European Evaluation Helpdesk for Rural Development

European Commission

GUIDELINES

ASSESSMENT OF RDP RESULTS: HOW TO PREPARE FOR REPORTING ON EVALUATION IN 2017

PART III – DRAFT NOVEMBER 2015

Disclaimer: This draft version will be presented to the Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP at its 8th Meeting on 12 November 2015 in Brussels. The present draft has neither been quality checked by the European Commission, nor has a language check been carried out.
Comments can be sent in written to jela@ruralevaluation.eu by 25 November 2015.

Recommended citation: (DRAFT VERSION NOT YET TO BE QUOTED)

EUROPEAN COMMISSION – Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development – Unit E.4 (2015): Guidelines. Assessment of RDP results: How to prepare for reporting on evaluation in 2017. Guidelines. Brussels

EUROPEAN EVALUATION HELPDESK FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

European Network for Rural Development

The Evaluation Helpdesk is responsible for the evaluation function within the European Network for Rural Development (ENRD) by providing guidance on the evaluation of RDPs and policies falling under the remit and guidance of DG AGRI's Unit E.4 'Evaluation and studies' of the European Commission (EC). In order to improve the evaluation of EU rural development policy the Evaluation Helpdesk supports all evaluation stakeholders, in particular DG AGRI, national authorities, RDP managing authorities and evaluators, through the development and dissemination of appropriate methodologies and tools; the collection and exchange of good practices; capacity building, and communicating with network members on evaluation related topics.

Additional information about the activities of European Evaluation Helpdesk for Rural Development is available on the Internet through the Europa server (http://enrd.ec.europa.eu).

GUIDELINES

ASSESSMENT OF RDP RESULTS: HOW TO PREPARE FOR REPORTING ON EVALUATION IN 2017

PART III (ANNEXES) – DRAFT NOVEMBER 2015

CONTENT

1 PART III - ANNEXES

1.1 Annex 1 – Proposed SFC template for point 7 of the AIR submitted in 2017

- Common evaluation questions (No of digits 7000)

Common evaluation question (no and question):			
Description of the system for answering the common evaluation question: e.g. common and additional (if needed) indicators used for this purpose, which methods and data were used etc.			
Values of common and additional indicators: Comments to calculation of common and additional indicators, findings of triangulation and interpretations of these values, taking in consideration also RDP context. In case the values of indicators cannot be calculated (e.g. low up take), justify why and explain what was the alternative way to answer the evaluation question (studies, expert opinion, theory of change etc.).			
Indicator	Calculated gross value	Calculated net value	Note
Code of common result indicator[1]			
Additional indicator´s title			
….			
Answer to CEQ			

- Programme specific evaluation questions[2] (No of digits 7000)

Programme specific evaluation question:			
Description of the system for answering the evaluation questions: e.g. common and programme specific indicators used for this purpose, which methods and data were used etc.			
Values of common and programme specific indicators: Comments to calculation of common and programme specific indicators, findings of triangulation and interpretations of these values, taking in consideration also RDP context. In case the values of indicators cannot be calculated (e.g. low up take), justify why and explain what was the alternative way to answer the evaluation question (studies, expert opinion, theory of change etc.			
Indicato	Calculated gross value	Calculated net value	Note
Code of common indicator[3]			
Programme specific indicator´s title			
….			
Answer to CEQ:			

[1] Commission implementing regulation (EU)No 808/2014, Annex IV
[2] Template is filled only if programme specific evaluation questions are used in the assessment of RDP in 2017
[3] Commission implementing regulation (EU)No 808/2014, Annex IV

1.2 Annex 2 - Overview of reporting requirements on RDP implementation and evaluation in the programming period 2014-2020

No. in Annex VII of 808/2014[4]		Additional legal Reference	Reporting requirements		
			Standard AIR (from 2016)	Enhanced AIR submitted in 2017	Enhanced AIR submitted in 2019
1	Key information on the implementation of the programme and its priorities:				
a)	Financial data: Financial implementation data for each measure and FA, a statement on expenditure incurred and declared in the declaration of expenditure.	1303/2013[5], Art. 50.2, 1305/2013[6], Art. 75.2	✓	✓	✓
b)	Common and programme-specific indicators and quantified target values: Information on RDP implementation as measured by common and programme specific indicators, including progress achieved in relation to the targets set for each FA and on realised output compared to planned output as set out in Indicator Plan	1303/2013, Art. 50.2, and 54.2 1305/2013, Art.69 808/2014, Art. 14.1b), Annex IV	✓	✓	✓
2	Progress in implementing the evaluation plan:	1303/2013, Art. 56.1 808/2014, Art.14.1f), Art.1			
a)	Description of any modifications made to the Evaluation Plan		✓	✓	✓
b)	Description of evaluation activities undertaken during the year	1305/2014, Art. 75.2	✓	✓	✓
c)	Description of activities undertaken in relation to the provision and management of data	1305/2014, Art. 70	✓	✓	✓
d)	List of completed evaluations, incl. references to where they have been published on-line	1303/2013 Art. 50.2, 1305/2014, Art. 76.3	✓	✓	✓
e)	A summary of completed evaluations, focussing on evaluation findings	1303/2013 Art. 50.2,	✓	✓	✓
f)	Description of communication activities to publicise evaluation findings	1303/2013 Art. 50.9	✓	✓	✓

