



**PROGRAM REGIONALNY**  
NARODOWA STRATEGIA SPÓJNOŚCI



WOJEWÓDZTWO  
KUJAWSKO-POMORSKIE

UNIA EUROPEJSKA  
EUROPEJSKI FUNDUSZ  
ROZWOJU REGIONALNEGO



*Mój region w Europie*

# **Ex ante evaluation of Regional Operational Programme for Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship 2014-2020**

## **Supplement No 2 to the Final Report**

### **Contractor:**

**Agrotec Polska sp. z o.o. (Lider konsorcjum)**

**ul. Dzika 19/23 lok. 55**

**00-172 Warszawa**

**Ecorys Polska Sp. z o.o.**

**ul. Łucka 2/4/6**

**00-845 Warszawa**

### **Contracting Authority:**

**Urząd Marszałkowski Województwa Kujawsko-Pomorskiego**

**Pl. Teatralny 2**

**87-100 Toruń**



**September 2014**

## Table of contents

1.	INTRODUCTION .....	3
1.1	ASSESSMENT OF THE RATIOS' SYSTEM .....	4
1.1.1	AP 1 BUILDING INNOVATION AND COMPETITIVENESS OF THE REGION .....	4
1.1.2	AP 2 DIGITAL REGION .....	7
1.1.3	AP 3 ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND LOW-CARBON ECONOMY IN THE REGION ..	8
1.1.4	AP 4 ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY REGION .....	10
1.1.5	AP 5 INTERNAL COHESION AND EXTERNAL ACCESSIBILITY OF THE REGION 12	
1.1.6	AP 6 COHESIVE SOCIETY AND COMPETITIVE HUMAN RESOURCES .....	13
1.1.7	AP 7 COMMUNITY-LED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT .....	15
1.1.8	AP 8 ACTIVE ON THE LABOUR MARKET .....	15
1.1.9	AP 9 COHESIVE SOCIETY .....	17
1.1.10	AP 10 INNOVATIVE EDUCATION.....	18
1.1.11	AP 11 COMMUNITY-LED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT .....	19
1.1.12	AP 12 TECHNICAL SUPPORT .....	20
1.2	ASSESSMENT OF THE MILESTONES SELECTED FOR THE PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK .....	21

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This document is a supplement to the final report of the ex-ante evaluation of Kuyavian-Pomeranian Regional Operational Programme for 2014-2020, approved in December 2013. Evaluation was realized by consortium Agrotec Poland sp. and Ecorys Poland sp. o.o at the request of the Marshal Office of the Kuyavian-Pomeranian voivodeship. The object of the survey was a project of Kuyavian-Pomeranian Regional Operational Programme for 2014-2020 version 2.0 from October 2013.

In the connection, that the evaluation was carried out at the same time as programming process, after the completion of the ex-ante evaluation, Marshal Office has prepared a new versions of ROP. There was therefore a need to update some information in order to respond to comments made by the European Commission.

This supplement applies to version 4.0 from April 2014 and includes the requirements of the European Commission. 55 proposal for a regulation of the General<sup>1</sup>, tj.:

- Appraisal of the relevance and clarity of the proposed programme indicators,
- Appraisal of how the expected outputs will contribute to results,
- Appraisal of whether the quantified target values for indicators are realistic, having regard to the support envisaged from the ESI Funds,
- Appraisal of the suitability of the milestones selected for the performance framework.

The final report on ex-ante evaluation found:

*The system of indicators covered by the ROP K-PV 2014-2020, based on indicators from the CLKI, is not complete. It includes output and strategic result indicators, but it does not state the target or basis values (for strategic indicators), not does it state data sources. RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended to supplement target and basis values (for strategic indicators) and state data sources.*

*The draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 does not state the value of interim objectives. Shortcomings of the draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 concern the definition of interim objectives (2018), final objectives (2023) and KES. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate plausibility of selected interim and final objectives, and to perform a risk analysis. RECOMMENDATION: It is necessary to supplement ROP K-PV 2014-2020 with interim and final objectives and KES.*

ROP K-PV 4.0 version was supplemented with reference to 2.0 version by the following items:  
Supplemented product and result indicators,

- Supplemented the values of the product and result indicators for financial investment priorities from the ERDF,
- Supplemented the milestones selected for the performance framework for investment priorities financed by the ERDF,
- Supplemented intermediate values and targets for the milestones selected for the performance framework for investment priorities financed by the ERDF.

The ROP version 4.0 was noted the following deficiencies:

- No target values for product and result indicators for financial investment priorities from the ESF,

---

<sup>1</sup> Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council (EU) no 1303/2013 of 17 December 2013 laying down common provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the Cohesion Fund, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund and laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the Cohesion Fund and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006.

No milestones selected for the performance framework for investment priorities financed by the ESF and intermediate values and targets. The following is a detailed assessment of the indicators from the ROP.

