

- Radom, 10 October 2018
  PROJECT MEETING
- PRIORITIZING ACTIONS/choose ALTERNATIVES for the strategic elaboration of the action plan SAP
- Greenersites | Veneto Region | Experts: Francesca Borga, Raffaella Licoe

#### Scope of the presentation



- The AHP as Decision Support System to support the elaboration of the SAP for the FUA/pilot sites
- Simulation of the process that should be implemented by each partners





#### SAP structure



- 1. Introduction
- 2. The context:
  - description of the FUA and the pilot area
  - description of the alternative actions (use template already shared by the partnership, but simply summarise the action)
- 3. The decisional process developed
  - The focus group, the stakeholders workshop
- 4. Analysis of the outcomes
- 5. Detailed description of selected action(s)







ESTABILISH the decision-making problem (hierarchy STUCTURE)

**Desk activity** 

CONUSULT EXPERTS to compare and weight criteria

**EXPERT Focus Group** 

Insert experts' Judgments in the tool (matrix), check consistency and calculate average weights

**Desk activity** 

identify 3/10 possible ctions to be implemented

CONSULT STAKEHOLDERS to assess performances of actions

Stakeholders workshop

Analyse outcomes, arrange interpretative reports for decision makers >>> elaborate the SAP





ESTABILISH the decision-making problem (hierarchy STUCTURE)

**Desk activity** 

CONUSULT EXPERTS to compare and weight criteria

**EXPERT Focus Group** 

Insert experts' Judgments in the tool (matrix), check consistency and calculate average weights

**Desk activity** 

identify 3/10 possible ctions to be implemented

CONSULT STAKEHOLDERS to assess performances of actions

Stakeholders workshop

Analyse outcomes, arrange interpretative reports for decision makers >>> elaborate the SAP



# The hierarchic decisional structure



#### **SAP GOAL**

Prioritizing effective actions (choosing among alternative actions) to promote the environmental rehabilitation of the brownfield sites and to make the Functional Urban Areas healthier & more liveable places"

Criteria 1	Criteria 2	Criteria 3	Criteria 4
C1 Environmental	C2 Socio-Cultural	C3 Economic	C4 Technical
Sustainability	Sustainability	Sustainability	Sustainability
subcriteria 1.1	subcriteria 2.1	subcriteria 3.1	subcriteria 4.1
		3.1 Impacts on the	4.1 Use of eco-compatible
1.1 Impacts on Air quality	2.1 Human health and safety	attractiveness of the place	materials and technologies
subcriteria 1.2	subcriteria 2.2	subcriteria 3.2	subcriteria 4.2
subcriteria 1.2	Subcriteria 2.2	subcriteria 3.2	subcriteria 4.2
1.2 Impacts on Soil and		2.2 Value for public	
1.2 Impacts on Soil and underground quality	2.2 Ethic and equity	3.2 Value for public organizations	4.2 Flexibility of the project
underground quanty	2.2 Linic and equity	Organizations	4.2 Flexibility of the project
subcriteria 1.3	subcriteria 2.3	subcriteria 3.3	subcriteria 4.3
1.3 Impacts on Water quality	2.3 Community involvement	3.3 Economic externalities	4.3 Minimisation of waste
subcriteria 1.4	subcriteria 2.4	subcriteria 3.4	subcriteria 4.4
1.4 Impacts on Ecosystems			
preservetion	2.4 Identity preservation	3.4 Employment	4.4 Life spam

Criteria 5
C5 Additional Criteria of
feasibility to be considered at
the end of the process

Judentena 3.1
5.1 Availability of necessary
resources

subcriteria 5 1

subcriteria 5.2

5.2 compliance with policy,
strategies and legislative
constrains

subcriteria 5.3
5.3 Timing of execution /
finalization

subcriteria 5.4
5.4 Technological risk





ESTABILISH the decision-making problem (hierarchy STUCTURE)

**Desk activity** 

CONUSULT **EXPERTS** to **compare and weight criteria** (questinnaire tool )

**EXPERT Focus Group** 

Insert experts' Judgments in the tool (matrix), check consistency and calculate average weights

