

Programme result and output indicators

- Guidelines and metrics

In line with Article 4 of the Implementing Regulation (EC) 897/2015, each ENI Programme shall contain a description of objectively verifiable indicators, with a baseline and a target value.

Every project of the HUSKROUA's 1st and 2nd call for proposals had to assume:

- one Programme result indicator **AND**
- one Programme output indicator,
- as well as to define own indicators, according to the project's specificities.

The general requirements for the **result and output or any other specific indicators** are the following:

- *Objectively verifiable*, meaning that the values shall not be biased by the opinion of a single individual.
- *Highly responsive to actions*, meaning that the values shall reflect the indicative actions envisaged by the Programme.
- *Interpreted unequivocally*, meaning that the values shall be easily interpretable.
- *Available when needed*, meaning that the procedure for collecting the necessary information and for interpreting it shall not be lengthy.
- *Shall not place an unnecessarily heavy burden to report*, meaning that the process of collecting and interpreting the information shall not be overly complicated.

The description below details per each result and output Programme indicator its definition and provides comments on the calculation method per each, as well as the sources of verification.

A. PROGRAMME RESULT INDICATORS:

1. **Increase of number of visitors of reconstructed sites (visitors) (TO 3 P 1):**

| Proposed indicator name | Additional number of visitors to the reconstructed or modernized sites (visitors) |
|-------------------------|---|
| Type of indicator | Result indicator |
| As reflected in the JOP | <p>TO3 Promotion of local culture and preservation of historical heritage Priority 1: Promoting local culture and history along with tourism functions Source of verification for the Programme: Aggregation of data from project level beneficiary reports after the implementation of the projects (project sustainability reports). Programme baseline value: 0 Programme target value: 20.000</p> |
| Context | This particular priority supports interventions which combine the development of cultural-historical heritage along a tourism function. Renovations of historic buildings without real cross-border tourism function and also tourism service or programme development, which are not built on cultural-historical-religious. |
| Measurement unit | Number |
| Definition | <p>Number of visitors of the reconstructed or modernized sites counts the individuals that visit the renewed cultural or historic sites. Renewed cultural or historic sites can be considered the buildings or their environment or the infrastructure which form the bases for touristic products developed: thematic routes, crossing the border, cultural programmes with cross border effect.</p> <p>For example the renovation of a cathedral cannot be considered such a site if the cross border value for tourism is not tackled or proven. At the same time, strictly tourism products are not relevant if not tackled for their cross border cultural, historical or religious value.</p> |
| Method | <p>Projects have to develop own procedures for keeping track of the number of visitors of reconstructed or modernized sites for the project implementation. Data from local or regional statistics office may also be used and processed.</p> <p>Soft projects that do not have an infrastructure component and focus on awareness raising of a thematic route or on digitalization of certain thematic routes (counted as modernization) shall take into account one or both of the below approaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - count the visitors they plan for certain events within the project; |

- gather data on the number of visitors in the respective sites that make up the thematic route.

Verification source Progress annual reports of projects and final report

2. Increased capacity in environmental protection and climate change mitigation (Based on surveys (baseline, mid-term, final) among key stakeholders e.g. water directorates. relevant NGOs institutions, authorities) - TO 6 P 1

