



## **Working Document<sup>1</sup>**

### **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)**

---

<sup>1</sup> Version of September 2016

# 1. Common evaluation questions related to rural development focus areas

## COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 1

<p><b>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?”</b></p>		
<p><b>1. List of measures contributing to the FA 1A</b></p> <p><b>Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:</b></p> <p><b>Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 1A<sup>2</sup>:</b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]</i></p>		
<p><b>2. Link between judgment criteria, common and additional<sup>3</sup> result indicators used to answer the CEQ</b></p> <p><i>[Mandatory]</i></p>		
<p><b>Judgment criteria<sup>4</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i></p>	<p><b>Common result indicators<sup>5</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i></p>	<p><b>Additional result indicators and information<sup>6</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i></p>
<p>RDP projects have been innovative and based on developed knowledge</p>	<p>T1: Percentage of expenditure under Articles 14, 15 and 35 of Regulation</p>	<p>Percentage of innovative projects out of all RDP supported projects</p>

<sup>2</sup> This also covers those measures /sub-measures which have shown secondary effects during the evaluation, and not only those who have been planned to contribute additionally to focus areas other than those programmed during the programme design.

<sup>3</sup> Additional result indicators are used if the common indicators are not sufficient to answer the CEQ, and if the success is specified with judgment criteria which are not measured with the common indicators.

<sup>4</sup> List judgment criteria used to specify the success of the intervention within the FA. The judgment criteria proposed by the WD: "Common Evaluation Questions for rural development programmes 2014-2020" are pre-filled in the table. Stakeholders in MS can propose their own judgment criteria to specify success in line with the specific intervention logic of the FA. In the system for answering the CEQ 1 – 21, one judgment criterion is linked to one indicator (common or additional).

<sup>5</sup> List common indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the indicators are listed in a consistent way with the judgment criteria and placed in the same line.

<sup>6</sup> List additional indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the judgment criteria are listed in a consistent way with the additional indicators and placed in the same line. Additional indicators filled in this column are those proposed in the WD: Common Evaluation Questions for Rural Development Programmes 2014-2020 as “additional information”. MS can use their own additional indicators and information if they consider the pre-filled ones as not relevant for the specific RDP.

	(EU) No 1305/2013 in relation to the total expenditure for the RDP	
Operational groups have been created		
Variety <sup>7</sup> of partners involved in EIP operational groups		Number and types of partners involved in cooperation projects
Innovative actions have been implemented and disseminated by the EIP operational groups		Number of supported innovative actions implemented and disseminated by EIP operational groups
<p><b>3. Methods applied<sup>8</sup></b></p> <p><b>Quantitative methods<sup>9</sup>:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Reasons for using the method</li> <li>ii. Description of methods to calculate ratios, gross or net (if applicable) values of common and additional indicators, or other indicators used (output, common context indicators)<sup>10</sup></li> <li>iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered</li> </ul> <p><b>Qualitative methods:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Reasons for using the method<sup>11</sup></li> <li>ii. Description of methods used<sup>12</sup></li> <li>iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered</li> </ul> <p><i>[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]</i></p>		

<sup>7</sup> Variety is defined by the representation of different socio-economic sectors (private, public, civil, agriculture, food industry, forestry, etc.) and organizations such as academia, banks, NGO, etc.

<sup>8</sup> In case the same method was used in answering several evaluation questions, the description does not need to be repeated in all respective tables. It is sufficient just to provide the reference to the respective table of the SFC template, point 7, where the method is described in detail.

<sup>9</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of additional result indicators, apart from those which are measured in absolute values or as a ratio and which can be deducted directly from the monitoring system.

<sup>10</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

<sup>11</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP results linked to FA 1A - introductory qualitative analysis, triangulation of quantitative findings, no data available (e.g. no RDP uptake under the FA 1A), etc.

<sup>12</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

#### 4. Quantitative values of indicators<sup>13</sup> and data sources

[Mandatory]

Indicator	Absolute value <sup>14</sup>	Ratio value <sup>15</sup>	Calculated gross value <sup>16</sup>	Calculated net value <sup>17</sup>	Data and information sources <sup>18</sup>
Common output indicators <sup>19</sup>					

<sup>13</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

<sup>14</sup> Value is aggregated from Pillar II operations database for output indicators, and/or from statistics databases for common context indicators or additional indicators, if they are used to answer the common evaluation questions.

<sup>15</sup> This column is filled for the common result indicator T1 and for additional indicators, if they are expressed in ratio values.

<sup>16</sup> This column is not filled for common indicators. Only for additional indicators and common context indicators, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of RDP beneficiaries. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>17</sup> This column is not filled for common indicators. Only for additional indicators and common context indicators, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Net value is the value of indicator attributed to the RDP intervention. See the guidelines Assessment of RDP results, chapter 7.2. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>18</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, EU/national/regional statistics, etc.

<sup>19</sup> The common output indicators can be also used (e.g. O13 and O16), especially if the value of output indicator is necessary to calculate the result indicator or in case it provides important information for answering the evaluation question. The selection of output indicators for answering the evaluation question is done in MS.

<b>Common result indicators</b>	T1 – Percentage of expenditure under Articles 14, 15 and 35 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 in relation to the total expenditure for the RDP					
<b>Additional result indicators<sup>20</sup></b>						
<b>Common Context indicators<sup>21</sup></b>						

<sup>20</sup> Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation questions in case the common indicators are considered insufficient for this purpose.

<sup>21</sup> The common context indicators can be also used to answer common evaluation questions if relevant (e. g. CCI 24).

**5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>22</sup>**

*[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]*

**6. Answer to evaluation question<sup>23</sup>**

*[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]*

**7. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>24</sup>**

**Conclusion**

*[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]*

**Recommendation**

*[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non - mandatory]*

**C.1**

**R.1**

**C.2**

**R.2**

**C.3**

**R.3**

---

<sup>22</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>23</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the analysis presented under points 3 and 4.

<sup>24</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 3 and 4 and the answer given under point 6.

## COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 2

**COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 2: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS SUPPORTED THE STRENGTHENING OF LINKS BETWEEN AGRICULTURE, FOOD PRODUCTION AND FORESTRY AND RESEARCH AND INNOVATION, INCLUDING FOR THE PURPOSE OF IMPROVED ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE?”**

**1. List of measures contributing to the FA 1B**

**Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:**

**Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 1B<sup>25</sup>:**

*[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]*

**2. Link between judgment criteria, common and additional<sup>26</sup> result indicators used to answer the CEQ**

*[Mandatory]*

<b>Judgment criteria<sup>27</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Common result indicators<sup>28</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Additional result indicators and information<sup>29</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>
Long term collaboration between agriculture, food production and forestry entities and institutions for research and innovation has been established	T2: Total number of co-operation operations supported under the cooperation measure (Art. 35 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013) (groups,	Percentage of cooperation operations continuing after the RDP support including for the purpose of improved environmental management and performance

<sup>25</sup> This also covers those measures /sub-measures which have shown secondary effects during the evaluation not only those who have been planned to contribute additionally to focus areas other than those programmed during the programme design.

<sup>26</sup> Additional indicators are used if the common indicators are not sufficient to answer the CEQ, and if the success is specified with judgment criteria which are not measured with the common indicators.

<sup>27</sup> List judgment criteria used to specify the success of the intervention within the FA. The judgment criteria proposed by the WD: "Common Evaluation Questions for rural development programmes 2014-2020" are pre-filled in the table. Stakeholders in MS can propose their own judgment criteria to specify success in line with the specific intervention logic of the FA. In the system for answering the CEQ 1 – 21 one judgment criterion is linked to one result indicator (common or additional).

<sup>28</sup> List common indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the indicators are listed in a consistent way with the judgment criteria and placed in the same line.

<sup>29</sup> List additional indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the judgment criteria are listed in a consistent way with the additional indicators and placed in the same line. Additional indicators filled in this column are those proposed in the WD: Common Evaluation Questions for rural Development Programmes 2014-2020 as “additional information”. MS can use their own additional indicators and information if they consider the pre-filled ones as not relevant for the specific RDP.

	networks/clusters, pilot projects...)	
Cooperation operations between agriculture, food production and forestry and research and innovation for the purpose of improved environmental management and performance have been implemented		
		Number and types of partners involved in cooperation projects

### 3. Methods applied<sup>30</sup>

#### Quantitative methods<sup>31</sup>:

- i. Reasons for using the method
- ii. Description of methods to calculate ratios, gross or net (if applicable) values of common and additional indicators, or other indicators used (output, common context indicators)<sup>32</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

#### Qualitative methods:

- i. Reasons for using the method<sup>33</sup>
- ii. Description of methods used<sup>34</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

*[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]*

<sup>30</sup> In case the same method was used in answering several evaluation questions, the description does not need to be repeated in all respective tables. It is sufficient just to provide the reference to the respective table of the SFC template, point 7, where the method is described in detail.

<sup>31</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of additional result indicators, apart from those which are measured in absolute values or as a ratio and which can be deducted directly from the monitoring system.

<sup>32</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

<sup>33</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP results linked to FA 1B - introductory qualitative analysis, triangulation of quantitative findings, no data available (e.g. no RDP uptake under the FA 1B), etc.

<sup>34</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.



#### 4. Quantitative values of indicators<sup>35</sup> and data sources

[Mandatory]

Indicator		Absolute value <sup>36</sup>	Ratio value <sup>37</sup>	Calculated gross value <sup>38</sup>	Calculated net value <sup>39</sup>	Data and information sources <sup>40</sup>
Common output indicators <sup>41</sup>						
Common result indicators	T2 – Total number of co-operation operations realised under the cooperation measure (Article 35 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/201					

<sup>35</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

<sup>36</sup> Value is aggregated from Pillar II operations database for output indicators (e.g. O4, O16), and/or from statistics databases for common context indicators or additional indicators, if they are used to answer the common evaluation questions.

<sup>37</sup> This column is filled for additional indicators, if they are expressed in ratio values.

<sup>38</sup> This column is not filled for common indicators. Only for additional indicators, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of RDP beneficiaries. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>39</sup> This column is not filled for common indicators. Only for additional indicators, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Net value is the value of indicator attributed to the RDP intervention. See the guidelines Assessment of RDP results, chapter 7.2. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>40</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, EU/national/regional statistics, etc.

<sup>41</sup> The common output indicators can be also used (e.g. O4, O16, O17), especially if the value of output indicator is necessary to calculate the result indicator or in case it provides important information for answering the evaluation question. The selection of output indicators for answering the evaluation question is done in MS.

	3) (groups, networks/ clusters, pilot projects ...)					
<b>Additional result indicators</b> 42						
<b>Common context indicators</b> 43						

---

42 Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation question in case the common indicators are considered insufficient for this purpose.

43 The common context indicators can be also used to answer common evaluation questions if relevant. Selection depends on the type of cooperation's operations.

<b>5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>44</sup></b> <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
<b>6. Answer to evaluation question<sup>45</sup></b> <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
<b>7. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>46</sup></b>	
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i>	<b>Recommendation</b> <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i>
C.1	R.1
C.2	R.2
C.3	R.3

### COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 3

<b>COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 3: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS SUPPORTED LIFELONG LEARNING AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING IN THE AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY SECTORS?”</b>
<b>1. List of measures contributing to the FA 1C</b>  <b>Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:</b>  <b>Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 1C<sup>47</sup>:</b>

<sup>44</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>45</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the analysis presented under points 3 and 4.

<sup>46</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 3 and 4 and the answer given under point 6.

<sup>47</sup> This also covers those measures /sub-measures which have shown secondary effects during the evaluation not only those who have been planned to contribute additionally to focus areas other than those programmed during the programme design.

[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]

**2. Link between judgment criteria, common and additional<sup>48</sup> indicators used to answer the CEQ**

[Mandatory]

<b>Judgment criteria<sup>49</sup></b> [Max. 255 characters]	<b>Common result indicators<sup>50</sup></b> [Max. 255 characters]	<b>Additional result indicators and information<sup>51</sup></b> [Max. 255 characters]
The number of rural people who have finalised lifelong learning and vocational training in the agriculture and forestry sectors has increased	T3: Total number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013	Percentage of trainees receiving certificates from recognized educational and training institutions via activities supported by RDP out of the total number of participants

**3. Methods applied<sup>52</sup>**

**Quantitative methods:**

- i. Reasons<sup>53</sup> for using the method
- ii. Description of methods to calculate ratios, gross or net (if applicable) values of common and additional indicators, or other indicators used (output, common context indicators)<sup>54</sup>

<sup>48</sup> Additional indicators are used if the common indicators are not sufficient to answer the CEQ, and if the success is specified with judgment criteria which are not measured with the common indicators.

<sup>49</sup> List judgment criteria used to specify the success of the intervention within the FA. The judgment criteria proposed by the WD: "Common Evaluation Questions for rural development programmes 2014-2020" are pre-filled in the table. Stakeholders in MS can propose their own judgment criteria to specify success in line with the specific intervention logic of the FA. In the system for answering the CEQ 1 – 21 one judgment criterion is linked to one result indicator (common or additional).

<sup>50</sup> List common indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the indicators are listed in a consistent way with the judgment criteria and placed in the same line.

<sup>51</sup> List additional indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the judgment criteria are listed in a consistent way with the additional indicators and placed in the same line. Additional indicators filled in this column are those proposed in the WD: Common Evaluation Questions for rural Development Programmes 2014-2020 as “additional information”. MS can use their own additional indicators and information if they consider the pre-filled ones as not relevant for the specific RDP.

<sup>52</sup> In case the same method was used in answering several evaluation questions, the description does not need to be repeated in all respective tables. It is sufficient just to provide the reference to the respective table of the SFC template, point 7, where the method is described in detail.

<sup>53</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of additional result indicators, apart from those which are measured in absolute values or as a ratio and which can be deducted directly from the monitoring system.

- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

**Qualitative methods:**

- i. Reasons for using the method<sup>55</sup>
- ii. Description of methods used<sup>56</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

*[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]*

---

<sup>54</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

<sup>55</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP results linked to FA 1C - introductory qualitative analysis, triangulation of quantitative findings, no data available (e.g. no RDP uptake under the FA 1C), etc.

<sup>56</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

#### 4. Quantitative values of indicators<sup>57</sup> and data sources

[Mandatory]

Indicator		Absolute value <sup>58</sup>	Ratio value <sup>59</sup>	Calculated gross value <sup>60</sup>	Calculated net value <sup>61</sup>	Data and information sources <sup>62</sup>
Common output indicators <sup>63</sup>						
Common result indicators	T3 - Total number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013					

<sup>57</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

<sup>58</sup> Value is aggregated from Pillar II operations database for output indicators, and/or from statistics databases for common context indicators or additional indicators, if they are used to answer the common evaluation questions.

<sup>59</sup> This column is filled for additional indicators, if they are expressed in ratio values.

