ANNEXES

Annex A. Determining Weights of Criteria

1. Applicant suitability (C_1)

Expert (k_i)	Weights of criteria determined by AHP method			
	c_1	c_2	c_3	c_4
1	0.2604	0.2570	0.3023	0.1803
2	0.2500	0.2500	0.2855	0.2145
3	0.2500	0.2510	0.2900	0.2090
4	0.2604	0.2570	0.3123	0.1703
5	0.2661	0.2260	0.3116	0.1962
6	0.2540	0.1981	0.2939	0.2540
7	0.2560	0.2821	0.2968	0.1651
q_i (Median)	**0.2560**	**0.2510**	**0.2968**	**0.1962**

$\sum_{i=1}^{m} q_i = 1$; $\chi^2 > \chi^2_{tbl} = 17.250 > 11.345$ – the agreement of experts' opinions is satisfactory.

2. Relevance of the project (C_2)

Expert (k_i)	Weights of criteria determined by AHP method						
	c_5	c_6	c_7	c_8	c_9	c_{10}	c_{11}
1	0.1549	0.0678	0.1475	0.0430	0.2368	0.1733	0.1767
2	0.0776	0.0533	0.1416	0.1362	0.2754	0.1580	0.1580
3	0.1531	0.1310	0.1667	0.0594	0.1835	0.1531	0.1531
4	0.1552	0.0679	0.1473	0.0430	0.2368	0.1731	0.1767
5	0.1590	0.0560	0.1279	0.0378	0.2565	0.1800	0.1829
6	0.1527	0.0840	0.1642	0.0502	0.2094	0.1678	0.1717
7	0.0670	0.0299	0.1040	0.0729	0.2977	0.2608	0.1678
q_i (Median)	**0.1531**	**0.0678**	**0.1473**	**0.0502**	**0.2368**	**0.1731**	**0.1717**

$\sum_{i=1}^{m} q_i = 1;\ \chi^2 > \chi^2_{tbl} = 36.43 > 16.812$ – the agreement of experts' opinions is satisfactory.

3. Methodological efficiency (C_3)

Expert (k_i)	Weights of criteria determined by AHP method						
	c_{12}	c_{13}	c_{14}	c_{15}	c_{16}	c_{17}	c_{18}
1	0.1497	0.1497	0.1497	0.0582	0.1414	0.1414	0.2100
2	0.1631	0.1531	0.1668	0.0312	0.0891	0.2241	0.1726
3	0.2048	0.1448	0.1448	0.0448	0.1243	0.1243	0.2121
4	0.1535	0.1081	0.1746	0.0596	0.1448	0.1445	0.2150
5	0.1610	0.0928	0.1893	0.0496	0.1289	0.1286	0.2499
6	0.1459	0.1266	0.1631	0.0747	0.1591	0.1591	0.1714
7	0.1599	0.1420	0.0611	0.0472	0.0515	0.3142	0.2241
q_i (Median)	**0.1599**	**0.1420**	**0.1631**	**0.0496**	**0.1289**	**0.1445**	**0.2121**

$\sum_{i=1}^{m} q_i = 1;\ \chi^2 > \chi^2_{tbl} = 29.938 > 16.812$ – the agreement of experts' opinions is satisfactory.

4. Risk control (C_4)

Expert (k_i)	Weights of criteria determined by AHP method				
	c_{19}	c_{20}	c_{21}	c_{22}	c_{23}
1	0.1078	0.2501	0.2501	0.1375	0.2545
2	0.1078	0.2501	0.2501	0.1375	0.2545
3	0.2068	0.2068	0.2068	0.1331	0.2465
4	0.1078	0.2501	0.2501	0.1375	0.2545
5	0.0851	0.2650	0.2650	0.1129	0.2719
6	0.1427	0.2297	0.2297	0.1668	0.2310
7	0.0665	0.1120	0.1572	0.0776	0.5867
q_i (Median)	**0.1078**	**0.2501**	**0.2501**	**0.1375**	**0.2545**

$\sum_{i=1}^{m} q_i = 1;\ \chi^2 > \chi^2_{tbl} = 25.802 > 13.277$ – the agreement of experts' opinions is satisfactory.

5. Economic feasibility (C_5)

Expert (k_i)	Weights of criteria determined by AHP method					
	c_{24}	c_{25}	c_{26}	c_{27}	c_{28}	c_{29}
1	0.1904	0.0846	0.1019	0.0590	0.2739	0.2903
2	0.2024	0.0870	0.0825	0.0812	0.2643	0.2827
3	0.1828	0.0907	0.1306	0.0744	0.2083	0.3132
4	0.1904	0.0846	0.1019	0.0590	0.2739	0.2903
5	0.1991	0.0682	0.0826	0.0517	0.2924	0.3060
6	0.1740	0.1117	0.1303	0.0687	0.2471	0.2682
7	0.0457	0.0550	0.1504	0.0527	0.3934	0.3028
q_i (Median)	**0.1904**	**0.0846**	**0.1019**	**0.0590**	**0.2739**	**0.2903**

$\sum_{i=1}^{m} q_i = 1;\ \chi^2 > \chi^2_{tbl} = 31.082 > 15.086$ – the agreement of experts' opinions is satisfactory.

6. Contribution to cross-cutting targets (Sustainable development, Gender Equity, Good Governance) (C_6)

Expert (k_i)	Weights of criteria determined by AHP method							
	c_{30}	c_{31}	c_{32}	c_{33}	c_{34}	c_{35}	c_{36}	c_{37}
1	0.0965	0.0765	0.1188	0.0808	0.0974	0.0763	0.3199	0.1339
2	0.1406	0.0773	0.1031	0.0815	0.0865	0.0617	0.2909	0.1585
3	0.1345	0.0525	0.1125	0.0722	0.1125	0.0723	0.2950	0.1485
4	0.0936	0.0728	0.1071	0.0766	0.1095	0.0766	0.3189	0.1449
5	0.1233	0.0685	0.1041	0.0675	0.1040	0.0675	0.3118	0.1533
6	0.1064	0.0589	0.1181	0.0689	0.1063	0.0889	0.3005	0.1521
7	0.1445	0.0591	0.1008	0.0669	0.0991	0.0654	0.2985	0.1657
q_i (Median)	**0.1233**	**0.0685**	**0.1071**	**0.0722**	**0.1040**	**0.0723**	**0.3005**	**0.1521**

$\sum_{i=1}^{m} q_i = 1;\ \chi^2 > \chi^2_{tbl} = 45.43 > 18.475$ – the agreement of experts' opinions is satisfactory.