## 1.1 ASSESSMENT OF THE RATIOS' SYSTEM

### 1.1.1 AP 1 BUILDING INNOVATION AND COMPETITIVENESS OF THE REGION

Investment priority	The criterion for assessing	Assessment	Justification
Investment priority 1.1.	Adequacy	+/-	Indicators are partially adequate. Product indicator is adequate, as it refers to the relevant effects of projects under the measures provided in IP 1.1. The proposed result indicator is adequate, although in the context of the PI objective and measures it is not optimal.
	Measurability	+	The measurability of indicator is guaranteed by the use of measurable data derived from the statistical / project reports to indicator's construction.
	The reality of the target values	+	Considering financial allocation for the IP and the estimated indicators unit costs, the predicted indicators' target values are real.
	Linking products to the results	+/-	Evaluator knows that the result indicator related to gross domestic expenditure on R&D (GERD) is strongly dependent of factors other than investments in public R&D infrastructure. At the same time, however, it should be noted that the number of scientific institutions receiving support for investment in R & D infrastructure not only affects the result on government and higher education sector R&D expenditure in relation to GDP, especially in a long term. Support for academic institutions can produce an atmosphere of respect for science. Moreover, under certain conditions, entrepreneurs can benefit from a new, modern infrastructure. Knowing that modern equipment has a better chance to solve their problems, they may be willing to invest more in research. It seems that the product indicator actually affects the outcome indicator, but it does not determine it.
	Data availability	+	Data available from the Central Statistical Office in Poland/the monitoring system of the Programme's implementation.
GENERAL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for the IP 1.1. is complete in the sense that it contains both the product and result indicator. However, there are indicators - mainly the result, but also the product - that would be specific for the action taken.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	We recommend adding indicators (within the Programme or its detailing), which will directly refer to the planned interventions.		

Investment priority	The criterion for assessing	Assessment	Justification
Investment priority 1.2.	Adequacy	+/-	Indicators are partially adequate. Product indicator is adequate, as it refers to the relevant effects of projects under the measures provided in IP 1.2. The proposed result indicator is adequate, although in the context of the PI objective and measures it is not optimal.
	Measurability	+	The measurability of indicator is guaranteed by the use of measurable data derived from the statistical / project reports to indicator's construction.
	The reality of the target values	+	Considering financial allocation for the IP and the estimated indicators unit costs, the predicted indicators' target values are real.
	Linking products to the results	+	Support to enterprises within this IP 1.2. is designed to overcome their difficulties with R&D activity. Overcoming the main barriers will stimulate enterprises

			to further action, which will be reflected in their spending on R&D.
	Data availability	+	Data available from the Central Statistical Office in Poland/the monitoring system of the Programme's implementation.
GENERAL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for the IP 1.2. is complete in the sense that it contains both the product and result indicator. However, there are indicators - mainly the result, but also the product - that would be specific for the action taken.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	We recommend adding indicators (within the Programme or its detailing), which will directly refer to the planned interventions		

Investment Priority	Criteria for the evaluation of the	Evaluation Of The	Justification
Investment priority 3.1	The Adequacy Of The	+	The positive assessment of the relevance of the selected indicators. Products include pointer types of projects within the framework of the PI.
	Measurability	+	The measurability of the indicator is ensured through the use of it measured data from statistical/project reports.
	Link products with the results	+	The positive assessment of the reality of the pointer value in the designated deadlines. To estimate the target pointer in 2023 were taken into consideration historical data from the perspective of the 2007-2013
	Linking products to the results	+	There is a link with an strategic outcome indicators, which is close to the range with.
	The Availability Of	+	The positive assessment of the availability of the necessary data
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator System of the product and strategic outcome is complete. At the stage of detail of additional indicators will be introduced allowing for the acquisition of additional reporting data.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	No recommendation for the analyzed indicators		

Investment Priority	Criteria for the evaluation of the	Evaluation Of The	Justification
Investment priority 3.2	The Adequacy Of The	+	The positive assessment of the relevance of the selected indicators. Products include pointer types of projects within the framework of the PI. At the stage of detail additional indicators will be introduced allowing for the acquisition of additional reporting data.
	Measurability	+	The measurability of the indicator is ensured through the use of it measured data from statistical/project reports.
	Link products with the results	+	The positive assessment of the reality of the pointer value in the designated deadlines. To estimate the target pointer in 2023 were taken into consideration historical data from the perspective of the 2007-2013
	Linking products to the results	+	There is a link with an strategic outcome indicators, which is close to the range with.

	The Availability Of	+	The positive assessment of the availability of the necessary data
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator System of the product and strategic outcome is complete. At the stage of detail whereas indicators: number of enterprises, which secured a foreign investor within one year from the receipt of support, the number of companies that have entered into new foreign markets as a result of the support (the new export markets), the number of companies that have taken advantage of affordable insurance/security systems for expansion into new markets, and the number/value of contracts secured by abroad among the supported entities		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	No recommendation for the analyzed indicators		

Investment Priority	Criteria for the evaluation of the	Evaluation Of The	Justification
Investment priority 3.3	The Adequacy Of The	+/-	It is appropriate to change the rate of employment growth in assisted firms from indicator result indicator on the product. This indicator includes new gross jobs created in enterprises supported by the calculated by full time equivalent. It will be adding monitoring index supported by clusters.
	Measurability	+	The measurability of the indicator is ensured through the use of it measured data from statistical/project reports.
	Link products with the results	+	The positive assessment of the reality of the pointer value in the designated deadlines. To estimate the target pointer in 2023 were taken into consideration historical data from the perspective of the 2007-2013
	Linking products to the results	+	There is a link with an strategic outcome indicators, which is close to the range with.
	The Availability Of	+	The positive assessment of the availability of the necessary data
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator System of the product and strategic outcome does not take into account the possible indicators for IF. In the framework of the investment priority 3.3, for the use of support instruments the development of the competitiveness of SMEs. It is proposed to add an indicator: the number of enterprises receiving financial assistance other than grants. It is proposed to add the output indicator: number of supported clusters (PCs).		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	It is proposed to provide for the possibility to introduce additional indicators in Detail and after receiving the results of the ex-ante evaluation IF where it is possible to propose additional indicators specific to the IF.		