<sup>60</sup> This column is not filled for common indicators. Only for additional indicators and common context indicators, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of RDP beneficiaries. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>61</sup> This column is not filled for common indicators. Only for additional indicators and common context indicators, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Net value is the value of indicator attributed to the RDP intervention. See the guidelines Assessment of RDP results, chapter 7.2. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>62</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, EU/national/regional statistics, etc.

<sup>63</sup> The common output indicators can be also used (e.g. O11, O12, O14), especially if the value of output indicator is necessary to calculate the result indicator or in case it provides important information for answering the evaluation question. The selection of output indicators for answering the evaluation question is done in MS.

<b>Additional result indicators</b> 64						
<b>Common Context indicators</b> 65						

---

<sup>64</sup> Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation questions in case the common indicators are considered insufficient for this purpose.

<sup>65</sup> The common context indicators can be also used to answer common evaluation questions if relevant (e. g. CCI 24).

<p><b>5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>66</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>6. Answer to evaluation question<sup>67</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>7. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>68</sup></b></p>	
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Mandatory]</i></p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non - mandatory]</i></p>
C.1	R.1
C.2	R.2
C.3	R.3

## COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 4

**COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 4: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS CONTRIBUTED TO IMPROVING THE ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE, RESTRUCTURING AND MODERNIZATION OF SUPPORTED FARMS IN PARTICULAR THROUGH INCREASING THEIR MARKET PARTICIPATION AND AGRICULTURAL DIVERSIFICATION?”**

**1. List of measures contributing to the FA 2A**

**Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:**

**Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 2A<sup>69</sup>:**

<sup>66</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>67</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the analysis presented under points 3 and 4.

<sup>68</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 3 and 4 and the answer given under point 6.



*[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]*

**2. Link between judgment criteria, common and additional<sup>70</sup> result indicators used to answer the CEQ**

*[Mandatory]*

<b>Judgment criteria<sup>71</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Common result indicators<sup>72</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Additional result indicators and information<sup>73</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>
Agricultural output per annual working unit of supported agricultural holdings has increased	R2: Change in agricultural output on supported farms/AWU (Annual Work Unit)	
Farms have been modernized Farms have been restructured	R1/T4: Percentage of agriculture holdings with RDP support for investments in restructuring or modernisation	Percentage of agriculture holdings with RDP support for investments regarding modernization
		Economic farm size structure of supported farms Percentage

**3. Methods applied<sup>74</sup>**

**Quantitative methods<sup>75</sup>:**

<sup>69</sup> This also covers those measures /sub-measures which have shown secondary effects during the evaluation not only those who have been planned to contribute additionally to focus areas other than those programmed during the programme design.

<sup>70</sup> Additional indicators are used if the common indicators are not sufficient to answer the CEQ, and if the success is specified with judgment criteria which are not measured with the common indicators.

<sup>71</sup> List judgment criteria used to specify the success of the intervention within the FA. The judgment criteria proposed by the WD: "Common Evaluation Questions for rural development programmes 2014-2020" are pre-filled in the table. Stakeholders in MS can propose their own judgment criteria to specify success in line with the specific intervention logic of the FA. In the system for answering the CEQ 1 – 21 one judgment criterion is linked to one result indicator (common or additional).

<sup>72</sup> List common result indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the indicators are listed in a consistent way with the judgment criteria and placed in the same line.

<sup>73</sup> List additional indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the judgment criteria are listed in a consistent way with the additional indicators and placed in the same line. Additional indicators filled in this column are those proposed in the WD: Common Evaluation Questions for rural Development Programmes 2014-2020 as "additional information". MS can use their own additional indicators and information if they consider the pre-filled ones as not relevant for the specific RDP.

<sup>74</sup> In case the same method was used in answering several evaluation questions, the description does not need to be repeated in all respective tables. It is sufficient just to provide the reference to the respective table of the SFC template, point 7, where the method is described in detail.

- i. Reasons for using the method
- ii. Description of methods to calculate ratios, gross or net (if applicable) values of common and additional result indicators, or other indicators used (output, common context indicators)<sup>76</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

**Qualitative methods:**

- i. Reasons for using the method<sup>77</sup>
- ii. Description of methods used<sup>78</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

*[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]*

---

<sup>75</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of all complementary result indicators and all other indicators including additional ones, apart from those which are measured in absolute values and as a ratio and which can be deducted directly from the monitoring system.

<sup>76</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

<sup>77</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP results linked to FA 2A - introductory qualitative analysis, triangulation of quantitative findings, no data available (e.g. no RDP uptake under the FA 2A), etc.

<sup>78</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

<b>4. Quantitative values of indicators<sup>79</sup> and data sources</b>								
<i>[Mandatory]</i>								
<b>Indicator</b>		<b>Absolute value<sup>80</sup></b>	<b>Ratio value<sup>81</sup></b>	<b>Calculated gross value<sup>82</sup></b>			<b>Calculated net value<sup>83</sup></b>	<b>Data and information sources<sup>84</sup></b>
				<b>Primary contributions</b>	<b>Secondary contributions, including LEADER/CLLD contributions</b>	<b>Total value</b>		
<b>Common output indicators<sup>85</sup></b>								
<b>Common result</b>	<b>R1/T4 – Percentage of</b>							

<sup>79</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

<sup>80</sup> Value is aggregated from Pillar II operations database for output indicators, and/or from statistics databases for common context indicators or additional indicators, if they are used to answer the common evaluation questions.

<sup>81</sup> This column is filled for the result indicator R1/T4 and for additional indicators, if they are expressed in ratio values. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>82</sup> The gross value of the complementary result indicator R2 is provided here. The gross value of used additional result indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of RDP beneficiaries. The gross value of indicators is inserted also in case the net value has been inserted in the table.

<sup>83</sup> The net value of the complementary result indicator R2 (in case it was possible to calculate it) is inserted here. The net value of used additional result indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Net value is the value of indicator attributed to the RDP intervention. See the guidelines Assessment of RDP results, chapter 7.2. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>84</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, EU/national/regional statistics, GIS, etc.

<sup>85</sup> The common output indicators can be also used, especially if the value of output indicator is necessary to calculate the result indicator or in case it provides important information for answering the evaluation question, e.g. number of holdings/operations supported (O3 and O4), physical areas supported (O6), number of livestock units supported (O8), etc. The selection of output indicators for answering the evaluation question is done in MS.

<b>indicator s</b>	<b>agricultural holdings with RDP support for investments in restructuring or modernisation</b>							
	<b>R2 – Change in agricultural output on supported farms<sup>86</sup></b>							
	<b>R2 – AWU</b>							
	<b>R2 - Change in agricultural output on supported farms / AWU (numerator/de nominator)<sup>87</sup></b>							
<b>Additional result indicator s<sup>88</sup></b>								

<sup>86</sup> Values of common complementary result indicators are collected separately for numerator and denominator.

<sup>87</sup> Will be automatically filled based on the data from the previous rows.

<sup>88</sup> Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation questions in case the common indicators are considered insufficient for this purpose.

<b>Common Context indicator s<sup>89</sup></b>								
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

---

<sup>89</sup> The common context indicators can be also used to answer common evaluation questions if relevant (e. g. CCI 14, CCI 27, CCI 26).

**5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>90</sup>**

*[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]*

**6. Answer to evaluation question<sup>91</sup>**

*[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]*

**7. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>92</sup>**

**Conclusion**

*[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]*

**Recommendation**

*[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non mandatory]*

**C.1**

**R.1**

**C.2**

**R.2**

**C.3**

**R.3**

## COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 5

**COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 5: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS SUPPORTED THE ENTRY OF ADEQUATELY SKILLED FARMERS INTO THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR AND IN PARTICULAR, GENERATION RENEWAL?”**

**1. List of measures contributing to the FA 2B**

**Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:**

**Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 2B<sup>93</sup>:**

<sup>90</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>91</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the analysis presented under points 3 and 4.

<sup>92</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 3 and 4 and the answer given under point 6.

<sup>93</sup> This also covers those measures /sub-measures which have shown secondary effects during the evaluation not only those who have been planned to contribute additionally to focus areas other than those programmed during the programme design.

*[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]*

**2. Link between judgment criteria, common and additional<sup>94</sup> result indicators used to answer the CEQ**

*[Mandatory]*

<b>Judgment criteria<sup>95</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Common result indicators<sup>96</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Additional result indicators and information<sup>97</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>
The share of adequately skilled young farmers in the agricultural sector has increased	R3/T5: Percentage of agriculture holdings with RDP supported business development plan/investments for young farmers	
Adequately skilled farmers have entered into the agricultural sector		Percentage of adequately skilled farmers in the agricultural sector of the RDP territory

**3. Methods applied<sup>98</sup>**

**Quantitative methods<sup>99</sup>:**

- i. Reasons for using the method
- ii. Description of methods to calculate ratios, gross or net (if applicable) values of common and additional result indicators, or other indicators

<sup>94</sup> Additional indicators are used if the common indicators are not sufficient to answer the CEQ, and if the success is specified with judgment criteria which are not measured with the common indicators.

<sup>95</sup> List judgment criteria used to specify the success of the intervention within the FA. The judgment criteria proposed by the WD: "Common Evaluation Questions for rural development programmes 2014-2020" are pre-filled in the table. Stakeholders in MS can propose their own judgment criteria to specify success in line with the specific intervention logic of the FA. In the system for answering the CEQ 1 – 21 one judgment criterion is linked to one result indicator (common or additional).

<sup>96</sup> List common result indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the indicators are listed in a consistent way with the judgment criteria and placed in the same line.

<sup>97</sup> List additional indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the judgment criteria are listed in a consistent way with the additional indicators and placed in the same line. Additional indicators filled in this column are those proposed in the WD: Common Evaluation Questions for rural Development Programmes 2014-2020 as "additional information". MS can use their own additional indicators and information if they consider the pre-filled ones as not relevant for the specific RDP.

<sup>98</sup> In case the same method was used in answering several evaluation questions, the description does not need to be repeated in all respective tables. It is sufficient just to provide the reference to the respective table of the SFC template, point 7, where the method is described in detail.

<sup>99</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of all complementary result indicators and all other indicators including additional ones, apart from those which are measured in absolute values and as a ratio and which can be deducted directly from the monitoring system.

- used (output, common context indicators)<sup>100</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

**Qualitative methods:**

- i. Reasons for using the method<sup>101</sup>
- ii. Description of methods used<sup>102</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

*[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]*

**4. Quantitative values of indicators<sup>103</sup> and data sources**

*[Mandatory]*

Indicator	Absolute value <sup>104</sup>	Ratio value <sup>105</sup>	Calculated gross value <sup>106</sup>	Calculated net value <sup>107</sup>	Data and information sources <sup>108</sup>
<b>Common output indicators<sup>109</sup></b>					

<sup>100</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

<sup>101</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP results linked to FA 2B - introductory qualitative analysis, triangulation of quantitative findings, no data available (e.g. no RDP uptake under the FA 2B), etc.

<sup>102</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

<sup>103</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

<sup>104</sup> Value is aggregated from Pillar II operations database for output indicators, and/or from statistics databases for common context indicators or additional indicators, if they are used to answer the common evaluation questions.

<sup>105</sup> This column is filled for the common result/target indicator R3/T5 and for additional indicators, if they are expressed in ratio values. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>106</sup> The gross value of used additional result indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of RDP beneficiaries. The gross value of indicator is inserted also in case the net value has been inserted in the table. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>107</sup> The net value of used additional result indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Net value is the value of indicator attributed to the RDP intervention. See the guidelines Assessment of RDP results, chapter 7.2. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>108</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, EU/national/regional statistics, GIS, etc.

<sup>109</sup> The common output indicators can be also used, especially if the value of output indicator is necessary to calculate the result indicator or in case it provides important information for answering the evaluation question,



<b>Common result indicators</b>	<b>R3/T5</b> – <b>Percentage of agriculture holdings with RDP supported business development plan/investments for young farmers</b>					
<b>Additional result indicators<sup>110</sup></b>						
<b>Common Context indicators<sup>111</sup></b>						

e.g. number of beneficiaries receiving the start-up aid young farmers (O4). The selection of output indicators for answering the evaluation question is done in MS.

<sup>110</sup> Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation questions in case the common indicators are considered insufficient for this purpose.

<sup>111</sup> The common context indicators can be also used to answer common evaluation questions if relevant (e. g. CCI 17, CCI 22, CCI 23, CCI 24).

<p><b>5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>112</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>6. Answer to evaluation question<sup>113</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>7. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>114</sup></b></p>	
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i></p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i></p>
C.1	R.1
C.2	R.2
C.3	R.3

## COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 6

<p><b>COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 6: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS CONTRIBUTED TO IMPROVING THE COMPETITIVENESS OF SUPPORTED PRIMARY PRODUCERS BY BETTER INTEGRATING THEM INTO THE AGRI-FOOD CHAIN THROUGH QUALITY SCHEMES, ADDING VALUE TO THE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS, PROMOTING LOCAL MARKETS AND SHORT SUPPLY CIRCUITS, PRODUCERS GROUPS AND INTER-BRANCH ORGANIZATION?”</b></p>
<p><b>1. List of measure contributing to the FA 3A</b></p> <p><b>Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:</b></p> <p><b>Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 3A<sup>115</sup>:</b></p>

<sup>112</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>113</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the analysis presented under points 3 and 4.

<sup>114</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 3 and 4 and the answer given under point 6.

*[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]*

**2. Link between judgment criteria, common and additional<sup>116</sup> result indicators used to answer the CEQ**

*[Mandatory]*

<b>Judgment criteria<sup>117</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Common result indicators<sup>118</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Additional result indicators and information<sup>119</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>
Implementation of quality schemes by primary producers has increased  Participation of primary producers in short circuit schemes, quality-oriented producer group and/or inter branch organization has increased	R4/T6: Percentage of agricultural holdings receiving support for participating in quality schemes, local markets and short supply circuits, and producer groups/organisations	Percentage of primary producers introducing quality schemes with RDP support
Competitiveness of supported primary producers has improved		Agricultural output on supported farms
The share of the final price of agriculture products retained with primary producers has increased		Margin of primary producers in the final price of agricultural products
The added value of agricultural products of primary producers has		

<sup>115</sup> This also covers those measures/sub-measures which have shown secondary effects during the evaluation not only those who have been planned to contribute additionally to focus areas other than those programmed during the programme design.

<sup>116</sup> Additional indicators are used if the common indicators are not sufficient to answer the CEQ, and if the success is specified with judgment criteria which are not measured with the common result indicators.

<sup>117</sup> List judgment criteria used to specify the success of the intervention within the FA. The judgment criteria proposed by the WD: "Common Evaluation Questions for rural development programmes 2014-2020" are pre-filled here. Stakeholders in MS can propose their own judgment criteria to specify success in line with the specific intervention logic of the FA. In the system for answering the CEQ 1 – 21 one judgment criterion is linked to one result indicator (common or additional).