7. Bilateral Relations (C_7)

Expert (k_i)	Weights of criteria determined by AHP method			
	c_{38}	c_{39}	c_{40}	c_{41}
1	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
2	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
3	0.2562	0.2922	0.3140	0.1376
4	0.2562	0.2922	0.3140	0.1376
5	0.2589	0.3108	0.3264	0.1039
6	0.2540	0.2540	0.2939	0.1981
7	0.2540	0.2540	0.2939	0.1981
q_i (Median)	**0.2540**	**0.2540**	**0.2939**	**0.1981**

$\sum_{i=1}^{m} q_i = 1;\ \chi^2 > \chi^2_{tbl} = 14.62 > 11.345$ – the agreement of experts' opinions is satisfactory.

8. Main quantitative indicators of the project (C_8)

Expert (k_i)	Weights of criteria determined by AHP method						
	c_{42}	c_{43}	c_{44}	c_{45}	c_{46}	c_{47}	c_{48}
1	0.1520	0.1208	0.0456	0.2011	0.2348	0.1404	0.1052
2	0.1402	0.1539	0.0134	0.1801	0.2297	0.1226	0.1602
3	0.1429	0.1439	0.0429	0.1829	0.1989	0.1429	0.1458
4	0.1678	0.0130	0.0395	0.2442	0.2321	0.1207	0.1826
5	0.1644	0.1148	0.0435	0.1787	0.1967	0.1335	0.1684
6	0.1459	0.2260	0.0477	0.1516	0.1956	0.1324	0.1008
7	0.1654	0.1245	0.0956	0.0992	0.2155	0.1488	0.1509
q_i (Median)	**0.1520**	**0.1245**	**0.0435**	**0.1801**	**0.2155**	**0.1335**	**0.1509**

$\sum_{i=1}^{m} q_i = 1;\ \chi^2 > \chi^2_{tbl} = 28.251 > 16.812$ – the agreement of experts' opinions is satisfactory.

Weights of the criteria groups:

Expert (k_i)	Weights of criteria determined by AHP method							
	C_1	C_2	C_3	C_4	C_5	C_6	C_7	C_8
1	0.0478	0.1748	0.1672	0.1509	0.1687	0.0420	0.0594	0.1892
2	0.0883	0.1336	0.1082	0.1179	0.2023	0.0940	0.0700	0.1856
3	0.0592	0.1481	0.1553	0.1473	0.1342	0.0689	0.1342	0.1528
4	0.0484	0.1738	0.1724	0.1519	0.1688	0.0356	0.0556	0.1935
5	0.0409	0.1835	0.1744	0.1587	0.1684	0.0338	0.0436	0.1967
6	0.0646	0.1537	0.1714	0.1362	0.1666	0.0414	0.0778	0.1881
7	0.1780	0.1567	0.0757	0.0576	0.1378	0.0587	0.1382	0.1973
q_i (Median)	**0.0592**	**0.1567**	**0.1672**	**0.1473**	**0.1684**	**0.0420**	**0.0700**	**0.1892**

$\sum_{i=1}^{m} q_i = 1;\ \chi^2 > \chi^2_{tbl} = 35.239 > 18.475$ – the agreement of experts' opinions is satisfactory.

Annex B. Description of the Assessed Renovation Projects Alternatives

Criteria	Weight (q_i)	Min/Max	Alternatives					
			Restoration and conservation of "Magura" historical complex (A_1)	**Revival and preservation of traditional building (A_2)**	**Reconstruction of the Obashieva House (A_3)**	**Opening of "Sofia Arsenal" museum for contemporary art (A_4)**	**Restoration and conservation of Shumen Fortress (A_5)**	**Optimal project alternative (A_o)**
Applicant suitability	**0.0592**	**Max**						
Suitability of the applicant to implement the project (c_1)	0.2560	Max	4	4	4	4	5	5
Suitability of the project partners (c_2)	0.2510	Max	1	4	4	1	4	5
Suitability the organisational resources / structure (c_3)	0.2968	Max	4	4	4	4	4	5
Adequateness of the publicity plan for the operation (c_4)	0.1962	Max	3	3	3	1	3	5

Relevance of the project	**0.1567**	**Max**						
Justification of the project (c_5)	0.1531	Max	4	3	4	4	3	5
Public consensus about the project (c_6)	0.0678	Max	4	4	4	4	4	5
Relevance of the overall project objective (c_7)	0.1473	Max	4	4	4	4	5	5
Meeting of the purpose of the project to the needs expressed by the applicant (c_8)	0.0502	Max	4	4	4	4	3	5
Purpose contribution in a national or regional perspective (c_9)	0.2368	Max	4	5	4	4	4	5
Innovativeness of the project (c_{10})	0.1731	Max	4	4	3	3	5	5
Implementation of EU legislation (c_{11})	0.1717	Max	4	3	3	3	3	5

Methodological efficiency (C_3)	**0.1672**	**Max**						
Effectiveness of the proposed solution compared to alternative solutions to the same problem (c_{12})	0.1599	Max	3	3	1	3	3	5
The choice of technology in a best available technique context (c_{13})	0.1420	Max	3	3	3	3	3	5
Clarity and feasibility of the time schedule (c_{14})	0.1631	Max	3	3	3	3	4	5
Relevance of the division into separate project activities (c_{15})	0.0496	Max	3	3	3	4	3	5
Suitability of the proposed indicators (c_{16})	0.1289	Max	3	4	3	4	4	5
Capacity building and human resources development (c_{17})	0.1445	Max	1	4	1	1	1	5
Operation and maintenance (c_{18})	0.2121	Max	3	4	4	4	3	5