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Indicator name | Increased capacity in environmental protection and climate change mitigation (Based on surveys (baseline, mid-term, final) among key stakeholders e.g. water directorates. relevant NGOs institutions, authorities) |
| Type of indicator | Result indicator |
| As reflected in JOP | <p>TO 6 Environmental protection, climate change mitigation and adaptation Priority 1: Sustainable use of the environment in the cross border area Source of verification for the Programme: Uniform methodology survey conducted by Programme Authorities at three dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -baseline survey implemented within 6 months after launching the programme implementation -mid-term survey conducted as part of the ongoing (mid-term) evaluation -final survey conducted in the last three months of programme implementation <p>Baseline: 3.50 Target value: 4.50</p> <p>93 surveys have been applied to project beneficiaries and stakeholders of the first two calls for proposals in order to define the baseline values. The sample of six projects is considered relevant for the TO and Priority. The methodology has been uniform and surveys have been carried in English, Hungarian, Slovak, Romanian and Ukraine as well.</p> <p>The target values have been defined by the selected projects and the arithmetic average of the baseline and target values shall be assumed by the Programme.</p> <p>Each project shall re-run the survey at the end of the project's implementation period in order to gather information and to control if the values are still relevant for the project and the Programme.</p> |
| Context | The Programme aims to support the preservation and sustainable use of common natural values in the border area, to initiate actions for energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy sources as well as to reduce the risks caused by wastes on the quality of waters. |
| Measurement unit | Value of the indicator from the surveys – the value is numerical reflecting a self-assessment on an uniform |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| | methodology on a general scale from 1 to 5 where 1 is insufficient; 5 exceptional |
| Definition | <p>Increased capacity shall be perceived as having more resources/ skills/ expertise/ tools in order to address challenges in the field of environmental protection and climate change mitigation by tackling and improving:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ protection of common natural values with demolishing the effects of borders on habitats and increasing the awareness of people living in the area; ➤ water quality of rivers crossing the borders as a result of interventions related to waste management and waste water Treatment; ➤ awareness, competence and skills of renewable energy technologies and energy efficiency interventions among citizens, businesses and institutions. <p>Increased capacity in environmental protection and climate change mitigation is a value that project applications have to measure for each project proposal based on a survey that is shall be provided by the JTS. The increase in capacity is measured through a self-assessment of the project partners and other stakeholders in the same field whose capacity shall improve as a result of the project.</p> |
| Method | <p>The result indicator is a composite indicator, based on a set of seven questions, addressing both quantitative and qualitative aspects of two types of institutions/organizations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project's applicants/ beneficiaries: Lead Applicants and Partners; 2. A secondary circle of stakeholders defined by the respondents from the previous point as relevant for their project, for example public and private entities, and consist <i>inter alia</i> of environmental protection agencies or other public bodies with similar competencies, national/natural parks administrations, forest administrations, water management directorates, civil organizations active in the field, etc. <p>The survey shall collect data at the beginning of the project implementation (before project activities start) and at the end of projects activities. Mid-term is also an intermediary phase which shall be used only by the Programme in order to control for review.</p> |
| Verification source | <p>Project application forms Final project reports</p> |

3. Increase of number of vehicles using the built, modernized transport and border management infrastructure (number of vehicles per day) - TO 7 P 1

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Proposed indicator name | Additional number of vehicles using the built, modernized transport and/ or border management infrastructure (average number of vehicles per day) |
| Type of indicator | Result indicator |
| As reflected in JOP | <p>TO 7 Improvement of accessibility to the regions, development of sustainable and climate-proof transport and communication networks and systems</p> <p>Priority 1: Development of transport infrastructure to improve the mobility of persons and goods</p> <p>Source of verification for the Programme: Aggregation of data from project level beneficiary reports after the implementation of the projects (project sustainability reports).</p> <p>Baseline: 0</p> <p>Target value: 1.000</p> |
| Context | The main aim of this priority is to support cross-border mobility of persons and goods, create the basis of economic co-operations and reduce the disparities of regions via the development of transport and border crossing infrastructure and services. |
| Measurement unit | Number of vehicles/ 24 h |
| Definition | <p>The additional increase of the number of vehicles during 24 hours. The indicator measures the additional estimated actual traffic flows based on observations - relevant sample of observation. The increase in the number of vehicles must be a direct consequence of the support. Increased number of vehicles number in two directions over a border or on a two way road or bicycle path should be reported as a sum for the entire border crossing point/ road/ bicycle lane.</p> <p>Built infrastructure means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - infrastructure that was constructed by the project where no infrastructure existed before or - in case of a road, for example, built infrastructure can also mean also that as a consequence of project completion, the capacity and quality of the previously existing local/secondary road is significantly improved to reach a higher classification. |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| | <p>Modernized infrastructure means refurbishment, renewal, enhanced or upgrading works facilitated through the project. A signaling system can be considered in extremis a type of modernized infrastructure.</p> <p>Border management infrastructure means any crossing-point authorized by the competent authorities for the crossing of national borders. May include land - road & rail – sea or river border crossing points.</p> <p>The Programme value for the indicator shall be the sum of the project value of the indicator (average number of vehicles per day).</p> |
| Method | <p>The Beneficiaries have to have an own methodology and be able to present their method of calculation. The measurement unit “number of vehicles/24 h” shall be based on direct observations or in extreme cases can be considered as an estimation of the theoretical maximum number of vehicles during 24h.</p> <p>The direct observation have to adjusted to the length of the project, have to be carried out at the beginning of the project and at the end of implementation and have to be sensitive to the seasonal flows of traffic. The average of vehicle per day can be the arithmetic average of at least three of four values as described above for direct observations.</p> |
| Verification source | Final project report; methodology for calculation has to be finalized and approved by the before the submission of the final project report. |