<sup>118</sup> List common result indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the indicators are listed in a consistent way with the judgment criteria and placed in the same line.

<sup>119</sup> List additional indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the judgment criteria are listed in a consistent way with the additional indicators and placed in the same line. Additional indicators filled in this column are those proposed in the WD: Common Evaluation Questions for rural Development Programmes 2014-2020 as "additional information". MS can use their own additional indicators and information if they consider the pre-filled ones as not relevant for the specific RDP.

increased		
<p><b>3. Methods applied<sup>120</sup></b></p> <p><b>Quantitative methods<sup>121</sup>:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Reasons for using the method</li> <li>ii. Description of methods to calculate ratios, gross or net (if applicable) values of common and additional result indicators, or other indicators used (output, common context indicators)<sup>122</sup></li> <li>iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered</li> </ul> <p><b>Qualitative methods:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Reasons for using the method<sup>123</sup></li> <li>ii. Description of methods used<sup>124</sup></li> <li>iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered</li> </ul> <p><i>[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]</i></p>		

<sup>120</sup> In case the same method was used in answering several evaluation questions, the description does not need to be repeated in all respective tables. It is sufficient just to provide the reference to the respective table of the SFC template, point 7, where the method is described in detail.

<sup>121</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of all complementary result indicators and all other indicators including additional ones, apart from those which are measured in absolute values and as a ratio and which can be deducted directly from the monitoring system.

<sup>122</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

<sup>123</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP results linked to FA 3A - introductory qualitative analysis, triangulation of quantitative findings, no data available (e.g. no RDP uptake under the FA 3A), etc.

<sup>124</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

#### 4. Quantitative values of indicators<sup>125</sup> and data sources

[Mandatory]

Indicator		Absolute value <sup>126</sup>	Ratio value <sup>127</sup>	Calculated gross value <sup>128</sup>	Calculated net value <sup>129</sup>	Data and information sources <sup>130</sup>
Common output indicators <sup>131</sup>						
Common result indicators	R4/T6 – Percentage of agricultural holdings receiving support for participating in quality schemes, local					

<sup>125</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

<sup>126</sup> Value is aggregated from Pillar II operations database for output indicators, and/or from statistics databases for common context indicators or additional indicators, if they are used to answer the common evaluation questions.

<sup>127</sup> This column is filled for the common result/target indicator R4/T6 and for additional indicators, if they are expressed in ratio values. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>128</sup> The gross value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of RDP beneficiaries. The gross value of indicator is inserted also in case the net value has been inserted in the table. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>129</sup> The net value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Net value is the value of indicator attributed to the RDP intervention. See the guidelines Assessment of RDP results, chapter 7.2. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>130</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, EU/national/regional statistics, GIS, etc.

<sup>131</sup> The common output indicators can be also used, especially if the value of output indicator is necessary to calculate the result indicator or in case it provides important information for answering the evaluation question, e.g. number of holdings/operations supported (O4), number of holdings participated in producers groups supported (O9), etc. The selection of output indicators for answering the evaluation question is done in MS.

	markets and short supply circuits, and producer groups/organizations					
<b>Additional result indicators<sup>132</sup></b>						
<b>Common Context indicators<sup>133</sup></b>						

<sup>132</sup> Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation questions in case the common indicators are considered insufficient for this purpose.

<sup>133</sup> The common context indicators can be also used to answer common evaluation questions if relevant (e. g. CCI 14, CCI 16).

<b>5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>134</sup></b> <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
<b>6. Answer to evaluation question<sup>135</sup></b> <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
<b>7. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>136</sup></b>	
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i>	<b>Recommendation</b> <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i>
<b>C.1</b>	<b>R.1</b>
<b>C.2</b>	<b>R.2</b>
<b>C.3</b>	<b>R.3</b>

## COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 7

<b>COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 7: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS SUPPORTED FARM RISK PREVENTION AND MANAGEMENT?”</b>
<b>1. List of measures contributing to the FA 3B</b>  <b>Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:</b>  <b>Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 3B<sup>137</sup>:</b>

<sup>134</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>135</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the analysis presented under points 3 and 4.

<sup>136</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 3 and 4 and the answer given under point 6.

<sup>137</sup> This also covers those measures /sub-measures which have shown secondary effects during the evaluation not only those who have been planned to contribute additionally to focus areas other than those programmed during the programme design.

*[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]*

**2. Link between judgment criteria, common and additional<sup>138</sup> result indicators used to answer the CEQ**

*[Mandatory]*

<b>Judgment criteria<sup>139</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Common result indicators<sup>140</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Additional result indicators and information<sup>141</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>
Participation of farms in risk prevention and management schemes has increased	R5/T7: Percentage of farms participating in risk management schemes	

**3. Methods applied<sup>142</sup>**

**Quantitative methods<sup>143</sup>:**

- i. Reasons for using the method
- ii. Description of methods to calculate ratios, gross or net (if applicable) values of common and additional result indicators, or other indicators used (output, common context indicators)<sup>144</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

**Qualitative methods:**

- i. Reasons for using the method<sup>145</sup>

<sup>138</sup> Additional indicators are used if the common indicators are not sufficient to answer the CEQ, and if the success is specified with judgment criteria which are not measured with the common indicators.

<sup>139</sup> List judgment criteria used to specify the success of the intervention within the FA. The judgment criteria proposed by the WD: "Common Evaluation Questions for rural development programmes 2014-2020" are pre-filled in the table. Stakeholders in MS can propose their own judgment criteria to specify success in line with the specific intervention logic of the FA. In the system for answering the CEQ 1 – 21 one judgment criterion is linked to one result indicator (common or additional).

<sup>140</sup> List common result indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the indicators are listed in a consistent way with the judgment criteria and placed in the same line.

<sup>141</sup> List additional result indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the judgment criteria are listed in a consistent way with the additional indicators and placed in the same line. Additional indicators filled in this column are those proposed in the WD: Common Evaluation Questions for rural Development Programmes 2014-2020 as "additional information". MS can use their own additional indicators and information if they consider the pre-filled ones as not relevant for the specific RDP.

<sup>142</sup> In case the same method was used in answering several evaluation questions, the description does not need to be repeated in all respective tables. It is sufficient just to provide the reference to the respective table of the SFC template, point 7, where the method is described in detail.

<sup>143</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of all complementary result indicators and all other indicators including additional ones, apart from those which are measured in absolute values and as a ratio and which can be deducted directly from the monitoring system.

<sup>144</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.



- ii. Description of methods used<sup>146</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

*[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]*

---

<sup>145</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP results linked to FA 3B - introductory qualitative analysis, triangulation of quantitative findings, no data available (e.g. no RDP uptake under the FA 3B), etc.

<sup>146</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

#### 4. Quantitative values of indicators<sup>147</sup> and data sources

[Mandatory]

Indicator		Absolute value <sup>148</sup>	Ratio value <sup>149</sup>	Calculated gross value <sup>150</sup>	Calculated net value <sup>151</sup>	Data and information sources <sup>152</sup>
Common output indicators <sup>153</sup>						
Common result indicators	R5/T7 – Percentage of farms participating in risk management schemes					
Additional result						

<sup>147</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

<sup>148</sup> Value is aggregated from Pillar II operations database for output indicators, and/or from statistics databases for common context indicators or additional indicators, if they are used to answer the common evaluation questions.

<sup>149</sup> This column is filled for the common result/target indicator R5/T7 and additional indicators, if they are expressed in ratio values.

<sup>150</sup> The gross value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of RDP beneficiaries. The gross value of indicator is inserted also in case the net value has been inserted in the table. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>151</sup> The net value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of RDP beneficiaries. Net value is the value of indicator attributed to the RDP intervention. See the guidelines Assessment of RDP results, chapter 7.2. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>152</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, EU/national/regional statistics, GIS, etc.

<sup>153</sup> The common output indicators can be also used, especially if the value of output indicator is necessary to calculate the result indicator or in case it provides important information for answering the evaluation question, e.g. number of holdings supported for premium for insurance (O4), etc. The selection of output indicators for answering the evaluation question is done in MS.

<b>indicators<sup>154</sup></b>						
<b>Common Context indicators<sup>155</sup></b>						

---

<sup>154</sup> Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation questions in case the common indicators are considered insufficient for this purpose.

<sup>155</sup> The common context indicators can be also used to answer common evaluation questions if relevant (e. g. CCI 17).

<p><b>5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>156</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>6. Answer to evaluation question<sup>157</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>7. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>158</sup></b></p>	
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Mandatory]</i></p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Not-mandatory]</i></p>
C.1	R.1
C.2	R.2
C.3	R.3

## COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 8

<p><b>COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 8: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS SUPPORTED THE RESTORATION, PRESERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF BIODIVERSITY, INCLUDING IN NATURA 2000 AREAS, AREAS FACING NATURAL AND OTHER SPECIFIC CONSTRAINS AND HNV FARMING, AND THE STATE OF EUROPEAN LANDSCAPES?”</b></p>
<p><b>1. Intervention logic of the FA 4A</b></p> <p><b>Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:</b></p> <p><b>Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 4A<sup>159</sup>:</b></p>

<sup>156</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>157</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the analysis presented under points 3 and 4.

<sup>158</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 3 and 4, and the answer given under point 6.

<sup>159</sup> This also covers those measures/sub-measures which have shown secondary effects during the evaluation not only those who have been planned to contribute additionally to focus areas other than those programmed during the programme design.

*[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]*

**2. Link between judgment criteria, common and additional<sup>160</sup> result indicators used to answer the CEQ**

*[Mandatory]*

<b>Judgment criteria<sup>161</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Common result indicators<sup>162</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Additional result indicators and information<sup>163</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>
Biodiversity on contracted land has been restored, preserved and enhanced	R6/ T8: Percentage of forest or other wooded areas under management contracts supporting biodiversity;  R7/T9: Percentage of agricultural land under management contracts supporting biodiversity and/or landscapes.	

**3. Methods applied<sup>164</sup>**

**Quantitative methods<sup>165</sup>:**

- i. Reasons for using the method
- ii. Description of methods to calculate ratios, gross or net (if applicable) values of common and additional result indicators, or other indicators

<sup>160</sup> Additional indicators are used if the common indicators are not sufficient to answer the CEQ, and if the success is specified with judgment criteria which are not measured with the common indicators.

<sup>161</sup> List judgment criteria used to specify the success of the intervention within the FA. The judgment criteria proposed by the WD: "Common Evaluation Questions for rural development programmes 2014-2020" are pre-filled in the table. Stakeholders in MS can propose their own judgment criteria to specify success in line with the specific intervention logic of the FA. In the system for answering the CEQ 1 – 21 one judgment criterion is linked to one result indicator (common or additional).

<sup>162</sup> List common result indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the indicators are listed in a consistent way with the judgment criteria and placed in the same line.

<sup>163</sup> List additional indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the judgment criteria are listed in a consistent way with the additional indicators and placed in the same line. Additional indicators filled in this column are those proposed in the WD: Common Evaluation Questions for rural Development Programmes 2014-2020 as “additional information”. MS can use their own additional indicators and information if they consider the pre-filled ones as not relevant for the specific RDP.

<sup>164</sup> In case the same method was used in answering several evaluation questions, the description does not need to be repeated in all respective tables. It is sufficient just to provide the reference to the respective table of the SFC template, point 7, where the method is described in detail.

<sup>165</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of all complementary result indicators and all other indicators including additional ones, apart from those which are measured in absolute values and as a ratio and which can be deducted directly from the monitoring system.

- used (output, common context indicators)<sup>166</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

**Qualitative methods:**

- i. Reasons for using the method<sup>167</sup>
- ii. Description of methods used<sup>168</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

*[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]*

---

<sup>166</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

<sup>167</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP results linked to FA 4A - introductory qualitative analysis, triangulation of quantitative findings, no data available (e.g. no RDP uptake under the FA 4A), etc.

<sup>168</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

#### 4. Quantitative values of indicators<sup>169</sup> and data sources

[Mandatory]

Indicator		Absolute value <sup>170</sup>	Ratio value <sup>171</sup>	Calculated gross value <sup>172</sup>	Calculated net value <sup>173</sup>	Data and information sources <sup>174</sup>
Common output indicators <sup>175</sup>						
Common result indicators	R6/T8 – Percentage Forest or other wooded area under management contracts supporting biodive					

<sup>169</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

<sup>170</sup> Value is aggregated from Pillar II operations database for output indicators, and/or from statistics databases for common context indicators or additional indicators, if they are used to answer the common evaluation questions.

<sup>171</sup> This column is filled for the common result/target indicators R6/T8 and R7/T9 and additional indicators, if they are expressed in ratio values.

<sup>172</sup> The gross value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of RDP beneficiaries.. The gross value of indicator is inserted also in case the net value has been inserted in the table. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>173</sup> The net value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Net value is the value of indicator attributed to the RDP intervention. See the guidelines Assessment of RDP results, chapter 7.2. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>174</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, EU/national/regional statistics, GIS, etc.

<sup>175</sup> The common output indicators can be also used, especially if the value of output indicator is necessary to calculate the result indicator or in case it provides important information for answering the evaluation question, e.g. total area (O5), physical area supported (O6), number of contract supported (O7), etc. The selection of output indicators for answering the evaluation question is done in MS.

	rsity					
	R7/T9 – Percent age of agricult ural land under manage ment contrac ts support ing biodive rsity and/or landsca pe					
<b>Addi tional result indica tors</b> 176						
<b>Com mon Conte xt indica tors</b> 177						

<sup>176</sup> Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation questions in case the common indicators are considered insufficient for this purpose.

<sup>177</sup> The common context indicators can be also used to answer common evaluation questions if relevant (e. g. CCI 34, CCI 35).



<p><b>5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>178</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>6. Answer to evaluation question<sup>179</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>7. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>180</sup></b></p>	
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Mandatory]</i></p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non mandatory]</i></p>
<b>C.1</b>	<b>R.1</b>
<b>C.2</b>	<b>R.2</b>
<b>C.3</b>	<b>R.3</b>

## COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 9

<p><b>COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 9: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS SUPPORTED THE IMPROVEMENT OF WATER MANAGEMENT, INCLUDING FERTILIZER AND PESTICIDE MANAGEMENT?”</b></p>
<p><b>1. List of measures contributing to the FA 4B</b></p> <p><b>Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:</b></p> <p><b>Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 4B<sup>181</sup>:</b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]</i></p>

<sup>178</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>179</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the analysis presented under points 3 and 4.

<sup>180</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 3 and 4, and the answer given under point 6.

<sup>181</sup> This also covers those measures/sub-measures which have shown secondary effects during the evaluation not only those who have been planned to contribute additionally to focus areas other than those programmed during the programme design.