Investment Priority	Criteria for the evaluation of the	Evaluation Of The	Justification
Investment priority 3.4	The Adequacy Of The	+/-	The positive assessment of the relevance of the selected indicators. You can carefully monitoring indicators input quality of the service provided by the IOB:
	Measurability	+	The measurability of the indicator is ensured through the use of it measured data from statistical/project reports.
	Link products with the results	+	The positive assessment of the reality of the pointer value in the designated deadlines. To estimate the target pointer in 2023 were taken into consideration historical data from the perspective of the 2007-2013

	Linking products to the results	+	There is a link with an strategic outcome indicators, which is close to the range with
	The Availability Of	+	The positive assessment of the availability of the necessary data
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator System of the product and strategic outcome is consistent with other indicators priority axis.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	It is proposed to add the output indicator: number of institutions supported business environment in professionalizing services instead of the number of supported IOB. This will also support the qualitative monitoring of the IOB.		

### 1.1.2 AP 2 DIGITAL REGION

Investment priority	The criterion for assessing	Assessment	Justification
Investment priority 2.3	Adequacy	+/-	The adequacy of the product indicator should be assessed positively.
	Measurability	+	Both the indicators proposed in the ROP and proposed by the Evaluator are measurable.
	The reality of the target values	+	Based on the experience of past financial perspective (2007-2013) can be assessed positively the reality of achieving the target value.
	Linking products to the results	+	<i>The number of public services available on-line with a degree of maturity of at least 3 - bilateral interaction will affect the achievement of the target outcome indicator, which is the number of generated API keys.</i>
	Accessibility	+	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available.
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for OP 2 should be considered as almost complete. It takes into account output and result indicators. There are set out targets, milestones, and there are also specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators. Base value is given only for the outcome indicator - but there is no such value in the case of product indicator. Specificity of the product indicator suggests that the base value $\neq$ 0.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	<p>It is recommended that:</p> <p>The base rate of product indicator should be specified.</p> <p>Replacing the result indicator <i>Number of generated API keys</i> should be considered. Another indicator should characterize a change in the field of public e-services in a broader context. Currently, the proposed indicator has merely effects associated closely with the implementation of the OP. A proposal for such an indicator is the <i>percentage of people using the Internet in dealing with the public administration</i> (indicator evaluating change in terms of the functionality of e-services by the user).</p> <p>We recommend adding the outcome indicator <i>Number of public services available on-line on the degree of maturity 4 - transaction</i> for the emergence the most developed e-services.</p> <p>Output indicators <i>Number of public services available on-line with a degree of maturity of 3 - Two-way interaction</i> and <i>Number of public services available on-line on the degree of ripeness 4 - the transaction</i> would have a strong connection with the proposed by Evaluator outcome indicator of <i>percentage of people using the Internet in dealing with public administration</i> if understood those contacts at least as bilateral interaction.</p>		

### 1.1.3 AP 3 ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND LOW-CARBON ECONOMY IN THE REGION

Investment priority	The criterion for assessing	Mark	Justification
Investment priority 4.1	Adequacy	+	The adequacy of the product indicator should be assessed positively. The result indicator <i>share of electricity production from renewable energy sources in total electricity production</i> corresponds to the type of intervention too. However, consider removing the remaining two outcome indicators.
	Measurability	+	The indicators proposed in the ROP are measurable.
	The reality of the target values	+	Based on the experience of past financial perspective (2007-2013) can be assessed positively the reality of achieving the target value.
	Linking products to the results	+	<i>Number of units of electricity production from RES</i> will result in the achievement of the target outcome indicator <i>share of electricity production from renewable sources in electricity production</i> .
	Accessibility	+	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available.
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for IP 4.1 (4a) should be considered as complete. It takes into account output and result indicators. There are set out targets, milestones, and there are also specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	<p>It is recommended that:</p> <p>Deleting result indicators <i>Additional capacity of renewable energy production</i> and <i>The estimated decrease in greenhouse gas emissions</i> should be considered. Currently, the proposed indicator has merely effects associated closely with the implementation of the OP.</p>		

Investment priority	The criterion for assessing	Mark	Justification
Investment priority 4.2	Adequacy	+	The adequacy of the product indicator should be assessed positively. The result indicator <i>Primary energy consumption</i> corresponds to the type of intervention too. However, consider removing the remaining two outcome indicators and replacing them with the new indicator.
	Measurability	+	The indicators proposed in the ROP are measurable.
	The reality of the target values	+	Based on the experience of past financial perspective (2007-2013) can be assessed positively the reality of achieving the target value.
	Linking products to the results	+	<i>Number of enterprises with the assistance of improved energy efficiency</i> will result in the achievement of the target of current result indicator: <i>Primary energy consumption</i> and proposed: <i>Electricity consumption per 1 million zł GDP</i> .
	Accessibility	+	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available.
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for IP 4.2 (4b) should be considered as complete. It takes into account output and result indicators. There are set out targets, milestones, and there are also specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	<p>It is recommended that:</p> <p>Deleting result indicators <i>Additional capacity of renewable energy production</i> and <i>The estimated decrease in greenhouse gas emissions</i> should be considered. Currently, the proposed indicator has merely effects associated closely with the implementation of the OP.</p> <p>Replacing the outcome indicator of <i>primary energy consumption</i> to a new indicator: <i>Electricity consumption per 1 million zł GDP</i> should be considered.</p>		