4. Increase of number of passengers using transport systems improved with the support of the programme (number of passengers)

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Proposed indicator name | Additional number of passengers using transport systems improved with the support of the programme (number of passengers per day) |
| Type of indicator | Result indicator |
| Reflected in JOP | <p>TO 7 Improvement of accessibility to the regions, development of sustainable and climate-proof transport and communication networks and systems</p> <p>Priority 1: Development of transport infrastructure to improve the mobility of persons and goods</p> <p>Source of verification for the Programme: Aggregation of data from project level beneficiary reports after the implementation of the projects (project sustainability reports).</p> |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| | <p>Baseline value: 0 (no value in JOP)</p> <p>Target value: 30.000</p> |
| Context | The main aim of this priority is to support cross-border mobility of persons and goods, create the basis of economic co-operations and reduce the disparities of regions via the development of transport and border crossing infrastructure and services. |
| Measurement unit | Number of passengers/ 24 h |
| Definition | <p>The current indicator measures actual traffic flow as measured for 24 h observations The additional number of passenger must be a direct consequence of the Programme support. Increased number in two directions over a border should be reported as summed up for the entire transport system.</p> <p>Transport system improvement may mean:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the building or upgrading of a road or a secondary road, or border crossing point or bicycle lane etc.; - connecting logistics points that would assist in having an additional the number of passengers served (intermodality). <p>The direct observation have to adjusted to the length of the project, have to be carried out at the beginning of the project and at the end of implementation and have to be sensitive to the seasonal flows of traffic. The average of number of passengers per day can be the arithmetic average of at least three of four values as described above for direct observations.</p> <p>The Programme value for this result indicator shall be the sum of the projects' values.</p> |
| Method | <p>Beneficiaries have to have own calculations or subcontracted observations on the actual increase of the number of passengers</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Obtain official data from the local or regional authorities, but be specific enough in order to narrow down the focus on the transport systems improved with the support of the programme</p> |
| Verification source | Progress and final report |

5. Risk management index (RMI) of the cross-border area

| Indicator name | Risk management index (RMI) of the cross-border area |
|---------------------|---|
| Type of indicator | Result indicator |
| As reflected in JOP | <p>TO8 Common challenges in the field of safety and security Priority 1: Support to joint activities for the prevention of natural and man-made disasters as well as joint action during emergency situations Source of verification: Uniform methodology survey conducted by Programme Authorities at three dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - baseline survey implemented within 6 months after launching the programme implementation - mid-term survey conducted as part of the ongoing (mid-term) evaluation - final survey conducted in the last three months of programme implementation <p>Baseline: 2.67 Target value: 3.50</p> <p>40 surveys have been applied to project beneficiaries and stakeholders of the first two calls for proposals in order to define the baseline and target values. The sample of five projects is considered relevant for the TO and Priority. The methodology has been uniform and surveys have been carried in English, Hungarian, Slovak, Romanian and Ukraine as well.</p> <p>The target values have been defined by the selected projects and the arithmetic average of the baseline and target values shall be assumed by the Programme.</p> <p>Each project shall re-run the survey at the end of the project’s implementation period in order to control if the values are still relevant for the project and the Programme.</p> |
| Context | <p>The risk of natural and man-made disasters should be decreased and the handling of such cases should be more effective with the use of new infrastructure elements, common strategies and co-operation platforms created for the programming area.</p> |
| Measurement unit | <p>Value of the indicator from the surveys – the value is numerical reflecting a self-assessment on an uniform methodology on scale from 1 to 5 where the following interpretation was provided for the scale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - Low 2 - Incipient 3 - Significant 4 - Optimal |

5 - Outstanding

Definition

The RMI brings together a group of indicators that measures a region's risk management performance and not the actual risk. The RMI scope is defined as indicated in „A System of Indicators for Disaster Risk Management in the Americas”, OMAR D. CARDONA, Instituto de Estudios Ambientales, IDEA, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Manizales
(<http://www.unisdr.org/2005/HFdialogue/download/tp3-paper-system-indicators.pdf>).

