



Proposed simplification of SFC2014: Section 7 "Evaluation" of Annual Implementation Reports

Expert Group for Monitoring
and Evaluating the CAP
8 February 2018
Unit C.4



Structure of Annual implementation reports (submitted each year by 30 June via SFC2014 by the Managing Authorities of the Rural development programmes)

1. Key information on implementation of the programme and its priorities
- 2. The progress in implementing the evaluation plan**
3. Issues which affect the performance of the programme and the measures taken
4. Steps taken to implement technical assistance and programme publicity requirements
5. Actions taken to fulfil ex ante conditionalities
6. Description of implementation of sub-programmes
- 7. Assessment of the information and progress towards achieving the objectives of the programme (this section is only included in the annual implementation reports submitted in 2017 and 2019)**
8. Implementation of actions to take into account the principles set out in Articles 5, 7 and 8 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013
9. Progress made in ensuring integrated approach to use EAFRD and other Union financial instruments
10. Report on implementation of financial instruments (Article 46 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013)
11. Encoding tables for Common and programme-specific indicators and quantified target values (PDF document of Annual implementation report : Overview tables – Annex I (Monitoring annex), Annex II, Annex III)
 - Table A: Committed expenditure by measure and focus area
 - Table B: Realised output indicators by measure and focus area
 - Table C: Breakdown for relevant outputs and measures by type of area, gender and/or age
 - Table D: Progress towards targets
 - Table E: Monitoring of transitional measures
 - Table F: Achievement of the performance framework indicators
 - Table G: Programme-specific indicators

2017 template of Section 7

Common Evaluation Question...: To what extent have RDP interventions...?

1. List of measures contributing to the Focus Area
2. Link between judgement criteria and common additional result indicators used to answer the question
3. Methods applied
4. Quantitative values of indicators and data sources
5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings
6. Answer to evaluation question [a maximum of 10 500 characters = approx. 3 pages]
7. Conclusions and recommendations

Overview of Member States' comments to the 2017 template of Section 7

- Late availability of template;
- Avoid repetitions;
- Too much information asked for;
- Seven sections under each evaluation question makes a very long report;
- Inserting information and data in the evaluation template was complex, tedious and repetitive;
- The point "Conclusions and recommendations" should be deleted – Section 2 g) "description of the follow-up given to evaluation results" covers the relevant information;
- SFC2014 template should reflect (only) the requirements of the Regulation.

Member States' comments were received by email and also discussed during a Good Practice Workshop reflecting on the Rural Development Programmes' evaluations (Latvia, September 2017) and in Yearly Capacity Building events.

Summary report – synthesis of the evaluation components of 2017 annual reports (Section 7):

- The link between the evaluation elements (judgement criteria, indicators) was overall well established in most of the RDPs;
- The use of standard evaluation methods was predominant;
- The use of more advanced methods is envisaged in 2019;
- Main challenges reported were data availability and the low level of uptake of the RDP (rural development programme).

Following the discussions during the Good practice workshop and during the Yearly Capacity Building events in each Member State (November 2017 – ongoing), DG AGRI proposes to limit the data requested under Section 7 of the Annual report (to be submitted in 2019).

Regulatory requirements in 2019

ANNEX VII to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 808/2014:

“7. (...) The AIRs submitted in 2017 and 2019 shall also include the following information resulting from evaluation activities:

Reporting and quantification of programme achievements, in particular through assessment of the complementary result indicators, and relevant evaluation questions.

The AIRs submitted in 2019 shall also include the following information resulting from evaluation activities:

Reporting on the progress towards the objectives of the programme and its contribution to achieving the Union strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth through, inter alia, assessment of the programme’s net contribution to changes in CAP impact indicator values, and relevant evaluation questions.”

Proposal for the 2019 template

Section 7 of the Annual Implementation Report to be submitted in 2019:

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION No....: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THE RDP INTERVENTIONS SUPPORTED?”