Investment priority	The criterion for assessing	Mark	Justification
Investment priority 4.3	Adequacy	+	The adequacy of the product indicator should be assessed positively. The result indicator <i>Primary energy consumption</i> corresponds to the type of intervention too. However, consider removing the remaining two outcome indicators and replacing them with the new indicator.
	Measurability	+	The indicators proposed in the ROP are measurable.
	The reality of the target values	+	Based on the experience of past financial perspective (2007-2013) can be assessed positively the reality of achieving the target value.
	Linking products to the results	+	<i>Number of buildings in terms of energy consumption modernized</i> will result in the achievement of the target of current result indicator: <i>Primary energy consumption</i> and proposed: <i>Electricity consumption per 1 million zł GDP</i> .
	Accessibility	+	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available.
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for IP 4.3 (4c) should be considered as complete. It takes into account output and result indicators. There are set out targets, milestones, and there are also specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	<p>It is recommended that:</p> <p>Deleting result indicators <i>Additional capacity of renewable energy production</i> and <i>The estimated decrease in greenhouse gas emissions</i> should be considered. Currently, the proposed indicator has merely effects associated closely with the implementation of the OP.</p> <p>Replacing the outcome indicator of <i>primary energy consumption</i> to a new indicator: <i>Electricity consumption per 1 million zł GDP</i> should be considered.</p>		

Investment priority	The criterion for assessing	Mark	Justification
Investment priority 4.5	Adequacy	+	The adequacy of the product indicator should be assessed positively. The result indicators corresponds to the type of intervention too. However, consider adding a new result indicator.
	Measurability	+	The indicators proposed in the ROP are measurable.
	The reality of the target values	+	Based on the experience of past financial perspective (2007-2013) can be assessed positively the reality of achieving the target value.
	Linking products to the results	+	<i>Number of units purchased passenger rolling stock in public transport</i> will result in the achievement of the target of current result indicators: <i>The estimated decrease in greenhouse gas emissions</i> and <i>greenhouse gas emissions</i> and proposed: <i>Number of passenger per one inhabitant in urban areas</i> .
	Accessibility	+	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available.
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for IP 4.3 (4c) should be considered as complete. It takes into account output and result indicators. There are set out targets, milestones, and there are also specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	<p>It is recommended that:</p> <p>Adding the indicator result <i>Total passenger per one inhabitant in urban areas</i> should be considered.</p>		

#### 1.1.4 AP 4 ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY REGION

Investment Priority	Criteria for the evaluation of the	Evaluation Of The	Justification
Investment priority 5.2	The Adequacy Of The	-	The indicator System should cover all types of intervention not only issues of water. It is appropriate to add a number of indicators of the population benefiting from measures of flood protection and control, and the number of well-coordinated emergency services.
	Measurability	+	The measurability of the indicator is ensured through the use of it measured data from statistical/project reports.
	Link products with the results	+	The positive assessment of the reality of the pointer value in the designated deadlines. To estimate the target pointer in 2023 were taken into consideration historical data from the perspective of the 2007-2013
	Linking products to the results	+	There is a link with an strategic outcome indicators, which is close to the range with
	The Availability Of	+	The positive assessment of the availability of the necessary data
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator System of the product and strategic outcome is consistent with other indicators priority axis.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	It is appropriate to add a number of indicators of the population benefiting from measures of flood protection and control, and the number of well-coordinated emergency services.		

Investment Priority	Criteria for the evaluation of the	Evaluation Of The	Justification
Investment priority 6.1	The Adequacy Of The	+/-	The indicator System does not cover all types of intervention within the framework of the PI 6.1
	Measurability	+	The measurability of the indicator is ensured through the use of it measured data from statistical/project reports.
	Link products with the results	+	The positive assessment of the reality of the pointer value in the designated deadlines. To estimate the target pointer in 2023 were taken into consideration historical data from the perspective of the 2007-2013
	Linking products to the results	+	There is a link with an strategic outcome indicators, which is close to the range with
	The Availability Of	+	The positive assessment of the availability of the necessary data
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator System of the product and strategic outcome is consistent with other indicators priority axis.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	It is appropriate to introduce an indicator result at the stage of ROP: the number of people covered by the selective collection of waste and waste management facilities supported by number of product and for information campaigns and education for the residents of the province.		

Investment Priority	Criteria for the evaluation of the	Evaluation Of The	Justification
Investment priority 6.2	The Adequacy Of The	+/-	The indicator System tailored to the types of intervention, it is appropriate to adjust the pointer to the strategic outcome and strategist.
	Measurability	+	The measurability of the indicator is ensured through the use of it measured data from statistical/project reports.
	Link products with the results	+	The positive assessment of the reality of the pointer value in the designated deadlines. To estimate the target pointer in 2023 were taken into consideration historical data from the perspective of the 2007-2013
	Linking products to the results	+	There is a link with an strategic outcome indicators, which is close to the range with
	The Availability Of	+	The positive assessment of the availability of the necessary data
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator System of the product and strategic outcome is consistent with other indicators priority axis.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	In PI 6.2 introduces strategic outcome indicator percentage of the population benefiting from municipal wastewater treatment plant. It is appropriate to replace it with an indicator of the percentage of the population using the STRATEGIST from urban waste water treatment (%) of what will be in accordance with the strategy about the same.		

Investment Priority	Criteria for the evaluation of the	Evaluation Of The	Justification
Investment priority 6.3	The Adequacy Of The	+	The positive assessment of the relevance of the selected indicators
	Measurability	+	The measurability of the indicator is ensured through the use of it measured data from statistical/project reports.
	Link products with the results	+	The positive assessment of the reality of the pointer value in the designated deadlines. To estimate the target pointer in 2023 were taken into consideration historical data from the perspective of the 2007-2013
	Linking products to the results	+	There is a link with an strategic outcome indicators, which is close to the range with
	The Availability Of	+	The positive assessment of the availability of the necessary data
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator System of the product and strategic outcome is consistent with other indicators priority axis.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	The STRATEGIST is the indicator: visitors to the museums and Museum branches per 1,000 of the population. the source of the annual report of the main statistical Office on a form with the symbol K-02 on the activities of the museums draw up museums and branches of the Museum, whose primary task as a cultural institution is the collection and dissemination of cultural goods. It is proposed to replace the current indicator: visitors to the museums and branches at the discretion of local government municipalities, districts and towns in the County per 1 000 inhabitants (GUS). Possible introduction of Common Indicator YOU (9) Increase in the expected number of visits is the supported sites of cultural or natural heritage and attractions. Monitored Indicator per year.		

