



Proposed Simplification

Working Document¹

SFC2014 EAFRD AIR technical guidance

**Proposed technical structure and content of
Point 7 of Annual Implementation Reports (AIR)
(referred to in Article 50 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013, Article 75 of
Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 and in ANNEX VII point 7 to
Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 808/2014)**

¹ Version of 23 July 2018

Notes

This proposed simplified template for Point 7 (information resulting from evaluation activities) of the annual implementation reports (AIRs) of 2014-2020 Rural Development Programmes (RDPs) takes into account the feedback received from Member States following the evaluation exercise included in the RDPs' AIRs submitted in 2017.

It aims to eliminate the need for Member States to upload information that is already included in other sections of the AIR and to align the SFC structure to the regulatory requirements, whilst ensuring that the information requested in Point 7 of the AIR allows for an adequate overview of the assessment of the information and progress towards achieving the objectives of the programmes.

Therefore, e.g. common context, output, result and target indicators already included in other parts of the AIR or of the RDP will not have to be filled in again in Point 7. The same applies to information included in the RDP or in other sections of the AIR.

NB. Because of practical reasons, it is not possible to provide Member States with separate excel sheet for the bulk update, so the data, that cannot be retrieved from other parts of the AIR is to be introduced directly in the SFC.

**1. Common evaluation questions related to rural development focus areas
(Common model for CEQs 1-18 related to Focus Areas)**

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION No 1 (FA 1A)

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION No 1 “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THE RDP INTERVENTIONS SUPPORTED INNOVATION, COOPERATION AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE KNOWLEDGE BASE IN RURAL AREAS?”

Answer to evaluation question

[A maximum of 17,500 characters = approx. 5 pages]

[SAME TEMPLATE FOR COMMON EVALUATION QUESTIONS 1 TO 18]

2. Common evaluation questions related to other RDP aspects

(Common model for CEQs 19-21)

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION No 19

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION No 19: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THE SYNERGIES AMONG PRIORITIES AND FOCUS AREAS ENHANCED THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE RDP?”

Answer to evaluation question

[A maximum of 17,500 characters = approx. 5 pages]

[SAME TEMPLATE FOR COMMON EVALUATION QUESTIONS 19 TO 21]

3. Common evaluation questions related to Union level objectives (Common model for CEQs 22-30)

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION No 22

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION No 22 “TO WHAT EXTENT HAS THE RDP CONTRIBUTED TO ACHIEVING THE EU 2020 HEADLINE TARGET OF RAISING THE EMPLOYMENT RATE OF THE POPULATION AGED 20 TO 64 TO AT LEAST 75%?”

Answer to evaluation question ²

[A maximum of 17,500 characters = approx. 5 pages]

[SAME TEMPLATE FOR COMMON EVALUATION QUESTIONS 22-30]

² For CEQs 22-3, the answers should contain an assessment of programme’s net contribution to changes in CAP impact indicators (Ref.: Annex VII point 7 to IR (EU) No 808/2014)

4. Programme specific evaluation questions

PROGRAMME SPECIFIC EVALUATION QUESTION LINKED TO PROGRAMME SPECIFIC FOCUS AREAS³

PROGRAMME SPECIFIC FOCUS AREA (PSEQ):⁴

PROGRAMME SPECIFIC EVALUATION QUESTION No ...:⁵

Answer to evaluation question

[A maximum of 17,500 characters = approx. 5 pages]

***[SAME TEMPLATE FOR EACH PROGRAMME SPECIFIC EVALUATION QUESTION
LINKED TO PROGRAMME SPECIFIC FOCUS AREAS]***

³ In case the RDP includes several programme specific focus areas, the table for programme specific evaluation question will be multiplied in the SFC template accordingly.

⁴ Insert the number and title of the programme specific focus area, e.g. 2C – “Improving the economic performance and market participation of forestry enterprises”

⁵ Insert the title of programme specific evaluation question, e.g. “To what extent have the RDP interventions supported the improvement of economic performance and market participation of forestry enterprises?”

PROGRAMME SPECIFIC EVALUATION QUESTION LINKED TO PROGRAMME SPECIFIC EVALUATION TOPIC⁶

EVALUATION TOPIC⁷:

PROGRAMME SPECIFIC EVALUATION QUESTION No...⁸:

Answer to evaluation question

[A maximum of 17,500 characters = approx. 5 pages]

***[SAME TEMPLATE FOR EACH PROGRAMME SPECIFIC EVALUATION QUESTION
LINKED TO PROGRAMME SPECIFIC EVALUATION TOPIC]***

⁶ In case the RDP evaluation plan contains the evaluation of several specific topics, e.g. the RDP delivery mechanism etc., the table for programme specific evaluation question will be multiplied in the SFC template accordingly.

⁷ Insert here the evaluation topic, e.g. „Programme delivery“

⁸ Insert the title of programme specific evaluation question linked to evaluation topic, e.g. “To what extent has the programme delivery contributed to the effective RDP implementation?”