Answer to evaluation question

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

(same template for all common and programme-specific evaluation questions)

Plus, at the end of Section 7 :

- one table with the quantification of the additional indicators; and
- another table with the quantification of the impact indicators.



SUMMARY TABLE OF QUANTIFIED ADDITIONAL INDICATORS

Indicator name <i>(drop-down menu with proposed additional indicators suggested in the Evaluation Guidelines and Working Documents & also allowing for new text)</i>	Indicator unit (ha, thousand ha, EUR, number, %, other (specify))	Value	Data and information sources and methodology used



SUMMARY TABLE OF QUANTIFIED IMPACT INDICATORS

Name of indicator	Indicator Unit (EUR, %, other (specify))	RDP Net contribution	Data and information sources and methodology used
1. Agricultural entrepreneurial income			
2. Agricultural factor income			
3. Total factor productivity in agriculture			
4. EU commodity price variability	NA	NA	NA
5. Consumer price evolution of food products	NA	NA	NA
6. Agricultural trade balance	NA	NA	NA
7. Emissions from agriculture			
8. Farmland bird index			
9. High Nature Value farming			
10. Water abstraction in agriculture			
11. Water quality			
12. Soil organic matter in arable land			
13. Soil erosion by water			
14. Rural employment rate			
15. Degree of rural poverty			
16. Rural GDP per capita			



What about the other (type of) indicators?

Common context indicators are (already) quantified in the Rural Development Programme.

Output indicators are (already) included in Section 11, Tables B, of the Annual implementation report.

Result indicators (including complementary result indicators) will be directly inserted in Section 11 of the Annual implementation report.



Section 11: Annex III of the AIR - Summary table of quantified results
 - in 2017, values inserted in Section 7 were automatically included in this table.
 - in 2019, those values will be inserted in this table.

Result indicator name and unit (1)	Target value (2)	Main value (3)	Secondary contribution (4)	LEADER/CLLD contribution (5)	Total RDP (6)=3+4+5
R1 / T4: percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP support for investments in restructuring or modernisation (focus area 2A)					
R2: Change in Agricultural output on supported farms/AWU (Annual Work Unit) (focus area 2A)	NA				
R3 / T5: percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP supported business development plan/investments for young farmers (focus area 2B)					
(...) etc.					
R24 / T23: Jobs created in supported projects (Leader) (focus area 6B)					
R25 / T24: percentage of rural population benefiting from new or improved services/infrastructures (ICT) (focus area 6C)					

Programme-specific (target and output) indicators, defined at RDP level and in the AIR, are (already) reported in Section 11, Tables G, of the Annual implementation report.

Table G1: Programme-Specific target indicators table

Table G2: Programme-Specific output indicators table

Example SFC2014 – table G.2:

Code	Output indicator name	Measure	Focus Area	Unit	Planned output	Output Value 2018	Comments
PSOI 1	Number of farms impacted	M05	3B	Number of farms	900	850	
PSOI 2	Additional households with broadband access if at least 30 Mbps	M07	6C	Number of households	26 475	20 016	

NB:

- Programme-specific indicators are used to answer programme-specific evaluation questions, in the cases where common and additional indicators cannot be used for this purpose.
- Additional indicators are used when common indicators are not considered sufficient to provide robust answers to common evaluation questions.



1. Annex III table: is it compulsory to quantify the secondary (and LEADER/CLLD) contributions? (columns (4) and (5) of Annex III table)

No. Although the quantification of secondary contributions is highly desirable, because it is good practice and it allows to show a more complete picture of the achievements of the RDP (and of LEADER), in strict legal terms it is not obligatory. If the RDP's evaluator is unable to quantify the secondary contributions, cells under columns (4) and (5) of Annex III can remain empty.