**Desk activity** 

identify 3/10 possible tions to be implement

CONSULT STAKEHOLDERS to assess performances of actions

**Stakeholders workshop** 

Analyse outcomes, arrange interpretative reports for decision makers >>> elaborate the SAP



#### The questionnarie structure



instruction:	purposel compare criteria to determine weight	is											
	l Answer. Is the criteria on the left more or less important then criteria on the right (same line) to achieve the general scope of the PLAN?  2 Rate: Explicit how many times the criteria on the left is more or less important then criteria on the right (same line)?  NB use YELLOW color to mark the cell corresponding to YOUR judgment or if you are working on paper mark your choice  purpose 2 compair sub-criteria to determine related weights  repeal the same operation to compare subcriteria amone each other  1 Answer. Is the sub-criteria on the left more or less important then sub-criteria on the right (same line) to ensure the main criteria is assumed by the plan?  2 Rate: Explicit how many times the sub-criteria on the left is more or less important then sub-criteria on the right (same line)?  TABLE 1 GENERAL CRITERIA pair wise comparison  CRITERIA  Tating score  Criteria on the left is more important than criteria on the left is mo												
2 Rate: Explicit how many times the criteria on the left is more or less important then criteria on the right (same line)?  NB use YELLOW color to mark the cell corresponding to YOUR judgment or if you are working on paper mark your choice  purpose 2 compair sub- criteria to determine related weights													
l Answer. Is the criteria on the left more or less important then criteria on the right (same line)?  NB use YELLOW color to mark the cell corresponding to YOUR judgment or if you are working on paper mark your choice purpose 2 compair sub-criteria to determine related weights  repeat the same operation to compare subcriteria among each other  1 Answer. Is the sub-criteria to determine related weights  repeat the same operation to compare subcriteria among each other  2 Rate: Explicit how many times the sub-criteria on the left is more or less important then sub-criteria on the right (same line) to ensure the main criteria is assumed by the plan?  2 Rate: Explicit how many times the sub-criteria on the left is more or less important then sub-criteria on the right (same line)?  TABLE 1 GENERAL CRITERIA pair wise comparison  CRITERIA  Tating score  Criteria on the left is more important than criteria on the right is more important than criteria on the left important than criteria on the le													
1 Answer. Is the criteria on the left more or less important then criteria on the right (same line) to achieve the general scope of the PLAN?  2 Rate: Explicit how many times the criteria on the left is more or less important then criteria on the right (same line)?  NB use YELLOW color to mark the cell corresponding to YOUR judgment or if you are working on paper mark your choice  purpose 2 compair sub-criteria to determine related weights  repeat the same operation to compare sub-criteria amone each other  1 Answer. Is the sub-criteria on the left more or less important then sub-criteria on the right (same line) to ensure the main criteria is assumed by the plan?  2 Rate: Explicit how many times the sub-criteria on the left is more or less important then sub-criteria on the right (same line)?  TABLE 1 GENERAL CRITERIA pair wise comparison  CRITERIA  Tailing score  Criteria on the left is more important than criteria on the right is more important than criteria on the left is criteria on the left is more important than													