Risk control (C_4)	**0.1473**	**Max**						
Control of the managerial risks (c_{19})	0.1078	Max	3	3	4	3	4	5
Control of the technical risks (c_{20})	0.2501	Max	3	3	4	3	4	5
Control of the financial risks (c_{21})	0.2501	Max	3	3	4	3	4	5
Control of the legal risks (c_{22})	0.1375	Max	3	3	4	3	4	5
Suitability of the management and control of risk (c_{23})	0.2545	Max	3	3	4	3	4	5
Economic feasibility (C_5)	**0.1581**	**Max**						
Feasibility of the budget (c_{24})	0.1904	Max	3	4	4	3	3	5
Revenue generation and additional benefit (c_{25})	0.0846	Max	3	3	1	1	3	5
Co-financing feasibility (c_{26})	0.1019	Max	3	4	4	4	3	5
Control of any in-kind contributions (c_{27})	0.0590	Max	3	3	4	3	3	5

Cost-effectiveness of the project (c_{28})	0.2739	Max	3	4	4	3	3	5
Economic life and post completion financing (c_{29})	0.2903	Max	3	3	4	4	4	5
Contribution to cross-cutting targets (Sustainable development, Gender Equity, Good Governance) (C_6)	**0.0420**	**Max**						
Recovery of natural resources (c_{30})	0.1233	Max	3	4	3	5	4	5
Strengthening of financial tools for ecosystem protection (c_{31})	0.0685	Max	3	3	3	3	3	5
Increase of public understanding of sustainability and positive influence on citizens' sustainability behavior (c_{32})	0.1071	Max	4	4	4	4	4	5
Positive effects for public health (c_{33})	0.0722	Max	4	4	3	3	4	5

Contribution to poverty reduction (c_{34})	0.1040	Max	4	3	3	3	4	5
Promotion of women's participation within the project (c_{35})	0.0723	Max	3	3	3	3	3	5
Improvement of participation of civil society into decision making processes (c_{36})	0.3005	Max	3	3	3	3	3	5
Proactive approach to preventing and dealing with corruption (c_{37})	0.1521	Max	3	3	3	3	3	5
Bilateral Relations (C_7)	**0.0700**	**Max**						
Partnership contribution to the quality or success of the project (c_{38})	0.2540	Max	1	4	4	1	4	5
Indications development and good working relations between the partners (c_{39})	0.2540	Max	1	3	4	1	4	5

Potential to develop the partnership beyond the project cooperation (c_{40})	0.2939	Max	1	4	4	1	4	5
Identification of the forms of bilateral relations other than partnerships (c_{41})	0.1981	Max	1	1	4	1	3	5
Main quantitative indicators of the project (C_8)	**0.1892**	**Max**						
Project budget (Thousands Euro) (c_{42})	0.1520	Min	339.43	398.552	304.99	2252.124	353.35	304,99
Duration of the project (months) (c_{43})	0.1245	Min	24	24	24	22	24	22
Staff involved in the project management (number) (c_{44})	0.0435	Max	5	5	6	8	5	10
Reconstruction average expenses (Thousands Euro per sq. m.) (c_{45})	0.1801	Min	0.870	0.370	0.653	1.800	0.137	0,137

Area of the newly developed infrastructure (sq.m) (c_{46})	0.2155	Max	3	0.391	0.25	1	2.5	3
Visitors increase after project implementation (thousandds of people) (c_{47})	0.1335	Max	30	10	35.2	30	15.756	40
Number of conserved and/or protected items (c_{48})	0.1509	Max	3	5	5	8	5	10

Annex C. Multiple Criteria Evaluation of Renovation Projects

Multiple criteria evaluation of the projects by SAW method

1) Applicant suitability (C_1)
Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_1	0.208	0.208	0.208	0.208	0.260
c_2	0.063	0.250	0.250	0.063	0.250
c_3	0.290	0.290	0.290	0.290	0.290
c_4	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.067	0.200
$\sum$	**0.761**	**0.948**	**0.948**	**0.627**	**1.000**

Ranking list: $A_5 \succ A_2 = A_3 \succ A_4 \succ A_1$.

2) Relevance of the project (C_2)
Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_5	0.150	0.113	0.150	0.150	0.113
c_6	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070
c_7	0.120	0.120	0.120	0.120	0.150
c_8	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.038
c_9	0.192	0.240	0.192	0.192	0.192
c_{10}	0.136	0.136	0.102	0.102	0.170
c_{11}	0.170	0.127	0.127	0.127	0.127
$\sum$	**0.888**	**0.856**	**0.812**	**0.812**	**0.860**

Ranking list: $A_1 \succ A_5 \succ A_2 \succ A_3 = A_4$.

3) Methodological efficiency (C_3)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_{12}	0.160	0.160	0.053	0.160	0.160
c_{13}	0.140	0.140	0.140	0.140	0.140
c_{14}	0.120	0.120	0.120	0.120	0.160
c_{15}	0.038	0.038	0.038	0.050	0.038
c_{16}	0.097	0.130	0.097	0.130	0.130
c_{17}	0.038	0.150	0.038	0.038	0.038
c_{18}	0.157	0.210	0.210	0.210	0.157
$\sum$	**0.750**	**0.947**	**0.696**	**0.848**	**0.822**

Ranking list: $A_2 \succ A_4 \succ A_5 \succ A_1 \succ A_3$.

4) Risk control (C_4)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_{19}	0.082	0.082	0.110	0.082	0.110
c_{20}	0.188	0.188	0.250	0.188	0.250
c_{21}	0.188	0.188	0.250	0.188	0.250
c_{22}	0.105	0.105	0.140	0.105	0.140
c_{23}	0.188	0.188	0.250	0.188	0.250
$\sum$	**0.750**	**0.750**	**1.000**	**0.750**	**1.000**

Ranking list: $A_3 = A_5 \succ A_1 = A_2 = A_4$.