The methodology for RMI is following the recommended structure of the four policies: risk identification, risk reduction, disaster management and governance. Each of the four policies is to be investigated the below dimensions for the status-quo and as expected after project implementation:

- Risk Identification: hazard monitoring and forecasting, hazard evaluation and mapping, and available public information and community participation (Survey question 1-3);
- Risk reduction: prevention and mitigation measures in field of land use, prevention and mitigation measures in field of hydrographical basin intervention and environmental protection and implementation of hazard-event control and protection techniques (Survey question 4-7);
- Disaster management: organization and coordination of emergency operations, emergency response planning and implementation of warning systems, community preparedness and training and rehabilitation and reconstruction planning (Survey question 8-10);
- Governance: institutional capacity (Survey question 11).

The scales applied for each of the indicators are similar to those in use in the suggested methodology, ranging from low to optimal (low, incipient, significant, optimal and outstanding), corresponding to values from 1 (low) to 5 (outstanding).

At the same time each respondent is required to estimate the territory for which the RMI is calculated (e.g. name of the town, county, commune and hectares and number of population)

Method

A survey that measures the RMI can be provided by the JTS upon request. The questionnaire shall be applied two types of institutions/organizations:

1. Applicants/ beneficiaries of projects applications: Lead Applicants and Partners;
2. A secondary circle of stakeholders defined by the respondents from the previous point as relevant

for their project, for example public and private entities.

The survey contains two dimensions: one that makes reference to the current situation of the RMI and the same questions are applied to the expected values of RMI after project's implementation.

The method is to be used before contracting and repeated on the same respondees at the end of implementation.

Verification source Actual filled in survey provided to the JTS. The JTS shall process the data and return the final values for the baseline and target per partnership.

6. Medical equipment density

| Indicator name | Medical equipment density |
|---|--|
| Type of indicator | Result indicator |
| As reflected in JOP – slight modification of wording of the indicator and of its source as approved by the last JMC | <p>TO8 Common challenges in the field of safety and security</p> <p>Priority 2: Support to the development of health</p> <p>Source of verification for the Programme: Aggregate data from projects level</p> <p>Medical equipment</p> <p>Baseline value: to be estimated by the end of 2019</p> <p>Target value: to be estimated by the end of 2019</p> |
| Context | Joint prevention programmes, improved health care infrastructure and cross border institutional co-operations are foreseen to improve health conditions of citizens and reduce the risk of human epidemiology hazards crossing the border. |
| Measurement unit | Density |
| Definition | <p>Medical equipment density for which the following variables shall be collected by each project beneficiary and by each project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Number of all the medical equipment at the beginning of the project – the sources shall be the own inventories and balance sheets prior to contract signature; ➤ Number of all medical equipment at the closing of the project – the sources shall be the own inventories and balance sheets in the year the project closed; ➤ Number of new acquired medical equipment: as supported by the project and any additional |

- medical equipment for the period the project is implemented (12 months or 24 or 36);
- Number of patients served by the medical institution or number of population covered as an estimation by the hospital/ health organization or institution.

Method

- **At the level of the projects** represents the density of the medical equipment per project, respectively the total number of medical equipment of the beneficiary hospital(s)/ organization(s) supported by the Programme x 1000 inhabitants / number of population covered.