	1 Answer: Is the criteria on the left more or less important then criteria on the right (same line) to achieve the general scope of the PLAN?  2 Rate: Explicit how many times the criteria on the left is more or less important then criteria on the right (same line)?  NB use YELLOW color to mark the cell corresponding to YOUR ludement or if you are working on paper mark your choice  Durnose 2 compair sub-criteria to determine related weights  repeat the same operation to compare subcriteria amone each other  1 Answer: Is the sub-criteria on the left more or less important then sub-criteria on the right (same line)?  TABLE 1 GENERAL CRITERIA pair wise comparison  CRITERIA  Tating Scote  Criteria on the left is more important than criteria on the left is more impo												
	I Answer. Is the criteria on the left more or less important then criteria on the right (same line)?  No use YELLOW color to mark the cell corresponding to YOUR indement or if you are working on paper mark your choice purpose 2 compair sub-criteria to determine related weights  repeat the same operation to compare subcriteria among each other  I Answer. Is the sub-criteria on the left is more or less important then sub-criteria on the right (same line) to ensure the main criteria is assumed by the plan?  2 Rate: Explicit how many times the sub-criteria on the left is more or less important then sub-criteria on the right (same line) to ensure the main criteria is assumed by the plan?  2 Rate: Explicit how many times the sub-criteria on the left is more or less important then sub-criteria on the right (same line)?  TABLE 1 GENERAL CRITERIA  Tating score  Criteria on the right is more important than criteria on the left is criteria.  Criteria 1 CI Environmental Sustainability  9 7 5 3 1 1 3 5 7 9 C2 Socio-Cultural Sustainability  Criteria 2 C1 Environmental Sustainability  9 7 5 3 1 1 3 5 7 9 C3 Economic Sustainability  Criteria 3 C1 Environmental Sustainability  Criteria 4 C2 Socio-Cultural Sustainability  Criteria 3 C7 Iteria 4 C7 Iteria 3 C7 Iteria 4 C7 Iteria 5 Iteria 5 Iteria 5 Iteria 5 Iteria 5 Iteria 6 Iteria 6 Iteria 6 Iteria 7 Iteria 7 Iteria 7 Iteria 8 Iteria 7 I												
	2 Rate: Explicit how many times the sub-criteria	m the le	eft is mo	re or le	ss impo	ortant th	en sub-	criteria	on the r	ight (sa	ime line)?		
	TAE	LE 1	GE	NER	AL C	RIT	ERIA	pair	wise	com	parison		
					ra	ting sec	xre						
					_	Π.	Cr	riteria on	the right	t is more			
			int than c	riteria o	n the	equal	importe	nt than	criteria o	n the left	4		
Criteria 1	C1 Environmental Sustainability	9	7	5	3	1	3	- 5	7	9	C2 Socio-Cultural Sustainability	Criteria 2	
Criteria 1	C1 Environmental Sustainability	9	7	5	3	1	3	- 5	7	9	C3 Economic Sustainability	Criteria 3	
Criteria 1	C1 Environmental Sustainability	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	C4 Technical Sustainability	Criteria 4	
Criteria 2	C2 Socio-Cultural Sustainability	9	7	5	3	1	3	- 5	7	9	C3 Economic Sustainability	Criteria 3	
Criteria 2	C2 Socio-Cultural Sustainability	9	7	5	3	1	3	- 5	7	9	C4 Technical Sustainability	Criteria 4	
Criteria 3	C3 Economic Sustainability	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	C4 Technical Sustainability	Criteria 4	

