

## HANDOUT

### Example of SFC template for CEQ no. 4

This handout provides an example of the SFC template for the AIR 2017, point 7 which contains the information resulting from RDP evaluation activities. This includes information on the quantification of programme achievements through the assessment of result indicators as well as answers to evaluation questions.

The SFC template provides

- a) for each of the 21 **common evaluation questions** a specific format which is customized to the evaluation question, the indicators to be used etc.
- b) One extra format for programme-specific evaluation question (PSEQ), to be replicated for each PSEQ to be answered in 2017.

The example of the SFC template shows the format for common evaluation question number 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?*”

**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. Intervention logic of the FA 2A:**

Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:

Measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 2A:

**2. Judgment criteria, common and additional<sup>1</sup> result indicators used to answer the CEQ:**

Judgment criteria <sup>2</sup>	Common result indicators <sup>3</sup>	Additional result indicators <sup>4</sup>

**3. Other indicators used for answering the CEQ<sup>5</sup>:**

Common output indicators	
Common context indicators	

**4. Qualitative information collected for answering the CEQ<sup>6</sup>:**

**5. Data needs and sources for calculation of indicator values:**

Indicator <sup>7</sup>	Data needs <sup>8</sup>	Data sources <sup>9</sup>

**6. Data gaps, problems encountered and solutions to overcome them<sup>10</sup>:**

<sup>1</sup> Additional indicators are used if the common indicators are not sufficient to answer the CEQ, and if the success is specified with the judgment criteria which is not measured with the common indicators.

<sup>2</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" can be used. Stakeholders in MS can propose their own judgment criteria to specify the 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>3</sup> List the 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>4</sup> List the additional indicators if they are used in answering the CEQ. Ensure that the judgment criteria are listed in a consistent way in the same line with the additional indicators and placed in the same line.

<sup>5</sup> Other than common and additional indicators, if used to answer the evaluation questions, should be listed here. It could be common output and common context indicators.

<sup>6</sup> Describe which qualitative information has been collected to answer the CEQ

<sup>7</sup> All indicators mentioned in the previous section are listed here: common result indicators, additional result indicators (if applied), common output indicators and common context indicators

<sup>8</sup> Data on beneficiaries needed to calculate the gross value of indicators are listed here. In case the net value of indicators is calculated also data needed for non-beneficiaries are listed here. Data needs should correspond with the method for calculation of indicators described in the following section.

<sup>9</sup> All data sources used for calculation of indicators should be listed here, e.g. Pillar II operations database, EU /national/regional statistics, GIS etc.

<sup>10</sup> All data gaps with respect to no uptake of the RDP FA, data reliability, existence, timing etc. should be mentioned here. Solutions how the gaps have been overcome should be described here as well.

## 7. Methods applied for the assessment of RDP results linked to the FA 2A:

- (a) Quantitative methods:
  - i. Reasons for using the method<sup>11</sup>
  - ii. Description of methods to calculate ratio, gross or net (if applicable) values of common and additional result indicators, or other indicators used ( output, common context indicators)<sup>12</sup>
  - iii. Challenges and solutions in application of described methods<sup>13</sup>
- (b) Qualitative methods - reasoning<sup>14</sup> and description of methods used <sup>15</sup>
  - i. Reasons for using the method<sup>16</sup>
  - ii. Description of methods<sup>17</sup>
  - iii. Challenges and solutions in application of described methods<sup>18</sup>

## 8. Quantitative values of indicators<sup>19</sup>:

Indicator		Absolute value <sup>20</sup>	Ratio value (%) <sup>21</sup>	Calculated gross value <sup>22</sup>	Calculated net value <sup>23</sup>
Common output indicators <sup>24</sup>					
Common result indicators <sup>25</sup>	R1 – Percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP support for investments in restructuring or modernisation				
	R2 – Change in agricultural output on supported farms/AWU				
Additional result indicator <sup>26</sup>					
Common context indicators <sup>27</sup>					

<sup>11</sup> Explanation of choosing the method.

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

<sup>13</sup> Description of challenges in application of described methods and solutions encountered

<sup>14</sup> Reasons why and when qualitative methods have been used - introductory qualitative analysis, triangulation of quantitative findings, no data available, e.g. no RDP uptake under the FA 2A etc.

<sup>15</sup> Explanation of reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP results linked to FA 2A, e.g. to triangulate quantitative findings, to bridge the data gaps: no RDP uptake under the FA, list and description of qualitative methods used

<sup>16</sup> Explanation of choosing the method.

<sup>17</sup> In case the same method was used for several indicators, the list of these indicators should be provided

<sup>18</sup> Description of challenges in application of described methods and solutions encountered

<sup>19</sup> Values are based on the quantitative methods described above

<sup>20</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>21</sup> This column is filled for the following result indicators: R1, R3, R4, R5, R6, R7, R8, R9, R10, R11, R12, R16, R17, R20, R23 and R25.

<sup>22</sup> The gross value of following result indicators is inserted here: R2, R13, R14, R15, R18, R19, R21 and R22. The gross value of used common context indicators is inserted here as well, if relevant.

<sup>23</sup> The net value of following result indicators is inserted here: R2, R13, R14, R15, R18, R19, R21 and R22. The net value of used common context indicators is inserted here as well, if relevant.

<sup>24</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 the 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.

<sup>25</sup> Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 808/2014, Annex IV.

<sup>26</sup> Additional indicators to common indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation questions in case the common indicators are not sufficient for this purpose.

<sup>27</sup> The common context indicators can be also used to answer the common evaluation questions, e.g. to calculate result indicator (for example CCI 18, CCI, 22, CCI 17), if result indicators are not sufficient to provide a robust answer to common evaluation questions (for example CCI 14, CCI, CCI 26).

<b>9. Qualitative findings<sup>28</sup>:</b>	
<b>10. Judgment on reliability and validity of findings<sup>29</sup>:</b>	
<b>11. Answer to the common evaluation question:</b>	
<b>12. Conclusions:</b>	<b>Recommendations:</b>

---

<sup>28</sup> Findings from the qualitative assessment are summarised here.

<sup>29</sup> Explanation on why finding of the assessment of RDP results related to FA 2A are reliable and valid.