
ANALYSIS OF INDIVIDUAL INDICATORS

Result indicators

1) Inhabitants benefiting from projects implementation within integrated urban development plans (no.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|----------|
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 1.1 interventions. It quantifies its usefulness for the end – users represented by population, which can be translated in social benefits.
- The indicator is rather sensitive to the intervention and it captures its progress over time. Changes in the variable it monitors – in this case, implementation of projects within integrated urban development plans – will be reflected in the value of the indicator (number of inhabitants) sometime after the project implementation. It is to be mentioned that the population varies over time due to different reasons.
- The indicator is obtained from beneficiaries after the project implementation and can be estimated based on project proposals and public records.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is average, requiring specific studies.

2) Companies established in the regional and local growth poles (no.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|----------|
| 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of interventions under KAI 1.1, focused on the development of growth poles.
- The indicator is rather sensitive to the intervention and it captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the activity it monitors – in this case, development of growth poles – is reflected in the value of the indicator (number of companies established). However, it can be influenced by other factors such as economic conditions, demography.
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, with some delay after the project implementation.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is average, requiring specific studies.

3) Jobs created/ maintained (no.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 1.1 interventions. It quantifies the jobs created and maintained, which can be translated in social benefits. It can be aggregated and can provide relevant information beyond project level. The system level recommendation is to re-label as “New jobs created: women / men (number)” and to use with different action categories. The “Jobs maintained” indicator should be kept as project level indicator, so the re-labelled indicator is consistent across KAIs and OPs. This change would not affect the quality of the information the indicator conveys but would improve manageability.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention, capturing the results during and after the project implementation;
- It can be obtained from the beneficiary during the project implementation, and after its completion;
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is average, requiring specific studies.

4) Visitors at sights - local cultural patrimony in the urban area (no.)

5) VISITORS AT SIGHTS – NATIONAL CULTURAL PATRIMONY (NO.)

6) VISITORS AT SIGHTS - UNESCO PATRIMONY (NO.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 1.1 interventions. It quantifies the capitalisation of the cultural patrimony, which can be translated in economic benefits. The system level recommendation is to collapse the three indicators into one and to re-label as “Visitors at sights (number)” and use with AC 112 UNESCO patrimony, AC 113 National cultural patrimony, AC 114 Local cultural patrimony in urban area. This change would not affect the quality of the information the indicator conveys but would improve manageability.
- The indicator is average sensitive to the intervention, capturing the results some time after the project implementation; it is also influenced by other factors such as accessibility, quality of accommodation services in the area, promotion.
- It can be obtained from the beneficiary after the project implementation;
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is average, requiring specific studies.

7) SMEs attracted in business structures (no.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|----------|
| 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of interventions under KAI 1.1, focused on providing support to SMEs through business structures.
- The indicator is rather sensitive to the intervention and it captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the activity it monitors – in this case, SMEs attracted in business structures – is reflected in the value of the indicator. However, it can be influenced by other factors such as the benefits of doing business in the business structures compared to other facilities.
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, at the end and after the project implementation.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no significant additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.

8) Large enterprises attracted in business structures (no.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|----------|
| 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of interventions under KAI 1.1, focused on providing support to large enterprises through business structures.
- The indicator is rather sensitive to the intervention and it captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the activity it monitors – in this case, large enterprises attracted in business structures – is reflected in the value of the indicator. However, it can be influenced by other factors such as the benefits of doing business in the business structures compared to other facilities.
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, at the end and after the project implementation.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no significant additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.

9) New jobs created: business infrastructure, of which (no.)

10) NEW JOBS CREATED: BUSINESS INFRASTRUCTURE, WOMEN (NO.)