**2. Link between judgment criteria, common and additional<sup>182</sup> result indicators used to answer the CEQ**

*[Mandatory]*

<b>Judgment criteria<sup>183</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Common result indicators<sup>184</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Additional result indicators and information<sup>185</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>
Water quality has improved	R8/T10: Percentage of agricultural land under management contracts to improve water management;  R9/T11: Percentage of forestry land under management contracts to improve water management.	Additional information on water quality of the land under management contracts

**3. Methods applied<sup>186</sup>**

**Quantitative methods<sup>187</sup>:**

- i. Reasons for using the method
- ii. Description of methods to calculate ratios, gross or net (if applicable) values of common and additional result indicators, or other indicators used (output, common context indicators)<sup>188</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions

<sup>182</sup> Additional indicators are used if the common indicators are not sufficient to answer the CEQ, and if the success is specified with judgment criteria which are not measured with the common indicators.

<sup>183</sup> List judgment criteria used to specify the success of the intervention within the FA. The judgment criteria proposed by the WD: "Common Evaluation Questions for rural development programmes 2014-2020" are pre-filled in the table. Stakeholders in MS can propose their own judgment criteria to specify success in line with the specific intervention logic of the FA. In the system for answering the CEQ 1 – 21 one judgment criterion is linked to one result indicator (common or additional).

<sup>184</sup> List common result indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the indicators are listed in a consistent way with the judgment criteria and placed in the same line.

<sup>185</sup> List additional indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the judgment criteria are listed in a consistent way with the additional indicators and placed in the same line. Additional indicators filled in this column are those proposed in the WD: Common Evaluation Questions for rural Development Programmes 2014-2020 as "additional information". MS can use their own additional indicators and information if they consider the pre-filled ones as not relevant for the specific RDP.

<sup>186</sup> In case the same method was used in answering several evaluation questions, the description does not need to be repeated in all respective tables. It is sufficient just to provide the reference to the respective table of the SFC template, point 7, where the method is described in detail.

<sup>187</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of all complementary result indicators and all other indicators including additional ones, apart from those which are measured in absolute values and as a ratio and which can be deducted directly from the monitoring system.

<sup>188</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

encountered

**Qualitative methods:**

- i. Reasons for using the method<sup>189</sup>
- ii. Description of methods used<sup>190</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

*[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]*

---

<sup>189</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP results linked to FA 4B - introductory qualitative analysis, triangulation of quantitative findings, no data available (e.g. no RDP uptake under the FA 4B), etc.

<sup>190</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

#### 4. Quantitative values of indicators<sup>191</sup> and data sources

[Mandatory]

Indicator		Absolute value <sup>192</sup>	Ratio value <sup>193</sup>	Calculated gross value <sup>194</sup>	Calculated net value <sup>195</sup>	Data and information sources <sup>196</sup>
Common output indicators <sup>197</sup>						
Common result indicators	R8/T10 – Percentage of agricultural land under management contracts to improve water manag					

<sup>191</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

<sup>192</sup> Value is aggregated from Pillar II operations database for output indicators, and/or from statistics databases for common context indicators or additional indicators, if they are used to answer the common evaluation questions.

<sup>193</sup> This column is filled for the common result/target indicators R8/T10 and R9/T11 and for additional indicators, if they are expressed in ratio values.

<sup>194</sup> The gross value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of RDP beneficiaries. The gross value of indicator is inserted also in case the net value has been inserted in the table. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>195</sup> The net value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Net value is the value of indicator attributed to the RDP intervention. See the guidelines Assessment of RDP results, chapter 7.2. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>196</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, EU/national/regional statistics, GIS, etc.

<sup>197</sup> The common output indicators can be also used, especially if the value of output indicator is necessary to calculate the result indicator or in case it provides important information for answering the evaluation question, e.g. total area (O5), physical area supported (O6), number of contract supported (O7), etc. The selection of output indicators for answering the evaluation question is done in MS.

	ement					
	R9/T11 – Percen tage of forestr y land under manag ement contra cts to improv e water manag ement					
	Addit ional result indica tors <sup>198</sup>					
	Com mon Conte xt indica tors <sup>199</sup>					

<sup>198</sup> Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation questions in case the common indicators are considered insufficient for this purpose.

<sup>199</sup> The common context indicators can be also used to answer common evaluation questions if relevant (e. g. CCI 40).

<p><b>5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>200</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>6. Answer to evaluation question<sup>201</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>7. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>202</sup></b></p>	
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i></p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non - mandatory]</i></p>
<b>C.1</b>	<b>R.1</b>
<b>C.2</b>	<b>R.2</b>
<b>C.3</b>	<b>R.3</b>

## COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 10

<p><b>COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 10: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS SUPPORTED THE PREVENTION OF SOIL EROSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF SOIL MANAGEMENT?”</b></p>
<p><b>1. List of measures contributing to the FA 4C</b></p> <p><b>Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:</b></p> <p><b>Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 4C<sup>203</sup>:</b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]</i></p>

<sup>200</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>201</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the analysis presented under points 3 and 4.

<sup>202</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 3 and 4 and the answer given under point 6.

<sup>203</sup> This also covers those measures /sub-measures which have shown secondary effects during the evaluation not only those who have been planned to contribute additionally to focus areas other than those programmed during the programme design.

**2. Link between judgment criteria, common and additional<sup>204</sup> result indicators used to answer the CEQ**

*[Mandatory]*

<b>Judgment criteria<sup>205</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Common result indicators<sup>206</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Additional result indicators and information<sup>207</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>
Soil management has improved	R10/T12: Percentage of agricultural land under management contracts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion;  R11/T13: Percentage of forestry land under management contracts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion.	
Soil erosion has been prevented		Additional information on soil erosion of the land under management contracts.

**3. Methods applied<sup>208</sup>**

**Quantitative methods<sup>209</sup>:**

<sup>204</sup> Additional indicators are used if the common indicators are not sufficient to answer the CEQ, and if the success is specified with judgment criteria which are not measured with the common indicators.

<sup>205</sup> List judgment criteria used to specify the success of the intervention within the FA. The judgment criteria proposed by the WD: "Common Evaluation Questions for rural development programmes 2014-2020" are pre-filled in the table. Stakeholders in MS can propose their own judgment criteria to specify success in line with the specific intervention logic of the FA. In the system for answering the CEQ 1 – 21 one judgment criterion is linked to one result indicator (common or additional).

<sup>206</sup> List common result indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the indicators are listed in a consistent way with the judgment criteria and placed in the same line.

<sup>207</sup> List additional indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the judgment criteria are listed in a consistent way with the additional indicators and placed in the same line. Additional indicators filled in this column are those proposed in the WD: Common Evaluation Questions for rural Development Programmes 2014-2020 as “additional information”. MS can use their own additional indicators and information if they consider the pre-filled ones as not relevant for the specific RDP.

<sup>208</sup> In case the same method was used in answering several evaluation questions, the description does not need to be repeated in all respective tables. It is sufficient just to provide the reference to the respective table of the SFC template, point 7, where the method is described in detail.

<sup>209</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of all complementary result indicators and all other indicators including additional ones, apart from those which are measured in absolute values and as a ratio and which can be deducted directly from the monitoring system.

- i. Reasons for using the method
- ii. Description of methods to calculate ratios, gross or net (if applicable) values of common and additional result indicators, or other indicators used (output, common context indicators)<sup>210</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

**Qualitative methods:**

- i. Reasons for using the method<sup>211</sup>
- ii. Description of methods used<sup>212</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

*[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]*

---

<sup>210</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

<sup>211</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP results linked to FA 4C - introductory qualitative analysis, triangulation of quantitative findings, no data available (e.g. no RDP uptake under the FA 4C), etc.

<sup>212</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.



#### 4. Quantitative values of indicators<sup>213</sup> and data sources

[Mandatory]

Indicator		Absolute value <sup>214</sup>	Ratio value <sup>215</sup>	Calculated gross value <sup>216</sup>	Calculated net value <sup>217</sup>	Data and information sources <sup>218</sup>
Common output indicators <sup>219</sup>						
Common result indicators	R10/T12 – Percentage of agricultural land under management contracts to improve soil mana					

<sup>213</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

<sup>214</sup> Value is aggregated from Pillar II operations database for output indicators, and/or from statistics databases for common context indicators or additional indicators, if they are used to answer the common evaluation questions.

<sup>215</sup> This column is filled for the common result/target indicators R10/T12 and R11/T13 and for additional indicators, if they are expressed in ratio values.

<sup>216</sup> The gross value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of RDP beneficiaries. The gross value of indicator is inserted also in case the net value has been inserted in the table. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>217</sup> The net value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Net value is the value of indicator attributed to the RDP intervention. See the guidelines Assessment of RDP results, chapter 7.2. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>218</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, EU/national/regional statistics, GIS, etc.

<sup>219</sup> The common output indicators can be also used, especially if the value of output indicator is necessary to calculate the result indicator or in case it provides important information for answering the evaluation question, e.g. total area (O5), physical area supported (O6), number of contract supported (O7), etc. The selection of output indicators for answering the evaluation question is done in MS.

	gemen t					
	R11/T 13 – Perce ntage of of forest ry land under mana gemen t contra cts to impro ve soil mana gemen t					
<b>Addi tional result indica tors<sup>220</sup></b>						
<b>Com mon Conte xt indica tors<sup>221</sup></b>						

<sup>220</sup> Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation questions in case the common indicators are considered insufficient for this purpose.

<sup>221</sup> The common context indicators can be also used to answer common evaluation questions if relevant (e. g. CCI 41, CCI 42).

<p><b>5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>222</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>6. Answer to evaluation question<sup>223</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>7. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>224</sup></b></p>	
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Mandatory]</i></p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i></p>
<b>C.1</b>	<b>R.1</b>
<b>C.2</b>	<b>R.2</b>
<b>C.3</b>	<b>R.3</b>

## COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 11

<p><b>COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 11: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS CONTRIBUTED TO INCREASING EFFICIENCY IN WATER USE BY AGRICULTURE?”</b></p>
<p><b>1. List of measures contributing to the FA 5A</b></p> <p><b>Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:</b></p> <p><b>Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 5A<sup>225</sup>:</b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]</i></p>

<sup>222</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>223</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the analysis presented under points 4 and 5.

<sup>224</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 4 and 5 and the answer given under point 6.

<sup>225</sup> This also covers those measures /sub-measures which have shown secondary effects during the evaluation not only those who have been planned to contribute additionally to focus areas other than those programmed during the programme design.

**2. Link between judgment criteria, common and additional<sup>226</sup> result indicators used to answer the CEQ**

*[Mandatory]*

<b>Judgment criteria<sup>227</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Common result indicators<sup>228</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Additional result indicators and information<sup>229</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>
Efficiency in water use by agriculture has increased	R12/T14: Percentage of irrigated land switching to more efficient irrigation system;  R13: Increase in efficiency of water use in agriculture in RDP supported projects.	

**3. Methods applied<sup>230</sup>**

**Quantitative methods<sup>231</sup>:**

- i. Reasons for using the method
- ii. Description of methods to calculate ratios, gross or net (if applicable) values of common and additional result indicators, or other indicators used (output, common context indicators)<sup>232</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

**Qualitative methods:**

<sup>226</sup> Additional indicators are used if the common indicators are not sufficient to answer the CEQ, and if the success is specified with judgment criteria which are not measured with the common indicators.

<sup>227</sup> List judgment criteria used to specify the success of the intervention within the FA. The judgment criteria proposed by the WD: "Common Evaluation Questions for rural development programmes 2014-2020" are pre-filled in this table. Stakeholders in MS can propose their own judgment criteria to specify success in line with the specific intervention logic of the FA. In the system for answering the CEQ 1 – 21 one judgment criterion is linked to one result indicator (common or additional).

<sup>228</sup> List common result indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the indicators are listed in a consistent way with the judgment criteria and placed in the same line.

<sup>229</sup> List additional indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the judgment criteria are listed in a consistent way with the additional indicators and placed in the same line. Additional indicators filled in this column are those proposed in the WD: Common Evaluation Questions for Rural Development Programmes 2014-2020 as "additional information". MS can use their own additional indicators and information if they consider the pre-filled ones as not relevant for the specific RDP.

<sup>230</sup> In case the same method was used in answering several evaluation questions, the description does not need to be repeated in all respective tables. It is sufficient just to provide the reference to the respective table of the SFC template, point 7, where the method is described in detail.

<sup>231</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of all complementary result indicators and all other indicators including additional ones, apart from those which are measured in absolute values and as a ratio and which can be deducted directly from the monitoring system.

<sup>232</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

- i. Reasons for using the method<sup>233</sup>
- ii. Description of methods used<sup>234</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

*[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]*

---

<sup>233</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP results linked to FA 5A - introductory qualitative analysis, triangulation of quantitative findings, no data available (e.g. no RDP uptake under the FA 5A), etc.

<sup>234</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

<b>4. Quantitative values of indicators<sup>235</sup> and data sources</b>							
<i>[Mandatory]</i>							
Indicator	Absolute value <sup>236</sup>	Ratio value <sup>237</sup>	Calculated gross value <sup>238</sup>			Calculated net value <sup>239</sup>	Data and information sources <sup>240</sup>
			Primary contributions	Secondary contributions, including LEADER/CLLD contributions	Total value		
<b>Common output indicators<sup>241</sup></b>							
<b>Common result indicators</b>	<b>R12/T14 – Percentage of irrigated land switching to</b>						

<sup>235</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

<sup>236</sup> Value is aggregated from Pillar II operations database for output indicators, and/or from statistics databases for common context indicators or additional indicators, if they are used to answer the common evaluation questions.

<sup>237</sup> This column is filled for the common result/target indicator R12/T14 and additional indicators, if they are expressed in ratio values.

<sup>238</sup> The gross value of the complementary result indicator R13 is inserted here. The gross value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of RDP beneficiaries. The gross value of indicator is inserted also in case the net value has been inserted in the table.

<sup>239</sup> The net value of the complementary result indicator R13 (in case it was possible to calculate it) is inserted here. The net value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Net value is the value of indicator attributed to the RDP intervention. See the guidelines Assessment of RDP results, chapter 7.2. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>240</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, EU/national/regional statistics, GIS, etc.

<sup>241</sup> The common output indicators can be also used, especially if the value of output indicator is necessary to calculate the result indicator or in case it provides important information for answering the evaluation question, e.g. total area (O5), physical area supported (O6), etc. The selection of output indicators for answering the evaluation question is done in MS.

	more efficient irrigation system							
	R13 – Increase in efficiency of water use in agriculture in RDP supported projects (m3 water used/standard output)							
<b>Additional result indicators<sup>242</sup></b>								
<b>Common Context indicators<sup>243</sup></b>								

<sup>242</sup> Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation questions in case the common indicators are considered insufficient for this purpose.

<sup>243</sup> The common context indicators can be also used to answer common evaluation questions if relevant (e. g. CCI 39).

