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Priority 2 – Targeted Analysis Project

• Using ESPON results to bring a European perspective to a national/regional policymakers
• Provide the option for national/regional policymakers to compare themselves to other regions and transfer of best-practice
• Improve the usefulness of ESPON results by testing new, experimental and innovative options such as:
  (1) Analysis of themes of interest for groups of regions, partly based on case studies,
  (2) Methodological frameworks for translating territorial development goals and policy aims into concrete actions; and,
  (3) Technical, methodological and analytical support to territorial planning processes and spatial programming and visions.
• Provision of analytical support and evidence based on ESPON results on thematic priorities in cooperation with other Structural Funds Programmes.
Developing Partnerships

The aim is to carry through targeted analyses in partnership with policy makers and/or practitioners showing an interest in gaining awareness of European evidence, information, experience and/or knowledge on common challenges related to their territorial and/or urban development.

The individual targeted analysis shall support better informed policy decisions by:

- Integrating ESPON findings with more detailed information and practical know-how
- Contributing to a sound knowledge of territorial development perspectives/ & trends through new understanding of future development potentials and challenges.
## Our Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>完成了</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review the current use of spatial data in the case study nations and identify any gaps, uncertainties or limitations</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine the extent to which ESPON data has informed national spatial planning strategies</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop guidelines on the use of indicators and ESPON data in territorial policy development at the national level;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify a core set of key indicators to inform spatial planning at the national level, drawing on ESPON research and datasets available in the case studies;</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider how the capacity for spatial analysis can be strengthened and harmonised at the national level; and</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine how national analytical experience and expertise can help to inform and take forward the EU Territorial Agenda and the implications for future ESPON research.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology

**Territorial Profiles**

- Evidence-based review of the territorial development potential and geographic specificity of each of the five national territories.
- Analysis of policy statements, policy objectives and development potential that define policy goals and establish territorial priorities

**Data and Indicators**

- Review of the extent of application of spatial data and ESPON results, and identification of national datasets and monitoring systems
- Identification of preliminary set of core and discretionary indicators
- Review of literature for indicator development and existing European and national indicator sets

**Consultation**

- Liaison with ESPON INTERCO, Database (M4D) and SCALES projects to verify indicators, identify data availability and address scale issues.
- Stakeholder workshops and focus groups: priority areas and perceptions on the applicability of indicators

**KitCasp indicator set for territorial cohesion territorial cohesion, economic competitiveness and sustainable development to inform spatial planning**
Methodology

Policy statements and territorial development potential: Policy goals and territorial priorities

Filtering

EU/ESPON Data

KITCASP indicator set for territorial cohesion territorial cohesion, economic competitiveness and sustainable development to inform spatial planning

Filtering

National Data

Stakeholders’ Perceptions: Objectives and development priorities for spatial planning
Methodology

Territorial Workshops
Project team, project stakeholders, national stakeholders and external expertise

Priority themes/domains

Set of Core Indicators

Territorial Focus Groups
Project team, project stakeholders, national stakeholders
Territorial Cohesion or Spatial Planning?