11) NEW JOBS CREATED: BUSINESS INFRASTRUCTURE, MEN (NO.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 1.1 interventions. It quantifies the jobs created and maintained, which can be translated in social benefits. It can be aggregated and can provide relevant information beyond project level. The system level recommendation is to collapse the three indicators into one and to re-label as “*New jobs created: women / men (number)*” and to use with AC 109 Business infrastructure. This change would not affect the quality of the information the indicator conveys but would improve manageability.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention, capturing the results during and after the project implementation;
- It can be obtained from the beneficiary during the project implementation, and after its completion;
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is average, requiring specific studies.

12) Persons benefitting from rehabilitated/ modernised/ equipped infrastructure - health infrastructure, of which: (no.)

13) PERSONS BENEFITTING FROM REHABILITATED/ MODERNISED/ EQUIPPED INFRASTRUCTURE - HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE, WOMEN (NO.)

14) PERSONS BENEFITTING FROM REHABILITATED/ MODERNISED/ EQUIPPED INFRASTRUCTURE - HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE, MEN (NO.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 1.1 interventions. It quantifies its usefulness for the end – users represented by vulnerable groups of the population, which can be translated in social benefits. The system analysis recommends to collapse the three indicators in one and re-label as “*Persons benefitting from rehabilitated/modernised/equipped social services infrastructure: women / men (number)*” and use with AC 104 Social services infrastructure. This change would not affect the quality of the information the indicator conveys but would improve manageability.

- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it captures its progress over time. Changes in the variable it monitors – in this case, rehabilitation of social infrastructure – will be reflected in the value of the indicator (number of beneficiaries).
- The indicator is obtained from beneficiaries after the project implementation, from its records.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, but it requires beneficiaries’ recording in order to be accurate. Data should be available at the social centres.

15) roma persons benefitting from rehabilitated/ modernised/ equipped infrastructure - social services infrastructure (no.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 1.1 interventions. It quantifies its usefulness for the end – users represented by vulnerable groups of the population, which can be translated in social benefits. The system analysis recommends re-labelling as “*Persons benefitting from rehabilitated/ modernised/ equipped infrastructure – Roma (number)*” and use with AC 104 Social services infrastructure. This change would not affect the quality of the information the indicator conveys but would improve manageability.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it captures its progress over time. Changes in the variable it monitors – in this case, rehabilitation of social infrastructure – will be reflected in the value of the indicator (number of beneficiaries).
- The indicator is obtained from beneficiaries after the project implementation, from its records.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, but it requires beneficiaries’ recording in order to be accurate. Data should be available at the social centres.

16) Persons benefitting from rehabilitated/ modernised/ equipped health infrastructure, of which (no./day)

17) PERSONS BENEFITING FROM REHABILITATED/ MODERNISED/ EQUIPPED HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE: WOMEN (NO./DAY)

18) PERSONS BENEFITING FROM REHABILITATED/ MODERNISED/ EQUIPPED HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE: MEN (NO./DAY)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|
| 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 3.1 interventions. It quantifies its usefulness for the end – users represented by population, which can be translated in health and social benefits. The system analysis recommends to collapse the three indicators in one and re-label as *“Persons benefiting from rehabilitated /modernised/equipped infrastructure: women / men (number)”* and use with AC 103 Health infrastructure. This change would not affect the quality of the information the indicator conveys but would improve manageability
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it captures its progress over time. Changes in the variable it monitors – in this case, rehabilitation of health infrastructure – will be reflected in the value of the indicator (number of persons).
- The indicator is obtained from beneficiaries after the project implementation.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator remains low, but it requires specific studies; information is available at the medical units.

19) Persons benefiting from rehabilitated/ modernised/ equipped infrastructure - social services infrastructure, of which: (no.)

20) PERSONS BENEFITING FROM REHABILITATED/ MODERNISED/ EQUIPPED INFRASTRUCTURE - SOCIAL SERVICES INFRASTRUCTURE, WOMEN (NO.)

