal skills)* • *Participants improving their quality of life/ experiencing a positive change in their socio-economic status*
Entities	
• Education providers: primary/secondary • Education providers: early years/childcare • Healthcare provider	• Positive result for education providers • Positive result for healthcare providers
Other counts	
• Jobs/FTE supported	

SO(j) Socio-economic integration of marginalised communities

Output indicators	Result indicators
Participants	
• Participants at risk of poverty, material deprivation or similar • Participants from vulnerable groups • Participants with vulnerable family situation • Professionals in healthcare or social services • Professionals in public administration or judiciary	• Participants improving their skills *(including basic and personal skills)* • Participants gaining a qualification, in employment, education/training or job searching • Individuals benefitting from health / social welfare services • Individuals accessing childcare facilities • *Participants improving their quality of life/ experiencing a positive change in their socio-economic status*
Entities	
• Education providers: primary/secondary • Education providers: early years/childcare • Healthcare providers	• Positive result for education providers • Positive result for healthcare providers
Other counts	
• Health programmes supported	

SO(k) Access to services

Output indicators	Result indicators
Participants	
• Participants at risk of poverty, material deprivation or similar • Participants with vulnerable family situation • Professionals in healthcare or social services • Service users/individuals	• Participants completing the intervention • Participants gaining a qualification, in employment, education/training or job searching • Participants improving their skills • Individuals benefitting from health / social welfare services • Individuals accessing childcare facilities • *Participants improving their quality of life/ experiencing a positive change in their socio-economic status*
Entities	
• Healthcare providers	• Healthcare providers with strengthened capacity
Other counts	
• Health programmes supported • Childcare placements/enrolments created/ supported • Items of protective equipment purchased	

SO(l) Social integration of people at risk of poverty

Output indicators	Result indicators
Participants	
• Participants from vulnerable groups	• Participants who improve their skills • Individuals benefitting from health/social welfare services • Individuals accessing childcare facilities • *Participants who improve their skills (including basic and personal skills)* • *Participants who improve their quality of life/who experience a positive change in their socio-economic status*

ICF