The questionnaire continues for subcriteria





# The complete questionnarie to compare criteria



filled in by	PP	ins n.	ins name o	í pp												
inica in b <sub>j</sub>	expert	ins secte	r			increase o	g esperi		Tagen							
nstruction:	purposel compare criteria to determine weigh	ts														
	1 Answer: Is the criteria on the left more or less i	important then criteria on the right (same line) to achieve the general scope of the PLAN?														
	2 Rate: Explicit how many times the criteria on the	ie left is	more o	r less ir	nportan	t then c	riteria (	n the ri	ght (sar	me line)	?					
	NB use YELLOW color to mark the cell corres	pondin	g to YO	UR iu	lgment	or if v	ou are	working	g on pa	per ma	rk vour choice					
	purpose 2 compair sub- criteria to determine i	elated v	veights													
	repeat the same operation to compare subcriteria															
	1 Answer: Is the sub-criteria on the left more or le	less important then sub criteria on the right (same line) to ensure the main criteria is assumed by the plan?														
	2 Rate: Explicit how many times the sub-criteria	on the le	eft is mo	re or le	ss impe	ortant th	en sub-	criteria	on the	right (sa	me line)?					
	TAI	BLE 1	GE	NER	AL C	RIT	ERLA	pair	wise	com	parison					
					CR	ITEF	RIA									
						ting sec	иc									
			on the l				С	riteria on	the righ	nt is more						
		importa right	int than e	riteria o	n the	equal		ant than s								
		Hent														
Criteria 1	C1 Environmental Sustainability	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	C2 Socio-Cultural Sustainability	Criteria 2				
Criteria 1	C1 Environmental Sustainability	9	7	- 5	3	1	3	5	7	9	C3 Economic Sustainability	Criteria 3				
	C1 Environmental Sustainability	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	C4 Technical Sustainability	Criteria 4				
	C2 Socio-Cultural Sustainability	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	C3 Economic Sustainability	Criteria 3				
Criteria 2	C2 Socio-Cultural Sustainability	9	7	- 5	3	1	3	5	7	9	C4 Technical Sustainability	Criteria 4				
Criteria 3	C3 Economic Sustainability	9	7	- 5	3	1	3	5	7	9	C4 Technical Sustainability	Criteria 4				
	TABLE 1.1 COM	MPAI	RISO	N of	<b>SUB</b>	CRI	TER	IA co	nnec	ted to	general criteria C1					
								nabili								
		_				ting sco			-7							
		0 10 1		0.1		anne aco	1									
			on the le ant than s			l	С	riteria on	the righ	ıt is more						
		right			ii tiic	equal	import	ant than e	criteria o	on the left	1					
											1					
ocriteria 1.1	1.1 Impacts on Air quality	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	1.2 Impacts on Soil and underground quality	subcriteria				
beriteria 1.1	1.1 Impacts on Air quality	9	7	- 5	3	1	3	5	7	9	1.3 Impacts on Water quality	subcriteria				
beriteria 1.1	1.1 Impacts on Air quality	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	1.4 Impacts on Ecosystems preservetion	subcriteria				
beriteria 1.2	1.2 Impacts on Soil and underground quality	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	1.3 Impacts on Water quality	subcriteria				
beriteria 1.2	1.2 Impacts on Soil and underground quality	9	7	- 5	3	1	3	5	7	9	1.4 Impacts on Ecosystems preservetion	subcriteria 1				
haritaria 1.2	1.3 Impacts on Water quality	9	7	- 5	3	1	3	5	7	9	1.4 Impacts on Ecosystems preservetion	subcriteria				
ocriteria 1.5																





ESTABILISH the decision-making problem (hierarchy STUCTURE)

**Desk activity** 

CONUSULT EXPERTS to compare and weight criteria

**EXPERT Focus Group** 

Insert experts' Judgments in the tool (matrix), check consistency and calculate average weights

**Desk activity** 

identify 3/10 possible ctions to be implemente

CONSULT STAKEHOLDERS to assess performances of actions

**Stakeholders workshop** 

Analyse outcomes, arrange interpretative reports for decision makers >>> elaborate the SAP





**GreenerSites** 

2 MAT	TRIX of PAIR WISE COMPARISON	- MAIN CR	ITERIA LE	VEL				
		Criteria 1	Criteria 2	Criteria 3	Criteria 4			
compare criteria in respect to the estabished goal		C1 Environmental Sustainability	C2 Socio- Cultural Sustainability	C3 Economic Sustainability	C4 Technical Sustainability	valu	ert in this table ue marked in th	e
Criteria 1	C1 Environmental Sustainability	1,00	0,00	0,00	0,00		le 1, following t	he
Criteria 2	C2 Socio-Cultural Sustainability	0,00	1,00	0,00	0,00	cold	or of the cell	
Criteria 3	C3 Economic Sustainability	0,00	0,00	1,00	0,00			
Criteria 4	C4 Technical Sustainability	0,00	0,00	0,00	1,00			
	total	0,00	0,00	0,00	1,00			
NO	DMALIZATION and consistency					_		
NO	RMALIZATION and consistency							
		Criteria 1	Criteria 2	Criteria 3	Criteria 4	TOTAL	AVERAGE weight	Consistency
GOAL		C1 Environmental Sustainability	C2 Socio-Cultural Sustainability	C3 Economic Sustainability	C4 Technical Sustainability			
Criteria 1	C1 Environmental Sustainability	0,40	0,35	0,58	0,31	1,65		4,35
Criteria 2	C2 Socio-Cultural Sustainability	0,06	0,05	0,03	0,06	0,20	4,95%	4,08
Criteria 3	C3 Economic Sustainability	0,13	0,35	0,19	0,31	0,99	24,79%	4,12
Criteria 4	C4 Technical Sustainability	0,40	0,25	0,19	0,31	1,16	29,02%	4,13
	total	1,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	4,00	/	
normalized sum ı	must be 1		aver	rage weight can sistency is ensu	be VALIDATEI			
					ensured who	sistency of the en the value in between 4 and	this coloum	