Investment Priority	Criteria for the evaluation of the	Evaluation Of The	Justification
PI 6.4	The Adequacy Of The	+/-	The indicator System does not cover all types of intervention within the framework of the PI.
	Measurability	+	The measurability of the indicator is ensured through the use of it measured data from statistical/project reports.
	Link products with the results	+	The positive assessment of the reality of the pointer value in the designated deadlines. To estimate the target pointer in 2023 were taken into consideration historical data from the perspective of the 2007-2013
	Linking products to the results	+	There is a link with an strategic outcome indicators, which is close to the range with
	The Availability Of	+	The positive assessment of the availability of the necessary data
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator System of the product and strategic outcome is consistent with other indicators priority axis.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	It is proposed to add the output indicator: number of centres carrying out activities in the field of environmental education supported. In RPO WK-P provides to support environmental education.		

#### 1.1.5 AP 5 INTERNAL COHESION AND EXTERNAL ACCESSIBILITY OF THE REGION

Investment priority	The criterion for assessing	Mark	Justification
Investment priority 7.2.	Adequacy	+/-	The adequacy of the products and results indicators should be assessed positively. Indicators correspond to the type of intervention and to each other too. Nevertheless taking into account the necessity of simplifying the specific objective it is recommended to verify them according to the modified objective.
	Measurability	+	The indicators proposed in the ROP are measurable.
	The reality of the target values	+	The target values are realistic.
	Linking products to the results	-	The products and results indicators are not linked. They refer to the different aspects of a specific objective. It is expected to be changed according to KE remarks.
	Accessibility	+	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available.
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for IP 7.2. should be considered as not complete. It takes into account output and result indicators which are not corresponding to each other. There are specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	It is recommended to replace an indicator referring to the safety on the roads with a WMDT indicator		

Investment priority	The criterion for assessing	Mark	Justification
Investment priority 7.3	Adequacy	+	The adequacy of the product indicator should be assessed positively.
	Measurability	+	Both the indicators proposed in the ROP and proposed by the Evaluator are measurable.
	The reality of the	+	Based on the public statistics the reality of achieving the

	target values		target value can be assessed positively.
	Linking products to the results	+	<i>The output indicator</i> will affect the achievement of the target result indicator,.
	Accessibility	+	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available.
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for IP 7.3. should be considered as complete. It takes into account output and result indicators. There are set out targets, milestones, and there are also specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators		
RECOMMENDATION	No recommendation		

Investment priority	The criterion for assessing	Mark	Justification
Investment priority 7.4.	Adequacy	+	The adequacy of the product indicator should be assessed positively.
	Measurability	+	Both the indicators proposed in the ROP and proposed by the Evaluator are measurable.
	The reality of the target values	+	Based on the public statistics the reality of achieving the target value can be assessed positively.
	Linking products to the results	+	<i>The output indicator</i> will affect the achievement of the target result indicator,.
	Accessibility	+	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available.
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for IP 7.4. should be considered as complete. It takes into account output and result indicators. There are set out targets, milestones, and there are also specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators.		
RECOMMENDATION	No recommendation		

#### 1.1.6 AP 6 COHESIVE SOCIETY AND COMPETITIVE HUMAN RESOURCES

Investment priority	The criterion for assessing	Mark	Justification
Investment priority 9.1.	Adequacy	+/-	The adequacy of the result indicator should be assessed as not fully implemented, according to KE remarks. The result indicator relates to the poverty which is not adequate to the types of operation. There should be an indicator referring to the number of patients covered by the primary health care.
	Measurability	+	Both the indicators proposed in the ROP and proposed by the Evaluator are measurable.
	The reality of the target values	+	Based on the public statistics the reality of achieving the target value can be assessed positively.
	Linking products to the results	-	<i>The output indicator</i> will not affect the achievement of the target result indicator
	Accessibility	+	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available.
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for IP 9.1 should be considered as not complete because of the inadequacy of output and result indicators. There are set out targets, milestones, and there are also specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators.		

	It has not been the KEW selected (key implementation steps).
RECOMMENDATION:	There should be a result indicator referring to the number of patients covered by the primary health care instead of the poverty indicator.

Investment priority	The criterion for assessing	Mark	Justification
Investment priority 9.2.	Adequacy	-	The adequacy of the product and result indicators should be assessed as not fully implemented, according to KE remarks. The result indicator relates to the poverty in general which is not adequate to the types of operation. The modification towards an indicator measuring poverty on urban areas is recommended.
	Measurability	+	Both the indicators proposed in the ROP and proposed by the Evaluator are measurable.
	The reality of the target values	+	Based on the public statistics the reality of achieving the target value can be assessed positively.
	Linking products to the results	-	<i>The output indicator</i> will not affect the achievement of the target result indicator,.
	Accessibility	+	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available.
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for IP 9.2 should be considered as not complete because of the inadequacy of output and result indicators. There are set out targets, milestones, and there are also specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators.  It has not been the KEW selected (key implementation steps).		
RECOMMENDATION	There should be a result indicator referring to poverty on urban areas.		