TABLE OF RESULT INDICATORS

in grey - cells with values retrieved/calculated from other parts of the report

Result Indicator Name and unit	Target Value (2)	Main value⁹ (3)	Secondary Contribution (4)	LEADER Contribution (5)	Total (6) =3+4+5
R1/T4 % holdings with RDP investment support	From RDP chapter 11	From AIR table D	N/A	Table B 2.2	Automatically calculated
R2 Change in agricultural output on supported farms/AWU	N/A				Automatically calculated
R3/T5 % holdings with RDP supported business plan/investment for young farmers	From RDP chapter 11	From AIR table D	N/A	Table B 2.2	Automatically calculated
R4/T6 % holdings with support for quality schemes, local markets, short supply circuits, producer groups/orgs	From RDP chapter 11	From AIR table D	N/A	Table B 2.2	Automatically calculated
R5/T7 % farms in risk management schemes	From RDP chapter 11	From AIR table D	N/A	Table B 2.2	Automatically calculated
R6/T8 % forest/wood contracted for biodiversity	From RDP chapter 11	From AIR table D	N/A	Table B 2.2	Automatically calculated
R7/T9 % UAA contracted for biodiversity/landscape	From RDP chapter 11	From AIR table D	N/A	Table B 2.2	Automatically calculated
R8/T10 % UAA contracted for water management	From RDP chapter 11	From AIR table D	N/A	Table B 2.2	Automatically calculated
R9/T11 % forest/wood contracted for water	From RDP chapter 11	From AIR table D	N/A	Table B 2.2	Automatically calculated

⁹ Values from operations attributed to primarily programmed Focus Areas will be automatically generated from the information included in the monitoring tables except for complementary result indicators.

management					
R10/T12 % UAA contracted for soil management	From RDP chapter 11	From AIR table D	N/A	Table B 2.2	Automatically calculated
R11/T13 % forest/wood contracted for soil management	From RDP chapter 11	From AIR table D	N/A	Table B 2.2	Automatically calculated
R12/T14 % irrigated land with improved efficiency	From RDP chapter 11	From AIR table D	N/A	Table B 2.2	Automatically calculated
R13 Increase in efficiency of water use	N/A				Automatically calculated
R14 Increase in efficiency of energy use	N/A				Automatically calculated
R15 Renewable energy produced	N/A				Automatically calculated
R16/T17 % LU covered by investments to reduce GHG/ammonia	From RDP chapter 11	From AIR table D	N/A	Table B 2.2	Automatically calculated
R17/18 % UAA contracted to reduce GHG/ammonia	From RDP chapter 11	From AIR table D	N/A	Table B 2.2	Automatically calculated
R18 Reduced emissions of methane/nitrous oxide	N/A				Automatically calculated
R19 Reduced ammonia emissions	N/A				Automatically calculated
R20/T19 % land contracted for C sequestration	From RDP chapter 11	From AIR table D	N/A	Table B 2.2	Automatically calculated
R21/T20 Jobs created	From RDP chapter 11	From AIR table D (automatically generated from table B2.2)		Table B 2.2	Automatically calculated
R22/T21 % rural population covered by LDS	From RDP chapter 11	From AIR table D	N/A	N/A as it should be the same as main value from column 3	Automatically calculated
R23/T22 % rural population with improved services/infrastruc	From RDP chapter 11	From AIR table D	N/A	Table B 2.2	Automatically calculated

ture						
R24/T23 Jobs created (LEADER)	From RDP chapter 11	From AIR table D	N/A	N/ A as it should be the same as main value from column 3	Automatically calculated	
R25/T24 % rural population with new/improved ICT	From RDP chapter 11	From AIR table D	N/A	Table B 2.2	Automatically calculated	

**TABLE OF ADDITIONAL INDICATORS USED TO SUPPORT
EVALUATION FINDINGS¹⁰**

Indicator type ¹¹	Indicator name	Focus Area	Indicator unit	Value	Comment

¹⁰ Please fill in the table, if any additional indicators were established and used to support evaluation findings.

¹¹ Output/result/impact

TABLE OF CAP IMPACT INDICATORS¹²

Name of common impact indicator		Indicator Unit = same as corresponding context indicators	Updated indicator value	RDP contribution ¹³	Comment
1. Agricultural entrepreneurial income		EUR (in real terms) / AWU (non-salaried)			
2. Agricultural factor income		EUR (in real terms) / AWU			
3. Total factor productivity in agriculture		Index			
7. Emissions from agriculture	Greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture	1 000 t of CO2 equivalent			
		% of total GHG emissions			
	Ammonia emissions from agriculture	1 000 t of NH3			
8. Farmland bird index		Index 2000 = 100			
9. High Nature Value farming		% HNV of total UAA			
10. Water abstraction in agriculture		1 000 m3			
11. Water quality	Gross Nutrient Balance – potential surplus of nitrogen (GNB- N)	Kg N / ha / year			
	Gross Nutrient Balance – potential surplus of phosphorus (GNB-P)	Kg P / ha / year			

¹²Link to common impact indicators fiches: <https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/cap-indicators/impact/impact-indicators-fiches.pdf>. Where data for an indicator calculated using the same definition and methodologies is not available, neither from EU nor national and regional sources, and an estimation of an indicator or a proxy is used, please flag this in the comment box.

¹³ To the extent possible evaluations should provide a quantified estimation of the net impacts of programmes on the values of the CAP impact indicators (ref. Annex VII point 7 to IR (EU) No 808/2014).

	Nitrates in freshwater – surface water	% of monitoring sites - high quality		
		% of monitoring sites - moderate quality		
		% of monitoring sites - poor quality		
	Nitrates in freshwater - groundwater	% of monitoring sites - high quality		
		% of monitoring sites - moderate quality		
		% of monitoring sites - poor quality		
12. Soil organic matter in land	Total	Mega tones		
	Mean SOC concentration	g/kg		
13. Soil erosion by water	Estimated rate of soil loss by water erosion	t / ha / year		
	Estimated agricultural area affected by a certain rate of soil erosion by water	1000 ha		
		% of the total agricultural area		
14. Rural employment rate	15-64 years	%		
	20-64 years	%		
15. Degree of rural poverty	Total poverty rate	% of total population		
	Poverty rate in rural areas	% of total population		
16. Rural GDP ¹⁴		PPS		

¹⁴ For MSs which do not have the "rural area" classification (e.g. Cyprus, Luxembourg, Malta), the most similar typology of "thinly populated areas" or "intermediate" areas should be used.