An example of calculation for a project with the following data:

| | Number of medical equipment at the beginning of the project - 2018 for example | Number of equipment procured within the project | Number of medical equipment at the end of the project (beneficiaries may buy medical equipment within own resources or within other projects as well) | Number of patients for 1 year |
|-----------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|
| Lead Applicant | 200 | 50 | 400 | 100.000 |
| Beneficiary 1 | 100 | 50 | 180 | 60.000 |
| Total | 300 | 100 | 580 | 160.000 |

The density of medical equipment per project shall be calculated as follows:

- Baseline value: $300 \text{ equipment} * 1000 \text{ inhabitants} / 160.000 \text{ patients} = 1.87$
- Target value: $580 \text{ equipment} * 1000 \text{ inhabitants} / 160.000 = 3.62$

- **At the level of the programme**, the baseline and the target values shall be calculated as the arithmetical average of all the supported projects;

Verification source

Project application forms;
Progress and final project reports

B. PROGRAMME OUTPUT INDICATORS

| Thematic Objective | Priority | Output indicator | Source of verification | Quantified target value | Method of calculation |
|---|----------|--|---|-------------------------|---|
| TO 3 Promotion of local culture and preservation of historical heritage Priority 1: Promoting local culture and history along with tourism functions | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of organisations using programme support for promoting local culture and preserving historical heritage(COI6) | Annual implementation report of the Programme | 40 | - |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of improved cultural and historical sites as a direct consequence of programme support(COI7) | Aggregation of data from project level reports of beneficiaries | 20 | Approximately 500000 EUR/site Total : 10 million |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of cross-border cultural events organised and touristic products developed using ENI support(COI8) | Aggregation of data from project level reports of beneficiaries | 30 | Approximately 40 000 EUR/event Budget: 1,2 million |

1. Number of organisations using programme support for promoting local culture and preserving historical heritage(COI6):

Definitions/comments:

Based on data taken from the programme data base, number of organisations using programme support for promoting local culture and preserving historical heritage.

Organisation: any form of institution with the primary aim of promotion of local culture and preservation of historical heritage. Can include e.g. universities (archaeology, folklore, etc.), NGOs, community development groups, third sector organisations, museums, marketing organisations focusing on preservation and development of local culture and historical heritage for tourism purposes, etc.

Support: includes grants, financial support other than grants, non-financial support, support that does not involve direct financial transfer (such as guidance, consultancy, etc.). Venture capital is considered as financial support.

Multiple counting needs to be eliminated. An organisation receiving support more than once is still only one organisation. Registering a unique identifier for each organisation to avoid multiple counting is a practice to recommend.

Note for applicants/ beneficiaries: COI6 can refer to project direct beneficiaries and final beneficiaries as well. For example a project can comprise of 4 partners, but the output indicator can be 20 or 30 in case in the target group of the project organizations are assisted to support the promotion of local culture and historical heritage.

2. Number of improved cultural and historical sites as a direct consequence of programme support(COI7)

Definitions/comments:

Number of cultural and historical sites being improved as a direct consequence of the support of the programme. Valid for site improvements of e.g. buildings, landscapes, sites or structures of local, regional, or national significance, works of monumental sculpture or paintings, new acquisitions to collections or museums, etc. The improvements must be of a permanent nature.

Note for applicants/ beneficiaries: Setting-up just a collection of cultural or historic sites and publishing it on the online or offline environments, without providing any improvements on the actual sites, do not constitute and is not sufficient to fulfill this output indicator.

3. Number of cross-border cultural events organised and touristic products developed using ENI support(COI8)

Definitions/comments:

Number of cross-border cultural events, festivals, congresses on preservation of cultural heritage, etc. within e.g. music, theatre, other forms of arts, local culture, etc. Cross-border event: event involving participants from at least two ENI CBC participating countries. Participants may include either organizers or audience.

Note for applicants/ beneficiaries: Events organized in one country that do not include audience from other countries of the Programme do not count as cross border ones.

| Thematic Objective | Priority | Output indicator | Source of verification | Quantified target value | Method of calculation |
|--|---|--|---|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| TO 6 Environmental protection, climate change mitigation and adaptation | Priority 1: Sustainable use of the environment in the cross border area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of persons actively participating in environmental actions and awareness raising activities (COI17) | Aggregation of data from project level reports of beneficiaries | 6000 | Approximately 200 EUR/participant |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of waste, wastewater, energy efficiency or renewable energy production interventions(programme specific indicator) | Aggregation of data from project level reports of beneficiaries | 30 | Approximately 400.000 EUR/project |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surface area of habitats supported in order to attain a better conservation status, ha (COI15) | Aggregation of data from project level reports of beneficiaries | 800 | Approximately 5000 EUR/ha |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of public transport lines with increased service level as direct consequence of the support (lines)(programme specific indicator) | Aggregation of data from project level reports of beneficiaries | 4 | 250 000 EUR/line |