Social and Economic Cohesion

Polycentrism

Territorial Cohesion

Environment

Environmental Sustainability

Cooperation/Governance
Selecting Themes

Table 5. List of spatial planning themes for grouping indicators for territorial cohesion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ireland</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>Iceland</th>
<th>Latvia</th>
<th>Basque Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recovery from economic crisis, increased competitiveness and employment promotion</td>
<td>Economic resilience and transition to low carbon economy</td>
<td>Strong local economies ensuring global competitiveness</td>
<td>Recovery from economic crisis, increased competitiveness and employment promotion</td>
<td>Economic performance and competitiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Settlement-Infrastructure alignment</td>
<td>Adaptation to and mitigation of climate change and environmental resource management</td>
<td>Attractive regions of high ecological values and strong territorial capital</td>
<td>Enhanced Settlement-Infrastructure alignment</td>
<td>Enhanced Settlement-Infrastructure alignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable development and enhanced management of environmental assets</td>
<td>Territorial co-operation and governance</td>
<td>Better Regional/Local Governance with emphasis on territorial cooperation</td>
<td>Sustainable development and transition to a low carbon economy</td>
<td>Territorial cooperation and governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Regional/Local Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced regional development</td>
<td>Integrated polycentric territorial development</td>
<td>Balanced regional development</td>
<td>Balanced regional development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity and regional resilience</td>
<td>Accessibility and fair access to services, markets and jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social inclusion / cohesion</td>
<td>Inclusion and quality of life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life, the importance of place and realising the potential of places based on territorial assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation and knowledge economy</td>
<td>Innovative territories</td>
<td>Innovation and knowledge economy</td>
<td>Innovation and the knowledge-based economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Emerging Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Competitiveness and Resilience</th>
<th>Adaptability, diversification, enabling economic activity, employment, economic cooperation/collaboration, innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managed/Integrated Spatial Development</td>
<td>Balanced regional development, settlement-infrastructure alignment, well-managed, effective, coherent to local needs, compact cities, polycentricity, territorial capacities and assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cohesion and Quality of Life</td>
<td>People, equality, well-being, access to services, choice, connecting to work/schools, green areas, healthy living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Resource Management</td>
<td>Landscape protection, climate change, low-carbon economy, enhanced management, sustainability, coastal mgmt., water mgmt., adaptation (floor risk), air quality, biodiversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Selecting Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Competitiveness and Resilience</th>
<th>Ireland</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>Basque Country</th>
<th>Latvia</th>
<th>Iceland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic value added (GVA) per capita</td>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td>GDP per inhabitant per year</td>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment rate of population aged 20-64</td>
<td>Employment rate of population aged 16-64</td>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>Economically active persons/total population</td>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population with accessibility to internet</td>
<td>Participation in higher education</td>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td>Population &gt; 10 years of age with tertiary education</td>
<td>Economically active statistical units of the market sector</td>
<td>Participation higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Direct Investment</td>
<td>Foreign Direct Investment</td>
<td>Balance of external trade</td>
<td>Total amount of foreign direct investment contributions per 1000 inhabitants of the municipality</td>
<td>Demographic structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total R &amp; D expenditure as % of GDP</td>
<td>Research and development</td>
<td>Business birth/death/survival rates</td>
<td>Self sufficiency of energy production</td>
<td>Proportion of export of high technology sectors from total annual export</td>
<td>Share of GDP in R&amp;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Medium Enterprises (SMEs)</td>
<td>Productivity: Gross Value Added (GVA) per capita</td>
<td>Rate of new firm creation</td>
<td>Turnover of innovative products</td>
<td>E-governance ranking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic structure</td>
<td>Breakdown of economic activity in traditional sectors (agriculture, construction, industry and services)</td>
<td>Labor productivity</td>
<td>Activity rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Composite indicator: Economic performance, well-being, disadvantage and resilience</td>
<td>Youth employment rate</td>
<td>Energy dependence – net import of energy resources/gross domestic energy consumption plus bunkering</td>
<td>Persons 20-39 years as a share of total population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of business visitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Economy Competitiveness & Resilience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Competitiveness and Resilience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td>€ per inhabitant</td>
<td>Highly consistent indicator across the case study regions and widely used in ESPON. Proposed by Scotland, Basque Country, Latvia and Iceland. Consideration should be given to GVA per capita, which is more widely used in Ireland and Scotland. Indicator included in SIESTA, PURR, INTERCO, EU-LUPA, DEMIPHER.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment rate of population aged 20-64</td>
<td>% (total work force)</td>
<td>Highly consistent indicator across the case study regions and widely used in ESPON. Proposed by Ireland, Scotland, Basque Country, Latvia and Iceland with slight variation in approach (e.g. employment versus unemployment). The indicator has been worded to align it to the EU2020 targets. Indicator included in SIESTA, PURR, TPM, INTERCO, EU-LUPA, DEMIPHER.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total R &amp; D expenditure as % of GDP</td>
<td>% of GDP</td>
<td>There is a level of consistency across the case study regions but not all put R&amp;D forward as an indicator. The variation in the wording suggest that &quot;Total R &amp; D expenditure as % of GDP&quot; may be the way forward. This indicator has been proposed by Ireland, Scotland and Iceland. R&amp;D indicators have been included in SIESTA, PURR, TPM AND INTERCO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme: SMEs and Innovation</td>
<td>Absolute Values</td>
<td>There is a level of consistency across the case study regions around this theme but no clear indicator emerges. Ireland proposes SMEs, the Basque Country &quot;rate of new firm creation&quot; and Latvia &quot;turnover of innovative products&quot;. We think there are merits in including an indicator around this theme. This indicator is not found in any of the relevant ESPON projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme: Forest Direct Investment and trade</td>
<td>€million</td>
<td>There is a level of consistency across the case study regions around this theme but no clear indicator emerges. Ireland proposes FDI, the Basque Country &quot;balance of external trade&quot;, Latvia &quot;foreign direct investment contributions&quot;, and Scotland refers to both FDI and value of exports. We think there are merits in including an indicator around this theme. This indicator is included in SIESTA and TPM.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Managed (Integrated) Spatial Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managed (Integrated) Spatial Development</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population density</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population change</td>
<td>Number of people per Km² Absolute values for change in population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House completions</td>
<td>Absolute values or % of total housing stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal split</td>
<td>% of total number of trips (bus, rail, car, bicycle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use change</td>
<td>% of total (building, roads, domestic, green space, agricultural, woodland, water, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (hospitals and schools)</td>
<td>Travel time (minutes) to hospitals/schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Social Cohesion and Quality of Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Cohesion and Quality of Life</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population aged 30-34 with tertiary education</strong></td>
<td>% of total population aged 30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population at risk of poverty</strong></td>
<td>% of total population with income below X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme: Green spaces</strong></td>
<td>% of total population within 500 metres of public green areas (active and passive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme: Well-being index</strong></td>
<td>% of total population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme: Dependency ratio</strong></td>
<td>% of total population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Environmental Resource Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Resource Management</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renewable Energy Production (Wind, Hydro, Biomass, etc.)</strong></td>
<td>Megawatts and % by renewable energy type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greenhouse gas emissions</strong></td>
<td>Tonnes CO₂ eq. per individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population at risk of flooding (living in flood-prone areas)</strong></td>
<td>% of total population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number and status of protected European habitats and species</strong></td>
<td>Number and Conservation Status (EU defined status of Natura 2000 sites - SACs and SPAs and Annexed species)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of municipal waste recycled</strong></td>
<td>Tonnes or % recycled of total volume of household waste produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water quality status</strong></td>
<td>Absolute values on the actual status or objective met/failed (as per WFD for groundwater, rivers, lakes, estuarine, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Questions