Piority	The criterion for assessing	Mark	Justification
Investment priority 10.4	Adequacy	+	The adequacy of the products and result indicators should be assessed positively. Indicators correspond to the type of intervention and to each other too.
	Measurability	+	The indicators proposed in the ROP are measurable.
	The reality of the target values	+	Based on the experience of past financial perspective (2007-2013) can be assessed positively the reality of achieving the target value.
	Linking products to the results	+	The products and results indicators are linked.
	Accessibility	+	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available.
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for IP 10.4 should be considered as complete. It takes into account output and result indicators. There are set out targets, and there are also specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:			

### 1.1.7 AP 7 COMMUNITY-LED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT

Investment Priority	Criteria for the evaluation of the	Evaluation Of The	Justification
PI 9.10	The Adequacy Of The	+/-	The indicator System does not cover all types of intervention within the framework of the PI. It will be adding indicators relating to particular types of scheduled activities for example. covering support investments in local roads. Outcome indicators should reflect the rephrasing to detailed relating to for example. the reduction in the number of people at risk of social exclusion, increase jobs, the creation of social economy entities, etc.
	Measurability	+	The measurability of the indicator is ensured through the use of it measured data from statistical/project reports.
	Link products with the results	+	The positive assessment of the reality of the pointer value in the designated deadlines. To estimate the target pointer in 2023 were taken into consideration historical data from the perspective of the 2007-2013
	Linking products to the results	+	There is a link with an strategic outcome indicators, which is close to the range with
	The Availability Of	+	The positive assessment of the availability of the necessary data
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator System of the product and strategic outcome is consistent with other indicators priority axis. However, you should rephrase and clarify wording to detailed PI.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	It will be adding indicators relating to particular types of scheduled activities for example. covering support investments in local roads. Outcome indicators should reflect the rephrasing to detailed PI. Possible use as an indicator of product Common Indicator No. 22. Total surface area of land rehabilitated.		

### 1.1.8 AP 8 ACTIVE ON THE LABOUR MARKET

Investment priority	The criterion for assessing	Mark	Justification
Investment priority 8.i	Adequacy	+	The adequacy of the products and results indicators should be assessed positively. Indicators correspond to the type of intervention and to each other too.
	Measurability	+	The indicators proposed in the ROP are measurable.
	The reality of the target values	+	Based on the experience of past financial perspective (2007-2013) can be assessed positively the reality of achieving the target value.
	Linking products to the results	+	The products and results indicators are linked, e.g. the product indicator no 3 and the results indicator no 4.
	Accessibility	+	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available.
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for IP 8.i should be considered as complete. It takes into account output and result indicators. There are specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:			

Investment priority	The criterion for assessing	Mark	Justification
Investment priority 8.ii	Adequacy	+	The adequacy of the products and result indicators should be assessed positively. Indicators correspond to the type of intervention and to each other too.
	Measurability	+	The indicators proposed in the ROP are measurable.
	The reality of the target values	+	Based on the experience of past financial perspective (2007-2013) can be assessed positively the reality of achieving the target value.
	Linking products to the results	+	The products and results indicators are linked; both product indicators are reflected in both result indicators.
	Accessibility	+	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available.
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for IP 8.iii should be considered as complete. It takes into account output and result indicators. There are specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:			

Investment priority	The criterion for assessing	Mark	Justification
Investment priority 8.iv	Adequacy	+	The adequacy of the products and result indicators should be assessed positively. Indicators correspond to the type of intervention and to each other too.
	Measurability	+	The indicators proposed in the ROP are measurable.
	The reality of the target values	+	Based on the experience of past financial perspective (2007-2013) can be assessed positively the reality of achieving the target value.
	Linking products to the results	+	The products and results indicators are linked. Both product indicators are reflected in the result indicator.
	Accessibility	+	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available.
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for IP 8.iv should be considered as complete. It takes into account output and result indicators. There are specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:			

Priority	The criterion for assessing	Mark	Justification
Investment priority 8.v	Adequacy	+	The adequacy of the products and result indicators should be assessed positively. Indicators correspond to the type of intervention and to each other too.
	Measurability	+	The indicators proposed in the ROP are measurable.
	The reality of the target values	+	Based on the experience of past financial perspective (2007-2013) can be assessed positively the reality of achieving the target value.
	Linking products to the results	+	The products and results indicators are linked. E.g the product indicator no 4 is reflected in the result indicator no 3 (goal 1); the other product indicators are reflected in the result indicator no 2 (goal2).
	Accessibility	+	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of



			value of indicator will be available.
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for IP 8.v should be considered as complete. It takes into account output and result indicators. There are specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:			

Investment priority	The criterion for assessing	Mark	Justification
Investment priority 8.vi	Adequacy	+	The adequacy of the products and result indicators should be assessed positively. Indicators correspond to the type of intervention and to each other too.
	Measurability	+	The indicators proposed in the ROP are measurable.
	The reality of the target values	+/-	The target values are not estimated.
	Linking products to the results	+	The products and results indicators are linked. Both product indicators are reflected in the result indicator.
	Accessibility	+	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available.
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for IP 8.vi should be considered as complete. It takes into account output and result indicators. There are specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	It is recommended that: Estimating the target values.		

#### 1.1.9 AP 9 COHESIVE SOCIETY

Investment priority	The criterion for assessing	Mark	Justification
Investment priority 9.4.	Adequacy	+	The adequacy of the product and result indicators should be assessed positively.
	Measurability	+	Both the indicators proposed in the ROP and proposed by the Evaluator are measurable.
	The reality of the target values	+	Based on the public statistics and public statements and evaluation reports for 2007-2013 the reality of achieving the target value can be assessed rather positively.
	Linking products to the results	+	<i>The output indicator</i> will affect the achievement of the target result indicator,.
	Accessibility	+	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available.
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for IP 9.4 should be considered as complete. There are set out targets, milestones, and there are also specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators.		
RECOMMENDATION	No recommendation		