## Average weight



GreenerSites

CH - d to to		l.										
filled in by	PP	ins n.	ins name of pp									
							I		/	_		
				ight of main								
		EXPERT 1	EXPERT 2	EXPERT 3	EXPERT 4	EXPERT 5	EXPERT 6	EXPERT 7	EXPERT 8	EXPERT 9	EXPERT 10	AVERAGE
Criteria 1	C1 Environmental Sustainability											
	·											
Criteria 2	C2 Socio-Cultural Sustainability											
Criteria 3	C3 Economic Sustainability											(
Criteria 4	C4 Technical Sustainability											, (
									in the	e case experts a	re less or more	e then
										hange the calcu number of exper		de for
			average we	ght of subcri	eria C1				the	iumber of exper	ts consulted	
		EXPERT 1		EXPERT 3		EXPERT 5	EXPERT 6	EXPERT 7	EXPERT 8	EXPERT 9	EXPERT 10	AVERAGE
subcriteria 1 1	1.1 Impacts on Air quality											
Judentena 1.1	The impacts of the quality											
subcriteria 1.2	1.2 Impacts on Soil and underground quality											
subcritoria 1 2	1.3 Impacts on Water quality											
subcriteria 1.3	1.5 impacts on water quanty						Co	ov ai	าd pa	ast th	ne -	
subcriteria 1.4	1.4 Impacts on Ecosystems preservetion											
			1			1	21	vera	$\sigma \Delta M$	eight		
				eight of subcr			а	vera	SC VV	Cigill		
		EXPERT 1	EXPERT 2	EXPERT 3	EXPERT 4	/ EXPERT 5	EXPERT 6	EXPERT 7	EXPERT 8	EXPERT 9	EXPERT 10	AVERAGE
subcriteria 2.1	2.1 Human health and safety						COI	nıng	out	by th	1e <b>-</b>	
subcriteria 2.2	2.2 Ethic and equity				<del>                                     </del>		"n	natri	x" fil	led i	1 -	
subcriteria 2.3	2.3 Community involvement							ia ci i	^ · · · · ·	1C G 11		
					/		\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	ith in	ıdiar	nont	_	
subcriteria 2.4	2.4 Identity preservation						VV	itii jt	iujei	nent	> _	
							exr	oress	ed b	y ead	ch 📮	
		EXPERT 1		EXPERT 3		EXPERT 5	EXPERT 6					AVERAGE
		EXI EIG 2	EXTERN E	EXT EITT 5	EXI EIG 4	EXTENT 5	TEXT EIT 0	ΔV	cpert		LINI LINI ZO	AVERAGE
subcriteria 3.1	3.1 Impacts on the attractiveness of the place								heir	د.		
subcriteria 3.2	3.2 Value for public organizations								+			
Judentena 3.2	3.2 Value for public organizations							n las	st coi	loun		
subcriteria 3.3	3.3 Economic externalities											
subcriteria 3.4	3.4 Employment							bivib	e tor	the		
Judentena 3.4	joer Employment	1					` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` `	ar v ru				
							пш	mha	c of c	exper	+c	
			average w	eight of subcr	teria C4		Hui	nnei	OT E	xhei	ts _	
		EXPERT 1		EXPERT 3	EXPERT 4	EXPERT 5	EXPERT 6	EXPERT 7	EXPERT 3	EXPERT 9	EXPERT 10	AVERAGE
								cou	nsult	ted		
subcriteria 4.1	4.1 Use of eco-compatible materials and technologies											
subcriteria 4.2	4.2 Flexibility of the project											
subcriteria 4.3	4.3 Minimisation of waste											
subcriteria 4.4	4.4 Life spam											
- ADD. 130110 4.4	z z.puiii					_		1				_





ESTABILISH the decision-making problem (hierarchy STUCTURE)

**Desk activity** 

CONUSULT EXPERTS to compare and weight criteria

**EXPERT Focus Group** 

Insert experts' Judgments in the tool (matrix), check consistency and calculate average weights