- What are good practices on the use of data to inform territorial policy development?
- How can the stakeholders make better use of ESPON data in developing their spatial policies?
- What data is needed for developing reliable key indicators?
- What are the key indicators for measuring territorial cohesion, competitiveness and sustainable development?
- How can indicators for different countries be compared?
- How can the key indicators most effectively inform spatial policy?
- To what extent are these indicators GIS-based and would this enhance their comparability and relevance?
- How can the key indicators be regularly updated and how is this to be managed?
Emerging Conclusions

• There is no such thing as a perfect indicator – they are an indirect measure: compromise between complexity and conciseness.
• Defining a common set of Pan-European indicators is extremely challenging:
• To be effective an indicator must be linked to a priority policy theme and have a clear rational purpose.
• Different policy goals and units of measurement present clear hurdles - Link to European policy offers best grounds for coherent EU wide indicators.
• Outcome indicators had greatest preference: The desirability of process (qualitative) indicators was not strong
• Spatial resolution matters for understanding trends.
• Indicators must be regularly measured to provide information sensitive to change.
• Wish Lists: The absence of data is not necessarily a reason for not selecting an indicator
Filtering

Does the indicator address the case studies’ policy objectives and development priorities (i.e. overall priority themes)?

2. Does the indicator enable assessing the performance and dynamics of balanced territorial development (i.e. can it be mapped to illustrate spatial patterns)?

3. Is the indicator regularly measured (i.e. are there reliable and timely datasets available or monitoring arrangements in place)?