Investment priority	The criterion for assessing	Mark	Justification
Investment priority 9.7.	Adequacy	+	The adequacy of the product and result indicators should be assessed positively.
	Measurability	+	Both the indicators proposed in the ROP and proposed by the Evaluator are measurable.
	The reality of the target values	+	Based on the public statistics , information from the governmental programs 2005-2007 the reality of achieving the target value can be assessed rather positively.
	Linking products to the results	+	<i>The output indicator</i> will affect the achievement of the target result indicator.
	Accessibility	+	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available.
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for IP 9.7 should be considered as complete. There are set out targets, milestones, and there are also specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators.		
RECOMMENDATION	No recommendation		

Investment priority	The criterion for assessing	Mark	Justification
Investment priority 9.8.	Adequacy	+	The adequacy of the product and result indicators should be assessed positively.
	Measurability	+	Both the indicators proposed in the ROP and proposed by the Evaluator are measurable.
	The reality of the target values	+	Based on the public statistics and regional programs for the development of social economy the reality of achieving the target value can be assessed positively.
	Linking products to the results	+	<i>The output indicator</i> will affect the achievement of the target result indicator, even when there are other measurement units.
	Accessibility	+	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available.
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for IP 9.8 should be considered as complete. There are set out targets, milestones, and there are also specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators.		
RECOMMENDATION	No recommendation		

#### 1.1.10 AP 10 INNOVATIVE EDUCATION

Investment priority	The criterion for assessing	Mark	Justification
Investment priority 10.1	Adequacy	+	The adequacy of the products and result indicators should be assessed positively. Indicators correspond to the type of intervention and to each other too.
	Measurability	+	The indicators proposed in the ROP are measurable.
	The reality of the target values	+	Based on the experience of past financial perspective (2007-2013) can be assessed positively the reality of achieving the target value.
	Linking products to	+/-	The products and results indicators generally are linked.

	the results		A connection between the product indicator no 1 and the results indicator is not clear.
	Accessibility	+	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available.
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for IP 10.1 should be considered as complete. It takes into account output and result indicators. There are specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	It is recommended that: Linking the product indicators and the results indicators more straightforward.		

Investment priority	The criterion for assessing	Mark	Justification
Investment priority 10.3	Adequacy	+	The adequacy of the products and result indicators should be assessed positively. Indicators correspond to the type of intervention and to each other too.
	Measurability	+	The indicators proposed in the ROP are measurable.
	The reality of the target values	+	Based on the experience of past financial perspective (2007-2013) can be assessed positively the reality of achieving the target value.
	Linking products to the results	+/-	The products and results indicators are linked.
	Accessibility	+	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available.
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for IP 10.3 should be considered as complete. It takes into account output and result indicators. There are specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:			

#### 1.1.11 AP 11 COMMUNITY-LED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT

Investment Priority	Criteria for the evaluation of the	Evaluation Of The	Justification
PI 9.9	The Adequacy Of The	+	Output indicators are relevant to the types of intervention.
	Measurability	+	The measurability of the indicator is ensured through the use of it measured data from statistical/project reports.
	Link products with the results	+	The positive assessment of the reality of the pointer value in the designated deadlines. To estimate the target pointer in 2023 were taken into consideration historical data from the perspective of the 2007-2013
	Linking products to the results	+	There is a link with an strategic outcome indicators, which is close to the range with
	The Availability Of	+	The positive assessment of the availability of the necessary data
OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	The indicator system for IP 9.9 should be considered as complete. It takes into account output and result indicators. There are specified data source and frequency of measurement indicators.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	no recommendation		

### 1.1.12 AP 12 TECHNICAL SUPPORT

Investment Priority	Criteria for the evaluation of the	Evaluation Of The	Justification
Does not apply to	The Adequacy Of The	+/	The positive assessment of the relevance of the selected indicators. The lack of outcome indicators.
	Measurability	+	The measurability of the indicator is ensured through the use of it measured data from statistical/project reports.
	Link products with the results	+	The positive assessment of the reality of the pointer value in the designated deadlines. To estimate the target pointer in 2023 were taken into consideration historical data from the perspective of 2007-2013.
	Linking products to the results	-	The lack of outcome indicators.
	The Availability Of	+	The positive assessment of the availability of the necessary data
OVERALL RATING:	The lack of outcome indicators. It is proposed to adjust indicators indicators in the national programme adopted on the Programme Support 2014-2020.		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	It is proposed to introduce a results-oriented indicators WLWK-compliant for technical assistance. It is proposed to consider the indicators: the average time for approval of the project, reducing the number of irregularities in the procedures for the award of public contracts; the average number of training days per year per employee; the effectiveness of the implementation of the objectives of the physical and financial (below 50% or above and 150 percent); The percentage of recommendations implemented operating software. In accordance with the recommendation of the MIR indicator value of implemented recommendations should not be higher than 50%.		