**Desk activity** 

identify 3/10 possible tions to be implemented

CONSULT STAKEHOLDERS to assess performances of actions

**Stakeholders workshop** 

Analyse outcomes, arrange interpretative reports for decision makers >>> elaborate the SAP





Select and describe shortly the actions using the form delivered in T1 > provide actions description to staholders during the workhop







#### Detailed description of concrete actions For each of the above actions, please indicate: Content of specific action Setting the scene. Please provide brief background information on the action. For infrastructure projects - please attach map of location. Short problem description Please outline the specific problem to be solved. Please also indicate possible risks Objective of specific action What should be the outcome of this action? Partners involved and description of participation process Who does what? Please list partners involved and briefly explain their function in the process. You should also refer to your regional stakeholder tables and the associated partner network





Planning of activities (timeline)
Please describe the stepwise process planning (short, mid and long-term perspective).
Financing
Please describe amount and source of funding (public: municipal, regional, national, European / private).
Progress of implementation
Please describe your concrete steps of implementation of the specific action. You should also refer to positive and inhibiting factors affecting the process (e.g. use of measures, instruments, and remediation techniques, development of recommendations for brownfield remediation, discussion with funding bodies, political support).  This section should be regularly updated (every two months).



5



ESTABILISH the decision-making problem (hierarchy STUCTURE)

**Desk activity** 

CONUSULT EXPERTS to compare and weight criteria

**EXPERT Focus Group** 

Insert experts' Judgments in the tool (matrix), check consistency and calculate average weights

**Desk activity** 

identify 3/10 possible ctions to be implement

CONSULT STAKEHOLDERS to assess performances of actions

Stakeholders workshop

Analyse outcomes, arrange interpretative reports for decision makers >>> elaborate the SAP



#### Perfomance



## Stakeholders are invited to rate the actions against diverse criteria and subcriteria

	İ											1					
	expert	ins sector		ins name of expert e-mail													
4 perfomance assessn	nent at criteria level																
		T	ACTION :	1		ACTION :	2		ACTION	3		ACTION	4	T	ACTION n	1	Т
		р	w	PT	р	w	PT	р	w	PT	р	w	PT	р	w	PT	1
Criteria 1	C1 Environmental Sustainability		0	C		C	) (	O	(	0		(	) (	0	0		o o
Criteria 2	C2 Socio-Cultural Sustainability		0	C		C	) (		C	0		(	) (	0	0		5
Criteria 3	C3 Economic Sustainability		0	) C		С	) (		C	0		(	) (	o e	0		5
Criteria 4	C4 Technical Sustainability		0			C	) (		(	0		(	) (		0		o
total score			0			0			0			0			0		
																	Ŧ
4.1 perfomance asses	sment at Subcriteria level /c1																
			ACTION :	1		ACTION :	2		ACTION	3		ACTION	4		ACTION r	1	
		р	w	PT	р	w	PT	р	w	PT	р	w	PT	р	w	PT	┸
subcriteria 1.1	1.1 Impacts on Air quality		0	) c		c	) (		(	0		(			0	-	)
1 1 1 4 2						<b>!</b>									0		_
subcriteria 1.2	1.2 Impacts on Soil and underground quality		0			C	) (	)	(	0		(	<u>'</u>		- 0		4
subcriteria 1.3	1.3 Impacts on Water quality		0	0 0		C	) (		(	) 0		(	) (		0		0
subcriteria 1.4	1.4 Impacts on Ecosystems preservetion		0	0		C	) (	)	C	0		(	) (		0		0
			0			0	)		0			0			0		┸