4. Does the indicator effectively provide information sensitive to change to timely aid decision-making processes?

5. Is the indicator well-understood by planners and decision-makers (i.e. can it communicate the results in a concise and accessible manner)?
Indicators translate complex relationships about phenomena in a simple way and in a manner which can be easily understood by policy-makers to provide usable and reliable signals of important trends.
- Recognised that the outcomes from strategic spatial planning in Ireland have been sub-optimal.
  - Unbalanced development
  - Development oversupply
  - Sprawl and Uneconomic Service Provision
  - Poor integration with Capital Investment Programmes
  - Poor environmental outcomes

- Renewed Focus on reform and a new emphasis on integrated and ‘Evidence Based’ planning
  - Planning Reform /Greater Oversight
  - Reform of Local Government /Regional structures
  - Regional Spatial & Economic Strategies
  - A new Collaborative NSS/RDS
## Europe 2020 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Priority</th>
<th>EU Target</th>
<th>Ireland Target</th>
<th>Northern Ireland PFG (2011-2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td>75% of 20-64 year-olds to be employed</td>
<td>69-71% of 20-64 year-olds to be employed</td>
<td>Contribute to rising levels of employment by supporting the promotion of over 25,000 new jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R&amp;D</strong></td>
<td>3% of the EU’s GDP to be invested in R&amp;D</td>
<td>Approximately 2% of GDP to be invested in R&amp;D (2.5% GNP)</td>
<td>Support £300 million investment by businesses in R&amp;D, with at least 20% coming from Small and Medium sized Enterprises (SMEs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate Change / Energy</strong></td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions 20% (or even 30%, if the conditions are right) lower than 1990</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions 20% lower than 1990</td>
<td>Continue to work towards a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by at least 35% on 1990 levels by 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20% of energy from renewables</td>
<td>16% of energy from renewables</td>
<td>Encourage achievement of 20% of electricity consumption from renewable sources and 4% renewable heat by 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20% increase in energy efficiency</td>
<td>2.75 million tonnes of oil equivalent reduction of energy consumption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>Reducing school drop-out rates below 10%</td>
<td>8% early school leaving</td>
<td>Increase the overall proportion of young people who achieve at least 5 General Certificate Secondary Education (GCSE) at A* - C or equivalent including GCSEs in Maths and English by the time they leave school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least 40% of 30-34 year-olds completing third level education</td>
<td>60% of 30-34 year-olds completing third level education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty / social exclusion</strong></td>
<td>At least 20 million fewer people in or at risk of poverty and social exclusion</td>
<td>At least 186,000 people out of the risk of poverty and exclusion by 2016</td>
<td>Deliver a range of measures to tackle poverty and social exclusion through the 'Delivering Social Change' framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EU Cohesion Policy accounts for one-third of the EU budget and is undergoing significant reform.

Future Cohesion funding will concentrate on a limited number of policy priorities, closely linked to the Europe 2020 strategy.

Conditional on verified progress towards targets with greater monitoring and conditionalities/incentives.

Points to an important new role for spatial data and indicators in implementing EU Cohesion Policy and maximising funding opportunities.
Europe 2020 Targets

- Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth

- Partnership for “an integrated approach for territorial development supported by all CSF Funds”

- Eleven CSF Themes

  - Strengthening R&D, innovation
  - Access & Quality of ICT
  - Enhance competitiveness of SMES, agriculture, fisheries and aquacultures
  - Support shift towards low carbon economy
  - Promoting climate change adaptation and protecting the environment
  - Sustainable transport
  - Social inclusion and combat poverty

- Operational Programmes
The main conclusion of this joint statement is that the Europe 2020 Strategy and the Territorial Agenda should cross-fertilise.

There is the need to strengthen the urban dimension in Cohesion Policy and to establish greater coordination between territorial and urban issues, to ensure that the two policies cross-fertilise and can support the implementation of the objectives in a mutual way.

“We encourage Member States to integrate the principles of territorial cohesion into their own national sectoral and integrated development policies and spatial planning mechanisms.”
TA 2020 Priorities

- Promote Polycentric and Balanced Territorial Development
- Encourage Integrated Development in Cities, Rural and Specific Regions
- **Territorial Integration in Cross Border and Transnational Functional regions**
- Ensure Global Competitiveness of the Regions Based on Strong Local Economies
- Improving Territorial Connectivity for Individuals, Communities and Enterprises
- Managing and Connecting Ecological, Landscape and Cultural Values of Regions
The identification of the most suitable core set of key indicators of significant practical use to policy-makers and practitioners at national and sub-national levels in the preparation of territorial development strategies.