<p><b>5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>244</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>6. Answer to evaluation question<sup>245</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>7. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>246</sup></b></p>	
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i></p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i></p>
<b>C.1</b>	<b>R.1</b>
<b>C.2</b>	<b>R.2</b>
<b>C.3</b>	<b>R.3</b>

## COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 12

<p><b>COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 12: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS CONTRIBUTED TO INCREASING EFFICIENCY IN ENERGY USE IN AGRICULTURE AND FOOD PROCESSING?”</b></p>
<p><b>1. List of measures contributing to the FA 5B</b></p> <p><b>Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:</b></p> <p><b>Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 5B<sup>247</sup>:</b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]</i></p>

<sup>244</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>245</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the analysis presented under points 3 and 4.

<sup>246</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 3 and 4 and the answer given under point 6.

<sup>247</sup> This also covers those measures /sub-measures which have shown secondary effects during the evaluation not only those who have been planned to contribute additionally to focus areas other than those programmed during the programme design.



**2. Link between judgment criteria, common and additional<sup>248</sup> result indicators used to answer the CEQ**

*[Mandatory]*

<b>Judgment criteria<sup>249</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Common result indicators<sup>250</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Additional result indicators and information<sup>251</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>
Efficiency of energy use in agriculture and food processing has increased	R14: Increase in efficiency of energy use in agriculture and food-processing in RDP supported projects;  T15: Total investment for energy efficiency.	

**3. Methods applied<sup>252</sup>**

**Quantitative methods<sup>253</sup>:**

- i. Reasons for using the method
- ii. Description of methods to calculate ratios, gross or net (if applicable) values of common and additional result indicators, or other indicators used (output, common context indicators)<sup>254</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

**Qualitative methods:**

<sup>248</sup> Additional indicators are used if the common indicators are not sufficient to answer the CEQ, and if the success is specified with judgment criteria which are not measured with the common indicators.

<sup>249</sup> List judgment criteria used to specify the success of the intervention within the FA. The judgment criteria proposed by the WD: "Common Evaluation Questions for rural development programmes 2014-2020" are pre-filled in the table. Stakeholders in MS can propose their own judgment criteria to specify success in line with the specific intervention logic of the FA. In the system for answering the CEQ 1 – 21 one judgment criterion is linked to one result indicator (common or additional).

<sup>250</sup> List common result indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the indicators are listed in a consistent way with the judgment criteria and placed in the same line.

<sup>251</sup> List additional indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the judgment criteria are listed in a consistent way with the additional indicators and placed in the same line. Additional indicators filled in this column are those proposed in the WD: Common Evaluation Questions for rural Development Programmes 2014-2020 as "additional information". MS can use their own additional indicators and information if they consider the pre-filled ones as not relevant for the specific RDP.

<sup>252</sup> In case the same method was used in answering several evaluation questions, the description does not need to be repeated in all respective tables. It is sufficient just to provide the reference to the respective table of the SFC template, point 7, where the method is described in detail.

<sup>253</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of all complementary result indicators and all other indicators including additional ones, apart from those which are measured in absolute values and as a ratio and which can be deducted directly from the monitoring system.

<sup>254</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

- i. Reasons for using the method<sup>255</sup>
- ii. Description of methods used<sup>256</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

*[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]*

---

<sup>255</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP results linked to FA 5B - introductory qualitative analysis, triangulation of quantitative findings, no data available (e.g. no RDP uptake under the FA 5B), etc.

<sup>256</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

<b>4. Quantitative values of indicators<sup>257</sup> and data sources</b>								
<i>[Mandatory]</i>								
<b>Indicator</b>		<b>Absolute value<sup>258</sup></b>	<b>Ratio value<sup>259</sup></b>	<b>Calculated gross value<sup>260</sup></b>			<b>Calculated net value<sup>261</sup></b>	<b>Data and information sources<sup>262</sup></b>
				<b>Primary contributions</b>	<b>Secondary contributions, including LEADER/CLLD contributions</b>	<b>Total value</b>		
<b>Common output indicators<sup>263</sup></b>								
<b>Common result indicator</b>	<b>T15 - Total investment for</b>							

<sup>257</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

<sup>258</sup> Value is aggregated from Pillar II operations database for output indicators, and/or from statistics databases for common target indicator T15 and for common context indicators or additional indicators, if they are used to answer the common evaluation questions.

<sup>259</sup> This column is filled for the additional indicators, if they are expressed in ratio values.

<sup>260</sup> The gross value of the complementary result indicator R14 is inserted here. The gross value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of RDP beneficiaries.. The gross value of indicator is inserted also in case the net value has been inserted in the table.

<sup>261</sup> The net value of the complementary result indicator R14 (in case it was possible to calculate it) is inserted here. The net value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Net value is the value of indicator attributed to the RDP intervention. See the guidelines Assessment of RDP results, chapter 7.2. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>262</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, EU/national/regional statistics, GIS, etc.

<sup>263</sup> The common output indicators can be also used, especially if the value of output indicator is necessary to calculate the result indicator or in case it provides important information for answering the evaluation question, e.g. total investment € (O2), etc. The selection of output indicators for answering the evaluation question is done in MS.

	energy efficiency							
	R14 – Increase in efficiency of energy use in agriculture and food-processing in RDP supported projects (Tonnes of oil equivalent /standard unit of output)							
<b>Additional result indicators<sup>264</sup></b>								

<sup>264</sup> Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation questions in case the common indicators are considered insufficient for this purpose.

<b>Common Context indicators<sup>265</sup></b>								
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

---

<sup>265</sup> The common context indicators can be also used to answer common evaluation questions if relevant (e. g. CCI 44).

<p><b>5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>266</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>6. Answer to evaluation question<sup>267</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>7. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>268</sup></b></p>	
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Mandatory]</i></p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i></p>
<b>C.1</b>	<b>R.1</b>
<b>C.2</b>	<b>R.2</b>
<b>C.3</b>	<b>R.3</b>

## COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 13

<p><b>COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 13: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS CONTRIBUTED TO THE SUPPLY AND USE OF RENEWABLE SOURCES OF ENERGY, OF BY-PRODUCTS, WASTES, RESIDUES AND OTHER NON-FOOD RAW MATERIAL FOR PURPOSES OF THE BIO-ECONOMY?”</b></p>
<p><b>1. List of measures contributing to the FA 5C</b></p> <p><b>Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:</b></p> <p><b>Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 5C<sup>269</sup>:</b></p>

<sup>266</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>267</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the analysis presented under points 3 and 4.

<sup>268</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 3 and 4, and the answer given under point 6.

<sup>269</sup> This also covers those measures /sub-measures which have shown secondary effects during the evaluation not only those who have been planned to contribute additionally to focus areas other than those programmed during the programme design.

*[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]*

**2. Link between judgment criteria, common and additional<sup>270</sup> result indicators used to answer the CEQ**

*[Mandatory]*

<b>Judgment criteria<sup>271</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Common result indicators<sup>272</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Additional result indicators and information<sup>273</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>
The supply of renewable energy has increased	R15: Renewable energy produced from supported projects; T16: Total investment in renewable energy production.	
The use of renewable energy has increased		Total investments for the use of renewable energy supported by the RDP; Renewable energy used in supported holdings.

**3. Methods applied<sup>274</sup>**

**Quantitative methods<sup>275</sup>:**

- i. Reasons for using the method
- ii. Description of methods to calculate ratios, gross or net (if applicable)

<sup>270</sup> Additional indicators are used if the common indicators are not sufficient to answer the CEQ, and if the success is specified with judgment criteria which are not measured with the common indicators.

<sup>271</sup> List judgment criteria used to specify the success of the intervention within the FA. The judgment criteria proposed by the WD: "Common Evaluation Questions for rural development programmes 2014-2020" are pre-filled in the table. Stakeholders in MS can propose their own judgment criteria to specify success in line with the specific intervention logic of the FA. In the system for answering the CEQ 1 – 21 one judgment criterion is linked to one result indicator (common or additional).

<sup>272</sup> List common result indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the indicators are listed in a consistent way with the judgment criteria and placed in the same line.

<sup>273</sup> List additional indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the judgment criteria are listed in a consistent way with the additional indicators and placed in the same line. Additional indicators filled in this column are those proposed in the WD: Common Evaluation Questions for rural Development Programmes 2014-2020 as “additional information”. MS can use their own additional indicators and information if they consider the pre-filled ones as not relevant for the specific RDP.

<sup>274</sup> In case the same method<sup>271</sup> was used in answering several evaluation questions, the description does not need to be repeated in all respective tables. It is sufficient just to provide the reference to the respective table of the SFC template, point 7, where the method is described in detail.

<sup>275</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of all complementary result indicators and all other indicators including additional ones, apart from those which are measured in absolute values and as a ratio and which can be deducted directly from the monitoring system.

values of common and additional result indicators, or other indicators used (output, common context indicators)<sup>276</sup>

- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

**Qualitative methods:**

- i. Reasons for using the method<sup>277</sup>
- ii. Description of methods used<sup>278</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

*[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]*

---

<sup>276</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

<sup>277</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP results linked to FA 5C - introductory qualitative analysis, triangulation of quantitative findings, no data available (e.g. no RDP uptake under the FA 5C), etc.

<sup>278</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.



4. Quantitative values of indicators <sup>279</sup> and data sources							
<i>[Mandatory]</i>							
Indicator	Absolute value <sup>280</sup>	Ratio value <sup>281</sup>	Calculated gross value <sup>282</sup>			Calculated net value <sup>283</sup>	Data and information sources <sup>284</sup>
			Primary contributions	Secondary contributions, including LEADER/CLLD contributions	Total value		
<b>Common output indicators<sup>285</sup></b>							

<sup>279</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

<sup>280</sup> Value is aggregated from Pillar II operations database for output indicators, and/or from statistics databases for common target indicator T16 and common context indicators or additional indicators, if they are used to answer the common evaluation questions.

<sup>281</sup> This column is filled for the the additional indicators, if they are expressed in ratio values.

<sup>282</sup> The gross value of the complementary result indicator R15 is inserted here. The gross value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of RDP beneficiaries. The gross value of indicator is inserted also in case the net value has been inserted in the table.

<sup>283</sup> The net value of the complementary result indicator R15 (in case it was possible to calculate it) is inserted here. The net value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Net value is the value of indicator attributed to the RDP intervention. See the guidelines Assessment of RDP results, chapter 7.2. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>284</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, EU/national/regional statistics, GIS, etc.

<sup>285</sup> The common output indicators can be also used, especially if the value of output indicator is necessary to calculate the result indicator or in case it provides important information for answering the evaluation question, e.g. total investment € (O2), etc. The selection of output indicators for answering the evaluation question is done in MS.

<b>Common result indicator</b>	<b>T16 Total investment in renewable energy production</b>							
	<b>R15 – Renewable energy produced from supported projects (Tonnes of oil equivalent)</b>							
<b>Additional result indicators</b> 286								
<b>Common Context indicators</b> 287								

<sup>286</sup> Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation questions in case the common indicators are considered insufficient for this purpose.

<sup>287</sup> The common context indicators can be also used to answer common evaluation questions if relevant (e. g. CCI 43, CCI 44).

<b>5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>288</sup></b> <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
<b>6. Answer to evaluation question<sup>289</sup></b> <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
<b>7. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>290</sup></b>	
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i>	<b>Recommendation</b> <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i>
<b>C.1</b>	<b>R.1</b>
<b>C.2</b>	<b>R.2</b>
<b>C.3</b>	<b>R.3</b>

## COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 14

<b>COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 14: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS CONTRIBUTED TO REDUCING GHG AND AMMONIA EMISSIONS FROM AGRICULTURE?”</b>
<b>1. List of measures contributing to the FA 5D</b>  <b>Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:</b>  <b>Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 5D<sup>291</sup>:</b>

<sup>288</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>289</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the analysis presented under points 3 and 4.

<sup>290</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 3 and 4 and the answer given under point 6.

<sup>291</sup> This also covers those measures /sub-measures which have shown secondary effects during the evaluation not only those who have been planned to contribute additionally to focus areas other than those programmed during the programme design.

*[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]*

**2. Link between judgment criteria, common and additional<sup>292</sup> result indicators used to answer the CEQ**

*[Mandatory]*

<b>Judgment criteria<sup>293</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Common result indicators<sup>294</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Additional result indicators and information<sup>295</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>
GHG and ammonia emissions from agriculture has been reduced	R16/T17: Percentage of LU (live-stock Unit) concerned by investments in live-stock management in view of reducing GHG (Green House Gas) and/or ammonia emissions;  R17/T18: Percentage of agricultural land under management contracts targeting reduction of GHG and/or ammonia emissions;  R18: Reduced emissions of methane and nitrous oxide;  R19: Reduced ammonia emissions.	

**3. Methods applied<sup>296</sup>**

<sup>292</sup> Additional indicators are used if the common indicators are not sufficient to answer the CEQ, and if the success is specified with judgment criteria which are not measured with the common indicators.

<sup>293</sup> List judgment criteria used to specify the success of the intervention within the FA. The judgment criteria proposed by the WD: "Common Evaluation Questions for rural development programmes 2014-2020" are pre-filled in the table. Stakeholders in MS can propose their own judgment criteria to specify success in line with the specific intervention logic of the FA. In the system for answering the CEQ 1 – 21 one judgment criterion is linked to one result indicator (common or additional).

<sup>294</sup> List common result indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the indicators are listed in a consistent way with the judgment criteria and placed in the same line.

<sup>295</sup> List additional indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the judgment criteria are listed in a consistent way with the additional indicators and placed in the same line. Additional indicators filled in this column are those proposed in the WD: Common Evaluation Questions for rural Development Programmes 2014-2020 as "additional information". MS can use their own additional indicators and information if they consider the pre-filled ones as not relevant for the specific RDP.

<sup>296</sup> In case the same method was used in answering several evaluation questions, the description does not need to be repeated in all respective tables. It is sufficient just to provide the reference to the respective table of the SFC template, point 7, where the method is described in detail.

**Quantitative methods<sup>297</sup>:**

- i. Reasons for using the method
- ii. Description of methods to calculate ratios, gross or net (if applicable) values of common and additional result indicators, or other indicators used (output, common context indicators)<sup>298</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

**Qualitative methods:**

- i. Reasons for using the method<sup>299</sup>
- ii. Description of methods used<sup>300</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

*[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]*

---

<sup>297</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of all complementary result indicators and all other indicators including additional ones, apart from those which are measured in absolute values and as a ratio and which can be deducted directly from the monitoring system.

<sup>298</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

<sup>299</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP results linked to FA 5D - introductory qualitative analysis, triangulation of quantitative findings, no data available (e.g. no RDP uptake under the FA 5D), etc.

<sup>300</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

4. Quantitative values of indicators <sup>301</sup> and data sources								
<i>[Mandatory]</i>								
Indicator		Absolute value <sup>302</sup>	Ratio value <sup>303</sup>	Calculated gross value <sup>304</sup>			Calculated net value <sup>305</sup>	Data and information sources <sup>306</sup>
				Primary contributions	Secondary contributions, including LEADER/CLLD contributions	Total value		
Common output indicators <sup>307</sup>								
Common result indicators	R16/T17 – Percent							

<sup>301</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

<sup>302</sup> Value is aggregated from Pillar II operations database for output indicators, and/or from statistics databases for common context indicators or additional indicators, if they are used to answer the common evaluation questions.