5) Economic feasibility (C_5)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_{24}	0.142	0.190	0.190	0.142	0.142
c_{25}	0.090	0.090	0.030	0.030	0.090
c_{26}	0.075	0.100	0.100	0.100	0.075
c_{27}	0.045	0.045	0.060	0.045	0.045
c_{28}	0.203	0.270	0.270	0.203	0.203
c_{29}	0.218	0.218	0.290	0.290	0.290
$\sum$	**0.773**	**0.913**	**0.940**	**0.810**	**0.845**

Ranking list: $A_3 \succ A_2 \succ A_5 \succ A_4 \succ A_1$.

6) Contribution to cross-cutting targets (Sustainable development, Gender Equity, Good Governance) (C_6)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_{30}	0.072	0.096	0.072	0.120	0.096
c_{31}	0.080	0.080	0.080	0.080	0.080
c_{32}	0.110	0.110	0.110	0.110	0.110
c_{33}	0.070	0.070	0.053	0.053	0.070
c_{34}	0.100	0.075	0.075	0.075	0.100
c_{35}	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070
c_{36}	0.300	0.300	0.300	0.300	0.300
c_{37}	0.150	0.150	0.150	0.150	0.150
$\sum$	**0.952**	**0.951**	**0.910**	**0.957**	**0.976**

Ranking list: $A_5 \succ A_4 \succ A_1 \succ A_2 \succ A_3$.

7) Bilateral Relations (C_7)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_{38}	0.063	0.250	0.250	0.063	0.250
c_{39}	0.063	0.188	0.250	0.063	0.250
c_{40}	0.075	0.300	0.300	0.075	0.300
c_{41}	0.050	0.050	0.200	0.050	0.150
$\sum$	**0.250**	**0.788**	**1.000**	**0.250**	**0.950**

Ranking list: $A_3 \succ A_5 \succ A_2 \succ A_1 = A_4$.

8) Main quantitative indicators of the project (C_8)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_{42}	0.135	0.115	0.150	0.020	0.130
c_{43}	0.119	0.119	0.119	0.130	0.119
c_{44}	0.025	0.025	0.030	0.040	0.025
c_{45}	0.029	0.068	0.039	0.014	0.180
c_{46}	0.220	0.029	0.018	0.073	0.183
c_{47}	0.111	0.037	0.130	0.111	0.058
c_{48}	0.056	0.094	0.094	0.150	0.094
$\sum$	**0.695**	**0.486**	**0.580**	**0.538**	**0.789**

Ranking list: $A_5 \succ A_1 \succ A_3 \succ A_4 \succ A_2$.

<u>Evaluation in all groups of criteria</u>

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
K_j^*	0.808	0.861	0.886	0.784	0.952

Ranking list: $A_5 \succ A_3 \succ A_2 \succ A_1 \succ A_4$.

Multiple criteria evaluation of the projects by TOPSIS method

1) Applicant suitability (C_1)

Normalized weighted decision making matrix

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_1	0.110240	0.110240	0.110240	0.110240	0.137800
c_2	0.035355	0.141421	0.141421	0.035355	0.141421
c_3	0.129692	0.129692	0.129692	0.129692	0.129692
c_4	0.098639	0.098639	0.098639	0.032880	0.098639

Ideal solution:
$A^+ = \{0.137800; 0.141421; 0.129692; 0.098639\}$

Negative ideal solution:
$A^- = \{0.110240; 0.035355; 0.129692; 0.032880\}$

Evaluation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
L_j^+	0.109588	0.027560	0.027560	0.127804	0.000000
L_j^-	0.065760	0.124797	0.124797	0.000000	0.127804
K_j	0.375024	0.819109	0.819109	0.000000	1.000000

Ranking list: $A_5 \succ A_2 = A_3 \succ A_1 \succ A_4$.

2) Relevance of the project (C_2)

Normalized weighted decision making matrix

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_5	0.073855	0.055391	0.073855	0.073855	0.055391
c_6	0.031305	0.031305	0.031305	0.031305	0.031305
c_7	0.063600	0.063600	0.063600	0.063600	0.079500
c_8	0.023408	0.023408	0.023408	0.023408	0.017556
c_9	0.101760	0.127200	0.101760	0.101760	0.101760
c_{10}	0.078520	0.078520	0.058890	0.058890	0.098150
c_{11}	0.094299	0.070724	0.070724	0.070724	0.070724

Ideal solution:
A^+= {0.073855; 0.031305; 0.079500; 0.023408; 0.127200; 0.098150; 0.094299}

Negative ideal solution:
A^-= {0.055391; 0.031305; 0.063600; 0.017556; 0.101760; 0.058890; 0.070724}

Evaluation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
L_j^+	0.035852	0.039177	0.054746	0.054746	0.039726
L_j^-	0.036280	0.032661	0.019369	0.019369	0.042357
K_j	0.502972	0.454653	0.261337	0.261337	0.516031

Ranking list: $A_5 \succ A_1 \succ A_2 \succ A_3 = A_4$.

3) Methodological efficiency (C_3)

Normalized weighted decision making matrix

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_{12}	0.078912	0.078912	0.026304	0.078912	0.078912
c_{13}	0.062610	0.062610	0.062610	0.062610	0.062610
c_{14}	0.066564	0.066564	0.066564	0.066564	0.088752
c_{15}	0.020801	0.020801	0.020801	0.027735	0.020801
c_{16}	0.048006	0.064008	0.048006	0.064008	0.064008
c_{17}	0.033541	0.134164	0.033541	0.033541	0.033541
c_{18}	0.077548	0.103397	0.103397	0.103397	0.077548

Ideal solution:
A^+= {0.078912; 0.062610; 0.088752; 0.027735; 0.064008; 0.134164; 0.103397}

Negative ideal solution:
$A^- = \{0.026304;\ 0.062610; 0.066564; 0.020801; 0.048006; 0.033541; 0.077548\}$

Evaluation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
L_j^+	0.107655	0.023246	0.117000	0.103040	0.104121
L_j^-	0.052608	0.117545	0.025849	0.061155	0.059295
K_j	0.328259	0.834889	0.180954	0.372451	0.362847

Ranking list: $A_2 \succ A_4 \succ A_5 \succ A_1 \succ A_3$.

