Outputs from the analysis of indicators - SUMMARY

The aim of this activity was to design and create a set of indicators complementing the existing ETIS and OECD indicators not always suitable for DM and did essentially "tailor-made" indicators for destination and DM audit, allowing staff to use all publicly available data. One of the important goals of the project is to increase the qualification of DM staff in the field of valuation and evaluation of destinations and the output of this activity will significantly help to achieve this goal.

The summary results are based on the overall number of indications from partner countries namely: **Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, Latvia, Poland and Turkey.**

It seems that the most universally used indicators are linked with either population development and transport accessibility of the destination or with the CAE (Collective accommodation establishments) accessibility and its performance.

Not all the indicators regarded as necessary are used in practice. There seems to be a need to use more frequently indicators representing the category "CAE performance", and category "Business entities related to tourism".

Indicators informing about the destination safety are more important on the national (country) level than overall. It occurs that there were 15 categories of indicators listed as applicable on the national (country) level by at least 5 countries. That should be considered a high number.

There were only 5 categories of indicators listed as applicable on the regional (DMO) level by at least 5 countries. That is a low number compared with the national (country) level.

There are only 2 categories of indicators listed as applicable for the service provider group. It seems that the segmentation of the service providers seems mainly based on the demographic criteria and that the product diagnosis relies heavily on accessibility within the destination.

Those indicators that are available in official statistics seem also important. But on the other hand not all those necessary are available in official statistics.

It seems there is no universal area (group of indicators) where field research is implemented. However the most popular for field research is "Satisfaction of visitors (overall in relative terms, according to individual segments - services, infrastructure, care for the development of tourism)". Three of the 6 researched countries reported the direct measurement of this category of indicators – that is the highest score among all the categories of indicators.

CONCLUSION

The category "Most frequently (5-6 indications) used indicators on the regional (DMO) level" seems to bring very significant input from the perspective of the project title, as it refers to the regional level of the Destination Management system. **There were only 5 categories of indicators listed as applicable on the regional (DMO) level by at least 5 countries.** That is a low number compared with the national (country) level.

The group of service providers generally uses much fewer indicators than both country-level DMOs and regional-level DMOs. Namely, there are 2 such indicators: age structure and accessibility within the destination. It seems that the segmentation of the service providers seems mainly based on demographic criteria and that the product diagnosis relies heavily on accessibility within the destination.

It seems there is no universal area (group of indicators) where field research is implemented. However the most popular for field research is "Satisfaction of visitors (overall in relative terms, according to individual segments - services, infrastructure, care for the development of tourism)". Three of the 6 researched countries reported the direct measurement of this category of indicators – that is the highest score among all the categories of indicators. It is also important that in the 2 countries this category of indicators is available in official statistics, reports databases, etc.