- **Review the current use of spatial data** by government and public agencies in the case study nations [Ireland, Scotland, Basque Country, Iceland, Latvia]

- **Examination of the extent to which ESPON data has informed** national spatial planning strategies and territorial development policy in each case;

- **Development of guidelines** on the use of indicators and ESPON data in territorial policy development at the national level;

- **Identification of a core set of key indicators** of territorial cohesion, economic competitiveness and sustainable development to inform spatial planning at the national level, drawing on ESPON research and datasets available in the case studies;

- Considerations on **how the capacity for spatial analysis can be strengthened and harmonised** at the national level; and

- **Examination of how national analytical experience and expertise can help to inform** and take forward the EU Territorial Agenda and the implications for future ESPON research.
Developing Indicators

Stage 1
- Defining approach and content
- Literature review

Stage 2
- Workshop
- Draft Report
- Feedback

Stage 3
- Incorporation of Feedback
- Revised draft report to NSG

Stage 4 'Test Run'
- Gathering data
- Refining the indicators
- Determining outputs

Stage 5 Report
- Test Run with selected indicator mapping
- Consult with other indicator experts

Stage 6 Final Indicators
- Incorporation of NSC Feedback & Completion of Indicators Report for the NSC

- Test Run Report to NSC March, 2013

Timeline:
- September 2012
  - Definition of Indicators
  - Test run commenced
- October - December 2012
  - Refinement of methodology
  - Population of indicator sets
  - Review
- January - March 2013
  - Definition of targets, outputs/analysis graphics
  - Completion of Test Run
- March - June 2013
  - Establishment of Baseline for RPG Mid-term review
- 2014+
  - On-going monitoring
Drawing on ESPON Research

Priority 2 – Targeted Analysis

- The use of existing results in partnership with different groups of stakeholders.
- Enhancing understanding of the larger territorial context,
- Making comparisons to other territories, regions and cities, and
- **Including a European perspective to considerations on the development of their territories.**
## Emerging Outcomes

### 2.2.1 Theme 1 - Economic Prosperity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RPG Aims and Objectives</th>
<th>Proposed Indicators</th>
<th>UoM</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Data Source (Comments on Availability and Frequency of data)</th>
<th>Presentation of Data (Mapping, Tables, Text, etc.)</th>
<th>Expected Analysis &amp; Outputs</th>
<th>Summary of Actual Outputs and Results of Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim 1:</strong> Realisation of the Economic Strategy underpinning the RPG’s</td>
<td><strong>Objective 1:</strong> Enable an increase in employment and economic activity in each region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It population (total and by gender) aged 30-34 with tertiary education</td>
<td>Absolute Values</td>
<td>The National Reform Programme – 2012 Update states that Ireland’s Headline Target is to increase the share of 30-34 year olds who have completed tertiary or equivalent education to at least 60%.</td>
<td>Special tabulation was carried out by the CSO. Information is available from the Census at a City and County level. Another special tabulation would be required at ED level.</td>
<td>Proposed mapping at Regional and County level. It is proposed to have 2 maps that show regions which are below and above National Reform Programme and Europe 2020 targets.</td>
<td>Third level educational attainment is a key prerequisite in building a globally competitive Smart Economy in accordance with national government policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment rate of population aged between 20-64.</strong></td>
<td>Absolute Values</td>
<td>65-71% of population aged between 20-64 in employment by 2020 (Taken from Ireland’s National Reform Programme – 2012 Update)</td>
<td>Special tabulation was carried out by the CSO. Information to populate this indicator was taken from the Quarterly National Household Survey (QNHS). QNHS information would not be accurate at a City and County level however data is available at these levels</td>
<td>Proposed mapping at Regional and County level. It is proposed to have 2 maps that show regions which are below and above National Reform Programme and Europe 2020 targets.</td>
<td>Increase/decrease in employment. It can assist appreciably in setting the right conditions for employment growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
- The indicator reflects the National Reform Programme which in turn is consistent with Europe 2020.