4) Risk control (C_4)

Normalized weighted decision making matrix

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_{19}	0.042962	0.042962	0.057283	0.042962	0.057283
c_{20}	0.097642	0.097642	0.130189	0.097642	0.130189
c_{21}	0.097642	0.097642	0.130189	0.097642	0.130189
c_{22}	0.054679	0.054679	0.072906	0.054679	0.072906
c_{23}	0.097642	0.097642	0.130189	0.097642	0.130189

Ideal solution:
$A^+ = \{0.057283; 0.130189; 0.130189; 0.072906; 0.130189\}$

Negative ideal solution:
$A^- = \{0.042962; 0.097642; 0.097642; 0.054679; 0.097642\}$

Evaluation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
L_j^+	0.060953	0.060953	0.000000	0.060953	0.000000
L_j^-	0.000000	0.000000	0.060953	0.000000	0.060953
K_j	0.000000	0.000000	1.000000	0.000000	1.000000

Ranking list: $A_3 = A_5 \succ A_1 = A_2 = A_4$.

5) Economic feasibility (C_5)

Normalized weighted decision making matrix

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_{24}	0.074208	0.098944	0.098944	0.074208	0.074208
c_{25}	0.050138	0.050138	0.016713	0.016713	0.050138
c_{26}	0.036927	0.049237	0.049237	0.049237	0.036927
c_{27}	0.024962	0.024962	0.033282	0.024962	0.024962
c_{28}	0.105453	0.140604	0.140604	0.105453	0.105453
c_{29}	0.107090	0.107090	0.142786	0.142786	0.142786

Ideal solution:

$A^+ = \{0.098944;0.050138;0.049237;0.033282;0.140604;0.142786\}$

Negative ideal solution:

$A^- = \{0.074208;0.016713;0.036927;0.024962;0.105453;0.107090\}$

Evaluation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
L_j^+	0.057814	0.033425	0.036653	0.055081	0.045478
L_j^-	0.033425	0.057814	0.055823	0.037759	0.048903
K_j	0.366347	0.633653	0.603646	0.406711	0.518146

Ranking list: $A_2 \succ A_3 \succ A_5 \succ A_4 \succ A_1$.

6) Contribution to cross-cutting targets (Sustainable development, Gender Equity, Good Governance) (C_6)

Normalized weighted decision making matrix

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_{30}	0.041569	0.055426	0.041569	0.069282	0.055426
c_{31}	0.035777	0.035777	0.035777	0.035777	0.035777
c_{32}	0.049193	0.049193	0.049193	0.049193	0.049193
c_{33}	0.034466	0.034466	0.025849	0.025849	0.034466
c_{34}	0.052076	0.039057	0.039057	0.039057	0.052076
c_{35}	0.031305	0.031305	0.031305	0.031305	0.031305
c_{36}	0.134164	0.134164	0.134164	0.134164	0.134164
c_{37}	0.067082	0.067082	0.067082	0.067082	0.067082

Ideal solution:

$A^+ = \{0.069282; 0.035777; 0.049193; 0.034466; 0.052076; 0.031305; 0.134164; 0.067082\}$

Negative ideal solution:

$A^- = \{0.041569; 0.035777; 0.049193; 0.025849; 0.039057; 0.031305; 0.134164; 0.067082\}$

Evaluation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
L_j^+	0.027713	0.019013	0.031808	0.015612	0.013856
L_j^-	0.015612	0.016317	0.000000	0.027713	0.020874
K_j	0.360347	0.461845	0.000000	0.639652	0.601032

Ranking list: $A_4 \succ A_5 \succ A_2 \succ A_1 \succ A_3$.

7) Bilateral Relations (C_7)

Normalized weighted decision making matrix

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_{38}	0.035355	0.141421	0.141421	0.035355	0.141421
c_{39}	0.038125	0.114374	0.152499	0.038125	0.152499
c_{40}	0.042426	0.169706	0.169706	0.042426	0.169706
c_{41}	0.037796	0.037796	0.151186	0.037796	0.113389

Ideal solution:
$A^+ = \{ 0.141421; 0.152499; 0.169706; 0.151186 \}$

Negative ideal solution:
$A^- = \{ 0.035355; 0.038125; 0.042426; 0.037796 \}$

Evaluation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
L_j^+	0.231060	0.119627	0.000000	0.231060	0.037796
L_j^-	0.000000	0.182384	0.231060	0.000000	0.215048
K_j	0.000000	0.603899	1.000000	0.000000	0.850515

Ranking list: $A_5 \succ A_2 \succ A_3 \succ A_1 = A_4$.

8) Main quantitative indicators of the project (C_8)

Normalized weighted decision making matrix

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_{42}	0.021559	0.025375	0.019397	0.143217	0.022449
c_{43}	0.059089	0.059089	0.059089	0.054165	0.059089
c_{44}	0.015119	0.015119	0.018142	0.024190	0.015119
c_{45}	0.073207	0.031134	0.054695	0.151463	0.011780
c_{46}	0.162655	0.021145	0.013555	0.054218	0.135546
c_{47}	0.066996	0.022332	0.078609	0.066996	0.035285
c_{48}	0.036990	0.061650	0.061650	0.098639	0.061650

Ideal solution:
$A^+ = \{0.019397; 0.054165; 0.024190; 0.011780; 0.162655; 0.078609; 0.098639\}$

Negative ideal solution:
$A^- = \{0.143217; 0.059089; 0.015119; 0.151463; 0.013555; 0.022332; 0.036990\}$

Evaluation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
L_j^+	0.088431	0.158358	0.159693	0.216185	0.064000
L_j^-	0.212487	0.170387	0.168760	0.086923	0.223056
K_j	0.706130	0.518295	0.513803	0.286772	0.777047

Ranking list: $A_5 \succ A_1 \succ A_3 \succ A_2 \succ A_4$.