#### Perfomance



26	<b>GreenerSites</b>	
	Oreerier Sites	

			1			1											
4.2 perfomance assess	sment at Subcriteria level /c2																
		ACTION 1				ACTION 2		ACTION 3		ACTION 4			ACTION n				
		р	w	PT	р	w	PT	р	w	PT	р	w	PT	р	w	PT	
subcriteria 2.1	2.1 Human health and safety		0	(	D	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
subcriteria 2.2	2.2 Ethic and equity		0	(		0	) 0		0	0		C	0		0	0	
subcriteria 2.3	2.3 Community involvement		0	(		0	0	)	0	0	)	C	0		0	0	
																	L
subcriteria 2.4	2.4 Identity preservation		0	(		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
			0		0		0		0			0					
4.3 perfomance assess	sment at Subcriteria level /c3																
			ACTION 1			ACTION 2		ACTION 3		ACTION 4			ACTION n				
		р	w	PT	р	w	PT	р	w	PT	р	w	PT	р	w	PT	
subcriteria 3.1	3.1 Impacts on the attractiveness of the place		0	(	D	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
subcriteria 3.2	3.2 Value for public organizations		0	(		0	) 0		0	0		C	0		0	0	
subcriteria 3.3	3.3 Economic externalities		0	(		0	0		0	0	)	0	0		0	0	
																	L
subcriteria 3.4	3.4 Employment		0	(		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
			0			0			0		0				0		
4.3 perfomance assess	sment at Subcriteria level /c3																
			ACTION 1			ACTION 2		ACTION 3		ACTION 4			ACTION n				
		р	w	PT	р	w	PT	р	w	PT	р	w	PT	р	w	PT	
subcriteria 4.1	4.1 Use of eco-compatible materials and technologies		0	(		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
subcriteria 4.2	4.2 Flexibility of the project		0	(		0	) 0		0	0		C	0		0	0	
subcriteria 4.3	4.3 Minimisation of waste		0	(		0	0		0	0		C	0		0	0	
subcriteria 4.4	4.4 Life spam		0	(		0	0		0	0		C	0		0	0	
			0			0		0		0				0			





ESTABILISH the decision-making problem (hierarchy STUCTURE)

**Desk activity** 

2 CONUSULT EXPERTS to compare and weight criteria

**EXPERT Focus Group** 

Insert experts' Judgments in the tool (matrix), check consistency and calculate average weights

**Desk activity** 

identify 3/10 possible tions to be implement

CONSULT STAKEHOLDERS to assess performances of actions

**Stakeholders workshop** 

Analyse outcomes, arrange interpretative reports for decision makers >>> elaborate the SAP



#### Last step - desk



- Raking actions against all criteria and subcriteria
- Or Raking actions against part of the criteria and subcriteria
- Interpret the outcomes and provide decision makers with a knowledge framework
- Let them decide which action should be implemented first







## Summarizing







#### Two different .xls will be provided to partners:

1. Tool1: to be used with experts

2. Tool 2: to be used with stakeholders





## CENTRAL EUROPE European Union European Regional Development Fund

#### Part/TOOL1

- Parnters DEFINE CRITERIA AND SUBCRITERIA SPECIFIC for the FUA/site addressed with the help of WP4 experts (Francesca+Raffaella)
- 2. Establish the **focus group** of **local thematic experts** 
  - they know the sites, but not necessary they need to know the actions
- Explain the scope of the project and of the participated evaluation process (if possible tell we use AHP method)
- 4. Invite **thematic experts** to answer the questionnaire (pair wise comparison)
- 5. Ask the support to the WP4 experts to Input data in the MATRIX of PAIR WISE COMPARISON (there will be 1 file for each expert: save with name AHP\_tool1\_ exp1, AHP\_tool1\_ exp2, AHP\_tool1\_ exp n, ...)
- 6. In case of inconsistency, the concerned expert will be asked to answer one more time to the questionnaire





#### PART/TOOL2



- 1. Based on results of Tool 1, WP4 experts (Francesca+Raffania, ..... calculate the average weights for each criteria and subcriteria (desk activity) and provide the partner the table to assess performances
- The Partner prepares a synthetic description of each possible Actions to be implemented in the considered area
- 3. The Partner identifies the stakeholders and invite them at the performance assessment workshop:
  - if the case, we suggest to explain it's a pilot activity in the EU project, it can be considered as a sort of capacity building experience... This approach could help to reduce stress in critical groups.
- 4. Invite stakeholders to fill in the performance table evaluating the performance level of each action against each criteria.
- WP4 experts will support the partner in elaborating data collected through these performance tables.
- Based on these results plus additional consideration, partner selects the priority Actions for its area, to be described more in detail in the SAP





#### We are here to help!

#### Thanks for the attention Francesca Borga, Raffaella Lioce

Francesca.Borga@epcsrl.eu | raffylioce@gmail.com