**Glossary:**
The European regional yearbook 2012, which refers specifically to Europe 2020 targets, defines tertiary education as follows: "Tertiary education is the level of education offered by universities, vocational universities, institutes of technology and other institutions that award academic degrees or professional certificates." For the Regional Indicators it’s recommended that we take the Eurostat regional yearbook 2012 definition.
### 2.2.2 Theme 2 - People and Place

| BPD Aim and Objectives | Proposed Indicators | UoM | Targets | Data Source (Comments on Availability and Frequency of data) | Presentation of Data (Mapping, Tables, Text, etc.) | Expected Analysis & Outputs | Summary of Actual Outputs and Results of Data Collection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim 3:</strong> To promote sustainable travel options and greater accessibility for the Gateways, Hubs and Tier 1 settlements</td>
<td>6.1 Work-related commuting by car, bus, rail, bicycle and walking</td>
<td>Absolute values</td>
<td>Work-related commuting by car will be reduced from a current modal share of 65% to 45% by 2020 (Smarter Travel); Increase % of population living and working in the Gateways, Hubs and Tier 1 settlements</td>
<td>CDI Census, POWSCAR, NTAR, DOT, ADO</td>
<td>Mapped using POWSCAR data or displayed in tables</td>
<td>Trends towards key Smarter Travel objectives</td>
<td>Please refer to sample mapping below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Emerging Outcomes

#### 2.2.3 Theme 3 - Environment and Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RPG Aims and Objectives</th>
<th>Proposed Indicators</th>
<th>UoM</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Presentation of Data</th>
<th>Expected Analysis &amp; Outputs</th>
<th>Summary of Actual Outputs and Results of Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim 1:</strong> To enable the achievement of regional environmental quality targets by coordinating spatial plans with other relevant environmental plans and strategies (e.g. water quality, climate change and waste)</td>
<td>Status of all water bodies (groundwater, rivers, lakes, estuaries, coastal, bathing, drinking waters)</td>
<td>Actual Status [EPA defined status of water bodies as per Water Framework Directive]</td>
<td>Achieve ‘good (ecological) status’ by 2015 (or consecutive time-frames) as set out in RBMPs. Achieve RBMP Objectives for 2015, 2021 and 2027</td>
<td>- RBMP Allocation Planning/EPA</td>
<td>- Map format based on WFD RBM/EPA datasets (Composite maps for indicators 1-3 to be explored)</td>
<td>This data gives an indication of the impact of urban and rural development on water quality in the regions. It will identify where existing water and wastewater investments are maintaining or improving water quality and will assist in providing rationale for future investment in priority strategic infrastructure, in particular, to support key RPG growth settlements.</td>
<td>Does the indicator work, what recommendations are proposed (e.g. amend, delete or new indicator) and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1:</strong> Achieve Objectives and targets of Water Framework Directive River Basin District Plan (RBMP) Management Plans within each region; and remove existing water and wastewater bottlenecks/deficits to support key RPG growth centres</td>
<td>Settlements (Main RPG settlements/County Towns) in compliance with UWWTD Discharge License</td>
<td>Absolute number of main RPG settlements to achieve compliance with UWWTD Discharge License by 2015 in line with the WFD</td>
<td>100% of main RPG settlements to achieve compliance with UWWTD Discharge License by 2015</td>
<td>- EPA WWTR Reports/EMA</td>
<td>- Table or map format (Identifying where settlements are in compliance with or non-compliant with the UWWTD)</td>
<td>This will also outline the transforming ecological status of water bodies and as a proxy for water dependent habitats and species.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
- This indicator determines whether each RBMP is reaching 'satisfactory' ecological status and whether RBMP objectives for 2015, 2021, and 2027 are being met (for example, in the Shannon RBMP 30-40% of coastal, estuaries, lakes, and reservoirs, rivers and canals have satisfactory ecological status and ground water is 75% satisfactory so all other waters need to improve). The indicator data will be available every six years and is scientifically sound.