21) PERSONS BENEFITING FROM REHABILITATED/ MODERNISED/ EQUIPPED INFRASTRUCTURE - SOCIAL SERVICES INFRASTRUCTURE, MEN (NO.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|----------|
| 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 3.2 interventions. It quantifies its usefulness for the end – users represented by population, which can be translated in social benefits. The system analysis recommends to collapse the three indicators in one and re-label as *“Persons benefiting from rehabilitated /modernised/equipped social services infrastructure: women / men (number)”* and use with AC 104 Social services infrastructure. This change would not affect the quality of the information the indicator conveys but would improve manageability.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it captures its progress over time. Changes in the variable it monitors – in this case, rehabilitation of social infrastructure – will be reflected in the value of the indicator (number of persons).
- The indicator is obtained from beneficiaries after the project implementation.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator remains low, but it requires specific studies; information is available at the social units.

22) roma Persons benefiting from rehabilitated/ modernised/ equipped infrastructure

see indicator 81

23) Average intervention time of mobile units in the rural area (communes) – infrastructure for emergency situations (minutes)

24) AVERAGE INTERVENTION TIME OF MOBILE UNITS IN THE URBAN AREA (CITIES/TOWNS)
– INFRASTRUCTURE FOR EMERGENCY SITUATIONS (MINUTES)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|
| 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is quite relevant for measuring the results of KAI 3.3 interventions. It quantifies the usefulness of mobile units to end users, represented by population, which can be translated in social and health benefits. The system analysis recommends collapsing the two indicators in one and re-labelling as *“Average intervention time of mobile units: in rural area (communes) / in urban area (cities/towns) (minutes)”* and to use with AC 106 Infrastructure for interventions in emergency situations. This change would not affect the quality of the information the indicator conveys but would improve manageability.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention, capturing the results after the project implementation.
- It can be obtained from the beneficiaries;
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is rather low, requiring specific calculation.

25) Students benefiting from rehabilitated/ modernised/extended university campuses (no.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 3.4 interventions. It quantifies its usefulness for the end – users represented by students, which can be translated in social and education benefits.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it captures its progress over time. Changes in the variable it monitors – in this case, rehabilitation of education infrastructure – will be reflected in the value of the indicator (number of students) after the project implementation.
- The indicator is obtained from beneficiaries after the project implementation.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator remains low, but it requires specific studies; information is available at the social units.

26) Students benefiting from rehabilitated/ modernised/equipped education units – infrastructure for pre-university education, of which: (no.)

27) STUDENTS BENEFITING FROM REHABILITATED/ MODERNISED/EQUIPPED EDUCATION UNITS –INFRASTRUCTURE FOR PRE-UNIVERSITY EDUCATION, WOMEN (NO.)

28) STUDENTS BENEFITING FROM REHABILITATED/ MODERNISED/EQUIPPED EDUCATION UNITS –INFRASTRUCTURE FOR PRE-UNIVERSITY EDUCATION, MEN (NO.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 3.4 interventions. It quantifies its usefulness for the end – users represented by students, which can be translated in social and education benefits. The system analysis recommends collapsing the nine indicators in one and re-labelling as *“Students benefiting from rehabilitated/ modernised/ extended/equipped education units: women / men (number)”* and to use with AC 107 Infrastructure for education – pre-university. This change would not affect the quality of the information the indicator conveys but would improve manageability.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it captures its progress over time. Changes in the variable it monitors – in this case, rehabilitation of education infrastructure – will be reflected in the value of the indicator (number of students) after the project implementation.
- The indicator is obtained from beneficiaries after the project implementation.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator remains low, but it requires specific studies; information is available at the social units.

29) STUDENTS BENEFITING FROM REHABILITATED/ MODERNISED/EQUIPPED EDUCATION UNITS –INFRASTRUCTURE FOR UNIVERSITY EDUCATION, OF WHICH: (NO.)

30) STUDENTS BENEFITING FROM REHABILITATED/ MODERNISED/EQUIPPED EDUCATION UNITS –INFRASTRUCTURE FOR UNIVERSITY EDUCATION, WOMEN (NO.)