<sup>303</sup> This column is filled for the common result/target indicators R16/T17 and R17/T18 and for additional if they are expressed in ratio values.

<sup>304</sup> The gross value of common complementary result indicators R18 and R19 are inserted here. The gross value of used common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of RDP beneficiaries. The gross value of indicator is inserted also in case the net value has been inserted in the table.

<sup>305</sup> The net value of common complementary result indicators R18 and R19 (in case it was possible to calculate it) is inserted here. The net value of used common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Net value is the value of indicator attributed to the RDP intervention. See the guidelines Assessment of RDP results, chapter 7.2. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>306</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, EU/national/regional statistics, GIS, etc.

<sup>307</sup> The common output indicators can be also used, especially if the value of output indicator is necessary to calculate the result indicator or in case it provides important information for answering the evaluation question, e.g. number of livestock units supported (O8), etc. The selection of output indicators for answering the evaluation question is done in MS.

<p>age of LU (Live-stock Unit) concerned by investments in livestock management in view of reducing the GHG, and/or ammonia emissions</p>							
<p>R17/T18 – Percent age of agricultural land under manage</p>							

<b>ment contract s targetin g reductio n of GHG, and/or ammoni a emission s</b>							
<b>R18 - Reduce d emission s of methane and nitrous oxide (CO2 equivale nt)</b>							
<b>R19 - Reduce d emission s of ammoni a from</b>							



	agriculture (Tonnes of ammonia)							
<b>Additional result indicators</b> 308								
<b>Common Context indicators</b> 309								

<sup>308</sup> Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation questions in case the common indicators are considered insufficient for this purpose.

<sup>309</sup> The common context indicators can be also used to answer common evaluation questions if relevant (e. g. CCI 18, CCI 21, CCI 45).

<p><b>5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>310</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>6. Answer to evaluation question<sup>311</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>7. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>312</sup></b></p>	
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i></p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i></p>
<b>C.1</b>	<b>R.1</b>
<b>C.2</b>	<b>R.2</b>
<b>C.3</b>	<b>R.3</b>

## COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 15

<p><b>COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 15: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS SUPPORTED CARBON CONSERVATION AND SEQUESTRATION IN AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY?”</b></p>
<p><b>1. List of measures contributing to the FA 5E</b></p> <p><b>Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:</b></p> <p><b>Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 5E<sup>313</sup>:</b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]</i></p>

<sup>310</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>311</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the analysis presented under points 3 and 4.

<sup>312</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 3 and 4 and the answer given under point 6.

<sup>313</sup> This also covers those measures /sub-measures which have shown secondary effects during the evaluation not only those who have been planned to contribute additionally to focus areas other than those programmed during the programme design.

**2. Link between judgment criteria, common and additional<sup>314</sup> result indicators used to answer the CEQ**

*[Mandatory]*

<b>Judgment criteria<sup>315</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Common result indicators<sup>316</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Additional result indicators and information<sup>317</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>
Carbon conservation and sequestration in agriculture and forestry has increased;  Agricultural and forestry land under enhanced management contract contributing to carbon sequestration has been enlarged	R20/T19: Percentage of agricultural and forest land under management contracts contributing to carbon sequestration and conservation	Additional information on carbon conservation and sequestration of the land under management contracts

**3. Methods applied<sup>318</sup>**

**Quantitative methods<sup>319</sup>:**

- i. Reasons for using the method
- ii. Description of methods to calculate ratios, gross or net (if applicable) values of common and additional result indicators, or other indicators used (output, common context indicators)<sup>320</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions

<sup>314</sup> Additional indicators are used if the common indicators are not sufficient to answer the CEQ, and if the success is specified with judgment criteria which are not measured with the common indicators.

<sup>315</sup> List judgment criteria used to specify the success of the intervention within the FA. The judgment criteria proposed by the WD: "Common Evaluation Questions for rural development programmes 2014-2020" are pre-filled in the table. Stakeholders in MS can propose their own judgment criteria to specify success in line with the specific intervention logic of the FA. In the system for answering the CEQ 1 – 21 one judgment criterion is linked to one result indicator (common or additional).

<sup>316</sup> List common result indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the indicators are listed in a consistent way with the judgment criteria and placed in the same line.

<sup>317</sup> List additional indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the judgment criteria are listed in a consistent way with the additional indicators and placed in the same line. Additional indicators filled in this column are those proposed in the WD: Common Evaluation Questions for rural Development Programmes 2014-2020 as "additional information". MS can use their own additional indicators and information if they consider the pre-filled ones as not relevant for the specific RDP.

<sup>318</sup> In case the same method was used in answering several evaluation questions, the description does not need to be repeated in all respective tables. It is sufficient just to provide the reference to the respective table of the SFC template, point 7, where the method is described in detail.

<sup>319</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of all complementary result indicators and all other indicators including additional ones, apart from those which are measured in absolute values and as a ratio and which can be deducted directly from the monitoring system.

<sup>320</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

encountered

**Qualitative methods:**

- i. Reasons for using the method<sup>321</sup>
- ii. Description of methods used<sup>322</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

*[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]*

---

<sup>321</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP results linked to FA 5E - introductory qualitative analysis, triangulation of quantitative findings, no data available (e.g. no RDP uptake under the FA 5E), etc.

<sup>322</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

#### 4. Quantitative values of indicators<sup>323</sup> and data sources

[Mandatory]

Indicator		Absolute value <sup>324</sup>	Ratio value <sup>325</sup>	Calculated gross value <sup>326</sup>	Calculated net value <sup>327</sup>	Data and information sources <sup>328</sup>
Common output indicators <sup>329</sup>						
Common result indicators	R20/T19 – Percentage of agricultural and forest land under management contracts contributing to					

<sup>323</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

<sup>324</sup> Value is aggregated from Pillar II operations database for output indicators, and/or from statistics databases for common context indicators or additional indicators, if they are used to answer the common evaluation questions.

<sup>325</sup> This column is filled for the common result/target indicator R20/T19 and for additional indicators, if they are expressed in ratio values.

<sup>326</sup> The gross value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of RDP beneficiaries. The gross value of indicator is inserted also in case the net value has been inserted in the table. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>327</sup> The net value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Net value is the value of indicator attributed to the RDP intervention. See the guidelines Assessment of RDP results, chapter 7.2. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>328</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, EU/national/regional statistics, GIS, etc.

<sup>329</sup> The common output indicators can be also used, especially if the value of output indicator is necessary to calculate the result indicator or in case it provides important information for answering the evaluation question, e.g. total area (afforested with agroforestry systems, under agri-environmental-climate, O5), etc. The selection of output indicators for answering the evaluation question is done in MS.

	<b>carbon sequestration and conservation</b>					
<b>Additional result indicators<sup>330</sup></b>						
<b>Common Context indicators<sup>331</sup></b>						

<sup>330</sup> Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation questions in case the common indicators are considered insufficient for this purpose.

<sup>331</sup> The common context indicators can be also used to answer common evaluation questions if relevant (e. g. CCI 33, CCI 41).

<p><b>5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>332</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>6. Answer to evaluation question<sup>333</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>7. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>334</sup></b></p>	
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i></p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i></p>
<b>C.1</b>	<b>R.1</b>
<b>C.2</b>	<b>R.2</b>
<b>C.3</b>	<b>R.3</b>

## COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 16

<p><b>COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 16: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS SUPPORTED THE DIVERSIFICATION, CREATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF SMALL ENTERPRISES AND JOB CREATION?”</b></p>
<p><b>1. List of measures contributing to the FA 6A</b></p> <p><b>Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:</b></p> <p><b>Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 6A<sup>335</sup>:</b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]</i></p>

<sup>332</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>333</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the analysis presented under points 3 and 4.

<sup>334</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 3 and 4 and the answer given under point 6.

<sup>335</sup> This also covers those measures /sub-measures which have shown secondary effects during the evaluation not only those who have been planned to contribute additionally to focus areas other than those programmed during the programme design.

**2. Link between judgment criteria, common and additional<sup>336</sup> result indicators used to answer the CEQ**

*[Mandatory]*

<b>Judgment criteria<sup>337</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Common result indicators<sup>338</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Additional result indicators and information<sup>339</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>
Jobs have been created	R21/T20: Jobs created in supported projects	
Small enterprises have been created		Percentage of new small enterprises created with RDP support
Small enterprises have diversified their economic activity		Percentage of small enterprises in the non-agricultural sector created with the RDP support

**3. Methods applied<sup>340</sup>**

**Quantitative methods<sup>341</sup>:**

- i. Reasons for using the method
- ii. Description of methods to calculate ratios, gross or net (if applicable) values of common and additional result indicators, or other indicators used (output, common context indicators)<sup>342</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

<sup>336</sup> Additional indicators are used if the common indicators are not sufficient to answer the CEQ, and if the success is specified with judgment criteria which are not measured with the common indicators.

<sup>337</sup> List judgment criteria used to specify the success of the intervention within the FA. The judgment criteria proposed by the WD: "Common Evaluation Questions for rural development programmes 2014-2020" are pre-filled in the table. Stakeholders in MS can propose their own judgment criteria to specify success in line with the specific intervention logic of the FA. In the system for answering the CEQ 1 – 21 one judgment criterion is linked to one result indicator (common or additional).

<sup>338</sup> List common result indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the indicators are listed in a consistent way with the judgment criteria and placed in the same line.

<sup>339</sup> List additional indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the judgment criteria are listed in a consistent way with the additional indicators and placed in the same line. Additional indicators filled in this column are those proposed in the WD: Common Evaluation Questions for rural Development Programmes 2014-2020 as "additional information". MS can use their own additional indicators and information if they consider the pre-filled ones as not relevant for the specific RDP.

<sup>340</sup> In case the same method was used in answering several evaluation questions, the description does not need to be repeated in all respective tables. It is sufficient just to provide the reference to the respective table of the SFC template, point 7, where the method is described in detail.

<sup>341</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of all complementary result indicators and all other indicators including additional ones, apart from those which are measured in absolute values and as a ratio and which can be deducted directly from the monitoring system.

<sup>342</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.



**Qualitative methods:**

- i. Reasons for using the method<sup>343</sup>
- ii. Description of methods used<sup>344</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

*[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]*

**4. Quantitative values of indicators<sup>345</sup> and data sources**

*[Mandatory]*

Indicator	Absolute value <sup>346</sup>	Ratio value <sup>347</sup>	Calculated gross value <sup>348</sup>	Calculated net value <sup>349</sup>	Data and information sources <sup>350</sup>
<b>Common output indicators<sup>351</sup></b>					

<sup>343</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP results linked to FA 6A - introductory qualitative analysis, triangulation of quantitative findings, no data available (e.g. no RDP uptake under the FA 6A), etc.

<sup>344</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

<sup>345</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

<sup>346</sup> Value is aggregated from Pillar II operations database for output indicators, and/or from statistics databases for additional and common context indicators or additional indicators, if they are used to answer the common evaluation questions.

<sup>347</sup> This column is filled for additional result indicators if they are expressed in ratio values. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>348</sup> The gross value of the common result/target indicator R21/T20 is inserted here. The gross value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of RDP beneficiaries. The gross value of indicator is inserted also in case the net value has been inserted in the table. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>349</sup> The net value of the common result/target indicator R21/T20 (in case it was possible to calculate it) is inserted here. The net value of used common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Net value is the value of indicator attributed to the RDP intervention. See the guidelines Assessment of RDP results, chapter 7.2. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>350</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, EU/national/regional statistics, GIS, etc.

<sup>351</sup> The common output indicators can be also used, especially if the value of output indicator is necessary to calculate the result indicator or in case it provides important information for answering the evaluation question, e.g. number of beneficiaries/holdings, e.g. supported for investment in processing and marketing, or receiving support for investment in non-agriculture activities (O4), etc. The selection of output indicators for answering the evaluation question is done in MS.

<b>Common result indicators</b>	<b>R21/T20 - Jobs created in supported projects</b>					
<b>Additional result indicators<sup>352</sup></b>						
<b>Common Context indicators<sup>353</sup></b>						

<sup>352</sup> Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation questions in case the common indicators are considered insufficient for this purpose.

<sup>353</sup> The common context indicators can be also used to answer common evaluation questions if relevant (e. g. CCI 5, CCI 6, CCI 7, CCI 10, CCI 11).

<p><b>5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>354</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>6. Answer to evaluation question<sup>355</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>7. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>356</sup></b></p>	
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i></p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non - Mandatory]</i></p>
<b>C.1</b>	<b>R.1</b>
<b>C.2</b>	<b>R.2</b>
<b>C.3</b>	<b>R.3</b>

## COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 17

<p><b>COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 17: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS SUPPORTED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT IN RURAL AREAS?”</b></p>
<p><b>1. List of measures contributing to the FA 6B</b></p> <p><b>Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:</b></p> <p><b>Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 6B<sup>357</sup>:</b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]</i></p>

<sup>354</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>355</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the analysis presented under points 3 and 4.

<sup>356</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 3 and 4 and the answer given under point 6.

<sup>357</sup> This also covers those measures /sub-measures which have shown secondary effects during the evaluation not only those who have been planned to contribute additionally to focus areas other than those programmed during the programme design.

**2. Link between judgment criteria, common and additional<sup>358</sup> result indicators used to answer the CEQ**

*[Mandatory]*

<b>Judgment criteria<sup>359</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Common result indicators<sup>360</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Additional result indicators and information<sup>361</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>
Employment opportunities have been created via local development strategies	R24/T23: Jobs created in supported projects (Leader)	
Rural territory and population covered by LAGs has increased	R22/T21: Percentage of rural population covered by local development strategies	
		Percentage of RDP expenditure in Leader measures with respect to total RDP expenditure
		Number of projects/initiatives supported by the Local Development Strategy
Access to services and local infrastructure has increased in rural areas  Services and local infrastructure in rural areas has improved	R23/T22: Percentage of rural population benefiting from improved services/infrastructures	
Rural people have participated in local actions		

<sup>358</sup> Additional indicators are used if the common indicators are not sufficient to answer the CEQ, and if the success is specified with judgment criteria which are not measured with the common indicators.

<sup>359</sup> List judgment criteria used to specify the success of the intervention within the FA. The judgment criteria proposed by the WD: "Common Evaluation Questions for rural development programmes 2014-2020" are pre-filled in the table. Stakeholders in MS can propose their own judgment criteria to specify success in line with the specific intervention logic of the FA. In the system for answering the CEQ 1 – 21 one judgment criterion is linked to one result indicator (common or additional).

<sup>360</sup> List common result indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the indicators are listed in a consistent way with the judgment criteria and placed in the same line.