**Glossary:**
- The Water Framework Directive (WFD) sets out four core objectives to be achieved by 2015 for all waters which are 1) Prevention deterioration; 2) Restore good status; 3) Reduce chemical pollution; and 4) Achieve protected areas objectives (Shannon RBMP, 2009). It is estimated that implementation of these measures in the RBMPs will result in good status being achieved for many waters in the first plan cycle, with further improvements during later plan cycles.

**Comments:**
- Firstly, data on information will be collected (RPG Towns, CSO, Population, Core Strategy, target, and identifies whether there is an adequate or limited water or wastewater capacity (local authority estimation and may not include new industry capacity additions, etc.), status of WSP projects (completed, ongoing, etc.). These can be compared to UWWTD status, i.e. passed, failed, or failed due to a particular reason based on EPA analysis.

**This information can be mapped, displaying key settlements with adequate and limited water and wastewater capacity.**

---
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Gateways & Hubs Development Index

1. Population
   - Population Growth
   - Age Vibrancy of Population

2. Enterprise & Employment
   - New Firm Formation
   - Quality of Sectoral Base
   - Unemployment Rate

3. Knowledge & Innovation
   - Labour Force Quality
   - Graduate Admissions
   - Third Level R&D

4. Natural & Physical Environment
   - River Water Quality
   - Drinking Water Quality
   - Waste Recycling

5. Transport & Connectivity
   - Travel-to-Work Times
   - Green Transport Usage
   - Public Transport Availability
   - Retail Activity
   - IT Connectivity

6. Health & Wellness
   - Mortality
   - Birth weight
   - Primary Health Care

7. Crime & Disorder
   - Crime
   - Breakdown of Crime

8. Deprivation & Affluence
   - Affluence and Deprivation

Gateways | Hubs Development Index 2012
Gateways & Hubs Development Index

FIGURE 7: MAP OF GATEWAY ZONES

Purple = Gateway Zone 1
Green = Gateway Zone 2
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Emerging Outcomes
Indicator Outputs

ILO Unemployment Rate (%) / 2012 Q3

Select Employment Indicator: ILO Unemployment Rate (%)
Move Slider to Change Time Period

Indicator: ILO Unemployment Rate (%)
Period: 2012 Q3
Region: South-West
Value: 12.9

Select Region: Border & Dublin;
ILO Unemployment Rate (%)

Legend:
- Border
- Dublin

Graphs showing unemployment rates over time for different regions.
Regional Spatial & Economic Strategies

- TA 2020 calls for **New Macro Regional Strategies** (Integrated Territorial Investments)
- Broad based integrated funding instruments to draw down Cohesion Policy Co-Financing in accordance with the ‘Additionality Principle’
- Macro-Regional Strategies should be based on principles of horizontal coordination, evidence informed policy making and integrated functional area development
- An emphasis on ‘**Place Based**’ policy to unleash endogenous territorial potential.
Concluding Remarks

- The **capacity to accurately and objectively monitor social, economic and environmental development trends and patterns across space and time is a central feature of any spatial planning system.**

- **Reform of EU Cohesion policy** and reorientation towards Europe 2020 underlines the current importance of developing appropriate territorial indicators and monitoring tools.

- All regions will be eligible for funding post – 2014 but will **be increasingly competing for scarcer funding opportunities.**

- Maximising funding opportunities, investment and development potential will require innovative and integrated approaches, clear choices in policy priorities and development of a dynamic set of indicators capable of monitoring regional specific progress towards targets.
Conclusion

- **Enormous range of datasets on an ever wider series of topics** has been collected in the EU and at national and regional levels. The use of these data to inform evidence-based policy-making has been sub-optimal, partly due to the sheer breadth, fragmentation and compartmentalised nature of the information available.

- **Strategic ‘buy-in’ from stakeholders** at national, regional, cross-border and local levels is critical to ensuring the success of a monitoring framework.

- **Institutional structures** in support the development of spatial monitoring frameworks.

- **Quality of communication between all stakeholders** and their commitment to a harmonised model of data capture and analysis.

- **Soft structures such as the draft non-statutory collaborative framework** and the three cross-border networks are likely to play a key role in facilitating cross-border working in this area.
Thank you for your attention!
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