4. Number of persons actively participating in environmental actions and awareness raising activities (COI17)

Definitions/comments:

Based on project reports, number of citizens/students/pupils etc. actively participating in environmental actions and awareness-raising activities as well as with regard to the promotion of energy efficiency. Active participation: implies participants take part in the environmental action e.g. cleanup campaigns and/or awareness-raising activities e.g. drawing competition, participation in events, etc. Receiving leaflets, being on an e-mail, or other passive actions is not considered active participation. The activities must be a direct consequence of the support.

5. Number of waste, wastewater, energy efficiency or renewable energy production interventions (programme specific indicator)

Definitions/comments:

The interventions implies having planned and implementing a type of infrastructure that has the role to produce renewable energy, address wastewater or waste or energy efficiency or assist to it. A pilot action (laboratory or equipment) can be considered the minimum type of intervention. An event or an awareness raising campaign is not considered an intervention (see above indicator).

6. Surface area of habitats supported in order to attain a better conservation status, ha (COI15)

Definitions/comments:

Surface of restored or created areas aimed to improve the conservation status of threatened species. The operations can be carried out both in or outside of Natura 2000 or Emerald Network areas, capable of improving the conservation status of targeted species, habitats or ecosystems for biodiversity and the provisioning of ecosystem-services. Areas that receive support repeatedly should be counted only once.

Note for applicants/ beneficiaries: the measurement unit shall be hectares.

| Thematic Objective | Priority | Output indicator | Source of verification | Quantified target value | Method of calculation |
|---|--|---|---|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| TO 7 Improvement of accessibility to the regions, development of sustainable and climate-proof transport and communication networks and systems | Priority 1: Development of transport infrastructure to improve the mobility of persons and goods | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total length of newly built roads (km) (COI26) | Aggregation of data from project level reports of beneficiaries | 5 | Average 2,95 mEUR |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total length of newly built bicycle roads and bicycle paths (km) (programme specific indicator) | Aggregation of data from project level reports of beneficiaries | | Average 450 kEUR/km |

| Thematic Objective | Priority | Output indicator | Source of verification | Quantified target value | Method of calculation |
|--------------------|----------|--|---|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total length of reconstructed or upgraded roads (km) (COI27) | Aggregation of data from project level reports of beneficiaries | 40 | Average 1 050 kEUR/km |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total length of reconstructed or upgraded bicycle roads and bicycle paths (km) (programme specific indicator) | Aggregation of data from project level reports of beneficiaries | | Average 50kEUR/km |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of public transport lines with increased service level as direct consequence of the support (lines)(programme specific indicator) | Aggregation of data from project level reports of beneficiaries | 4 | 250 000 EUR/line |

7. Total length of newly built roads (km) (COI26)

Definitions/comments:

Length of roads (in kilometers) constructed by the project where: either: – no road existed before; or – as a consequence of project completion, the capacity and quality of the previously existing local/secondary road is significantly improved to reach a higher classification (e.g. national road or equivalent); in this case the road cannot be counted under indicator nr ENI/CBC 27 (“Total length of reconstructed or upgraded roads”).

Note to applicants/ beneficiaries: the measurement unit is Km.

8. Total length of newly built bicycle roads and bicycle paths (km) (programme specific indicator)

Definitions/ comments:

Length of bicycle road constructed by the project where no railroad existed before.

Note to applicants/ beneficiaries: the measurement unit is Km.

9. Total length of reconstructed or upgraded roads (km) (COI27)

Definitions/ comments:

Length of roads where the capacity or quality of the road (including safety standards) was improved as a direct consequence of the support. If the upgrade is significant enough for the road to qualify as new road, it will be counted under indicator nr ENI/CBC 26 (“Total length of newly built roads”) and not under this indicator.