<sup>361</sup> List additional indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the judgment criteria are listed in a consistent way with the additional indicators and placed in the same line. Additional indicators filled in this column are those proposed in the WD: Common Evaluation Questions for rural Development Programmes 2014-2020 as "additional information". MS can use their own additional indicators and information if they consider the pre-filled ones as not relevant for the specific RDP.

Rural people have benefited from local actions		
<p><b>3. Methods applied<sup>362</sup></b></p> <p><b>Quantitative methods<sup>363</sup>:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Reasons for using the method</li> <li>ii. Description of methods to calculate ratios, gross or net (if applicable) values of common and additional result indicators, or other indicators used (output, common context indicators)<sup>364</sup></li> <li>iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered</li> </ul> <p><b>Qualitative methods:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Reasons for using the method<sup>365</sup></li> <li>ii. Description of methods used<sup>366</sup></li> <li>iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered</li> </ul> <p><i>[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]</i></p>		

<sup>362</sup> In case the same method was used in answering several evaluation questions, the description does not need to be repeated in all respective tables. It is sufficient just to provide the reference to the respective table of the SFC template, point 7, where the method is described in detail.

<sup>363</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of all complementary result indicators and all other indicators including additional ones, apart from those which are measured in absolute values and as a ratio and which can be deducted directly from the monitoring system.

<sup>364</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

<sup>365</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP results linked to FA 6B - introductory qualitative analysis, triangulation of quantitative findings, no data available (e.g. no RDP uptake under the FA 6B), etc.

<sup>366</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

#### 4. Quantitative values of indicators<sup>367</sup> and data sources

[Mandatory]

Indicator		Absolute value <sup>368</sup>	Ratio value <sup>369</sup>	Calculated gross value <sup>370</sup>	Calculated net value <sup>371</sup>	Data and information sources <sup>372</sup>
Common output indicators <sup>373</sup>						
Common result indicators	R24/T23 - Jobs created in supported projects (Leader)					
	R22/T21 - percentage of					

<sup>367</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

<sup>368</sup> Value is aggregated from Pillar II operations database for output indicators, and/or from statistics databases for additional and common context indicators or additional indicators, if they are used to answer the common evaluation questions.

<sup>369</sup> This column is filled for the common result/target indicator R22/T21, R23/T22, and additional indicators if they are expressed in ratio values. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>370</sup> The gross value of the common result/target indicator R24/T23 is inserted here. The gross value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of RDP beneficiaries. The gross value of indicator is inserted also in case the net value has been inserted in the table. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>371</sup> The net value of the common result/target indicator R24/T23 (in case it was possible to calculate it) is inserted here. The net value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Net value is the value of indicator attributed to the RDP intervention. See the guidelines Assessment of RDP results, chapter 7.2. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>372</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, EU/national/regional statistics, GIS, etc.

<sup>373</sup> The common output indicators can be also used, especially if the value of output indicator is necessary to calculate the result indicator or in case it provides important information for answering the evaluation question, e.g. all LEADER related output indicators, number of actions/operation supported (O3), number of beneficiaries/holdings (O4), population benefiting from improved services (O15), etc. The selection of output indicators for answering the evaluation question is done in MS.

	rural population covered by local development strategies					
	R23/T22 - percentage of rural population benefiting from improved services/infrastructures					
<b>Additional result indicators</b> <sup>374</sup>						
<b>Common Context indicators</b> <sup>375</sup>						

<sup>374</sup> Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation questions in case the common indicators are considered insufficient for this purpose.

<sup>375</sup> The common context indicators can be also used to answer common evaluation questions if relevant (e. g. CCI 1, CCI 2, CCI 3, CCI 8, CCI 10, CCI 12).

<b>5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>376</sup></b> <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
<b>6. Answer to evaluation question<sup>377</sup></b> <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
<b>7. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>378</sup></b>	
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters- Mandatory]</i>	<b>Recommendation</b> <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i>
<b>C.1</b>	<b>R.1</b>
<b>C.2</b>	<b>R.2</b>
<b>C.3</b>	<b>R.3</b>

## COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 18

<p><b>COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 18: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS ENHANCED THE ACCESSIBILITY, USE AND QUALITY OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES (ICT) IN RURAL AREAS?”</b></p>
<p><b>1. List of measures contributing to the FA 6C</b></p> <p><b>Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:</b></p> <p><b>Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 6C<sup>379</sup>:</b></p>

<sup>376</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>377</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the analysis presented under points 3 and 4.

<sup>378</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 3 and 4 and the answer given under point 6.

<sup>379</sup> This also covers those measures /sub-measures which have shown secondary effects during the evaluation not only those who have been planned to contribute additionally to focus areas other than those programmed during the programme design.



*[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]*

**2. Link between judgment criteria, common and additional<sup>380</sup> result indicators used to answer the CEQ**

*[Mandatory]*

<b>Judgment criteria<sup>381</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Common result indicators<sup>382</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Additional result indicators and information<sup>383</sup></b> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>
Access of rural households to ICT has increased	R25/T24: Percentage of rural population benefiting from new or improved services/infrastructures (Information and Common Technology - ICT)	Percentage of rural households accessing ICT with the RDP support

**3. Methods applied<sup>384</sup>**

**Quantitative methods<sup>385</sup>:**

- i. Reasons for using the method
- ii. Description of methods to calculate ratios, gross or net (if applicable) values of common and additional result indicators, or other indicators used (output, common context indicators)<sup>386</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions

<sup>380</sup> Additional indicators are used if the common indicators are not sufficient to answer the CEQ, and if the success is specified with judgment criteria which are not measured with the common indicators.

<sup>381</sup> List judgment criteria used to specify the success of the intervention within the FA. The judgment criteria proposed by the WD: "Common Evaluation Questions for rural development programmes 2014-2020" are pre-filled in the table. Stakeholders in MS can propose their own judgment criteria to specify success in line with the specific intervention logic of the FA. In the system for answering the CEQ 1 – 21 one judgment criterion is linked to one result indicator (common or additional).

<sup>382</sup> List common result indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the indicators are listed in a consistent way with the judgment criteria and placed in the same line.

<sup>383</sup> List additional indicators used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the judgment criteria are listed in a consistent way with the additional indicators and placed in the same line. Additional indicators filled in this column are those proposed in the WD: Common Evaluation Questions for rural Development Programmes 2014-2020 as “additional information”. MS can use their own additional indicators and information if they consider the pre-filled ones as not relevant for the specific RDP.

<sup>384</sup> In case the same method was used in answering several evaluation questions, the description does not need to be repeated in all respective tables. It is sufficient just to provide the reference to the respective table of the SFC template, point 7, where the method is described in detail.

<sup>385</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of all complementary result indicators and all other indicators including additional ones, apart from those which are measured in absolute values or as a ratio and which can be deducted directly from the monitoring system.

<sup>386</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

encountered

**Qualitative methods:**

- i. Reasons for using the method<sup>387</sup>
- ii. Description of methods used<sup>388</sup>
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

*[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]*

#### 4. Quantitative values of indicators<sup>389</sup> and data sources

*[Mandatory]*

Indicator		Absolute value <sup>390</sup>	Ratio value <sup>391</sup>	Calculated gross value <sup>392</sup>	Calculated net value <sup>393</sup>	Data and information sources <sup>394</sup>
Common output indicators <sup>395</sup>						
Common	R25/T24					

<sup>387</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP results linked to FA 6C - introductory qualitative analysis, triangulation of quantitative findings, no data available (e.g. no RDP uptake under the FA 6C), etc.

<sup>388</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

<sup>389</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

<sup>390</sup> Value is aggregated from Pillar II operations database for output indicators, and/or from statistics databases for common context indicators or additional indicators, if they are used to answer the common evaluation questions.

<sup>391</sup> This column is filled for the common result/target indicator R23/T22 and additional indicators if they are expressed in ratio values.

<sup>392</sup> The gross value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of RDP beneficiaries. The gross value of indicator is inserted also in case the net value has been inserted in the table. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>393</sup> The net value of used additional indicators and common context indicators is inserted here as well, if they are not expressed in ratio values. Net value is the value of indicator attributed to the RDP intervention. See the guidelines Assessment of RDP results, chapter 7.2. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>394</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, EU/national/regional statistics, GIS, etc.

<sup>395</sup> The common output indicators can be also used, especially if the value of output indicator is necessary to calculate the result indicator or in case it provides important information for answering the evaluation question, e.g. number of actions/operations supported (O3), number of beneficiaries (O3), population benefiting from improved services, etc. The selection of output indicators for answering the evaluation question is done in MS.

<b>result indicators</b>	<b>percentage of rural population benefiting from new or improved services / infrastructures (ICT)</b>					
<b>Additional result indicators</b> <small>396</small>						
<b>Common Context indicators</b> <small>397</small>						

<sup>396</sup> Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation questions in case the common indicators are considered insufficient for this purpose.

<sup>397</sup> The common context indicators can be also used to answer common evaluation questions if relevant (e. g. CCI 1).

**5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>398</sup>**

*[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]*

**6. Answer to evaluation question<sup>399</sup>**

*[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]*

**7. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>400</sup>**

**Conclusion**

*[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]*

**Recommendation**

*[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]*

**C.1**

**R.1**

**C.2**

**R.2**

**C.3**

**R.3**

<sup>398</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>399</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the analysis presented under points 3 and 4.

<sup>400</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 3 and 4 and the answer given under point 6.

# 1. COMMON EVALUATION QUESTIONS RELATED TO OTHER RDP ASPECTS

## 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?”**

### 1. Programme synergies and transverse effects

**Programme synergies (positive transverse effects) between measures, between focus areas and between priorities<sup>401</sup>:**

*[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]*

### 2. Methods applied

**Quantitative methods:**

- i. Reasons for using the method
- ii. Description of the method to assess synergies between focus areas and between RD priorities, taking in consideration the primary and secondary contributions of operations to focus areas.
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

**Qualitative methods:**

- i. Reasons for using the method<sup>402</sup>
- ii. Description of methods used
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

*[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]*

### 3. Quantitative findings based on the calculation of secondary contributions of operations to focus areas<sup>403</sup>

*[Mandatory]*

<sup>401</sup> Highlight and list synergies between measures, e.g. Art. 17 – Art. 19, between focus areas and between RD priorities, e.g. between focus areas: 2A – 6A, 2A – 6A etc., between priorities: e.g. priority 2 – priority 6, etc.

<sup>402</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP synergies.

<sup>403</sup> Here the findings from the calculation of common, additional and common context indicators, applied in the assessment of programme results (see also focus areas related CEQs and their answers) are used. Moreover, secondary contributions of operations programmed under other focus areas to the value of calculated indicator should be highlighted. The aim is to show if the contributions are significant or not. The high contributions indicate the high synergy between focus areas and vice versa, the low contributions indicate low synergy.

<p><b>4. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>404</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>5. Answer to evaluation question<sup>405</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i></p>	
<p><b>6. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>406</sup></b></p>	
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i></p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i></p>
<b>C.1</b>	<b>R.1</b>
<b>C.2</b>	<b>R.2</b>
<b>C.3</b>	<b>R.3</b>

## COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 20

<p><b>COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 20: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CONTRIBUTED TO ACHIEVING THE OBJECTIVES LAID DOWN IN ARTICLE 59 OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013 AND ART. 51(2) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1305/2013?”</b></p>
<p><b>1. Support for technical assistance (other than NRN)</b></p> <p><b>Activities under the TA:<sup>407</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]</i></p>
<p><b>2. Link between judgment criteria and additional indicators used to answer the</b></p>

<sup>404</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>405</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the quantitative and qualitative analysis presented under points 2 and 3.

<sup>406</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 2 and 3 and the answer given under point 5.

<sup>407</sup> Activities envisioned to be implemented via technical assistance other than NRN are listed here

<b>CEQ</b>	
<i>[Mandatory]</i>	
<b>Judgment criteria</b> <sup>408</sup> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Additional indicators</b> <sup>409</sup> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>
Institutional and administrative capacities for the effective management of the RDP have been strengthened	Number of staff involved in RDP management Skills of staff involved in RDP management Functionality of the IT system for programme management
Capacities of relevant partners as defined by the Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013, Art. 5(1) have been reinforced	Types and number of capacity building activities
RDP has been communicated with the public and information has been disseminated	Number of RDP communication and dissemination activities Number of people receiving information about the RDP Information on the use of evaluation results
Monitoring has been improved	
Evaluation methods have been improved and have provided robust evaluation results	
The RDP implementation has been improved	The length of the application and payment process
Administrative burden on beneficiaries has been reduced	
<p><b>3. Methods applied</b></p> <p><b>Quantitative methods</b><sup>410</sup>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Reasons for using the method</li> <li>ii. Description of method</li> <li>iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered</li> </ul> <p><b>Qualitative methods:</b></p>	

<sup>408</sup> Judgment criteria pre-filled in this table are those spelled in the WD Common evaluation questions for Rural Development Programmes 2014-2020. Stakeholders in MS can develop their own judgment criteria.

<sup>409</sup> List additional indicators used in answering the CEQ. Additional indicators should be in consistency with judgment criteria. In this table are pre-filled the additional indicators as spelled in the WD Common evaluation questions for Rural Development Programmes 2014-2020- Stakeholders in MS can develop their own additional indicators.

<sup>410</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of additional result indicators (if applied) apart from those which are deducted directly from the monitoring system.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Reasons for using the method<sup>411</sup></li> <li>ii. Description of methods used</li> <li>iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered</li> </ul> <p><i>[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]</i></p>				
<p><b>4. Quantitative values of indicators<sup>412</sup> and data sources</b></p> <p><i>[Mandatory]</i></p>				
<b>Indicator</b>		<b>Absolute value<sup>413</sup></b>	<b>Ratio value<sup>414</sup></b>	<b>Data and information sources<sup>415</sup></b>
<b>Common output indicators<sup>416</sup></b>				
<b>Additional indicators<sup>417</sup></b>				
<p><b>5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>418</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i></p>				
<p><b>6. Answer to evaluation question<sup>419</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i></p>				
<p><b>7. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>420</sup></b></p>				

<sup>411</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP technical assistance.

<sup>412</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

<sup>413</sup> Value is aggregated from Pillar II operations database for output indicators, and/or from MA monitoring tables for additional indicators, if they are used to answer the common evaluation questions.

<sup>414</sup> This column is filled for the additional indicators, if they are expressed as ratio.

<sup>415</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, MA statistics, etc.

<sup>416</sup> The common output indicators can be also used. The selection of output indicators for answering the evaluation question is done in MS.

<sup>417</sup> Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation question.

<sup>418</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>419</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the quantitative and qualitative analysis presented under points 3 and 4.

<sup>420</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 3 and 4 and the answer given under point 6.