31) STUDENTS BENEFITING FROM REHABILITATED /MODERNISED/EQUIPPED EDUCATION UNITS –INFRASTRUCTURE FOR UNIVERSITY EDUCATION, MEN (NO.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 3.4 interventions. It quantifies its usefulness for the end – users represented by students, which can be translated in social and education benefits. The system analysis recommends collapsing the nine indicators in one and re-labelling as *“Students benefiting from rehabilitated/ modernised/ extended/equipped education units: women / men (number)”* and to use with AC 108 - Infrastructure for education –university. This change would not affect the quality of the information the indicator conveys but would improve manageability.

- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it captures its progress over time. Changes in the variable it monitors – in this case, rehabilitation of education infrastructure – will be reflected in the value of the indicator (number of students) after the project implementation.
- The indicator is obtained from beneficiaries after the project implementation.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator remains low, but it requires specific studies; information is available at the social units.

32) STUDENTS BENEFITING FROM REHABILITATED/ MODERNISED/EQUIPPED UNITS – INFRASTRUCTURE FOR CONTINUOUS VOCATIONAL TRAINING, OF WHICH: (NO.)

33) STUDENTS BENEFITING FROM REHABILITATED/ MODERNISED/EQUIPPED INFRASTRUCTURE –INFRASTRUCTURE FOR CONTINUOUS VOCATIONAL TRAINING, WOMEN (NO.)

34) STUDENTS BENEFITING FROM REHABILITATED/ MODERNISED/EQUIPPED INFRASTRUCTURE – INFRASTRUCTURE FOR CONTINUOUS VOCATIONAL TRAINING, MEN (NO.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|----------|
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 3.4 interventions. It quantifies its usefulness for the end – users represented by students, which can be translated in social and education benefits. The system analysis recommends collapsing the nine indicators in one and re-labelling as *“Students benefiting from rehabilitated/ modernised/ extended/equipped education units: women / men (number)”* and to use with AC 105 - Infrastructure for continuous vocational training. This change would not affect the quality of the information the indicator conveys but would improve manageability.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it captures its progress over time. Changes in the variable it monitors – in this case, rehabilitation of education infrastructure – will be reflected in the value of the indicator (number of students) after the project implementation.
- The indicator is obtained from beneficiaries after the project implementation.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator remains low, but it requires specific studies; information is available at the social units.

35) *Students belonging to disadvantaged groups benefiting from rehabilitated/modernised/extended /equipped education units - infrastructure for pre-university education (no.)*

- 36) STUDENTS BELONGING TO DISADVANTAGED GROUPS BENEFITING FROM REHABILITATED/MODERNISED/EXTENDED/EQUIPPED EDUCATION UNITS - INFRASTRUCTURE FOR UNIVERSITY EDUCATION (NO.)
- 37) STUDENTS BELONGING TO DISADVANTAGED GROUPS BENEFITING FROM REHABILITATED/MODERNISED/EXTENDED/EQUIPPED CONTINUOUS VOCATIONAL TRAINING UNITS - INFRASTRUCTURE FOR CONTINUOUS VOCATIONAL TRAINING (NO.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|----------|
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 3.4 interventions. It quantifies its usefulness for the end – users represented by students, which can be translated in social and education benefits. The system analysis recommends collapsing the three indicators in one and re-labelling as *“Students belonging to disadvantaged groups benefiting from rehabilitated/ modernised/ extended/equipped education units”* and to use with AC 105 Infrastructure for continuous vocational training, AC 107 Infrastructure for education – pre-university, AC 108 - Infrastructure for education – university. This change would not affect the quality of the information the indicator conveys but would improve manageability.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it captures its progress over time. Changes in the variable it monitors – in this case, rehabilitation of education infrastructure – will be reflected in the value of the indicator (number of students) after the project implementation.
- The indicator is obtained from beneficiaries after the project implementation.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator remains low, but it requires specific studies; information is available at the social units.

38) New jobs created: business infrastructure, of which (no.)