Evaluation in all groups of criteria

Normalized weighted decision making matrix

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
C_1	0.014	0.031	0.031	0.000	0.038
C_2	0.085	0.077	0.044	0.044	0.087
C_3	0.052	0.133	0.029	0.059	0.058
C_4	0.000	0.000	0.104	0.000	0.104
C_5	0.054	0.088	0.093	0.059	0.076
C_6	0.014	0.018	0.000	0.025	0.024
C_7	0.000	0.029	0.048	0.000	0.041
C_8	0.102	0.075	0.074	0.041	0.112

Ideal solution:
$A^+ = \{0.038; 0.087; 0.133; 0.104; 0.093; 0.025; 0.048; 0.112\}$.

Negative ideal solution:
$A^- = \{0.000; 0.044; 0.029; 0,000; 0.054; 0.000; 0.000; 0.041\}$.

Evaluation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
L_j^+	0.150	0.115	0.122	0.169	0.079
L_j^-	0.079	0.129	0.131	0.040	0.152
K_j	0.343	0.528	0.518	0.191	0.659

Ranking list: $A_5 \succ A_2 \succ A_3 \succ A_1 \succ A_4$.

Multiple criteria evaluation of the projects by COPRAS method

1) Applicant suitability (C_1)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_1	0.049524	0.049524	0.049524	0.049524	0.061905
c_2	0.017857	0.071429	0.071429	0.017857	0.071429
c_3	0.058	0.058	0.058	0.058	0.058
c_4	0.046154	0.046154	0.046154	0.015385	0.046154
S_{+j}	0.171535	0.225106	0.225106	0.140766	0.237487
S_{-j}	-	-	-	-	-
Q_j	0.171535	0.225106	0.225106	0.140766	0.237487
$N_j(\%)$	72.23	94.79	94.79	59.27	100.00

Ranking list: $A_5 \succ A_2 = A_3 \succ A_1 \succ A_4$.

2) Relevance of the project (C_2)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_5	0.033333	0.025	0.033333	0.033333	0.025
c_6	0.014	0.014	0.014	0.014	0.014
c_7	0.028571	0.028571	0.028571	0.028571	0.035714
c_8	0.010526	0.010526	0.010526	0.010526	0.007895
c_9	0.045714	0.057143	0.045714	0.045714	0.045714
c_{10}	0.035789	0.035789	0.026842	0.026842	0.044737
c_{11}	0.0425	0.031875	0.031875	0.031875	0.031875
S_{+j}	0.210435	0.202905	0.190862	0.190862	0.204935
S_{-j}	-	-	-	-	-
Q_j	0.210435	0.202905	0.190862	0.190862	0.204935
$N_j(\%)$	100.00	96.42	90.70	90.70	97.39

Ranking list: $A_1 \succ A_5 \succ A_2 \succ A_3 = A_4$.

3) Methodological efficiency (C_3)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_{12}	0.036923	0.036923	0.012308	0.036923	0.036923
c_{13}	0.028	0.028	0.028	0.028	0.028
c_{14}	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04
c_{15}	0.009375	0.009375	0.009375	0.0125	0.009375
c_{16}	0.021667	0.028889	0.021667	0.028889	0.028889
c_{17}	0.01875	0.075	0.01875	0.01875	0.01875
c_{18}	0.035	0.046667	0.046667	0.046667	0.035
S_{+j}	0.179715	0.254854	0.166766	0.201729	0.196937
S_{-j}	-	-	-	-	-
Q_j	0.179715	0.254854	0.166766	0.201729	0.196937
$N_j(\%)$	70.52	100.00	65.44	79.15	77.27

Ranking list: $A_2 \succ A_4 \succ A_5 \succ A_1 \succ A_3$.

4) Risk control (C_4)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_{19}	0.019412	0.019412	0.025882	0.019412	0.025882
c_{20}	0.044118	0.044118	0.058824	0.044118	0.058824
c_{21}	0.044118	0.044118	0.058824	0.044118	0.058824
c_{22}	0.024706	0.024706	0.032941	0.024706	0.032941
c_{23}	0.044118	0.044118	0.058824	0.044118	0.058824
S_{+j}	0.176471	0.176471	0.235294	0.176471	0.235294
S_{-j}	-	-	-	-	-
Q_j	0.176471	0.176471	0.235294	0.176471	0.235294
$N_j(\%)$	75	75	100	75	100

Ranking list: $A_3 = A_5 \succ A_1 = A_2 = A_4$.

5) Economic feasibility (C_5)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_{24}	0.033529	0.044706	0.044706	0.033529	0.033529
c_{25}	0.024545	0.024545	0.008182	0.008182	0.024545
c_{26}	0.016667	0.022222	0.022222	0.022222	0.016667
c_{27}	0.01125	0.01125	0.015	0.01125	0.01125
c_{28}	0.047647	0.063529	0.063529	0.047647	0.047647
c_{29}	0.048333	0.048333	0.064444	0.064444	0.064444
S_{+j}	0.181972	0.214586	0.218084	0.187275	0.198083
S_{-j}	-	-	-	-	-
Q_j	0.181972	0.214586	0.218084	0.187275	0.198083
$N_j(\%)$	83.44	98.40	100.00	85.87	90.83

Ranking list: $A_3 \succ A_2 \succ A_5 \succ A_4 \succ A_1$.