## 1.2 ASSESSMENT OF THE MILESTONES SELECTED FOR THE PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK

Priority Axes	Indicator	Validity of selection - whether the ratios will provide relevant information on the progress in implementation	Realistic target values - assessment of the feasibility of achieving the declared indicator value at a specified time	Assessment of the availability of the necessary data	Assessment of the suitability of the milestones selected for the performance framework – general assessment	Recommendations
<b>1 BUILDING INNOVATION AND COMPETITIVENESS OF THE REGION</b>	<b>Number of enterprises receiving support</b>	Positive assessment of accuracy of the chosen indicator	Positive assessment of the feasibility of achieving the declared indicator value at a specified time	Positive assessment of the availability of the necessary data	Positive assessment of indicator	No recommendations concerning this indicator
<b>2 DIGITAL REGION</b>	<b>Total public services available on-line with a degree of maturity of at least 3 - bilateral interaction</b>	The indicator has been chosen correctly	Based on the experience of the 2007-2013 financial perspective should be positively assessed the reality of achieving the intermediate and target rate at a specified time	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available	Intermediate targets for the purposes of the performance framework have been selected correctly	inclusion of the indicator <i>Number of public services available on-line on the degree of ripeness 4 - transaction</i> as suggested by the EC should be considered
<b>3 ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND LOW-CARBON ECONOMY IN THE REGION</b>	<b>Number of units of electricity production from RES</b>	The indicator has been chosen correctly	Based on the experience of the 2007-2013 financial perspective should be positively assessed the reality of achieving the intermediate and target rate at a specified time	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available	Intermediate targets for the purposes of the performance framework have been selected correctly	No additional recommendations
	<b>Number of buildings in terms of energy consumption modernized</b>	The indicator has been chosen correctly	Based on the experience of the 2007-2013 financial perspective should be positively assessed the reality of achieving the	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator	Intermediate targets for the purposes of the performance framework have been selected correctly	No additional recommendations

			intermediate and target rate at a specified time	will be available		
	<b>Number of units purchased passenger rolling stock in public transport public transport</b>	The indicator has been chosen correctly	Based on the experience of the 2007-2013 financial perspective should be positively assessed the reality of achieving the intermediate and target rate at a specified time	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available	Intermediate targets for the purposes of the performance framework have been selected correctly	No additional recommendations
<b>4 ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY REGION</b>	<b>The volume of retained water - output indicator</b>	The indicator has been chosen correctly. Target value calculated based on the unit cost of one m <sup>3</sup> of retained water	Based on the experience of the 2007-2013 financial perspective should be positively assessed the reality of achieving the intermediate and target rate at a specified time	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available	Positive assessment of indicator	It is reasonable to modify the name of the indicator in front of the corresponding index of UP: Capacity of small water retention
	<b>The length of the sanitary sewage system - output indicator</b>	The indicator has been chosen correctly. Target value calculated based on the cost per unit on the basis of capital expenditures from KPOŚK (National Waste Management Plan)	Based on the experience of the 2007-2013 financial perspective should be positively assessed the reality of achieving the intermediate and target rate at a specified time	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available	Positive assessment of indicator	No additional recommendations
	<b>Number of immovable monuments of supported – output indicator</b>	The indicator has been chosen correctly.	Based on the experience of the 2007-2013 financial perspective should be positively assessed the reality of achieving the intermediate and	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available	Positive assessment of indicator	No additional recommendations

			target rate at a specified time. The unit cost calculated on the basis of the average cost of investments involving the conservation of monuments in all the regional operational programs current perspective. On the basis of the report of the progress of implementation of the Regional Operational Programmes for 2007-2013, Year 2012			
	<b>Number of supported forms of nature - output indicator</b>	The indicator has been chosen correctly and includes a number of parks, nature reserves, protected landscape areas and other forms of conservation that have received support	Based on the experience of the 2007-2013 financial perspective the reality of achieving the intermediate and target rate at a specified time should be positively assessed. In calculating the value of the target adopted in the proposed unit cost estimates Marshal's Office's perspective was taken into account.	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available	Positive assessment of indicator	No additional recommendations
<b>5 INTERNAL COHESION AND EXTERNAL ACCESSIBILITY OF THE REGION</b>	<b>Total length of the rebuilt or modernised roads</b>	The indicator has been chosen correctly	Based on the experience of the 2007-2013 financial perspective should be positively assessed the reality of achieving the intermediate and target rate at a	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available	Intermediate targets for the purposes of the performance framework have been selected correctly but not completely	inclusion of the indicator <i>Total length of the rebuild or modernized railways</i> as suggested by the EC should be considered

			specified time			
<b>6 COHESIVE SOCIETY AND COMPETITIVE HUMAN RESOURCES</b>	<b>Number of supported health service entities</b>	Positive assessment of accuracy of the chosen indicator	Positive assessment of the feasibility of achieving the declared indicator value at a specified time	Positive assessment of the availability of the necessary data	Positive assessment of indicator	No recommendations concerning this indicator
<b>7 COMMUNITY-LED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>Number of new / rebuilt / converted facilities located in the revitalized areas</b>	Positive assessment of accuracy of the chosen indicator	Based on the experience of the 2007-2013 financial perspective should be positively assessed the reality of achieving the intermediate and target rate at a specified time. The unit cost was calculated based on data from the reports for the first half of 2012. On the corresponding investments implemented under the ROP 2007-2013, the sub-measure on the renewal and development of village centers.	In the description of proposed indicators there are proposed sources where data necessary to determine of value of indicator will be available	Intermediate targets for the purposes of the performance framework have been selected correctly but not completely	Possible inclusion of an indicator: the number of implemented local development strategies; Ttotal surface of revitalized areas (Common indicator no 22 according to The Programming Period 2014-2020 Guidance Document on Monitoring and Evaluation – European Regional Development Fund And Cohesion Fund)
<b>8 ACTIVE ON THE LABOUR MARKET</b>	<b>There is no output indicators chosen as mile stones</b>	-	-	-	-	-
<b>9 COHESIVE SOCIETY</b>	<b>There is no output indicators chosen as mile stones</b>	-	-	-	-	It is recommended to include an indicator: <i>Number of people at risk of social exclusion supported during the program.</i>  It is also recommended to include indicators referring to disabled



						people.
<b>10 INNOVATIVE EDUCATION</b>	<b>There is no output indicators chosen as mile stones</b>	-	-	-	-	-
<b>11 COMMUNITY-LED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>No output indicator chosen as mile stones</b>	-	-	-	-	An overview of types of activities according to the EC comments should be made and if seems justified - clarification of the scope of support and then reformulated and adapted to the revised types of activities.