39) NEW JOBS CREATED: BUSINESS INFRASTRUCTURE, WOMEN (NO.)

40) NEW JOBS CREATED: BUSINESS INFRASTRUCTURE, MEN (NO.)

see indicators 75, 76, 77

41) SMEs attracted in business structures (no.)

SEE INDICATOR 73

42) Micro-enterprises attracted in business structures (no.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|
| 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of interventions under KAI 4.1, focused on providing support to micro-enterprises through business structures.
- The indicator is rather sensitive to the intervention and it captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the activity it monitors – in this case, micro-enterprises attracted in business structures – is reflected in the value of the indicator. However, it can be influenced by other factors such as the benefits of doing business in the business structures compared to other facilities.
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, at the end and after the project implementation.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no significant additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.

43) New jobs created in business support structures (no.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 4.2 interventions. It quantifies the jobs created, which can be translated in social benefits. It can be aggregated and can provide relevant information beyond project level. The system level recommendation is to re-label as “New jobs created: women / men (number)” and to use with AC 109 Business infrastructure. This change would not affect the quality of the information the indicator conveys but would improve manageability.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention, capturing the results during and after the project implementation;
- It can be obtained from the beneficiary during the project implementation, and after its completion;
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is average, requiring specific studies.

44) New jobs created: polluted and unused industrial sites, of which: (no.)

45) NEW JOBS CREATED: POLLUTED AND UNUSED INDUSTRIAL SITES, WOMEN (NO.)

46) New jobs created: polluted and unused industrial sites, men (no.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 4.2 interventions. It quantifies the jobs created and maintained, which can be translated in social benefits. It can be aggregated and can provide relevant information beyond project level. The system level recommendation is to collapse the three indicators into one and to re-label as “*New jobs created: women / men (number)*” and to use with AC 110 Industrial and polluted sites. This change would not affect the quality of the information the indicator conveys but would improve manageability.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention, capturing the results during and after the project implementation;
- It can be obtained from the beneficiary during the project implementation, and after its completion;
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is average, requiring specific studies.

47) *New jobs created in assisted microenterprises (no.)*

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|----------|
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 4.3 interventions. It quantifies the jobs created, which can be translated in social benefits. It can be aggregated and can provide relevant information beyond project level. The system level recommendation is to re-label as “*New jobs created: women / men (number)*” and to use with AC 111 Supporting the entrepreneurial environment. This change would not affect the quality of the information the indicator conveys but would improve manageability.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention, capturing the results during and after the project implementation;
- It can be obtained from the beneficiary during the project implementation, and after its completion;
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is average, requiring specific studies.

48) *New jobs created: business infrastructure, of which (no.)*

49) NEW JOBS CREATED: BUSINESS INFRASTRUCTURE, WOMEN (NO.)

50) NEW JOBS CREATED: BUSINESS INFRASTRUCTURE, MEN (NO.)

see indicators 75, 76, 77

51) *New jobs created / maintained (no.)*

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 5.1 interventions. It quantifies the jobs created and maintained, which can be translated in social benefits. It can be aggregated and can provide relevant information beyond project level. The system level recommendation is to re-label as “*New jobs created: women / men (number)*” and to use with different action categories. The “Jobs maintained” indicator should be kept as project level indicator, so the re-labelled indicator is consistent across KAIs and OPs. This change would not affect the quality of the information the indicator conveys but would improve manageability.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention, capturing the results during and after the project implementation;
- It can be obtained from the beneficiary during the project implementation, and after its completion;
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is average, requiring specific studies.

52) Visitors at sights - local cultural patrimony in the urban area (no.)

53) VISITORS AT SIGHTS – NATIONAL CULTURAL PATRIMONY (NO.)

54) VISITORS AT SIGHTS - UNESCO PATRIMONY (NO.)