6) Contribution to cross-cutting targets (Sustainable development, Gender Equity, Good Governance) (C_6)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_{30}	0.018947	0.025263	0.018947	0.031579	0.025263
c_{31}	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016
c_{32}	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022
c_{33}	0.015556	0.015556	0.011667	0.011667	0.015556
c_{34}	0.023529	0.017647	0.017647	0.017647	0.023529
c_{35}	0.014	0.014	0.014	0.014	0.014
c_{36}	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06
c_{37}	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03
S_{+j}	0.200032	0.200466	0.190261	0.202893	0.206348
S_{-j}	-	-	-	-	-
Q_j	0.200032	0.200466	0.190261	0.202893	0.206348
$N_j(\%)$	96.94	97.15	92.20	98.33	100.00

Ranking list: $A_5 \succ A_4 \succ A_2 \succ A_1 \succ A_3$.

7) Bilateral Relations (C_7)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_{38}	0.017857	0.071429	0.071429	0.017857	0.071429
c_{39}	0.019231	0.057692	0.076923	0.019231	0.076923
c_{40}	0.021429	0.085714	0.085714	0.021429	0.085714
c_{41}	0.02	0.02	0.08	0.02	0.06
S_{+j}	0.078516	0.234835	0.314066	0.078516	0.294066
S_{-j}	-	-	-	-	-
Q_j	0.078516	0.234835	0.314066	0.078516	0.294066
$N_j(\%)$	25.00	74.77	100.00	25.00	93.63

Ranking list: $A_3 \succ A_5 \succ A_2 \succ A_1 = A_4$.

8) Main quantitative indicators of the project (C_8)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
c_{42}	0.013939	0.016406	0.012541	0.092599	0.014515
c_{43}	0.026441	0.026441	0.026441	0.024237	0.026441
c_{44}	0.006897	0.006897	0.008276	0.011034	0.006897
c_{45}	0.040888	0.017389	0.030548	0.084595	0.00658
c_{46}	0.092437	0.012017	0.007703	0.030812	0.077031
c_{47}	0.032231	0.010744	0.037818	0.032231	0.016975
c_{48}	0.017308	0.028846	0.028846	0.046154	0.028846
S_{+j}	0.148873	0.058503	0.082643	0.120232	0.129749
S_{-j}	0.081268	0.060236	0.06953	0.201431	0.047535
Q_j	0.164659	0.077083	0.096846	0.147681	0.1372
$N_j(\%)$	100.00	46.81	58.82	89.69	83.32

Ranking list: $A_1 \succ A_4 \succ A_5 \succ A_3 \succ A_2$.

Evaluation in all groups of criteria

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
C_1	0.010	0.013	0.013	0.008	0.014
C_2	0.033	0.032	0.030	0.030	0.032
C_3	0.030	0.043	0.028	0.034	0.033
C_4	0.026	0.026	0.035	0.026	0.035
C_5	0.031	0.036	0.037	0.031	0.033
C_6	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.009	0.009
C_7	0.006	0.016	0.022	0.006	0.021
C_8	0.031	0.015	0.018	0.028	0.026
S_{+j}	0.175	0.190	0.191	0.172	0.202
S_{-j}	-	-	-	-	-
Q_j	0.175	0.190	0.191	0.172	0.202
$N_j(\%)$	86.5	97.3	94.3	84.9	100

Ranking list: $A_5 \succ A_3 \succ A_2 \succ A_1 \succ A_4$.

Multiple criteria evaluation of the projects by ARAS method

1) Applicant suitability (C_1)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5	A_o
c_1	0.039385	0.039385	0.039385	0.039385	0.049231	0.049231
c_2	0.013211	0.052842	0.052842	0.013211	0.052842	0.066053
c_3	0.047488	0.047488	0.047488	0.047488	0.047488	0.05936
c_4	0.0327	0.0327	0.0327	0.0109	0.0327	0.0545
R_j	**0.132783**	**0.172415**	**0.172415**	**0.110983**	**0.182261**	**0.229143**
N_j^*	**0.579476**	**0.752432**	**0.752432**	**0.484339**	**0.795401**	**1**

Ranking list: $A_o \succ A_5 \succ A_2 = A_3 \succ A_1 \succ A_4$.

2) Relevance of the project (C_2)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5	A_o
c_5	0.026626	0.01997	0.026626	0.026626	0.01997	0.033283
c_6	0.010848	0.010848	0.010848	0.010848	0.010848	0.01356
c_7	0.022662	0.022662	0.022662	0.022662	0.028327	0.028327
c_8	0.008367	0.008367	0.008367	0.008367	0.006275	0.010458
c_9	0.036431	0.045538	0.036431	0.036431	0.036431	0.045538
c_{10}	0.02885	0.02885	0.021638	0.021638	0.036063	0.036063
c_{11}	0.032705	0.024529	0.024529	0.024529	0.024529	0.040881
R_j	**0.166488**	**0.160763**	**0.151099**	**0.151099**	**0.162441**	**0.20811**
N_j^*	**0.800000**	**0.77249**	**0.726055**	**0.726055**	**0.780556**	**1**

Ranking list: $A_0 \succ A_1 \succ A_5 \succ A_2 \succ A_3 = A_4$.

3) Methodological efficiency (C_3)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5	A_o
c_{12}	0.02665	0.02665	0.008883	0.02665	0.02665	0.044417
c_{13}	0.0213	0.0213	0.0213	0.0213	0.0213	0.0355
c_{14}	0.0233	0.0233	0.0233	0.0233	0.031067	0.038833
c_{15}	0.007086	0.007086	0.007086	0.009448	0.007086	0.01181
c_{16}	0.016813	0.022417	0.016813	0.022417	0.022417	0.028022
c_{17}	0.011115	0.044462	0.011115	0.011115	0.011115	0.055577
c_{18}	0.027665	0.036887	0.036887	0.036887	0.027665	0.046109
R_j	**0.133929**	**0.182102**	**0.125384**	**0.151117**	**0.1473**	**0.260267**
N_j^*	**0.514585**	**0.699673**	**0.481753**	**0.580625**	**0.565959**	**1**

Ranking list: $A_o \succ A_2 \succ A_4 \succ A_5 \succ A_1 \succ A_3$.