Note to applicants/ beneficiaries: the measurement unit is Km.

10. Total length of reconstructed or upgraded bicycle roads and bicycle paths (km) (programme specific indicator)

Definitions/ comments:

Length of bicycle roads where the capacity or quality of the road (including safety standards) was improved as a direct consequence of the support. If the upgrade is significant enough for the bicycle road to qualify as new road, it will be counted under indicator (“Total length of newly built bicycle roads and bicycle paths”) and not under this indicator.

Note to applicants/ beneficiaries: the measurement unit is Km.

11. Number of public transport lines with increased service level as direct consequence of the support (lines)(programme specific indicator)

Definitions/ comments:

Increased service level equals to an increase of quality or capacity as a direct consequence of the support. This can include additional services offered to users of transport line (e.g. increase of speed or set up of special services or schedules, intermodality) or to administrators of these services (use of more efficient or climate proof fuel or signaling or a combination of already mentioned services or others).

Note to applicants/ beneficiaries: the measurement unit is number of public transport line as identifiable as such by a local or regional authority or transport administrator.

| Thematic Objective | Priority | Output indicator | Source of verification | Quantified target value | Method of calculation |
|--|--|---|---|-------------------------|---|
| TO 8 Common challenges in the field of safety and security | Priority 1: Support to joint activities for the prevention of natural and man-made disasters as well as joint action during emergency situations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of co-operating organisations in disaster management(programme specific indicator). | Aggregation of data from project level reports of beneficiaries | 8 | 2 from each country |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population benefiting from flood protection measures services as a direct consequence of the support, persons (COI31) | Aggregation of data from project level reports of beneficiaries | 25 000 | Estimation based on population density in riverside areas |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population benefiting from forest fire protection measures services as a direct consequence of the support, persons (COI32) | Aggregation of data from project level reports of beneficiaries | 5000 | Estimation based on population density in forest areas |
| | Priority 2: Support to the development of health | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population covered by improved health services as a direct consequence of the support (COI30) | Aggregation of data from project level reports of beneficiaries | 178 000 | Calculation based on the health infrastructure density |

12. Number of co-operating organisations in disaster management (programme specific indicator).

Definitions/comments:

Number of organisations receiving support in any form from the ENI and using it for cooperation in disaster management.

Support: includes grants, financial support other than grants, non-financial support, support that does not involve direct financial transfer (such as guidance, consultancy, etc.).

Organisation: any form of institution of which disaster management or education for disaster management is a primary activity. May hence include public, private, or third sector institutions, universities or schools etc. Multiple counting needs to

be eliminated. An organisation receiving support more than once is still only one organisation. Registering a unique identifier for each organisation to avoid multiple counting is a practice to recommend.

13. Population benefiting from flood protection measures services as a direct consequence of the support, persons (COI31)

Definitions/comments:

Number of people exposed to flood risk where vulnerability decreased as a direct consequence of a supported project. Other than flood (or forest fire) risk prevention measures will be counted in programme specific indicators.

Note to applicants/ beneficiaries: Measurement unit: Persons

14. Population benefiting from forest fire protection measures services as a direct consequence of the support, persons (COI32)

Definitions/comments:

Number of people exposed to forest fire hazards where vulnerability decreased as a direct consequence of a supported project. Other than forest fire (or flood) risk prevention measures will be counted in programme specific indicators.

Note to applicants/ beneficiaries: measurement unit: persons.

15. Population covered by improved health services as a direct consequence of the support (COI30)

Definitions/comments:

Population of a certain area expected to benefit from the health services supported by the project. It includes new or improved buildings, new equipment for various type of health service (prevention, outpatient or inpatient care, aftercare), or new or improved health service structures (e.g. telemedicine). The indicator excludes multiple counting at the project level even if the intervention includes several services targeting the same persons: one person still counts as one even if that person will benefit from improvement of several different services which were supported by the project. For example, an after care facility is developed in a city with a population of 100 000 inhabitants. It will serve half the city's population, thus the indicator value will increase by 50 000. If later a prevention service is developed in the same city that will serve the whole population, the indicator value will only increase by another 50 000.

Note to applicants/ beneficiaries: Measurement unit: Persons.