SEE INDICATORS 70, 71,72

55) Tourists’ arrivals in the accomodation structures rehabilitated/modernised/equipped (no.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 5.2 interventions. It quantifies the capitalisation of accommodation structures, which can be translated in economic benefits.
- The indicator is average sensitive to the intervention, capturing the results some time after the project implementation; it is also influenced by other factors such as accessibility, quality of accommodation services in the area, promotion.
- It can be obtained from beneficiaries after the project implementation;
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is rather low, requiring specific calculation.

56) *overnight staying in the rehabilitated/modernised/equipped accommodation infrastructure (no.)*

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 5.2 interventions. It quantifies the capitalisation of accommodation structures, which can be translated in economic benefits.
- The indicator is average sensitive to the intervention, capturing the results some time after the project implementation; it is also influenced by other factors such as accessibility, quality of accommodation services in the area, sights to be visited, business environment (in case of business tourism).
- It can be obtained from beneficiaries after the project implementation;
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is rather low, requiring specific calculation.

57) *New jobs created/ maintained (no.)*

SEE INDICATOR 117

58) *Visitors at sights - tourism infrastructure for the capitalisation of natural resources (no.)*

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 5.2 interventions. It quantifies the capitalisation of natural resources, which can be translated in economic benefits. The system level recommendation is to collapse the three indicators into one and to re-label as “*Visitors at sights (number)*”. This change would not affect the quality of the information the indicator conveys but would improve manageability.
- The indicator is average sensitive to the intervention, capturing the results some time after the project implementation; it is also influenced by other factors such as accessibility, quality of accommodation services in the area, promotion.
- It can be obtained from the beneficiary after the project implementation;

- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is average, requiring specific studies.

59) New jobs created –tourism accommodation infrastructure, of which: (no.)

- 60) NEW JOBS CREATED –TOURISM ACCOMMODATION INFRASTRUCTURE, WOMEN (NO.)
 61) NEW JOBS CREATED –TOURISM ACCOMMODATION INFRASTRUCTURE, MEN (NO.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|----------|
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 5.2 interventions. It quantifies the jobs created, which can be translated in social benefits. It can be aggregated and can provide relevant information beyond project level. The system level recommendation is to re-label as “*New jobs created: women / men (number)*” and use with AC 116 Tourism accommodation infrastructure. This change would not affect the quality of the information the indicator conveys but would improve manageability.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention, capturing the results during and after the project implementation;
- It can be obtained from the beneficiary during the project implementation, and after its completion;
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is average, requiring specific studies.

62) New jobs created –tourism recreation infrastructure, of which: (no.)

- 63) NEW JOBS CREATED –TOURISM RECREATION INFRASTRUCTURE, WOMEN (NO.)
 64) NEW JOBS CREATED –TOURISM RECREATION INFRASTRUCTURE, MEN (NO.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|----------|
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 5.2 interventions. It quantifies the jobs created, which can be translated in social benefits. It can be aggregated and can provide relevant information beyond project level. The system level recommendation is to re-label as “*New jobs created: women / men (number)*” and use with AC 115 Tourism recreation infrastructure. This change would not affect the quality of the information the indicator conveys but would improve manageability.

- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention, capturing the results during and after the project implementation;
- It can be obtained from the beneficiary during the project implementation, and after its completion;
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is average, requiring specific studies.

65) *Persons benefiting from the newly built/rehabilitated/ modernised/extended infrastructure – tourism recreation infrastructure (no.)*

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|----------|
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 5.2 interventions. It quantifies its usefulness for the end – users represented by the population, which can be translated in economic benefits. The system analysis recommends re-labelling as *“Persons benefiting from the newly built/rehabilitated/modernised/extended infrastructure (number) and use with AC 115 Tourism recreation infrastructure.* This change would not affect the quality of the information the indicator conveys but would improve manageability.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it captures its progress over time. Changes in the variable it monitors – in this case, rehabilitation of social infrastructure – will be reflected in the value of the indicator (number of beneficiaries).
- The indicator is obtained from beneficiaries after the project implementation, from its records.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, but it requires beneficiaries’ recording in order to be accurate. Data should be available at the social centres.