4) Risk control (C_4)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5	A_o
c_{19}	0.0147	0.0147	0.0196	0.0147	0.0196	0.0245
c_{20}	0.034105	0.034105	0.045473	0.034105	0.045473	0.056841
c_{21}	0.034105	0.034105	0.045473	0.034105	0.045473	0.056841
c_{22}	0.01875	0.01875	0.025	0.01875	0.025	0.03125
c_{23}	0.034705	0.034705	0.046273	0.034705	0.046273	0.057841
R_j	**0.136364**	**0.136364**	**0.181818**	**0.136364**	**0.181818**	**0.227273**
N_j^*	**0.600000**	**0.600000**	**0.800000**	**0.600000**	**0.800000**	**1**

Ranking list: $A_o \succ A_3 = A_5 \succ A_1 = A_2 = A_4$.

5) Economic feasibility (C_5)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5	A_o
c_{24}	0.025964	0.034618	0.034618	0.025964	0.025964	0.043273
c_{25}	0.015863	0.015863	0.005288	0.005288	0.015863	0.026438
c_{26}	0.013291	0.017722	0.017722	0.017722	0.013291	0.022152
c_{27}	0.008429	0.008429	0.011238	0.008429	0.008429	0.014048
c_{28}	0.03735	0.0498	0.0498	0.03735	0.03735	0.06225
c_{29}	0.037865	0.037865	0.050487	0.050487	0.050487	0.063109
R_j	**0.138761**	**0.164296**	**0.169152**	**0.145238**	**0.151383**	**0.231269**
N_j^*	**0.600000**	**0.710413**	**0.731411**	**0.628007**	**0.654576**	**1**

Ranking list: $A_0 \succ A_3 \succ A_2 \succ A_5 \succ A_4 \succ A_1$.

6) Contribution to cross-cutting targets (Sustainable development, Gender Equity, Good Governance) (C_6)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5	A_o
c_{30}	0.015413	0.02055	0.015413	0.025688	0.02055	0.025688
c_{31}	0.010275	0.010275	0.010275	0.010275	0.010275	0.017125
c_{32}	0.017136	0.017136	0.017136	0.017136	0.017136	0.02142
c_{33}	0.012557	0.012557	0.009417	0.009417	0.012557	0.015696
c_{34}	0.018909	0.014182	0.014182	0.014182	0.018909	0.023636
c_{35}	0.010845	0.010845	0.010845	0.010845	0.010845	0.018075
c_{36}	0.045075	0.045075	0.045075	0.045075	0.045075	0.075125
c_{37}	0.022815	0.022815	0.022815	0.022815	0.022815	0.038025
R_j	**0.153024**	**0.153434**	**0.145158**	**0.155433**	**0.158162**	**0.23479**
N_j^*	**0.65175**	**0.653497**	**0.618246**	**0.662009**	**0.673631**	**1**

Ranking list: $A_0 \succ A_5 \succ A_4 \succ A_2 \succ A_1 \succ A_3$.

7) Bilateral Relations (C_7)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5	A_o
c_{38}	0.013368	0.053474	0.053474	0.013368	0.053474	0.066842
c_{39}	0.014111	0.042333	0.056444	0.014111	0.056444	0.070556
c_{40}	0.015468	0.061874	0.061874	0.015468	0.061874	0.077342
c_{41}	0.013207	0.013207	0.052827	0.013207	0.03962	0.066033
R_j	**0.056155**	**0.170887**	**0.224618**	**0.056155**	**0.211412**	**0.280773**
N_j^*	**0.200000**	**0.608632**	**0.800000**	**0.200000**	**0.752963**	**1**

Ranking list: $A_o \succ A_3 \succ A_5 \succ A_2 \succ A_1 = A_4$.

8) Main quantitative indicators of the project (C_8)

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5	A_o
c_{42}	0.029292	0.024947	0.032603	0.004415	0.028139	0.032603
c_{43}	0.02014	0.02014	0.02014	0.021971	0.02014	0.021971
c_{44}	0.005577	0.005577	0.006692	0.008923	0.005577	0.011154
c_{45}	0.01008	0.023701	0.013429	0.004872	0.064009	0.064009
c_{46}	0.063751	0.008309	0.005313	0.02125	0.053126	0.063751
c_{47}	0.024883	0.008294	0.029196	0.024883	0.013068	0.033177
c_{48}	0.012575	0.020958	0.020958	0.033533	0.020958	0.041917
R_j	**0.166297**	**0.111926**	**0.128331**	**0.119847**	**0.205017**	**0.268582**
N_j^*	**0.619168**	**0.41673**	**0.47781**	**0.44622**	**0.763334**	**1**

Ranking list: $A_0 \succ A_5 \succ A_1 \succ A_3 \succ A_4 \succ A_2$.

All groups of criteria

Calculation results

	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5	A_o
C_1	0.0079	0.0102	0.0102	0.0066	0.0108	0.0136
C_2	0.0261	0.0252	0.0237	0.0237	0.0255	0.0326
C_3	0.0224	0.0304	0.0210	0.0253	0.0246	0.0435
C_4	0.0201	0.0201	0.0268	0.0201	0.0268	0.0335
C_5	0.0234	0.0277	0.0285	0.0245	0.0255	0.0389
C_6	0.0064	0.0064	0.0061	0.0065	0.0066	0.0099
C_7	0.0039	0.0120	0.0157	0.0039	0.0148	0.0197
C_8	0.0315	0.0212	0.0243	0.0227	0.0388	0.0508
R_j	**0.1416**	**0.1532**	**0.1562**	**0.1332**	**0.1734**	**0.2424**
N_j^*	**0.5841**	**0.6318**	**0.6443**	**0.5494**	**0.7151**	**1.00**

Ranking list: $A_o \succ A_5 \succ A_3 \succ A_2 \succ A_1 \succ A_4$.