

“The *ex ante* evaluation of SWOT and needs assessment – prerequisite for a sound RDP intervention logic?”

Case Study the Czech Republic

Jaroslav Pražan

Institute of Agricultural Economics and
Information (ÚZEI)

prazan.jaroslav@uzei.cz

Structure of presentation

- Introduction
- Approach to SWOT analysis
- Approach to needs design
- Approach to design of intervention logic
- Difficulties appeared during the process (recognised by MA and evaluators)
- Issues raised by ex-ante evaluators
- Overcoming the difficulties
- Lessons learned

Introduction

- Country – the Czech Republic
- Who we are – ÚZEI and Ministry of Agriculture (MA)
- Role in the RDP design – providing expert knowledge and help in design of the document, cooperation UZEI and MA
- Timing of RDP design

Preparation for SWOT analysis

- Using priorities and grouping of topics when forming working groups (8 groups, LFA and forestry separate)
- Design of simple intervention logic to show reasoning from problem to measure
- Designing structure of analysis using priority structure
- Collecting data and doing analysis of situation – feedback at MA

Approach to SWOT and needs assessment

- Doing analysis and regular discussion
- SWOT – instructions, design, feedback, iteration
- Needs definition based on change of weak points of SWOT to strengths in order to meet opportunities and face threats
- The first suggestions on measures
- Feedback from stakeholders (discussion on each priority)

Approach to SWOT and needs assessment - II

- Issues during the process of SWOT analysis and needs assessment:
 - Not enough experience of working teams with SWOT analysis and intervention logic
 - Data availability
- Solutions: training on meetings, preparation of examples, feedback to the first drafts
- Lessons: data collection in advance (continual), preparation of teams for RDP design in advance

Ex-ante evaluation

- The process of feedback provision (frequency, timing, dealing with feedback)
 - 1 st report (preliminary): evaluation of first outputs of working groups (December 2012)
 - 2 nd report: evaluation of analysis, SWOT (January 2013)
 - 3 rd report: + intervention logic and measure choice (May 2013)
 - iterative process (August 2013, December 2013 ...)

Ex-ante evaluation's feedback

- The main issues raised:
 - addition of missing context indicators
 - definition of rural areas must be clear
 - not entirely clear link between SWOT – needs - measures (recommendation – cross table with links)
 - ex-ante conditionalities
- The consequences to the intervention logic
- Main challenges
- Solutions adopted

Conclusions and lessons I

- Lessons during SWOT/needs assessment and ex-ante
 - Data availability
 - Low knowledge of SWOT and intervention logic knowledge among experts
 - Priorities were not clear at MA during SWOT/needs definition, came much later
 - Because busy with data collection not enough time to learn (e.g. SWOT, building intervention logic).

Influence of SWOT/needs assessment on the strategy

- The results of SWOT were directly translated to strategy (summary stressing key points of each priority)
- Needs are also named and the strategy
- The strategy shows how needs are met by combination of measures, shows importance of needs (e.g. by budget distribution)