2. Section 7 "evaluation questions": Five A4 pages to reply to each evaluation question is too much / too little.

Five pages is the maximum length. You can reply in one page. Any reply, no matter how complex the issue, should fit in 5 pages. However, if so wished, a more detailed reply can be included in a stand-alone evaluation report. It is not compulsory to produce such a detailed evaluation report but, if the Managing Authority so wishes, it can publish the report and include a link (to that stand-alone evaluation report) under the annual report's Section 2 d) "progress in implementing the evaluation plan" – "list of completed evaluations, including references to where they have been published on-line". [See next question.](#)



- 3. If a RDP wants to have a stand-alone evaluation report, it will publish it and include a link to that report under Section 2 d) “progress in implementing the evaluation plan” - “list of completed evaluations”. Would the text of the stand-alone evaluation report be considered compliant with the evaluation requirements of the annual report to be submitted in 2019?**

No. According to the so-called “SFC-regulation” (Commission Regulation 184/2014) the information provided in the electronic forms embedded in SFC2014 (“structured data”) may not be replaced by non-structured data, including the use of hyperlinks. Therefore, for purposes of the evaluation requirements in the annual report to be submitted in 2019, the relevant information is the data which will be included in Section 7 and the indicators which will be quantified in the Annual report.

- 4. In case of a stand-alone evaluation report, under Section 2 e) “a summary of completed evaluations, focussing on evaluation findings”, can the text just mention “see Section 7”?**

Yes.



- 5. In the proposed 2019 template, the summary tables of quantified additional indicators and of impact indicators include a column for “data and information sources and methodology used”. What is required here?**

Basic information (keywords) on how the indicator was quantified. For instance: Eurostat, regional data, survey, etc... More guidance will be provided in the Guidelines for the 2019 evaluation.

- 6. In the proposed 2019 template, the summary tables of additional indicators only allow for quantification. Some RDPs might have additional indicators that will be answered with qualitative information. Can we include text (instead of a value)?**

Yes, if Member States consider this useful, we can adapt the additional indicators' table to (also) include qualitative data.



7. In 2019, can a Managing Authority request that evaluators use the 2017 template for Section 7?

The 2017 template follows a logical structure for evaluations, which is very complete and useful. Managing Authorities, if they so wish, may request in 2019 that evaluators use the 2017 template and publish that report as a stand-alone evaluation report. However, the only (template) fields that will be included in Section 7 of the annual report to be submitted in 2019 will be the “replies to the evaluation questions” and the indicators.

8. How can Managing Authorities (MA) update the Common context indicators (in the RDP)?

Common Context Indicators should be updated as soon as possible, especially if the RDP values predate the year 2013. Managing Authorities must insert in SFC2014 the updated values under point 4.1.6 of the RDP. SFC2014 keeps the initial values submitted for the RDP approval in a first column and shows the update(s) in additional column(s): see example in the next slide.



Example – SFC2014 - RDP:

4.1.6 Common Context Indicators

I.9: Socio-economic and rural situation – Poverty rate

Indicator name	Unit	Value	Year	Updated value	Updated year	Comments
Total	% of total population	36.6	2012	32.7	2014	
Rural (thinly populated)	% of total population	40.6	2012	38.6	2014	

Procedure to update the Common Context Indicators:

- MA sends the updated Common context indicators' value to EUROSTAT (*);
- MA uploads the new values in SFC2014 under programme modification RDP – point 4.1.6 (see example above).
- MA includes the updated Common context indicators' values in the next RDP modification request to be sent to the European Commission.

(* in case of common context indicators of regional RDPs for which regional data is not collected by EUROSTAT, Managing Authorities obviously skip this step.



9. Procedure and Calendar

DG AGRI would like to know Member States' opinions on this proposed template by Friday 2 March 2018. You can send comments by email (email subject: "SFC2014 template") to:

Agri-evaluation@ec.europa.eu.

We will consider your comments and will include the final agreed template in the Guidelines for the 2019 evaluation, which should be published this summer 2018. We will also upload the agreed Section 7 of the SFC2014 template in CIRCAbc, under the information point of our Expert Group meeting which will take place after the summer (tentatively scheduled for 19 September).