<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i>	<i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i>
<b>C.1</b>	<b>R.1</b>
<b>C.2</b>	<b>R.2</b>
<b>C.3</b>	<b>R.3</b>

## COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 21

<p><b>COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 21: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAS THE NATIONAL RURAL NETWORK CONTRIBUTED TO ACHIEVING THE OBJECTIVES LAID DOWN IN ARTICLE 54(2) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1305/2013?”</b></p>
<p><b>1. Intervention logic of the NRN</b></p> <p><b>Common objectives and linked group of activities (both common and NRN specific):<sup>421</sup></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Group of activity:</b></li> </ul> <p><b>NRN specific objectives and linked groups of activities (both common and NRN specific):<sup>422</sup></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Group of activity:</b></li> </ul> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]</i></p>
<p><b>2. Link between judgment criteria and additional NRN specific indicators used to answer the CEQ</b></p> <p><i>[Mandatory]</i></p>

<sup>421</sup> Each of the common NRN objective is linked to groups activities (both common of Art. 54(3) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 and NRN specific defined in MS), listed in bullet points under the common objective

<sup>422</sup> Each of the NRN specific objective is linked to groups activities (both common of Art. 54(3) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 and NRN specific defined in MS), listed in bullet points under the common objective

<b>Judgment criteria</b> <sup>423</sup> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<b>Additional NRN specific result indicators</b> <sup>424</sup> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>
Number and types of stakeholders involved in RDP implementation has increased	Number of stakeholders (by type) participating in the implementation of the RDP due to activities of the NRN (including those through LAGs)
The quality of implementation of the RDP has been improved through the activities of the NRN, e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved capacity of RDP beneficiaries</li> <li>• Improved evaluation awareness</li> <li>• Lessons from evaluations are taken into account in programme implementation</li> </ul>	Number of RDP modifications based on evaluation findings and recommendations from thematic working groups organized by the NRN
Broader public and potential beneficiaries are aware of the rural development policy and funding opportunities through activities of the NRN	% of RDP implemented projects encouraged by NRN(P) activities  Number persons that have been informed about the rural development policy and funding opportunities through the NRN communication tools
Innovation in agriculture, food production forestry and rural areas has been fostered by the NRN opportunities	% of innovative projects encouraged by NRN out of the total number of innovative projects supported by the RDP(s)
<p><b>3. Methods applied</b></p> <p><b>Quantitative methods</b><sup>425</sup>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Reasons for using the method</li> <li>ii. Description of methods to assess additional indicators</li> <li>iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered</li> </ol> <p><b>Qualitative methods:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Reasons for using the method<sup>426</sup></li> <li>ii. Description of methods used</li> <li>iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered</li> </ol>	

<sup>423</sup> The judgment criteria proposed by the WD: "Common Evaluation Questions for rural development programmes 2014-2020" are pre-filled in the table. Stakeholders in MS can propose their own judgment criteria to specify success of the NRN.

<sup>424</sup> List additional indicators used in answering the CEQ. Additional indicators should be in consistency with judgment criteria. In this table are pre-filled the additional indicators as spelled in the WD Common evaluation questions for Rural Development Programmes 2014-2020- Stakeholders in MS can develop their own additional indicators.

<sup>425</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of additional result indicators, apart from those which can be deducted directly from the monitoring system.

<sup>426</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the NRN results.

*[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]*

**4. Quantitative values of indicators<sup>427</sup> and data sources**

*[Mandatory]*

Indicator		Absolute value <sup>428</sup>	Ratio value <sup>429</sup>	Calculated gross value <sup>430</sup>	Calculated net value <sup>431</sup>	Data information sources <sup>432</sup> and
<b>Output indicators</b> (common and NRN specific) <sup>433</sup>						
<b>Additional result indicators</b> <sup>434</sup>						

**5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>435</sup>**

*[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]*

**6. Answer to evaluation question<sup>436</sup>**

<sup>427</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

<sup>428</sup> Value is aggregated from Pillar II operations database for output indicators, and/or from MA statistics for additional indicators, if they are used to answer the common evaluation questions.

<sup>429</sup> This column is filled for the additional indicators with ratio value.

<sup>430</sup> This column contains the gross value of additional indicators if they are not expressed in ratio values. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of beneficiaries. Gross value is inserted here also in case the net value of the same indicator has been calculated.

<sup>431</sup> This column contains the net value of additional indicators if they are not expressed in ratio values. Net value is the value of indicator attributed to the NRN intervention. See guidelines for NRN evaluation, chapter 3.1 – 3.4

<sup>432</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, MA statistics, etc.

<sup>433</sup> The common output indicators used to monitor NRN activities are: number of thematic and analytical exchanges set up with the support of NRN (O24), number of NRN communication tools (O25). Number of ENRD activities in which the NRN has participated (O26). MS may also apply NRN specific output indicators to capture outputs of NRN specific groups of activities.

<sup>434</sup> Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation question.

<sup>435</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>436</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the analysis presented under points 3 and 4.

*[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]*

**7. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>437</sup>**

**Conclusion**

*[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]*

**Recommendation**

*[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]*

**C.1**

**R.1**

**C.2**

**R.2**

**C.3**

**R.3**

---

<sup>437</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 3 and 4 and the answer given under point 6.

## 2. PROGRAMME SPECIFIC EVALUATION QUESTIONS

### PROGRAMME SPECIFIC EVALUATION QUESTION LINKED TO PROGRAMME SPECIFIC FOCUS AREAS<sup>438</sup>

<p><b>PROGRAMME SPECIFIC FOCUS AREA (PSEQ):<sup>439</sup></b></p> <p><b>PROGRAMME SPECIFIC EVALUATION QUESTION NO:<sup>440</sup></b></p>		
<p><b>1. Rational for programme specific focus area<sup>441</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]</i></p>		
<p><b>2. List of measures contributing to the programme specific FA</b></p> <p><b>Programmed measures/sub-measures:</b></p> <p><b>Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs (common and programme specific) which show secondary contributions to programme specific FA<sup>442</sup>:</b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]</i></p>		
<p><b>3. Link between judgment criteria and common and /or programme specific result indicators<sup>443</sup> used to answer the PSEQ</b></p> <p><i>[Mandatory]</i></p>		
<p><b>Programme specific judgment criteria<sup>444</sup></b></p>	<p><b>Common result indicators<sup>445</sup></b></p>	<p><b>Programme specific result indicators<sup>446</sup></b></p>

<sup>438</sup> In case the RDP includes several programme specific focus areas, the table for programme specific evaluation question should be multiplied in the SFC template accordingly.

<sup>439</sup> Insert the number and title of the programme specific focus area, e.g. 2C – “Improving the economic performance and market participation of forestry enterprises”

<sup>440</sup> 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?”

<sup>441</sup> Explain reasons why the programme specific focus area has been introduced in the RDP, linking it to the SWOT and needs assessment and to the overall RDP intervention logic.

<sup>442</sup> This covers measures /sub-measures which have shown secondary contribution during the evaluation not only those who have been planned to contribute additionally to focus areas other than those programmed during the programme design.

<sup>443</sup> Programme specific result indicators are used to answer the PSEQ. Common indicators can be also used if relevant.

<i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	<i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>
<p><b>4. Methods applied<sup>447</sup></b></p> <p><b>Quantitative methods<sup>448</sup>:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Reasons for using the method</li> <li>ii. Description of methods to calculate ratios, gross or net (if applicable) values of common and programme specific indicators<sup>449</sup></li> <li>iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered</li> </ol> <p><b>Qualitative methods:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Reasons for using the method<sup>450</sup></li> <li>ii. Description of methods used<sup>451</sup></li> <li>iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered</li> </ol> <p><i>[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]</i></p>		
<p><b>5. Quantitative values of indicators<sup>452</sup> and data sources</b></p> <p><i>[Mandatory]</i></p>		

<sup>444</sup> Programme specific judgment criteria specify the success of the intervention under the programme specific focus area and are linked to common and programme specific indicators used to answer the PSEQ

<sup>445</sup> List common result indicators if used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the indicators are listed in a consistent way with the judgment criteria and placed in the same line.

<sup>446</sup> List programme specific result indicators used in answering the PSEQ in consistency with programme specific judgment criteria. Indicators must be in consistency with the judgment criteria.

<sup>447</sup> In case the same method was used in answering this PSEQ as in answering other evaluation questions, the description does not need to be repeated in all respective tables. It is sufficient just to provide the reference to the respective table of the SFC template, point 7, where the method is described in detail.

<sup>448</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of all common complementary result indicators and for programme specific indicators of similar nature, apart from those which can be deducted directly from the monitoring system.

<sup>449</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

<sup>450</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP results linked to programme specific FA - introductory qualitative analysis, triangulation of quantitative findings, no data available (e.g. no RDP uptake under the FA), etc.

<sup>451</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided.

<sup>452</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

Indicator		Absolute value <sup>453</sup>	Ratio value <sup>454</sup>	Calculated gross value <sup>455</sup>	Calculated net value <sup>456</sup>	Data information sources <sup>457</sup> and
Common output indicators <sup>458</sup>						
Programme specific output indicators <sup>459</sup>						
Common indicators <sup>460</sup>						
Programme specific indicators <sup>461</sup>						
<p><b>6. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings<sup>462</sup></b></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i></p>						

<sup>453</sup> Value is aggregated from Pillar II operations database for output indicators, and/or from statistics databases for common indicators or programme specific indicators, if they are used to answer the PSEQ.

<sup>454</sup> This column is filled for the common and programme specific indicators if they are expressed as ratio.

<sup>455</sup> This column is filled for gross values of common and programme specific indicators, if applicable. The gross value is inserted here also in net value was inserted in the table. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of RDP beneficiaries. If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>456</sup> This column is filled for net values of common and programme specific indicators, if applicable. Net value is the value of indicator attributed to the RDP intervention. See the guidelines Assessment of RDP results, chapter 7.2.

If there are secondary contributions or LEADER/CLLD contributions to the value of indicator, please explain under point 6 "Answer to evaluation questions".

<sup>457</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, EU/national/regional statistics, GIS etc.

<sup>458</sup> The common output indicators can be also used to answer the PSEQ. The selection of output indicators for answering the evaluation question is done in MS.

<sup>459</sup> The MS can also apply programme specific output indicators to answer the PSEQ.

<sup>460</sup> The common indicators can be also used to answer PSEQ. Decision which common indicators could be used in done in MS.

<sup>461</sup> PSEQ is answered with programme specific indicators which are developed in MS.

<sup>462</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<b>7. Answer to evaluation question<sup>463</sup></b> <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
<b>8. Conclusions and recommendations<sup>464</sup></b>	
<b>Conclusion</b> <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i>	<b>Recommendation</b> <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i>
<b>C.1</b>	<b>R.1</b>
<b>C.2</b>	<b>R.2</b>
<b>C.3</b>	<b>R.3</b>

**PROGRAMME SPECIFIC EVALUATION QUESTION  
LINKED TO PROGRAMME SPECIFIC EVALUATION  
TOPIC<sup>465</sup>**

<b>EVALUATION TOPIC<sup>466</sup>:</b>
<b>PROGRAMME SPECIFIC EVALUATION QUESTION NO<sup>467</sup>:</b>
<b>1. Rational for choosing the programme specific evaluation topic<sup>468</sup></b> <i>[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]</i>
<b>2. Link between judgment criteria and programme specific indicators<sup>469</sup> used to answer the PSEQ</b>

<sup>463</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the analysis presented under points 4 and 5.

<sup>464</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 4 and 5 and the answer given under point 7.

<sup>465</sup> 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 should be multiplied in the SFC template accordingly.

<sup>466</sup> Insert here the evaluation topic, e.g. „Programme delivery“

<sup>467</sup> 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?”

<sup>468</sup> Explain the reason why the programme specific evaluation topic has been chosen.

<sup>469</sup> Programme specific indicators are used to answer the PSEQ. They should be in consistency with the programme specific judgment criteria linked to the topic.



<i>[Mandatory]</i>					
<b>Programme specific judgment criteria</b> <sup>470</sup> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>			<b>Programme specific result indicators</b> <sup>471</sup> <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>		
<b>3. Methods applied</b>					
<p><b>(b) Quantitative methods</b><sup>472</sup>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Reasons for using the method</li> <li>ii. Description of methods to assess programme specific indicators</li> <li>iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered</li> </ul> <p><b>(c) Qualitative methods:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Reasons for using the method<sup>473</sup></li> <li>ii. Description of methods used</li> <li>iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered</li> </ul>					
<i>[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]</i>					
<b>4. Quantitative values of indicators</b> <sup>474</sup> <b>and data sources</b>					
<i>[Mandatory]</i>					
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Absolute value</b> <sup>475</sup>	<b>Ratio value</b> <sup>476</sup>	<b>Calculated gross value</b> <sup>477</sup>	<b>Calculated net value</b> <sup>478</sup>	<b>Data information sources</b> <sup>479</sup> <b>and</b>

<sup>470</sup> Programme specific judgment criteria are developed in MS to specify success within the frame of the evaluation topic, e.g. what is the success in RDP delivery.

<sup>471</sup> List programme specific result indicators used in answering the PSEQ in consistency with programme specific judgment criteria.

<sup>472</sup> Quantitative methods are applicable for the assessment of programme specific indicators, apart from those which be deducted directly from the monitoring system.

<sup>473</sup> Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the programme specific indicators.

<sup>474</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

<sup>475</sup> This column is filled for the programme specific indicators, in case they are expressed in absolute values.

<sup>476</sup> This column is filled for the programme specific indicators, in case they are expressed in ratio.

<sup>477</sup> This column contains the gross value of programme specific indicators if they are not expressed in ratio values. Gross value is the value of indicator observed within the group of beneficiaries. Gross value is inserted here also in case the net value of the same indicator has been calculated.

<sup>478</sup> This column contains the net value of programme specific indicators if they are not expressed in ratio values. Net value is the value of indicator attributed to the RDP intervention. See guidelines Assessment of RDP results, chapter 7.2.

<b>Program me specific indicators</b> 480					
<p><b>5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings</b><sup>481</sup></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i></p>					
<p><b>6. Answer to evaluation question</b><sup>482</sup></p> <p><i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i></p>					
<p><b>7. Conclusions and recommendations</b><sup>483</sup></p>					
<b>Conclusion</b>			<b>Recommendation</b>		
<i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i>			<i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i>		
<b>C.1</b>			<b>R.1</b>		
<b>C.2</b>			<b>R.2</b>		
<b>C.3</b>			<b>R.3</b>		

<sup>479</sup> All data and information sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. PA monitoring, MA statistics, etc.

<sup>480</sup> Programme specific are developed in MS to answer PSEQ.

<sup>481</sup> Explain problems faced by the evaluator during the assessment, e.g. data and information availability, timing and coordination issues, etc. which might have threatened the reliability and validity of evaluation findings.

<sup>482</sup> On the basis of the evidence resulting from the analysis presented under points 3 and 4.

<sup>483</sup> On the basis of the information collected under points 3 and 4 and the answer given under point 6.