66) *Website visitors (no.)*

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|----------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |

Comments

- The indicator has a limited relevance for measuring the results of interventions financing publicity and awareness activities. Although the number of persons accessing the website may be important, the number of visits show users interest in the information posted. A more relevant indicator is *“Website visits”*, which is already included in the list of indicators.
- The indicator is partially sensitive to the intervention and will capture its progress only after the project is completed.
- It is easily available by triggering specific reports.
- Due to this, it has limited collection costs.

67) Website visits (number)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|
| 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |

Comments

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of interventions financing publicity and awareness activities
- The indicator is partially sensitive to the intervention and will capture its progress only after the project is completed.
- It is easily available by triggering specific reports.
- Due to this, it has limited collection costs.

68) Visitors at the information centres (no.)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of KAI 5.3 interventions. It quantifies the usefulness of information centres to its end users, represented by the population, which can be translated in economic benefits. The system level recommendation is to re-label as “*Visitors at the tourism information centres (number)*”, to provide consistency across the KAI. This change would not affect the quality of the information the indicator conveys but would improve manageability.
- The indicator is average sensitive to the intervention, capturing the results some time after the project implementation; it is also influenced by other factors such as promotion.
- It can be obtained from the beneficiary after the project implementation;
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is average, requiring specific studies.

69) Public awareness level related to rop (%)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

Comments

- The indicator is very relevant for measuring the results of interventions financing all types publicity and promotion activities (events, campaigns, materials, on-line content etc), for KAI 6.2. The system

analysis recommends re-labelling as “Population awareness level” to increase consistency across OPs.

- The indicator is partially sensitive to the intervention and will capture its progress only after the project is completed. Also, it can be influenced by other factors such as initiatives developed from other funding sources, as well as by the quality of the dissemination activities.
- It is only available through specific studies/surveys.
- Due to this, it has higher collection costs.

70) Website visits (number)

see indicator 133

THE FOLLOWING INDICATORS HAVE BEEN INTRODUCED AS A RESULT OF THE SYSTEM LEVEL ANALYSIS (SEE TABLE 12)

71) Increase of transport capacity for passengers (thou passengers/year)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|----------|
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of interventions under KAI 2.1, focused on improvement of transportation network.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention but will capture its progress only after the project is completed.
- The indicator is available with some delay after the project implementation.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting is average, requiring specific studies.

72) Increase of transport capacity for freight (thou. tons/year)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|

| | | | |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of interventions under KAI 2.1, focused on improvement of transportation network.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention but will capture its progress only after the project is completed.
- The indicator is available with some delay after the project implementation.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting is average, requiring specific studies.

73) strategies, studies, analyses, plans implemented

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|----------|
| 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |

Comments:

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the results of interventions under KAI 6.1.
- The indicator is moderate sensitive to the intervention and will capture its progress only after the project is completed.
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, with some delay after the project implementation.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.

74) Degree of satisfaction of training participants (%)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|----------|
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |

Comments

- The indicator is very relevant for measuring the results of interventions financing training activities, under KAI 6.1.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention but will capture its progress only after the project is completed.
- It is only available through specific studies, based on assessments made by participants at the end of training activities. Due to this, it has low collection costs.

New proposed indicators resulting from the individual analysis

75) Participants at events organized (number)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

| Relevance | Sensitivity | Availability | Cost |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|----------|
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

Comments

- The indicator is proposed to replace output indicator “Communication and promotion events (number)”. This change would increase the relevance, since the indicator would capture the magnitude of the events, not just the number.
- The indicator is very sensitive to the intervention and will capture its progress immediately after the activity is completed. It is easily available from beneficiaries, from progress and final reports and can be updated by the MA as soon as reports are received.
- It is easily available from beneficiaries, from progress and final reports and can be updated by the MA as soon as reports are received. Due to this, it has limited collection costs.