[4] Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 808/2014
[5] Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013
[6] Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013

No. in Annex VII of 808/2014[4]		Additional legal Reference	Reporting requirements		
			Standard AIR (from 2016)	Enhanced AIR submitted in 2017	Enhanced AIR submitted in 2019
g)	Description of follow-up given to evaluation results	1303/2013 Art. 56.3	✓	✓	✓
3	Issues which affect the performance (quality and effectiveness of RDP implementation) of the programme and the measures taken		✓	✓	✓
4	Steps taken to implement technical assistance (including the establishment of the NRN) and programme publicity requirements	1305/2014, Art. 54.1 808/2014, Art. 13,			
a)	In case of coverage under the technical assistance of the establishment and functioning of NRN, the report shall describe actions taken and state of play as regards the establishment of the NRN and the implementation of this action plan	1305/2014, Art. 54.3	✓	✓	✓
b)	Steps taken to ensure that the programme is publicised	1305/2014, Art. 8.1m)iii),	✓	✓	✓
5	Actions taken to fulfil ex ante conditionalities (where relevant), description by priority/focus area/measure.	1303/2013 Art. 19.1, Art 50.2	✓	✓	
6	Description of implementation of sub-programmes as measured by common and specific indicators including on the progress achieved in relation to targets set in the indicator plan of the sub-programme	1305/2013 Art.7.1, 75.3		✓	✓
7	Assessment of the information and progress towards achieving objectives of the programme:				
	Reporting and quantification of programme achievements, in particular through assessment of the complementary result indicators and relevant evaluation questions	1303/2013, Art. 50.2 808/2014, Art. 14,		✓	✓
	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	1303/2013, Art. 54.1 808/2014, Art. 14,			✓

No. in Annex VII of 808/2014[4]		Additional legal Reference	Reporting requirements		
			Standard AIR (from 2016)	Enhanced AIR submitted in 2017	Enhanced AIR submitted in 2019
8	Implementation of actions to take into account principles set out in Articles 5, 7 and 8 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013				
a)	Promotion of equality between men and women and non-discrimination,	1303/2013 Art.7		✓	✓
b)	Sustainable development	1303/2013 Art.8		✓	✓
c)	Role of partners	1303/2013 Art.5		✓	✓
9	Progress made in ensuring an integrated approach to support the territorial development of rural areas, including through local development strategies	1303/2013 Art. 32-36 1305/2014, Art.42-44			✓
10	Report on implementation of financial instruments (as annex to AIR)				
	including for each financial instrument the information contained in Article 46.2 points a) to g) and i) of Reg. 1303/2013	1303/2013 Art. 46.2, points a) – g) and i)	✓	✓	✓
	Including the information contained in Article 46.2 points h) and j) of Reg. 1303/2013	1303/2013 Art. 46.2, points h) and j)		✓	✓

1.3 Annex 3 - The role of rural development stakeholders in the dissemination and communication of evaluation results

WHO?	WHAT?	TO WHOM?	WHY?
MA	Report on evaluation in AIR submitted in 2017	EC	Inform the Commission, fulfil legal requirements
	Summary of major evaluation findings, conclusions recommendations	Policy makers	Inform policy makers, signal RDP modification needs
	Responses to recommendations, required action points	Policy makers	Ensure follow-up of recommendations, plan changes
	Organising a final conference / workshop	MA, PA, SG, stakeholders, evaluator	Summarising main findings, discussing action point, learning from the evaluation
	Press releases, articles in newsletters, round tables in TV, Radio,	Media, general public, media, researchers, stakeholders	Increase transparency of policy and knowledge about RDP results
	Publish report and citizen's summary on the website,	General public	Access to information on RDP results
Evaluator	Citizen's summary	MA	Concise summary of main points
	Presentation	MC, SG	Informing the MC & SG, allowing questions
	Presentation (if requested by the MA)	Other stakeholders	Informing stakeholders (e.g. farmers' organisation, environmental organisations)
	Presentation in a final conference / workshop	MA, PA, SG, stakeholders,	Summarising main findings, discussing action points,
NRN	Article in newsletter on findings, conclusions and recommendations	Stakeholders	Increase knowledge about the report and RDP results
	Post about evaluation report on website	General public,stakeholders	Increase knowledge about the report and RDP results
LAGs	Article in newsletter (from a Leader point of view)	Stakeholders	Increase knowledge about the report and RDP results

Source: European Evaluation Helpdesk for Rural Development

1.4 Annex 4 - Check-list for self-assessment of the quality of the evaluation report

Title of the evaluation:
Department / unit responsible:
Evaluator / contractor:
Assessment carried out by: (name organisations/units involved in the assessment) Date of quality assessment:

- RELEVANCE

Does the evaluation respond to information needs of the commissioning body and fit the Terms of Reference?

Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Arguments for scoring:

- SCOPE

Is the rationale of the programme and its set of outputs, results and impacts examined fully, including both intended and unexpected policy interactions and consequences?

Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Arguments for scoring:

- APPROPRIATE DESIGN

Is the design for the evaluation adequate for obtaining results needed to answer the evaluation questions?

SCORING

Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Arguments for scoring:

- RELIABLE DATA

Are primary and secondary data collected adequate for their intended use and have their reliability been ascertained? Have data weaknesses and limitations been explained?

Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Arguments for scoring:

- SOUND ANALYSIS

Are qualitative and quantitative data appropriately and systematically analysed to answer evaluation questions and cover other information needs in a valid manner? Are cause and effect links between the intervention and its results explained? Are external factors correctly taken into consideration?

Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Arguments for scoring:

- CREDIBLE FINDINGS

Do findings follow logically from and are justified by the data / information, analysis and interpretations based on pre-established criteria? Are findings based on carefully explained assumptions and rationale?

Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Arguments for scoring:

- VALID CONCLUSIONS

Are conclusions non-biased and fully based on findings? Are conclusions clear, clustered and prioritised?

Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Arguments for scoring:

- HELPFUL RECOMMENDATIONS

Are areas needing improvements identified in coherence with the conclusions? Are the suggested options realistic, impartial and sufficiently detailed to be operationally applicable?

Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Arguments for scoring:

- CLARITY

Is the report well structured, balanced and written in an understandable manner?

Is the report easy to read and has a short but comprehensive summary? Does the report contain graphs and tables?

Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Arguments for scoring:

- OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FINAL REPORT

Overall, the quality of the report is assessed to be:

Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Does the evaluation fulfil contractual conditions?

Are the findings and conclusions of the report reliable, and are there any specific limitations to their validity and completeness?

Is the information in the report potentially useful for communicating the impacts and achievements of the programme?

1.5 Annex 5 - Minimum requirements and good practice in reporting on evaluation in the AIR submitted in 2017

Evaluation tasks and reporting requirements on evaluation in 2017 are described in Part II. In addition to legal requirements, programme authorities in Member States may decide to go beyond the minimum reporting requirements, and provide more information on evaluation in the relevant AIR sections, as shown below:

Requirements for reporting in relation to evaluation tasks - AIR submitted in 2017	Optional elements as good practice - examples
Report on any issues affecting the performance of the programme and measures taken.[7]	Report on the assessment of RDP delivery mechanisms, (not explicitly required by legal acts) as they can influence the programme´ effectiveness, efficiency, results, and impacts: e.g. assessment of RDP targeting, application of financial instruments in particular measures, project applications, selections, payment procedures, the role of RDP communication to beneficiaries etc.
Inform about activities undertaken in relation to and progress in implementing the Evaluation plan.[8]	Report on activities, which were conducted beyond the minimum requirements, e.g. those planned and implemented in line with the internal planning documents for evaluation (e.g. steering group for evaluation, collaboration with evaluation experts, arrangements for data for evaluation beyond compulsory monitoring, etc.
Inform about financial commitments and expenditures by measure[9],	Provide information on the breakdown of financial commitments and expenditures in a way which helps later to conduct various assessments, for example with respect to the additional contribution (secondary effects) provide information on expected, unexpected, real contributions to flagged FA expressed in financial commitments and expenditures.
Report on the financial data, common, and programme specific indicators and quantified target values[10], where appropriate.	Provide information on the approach when and how programme specific indicators have been developed and how the values for all indicators have been calculated.
Inform on the quantification and assessment of programme achievements through common and programme specific result indicators[11], where appropriate.	In case of low uptake with respect to financial commitments, conduct and report on studies, which assess the interest of potential beneficiaries to apply for support from the RDP measures and estimate results/achievements of RDP objectives.

[7] Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013, Art. 50 and Commission implementing regulation No 808/2014, Annex VII, point 2 e) and point 3
[8] Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013, Art. 75 and Commission implementing regulation No 808/2014, Annex VII, point 2
[9] Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013, Art. 75 and Commission implementing regulation No 808/2014, Annex VII, point 2
[10] Commission implementing regulation, Annex VII, point 1
[11] Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013, Art. 50 and 57 (ex post), Commission implementing regulation No 808/2014, Art. 14.1 b) and Annex IV and Annex VII, point 1 and point 7

Requirements for reporting in relation to evaluation tasks - AIR submitted in 2017	Optional elements as good practice - examples
Report on contribution of the financial instruments to the achievement of indicators of the priority of measure concerned [12]	Explain why FI are used in the implementation of particular measures in supporting particular beneficiaries and how this might influence the effectiveness and efficiency of the programme. In case of sufficient uptake report on the role of targeting of the RDP support via financial instruments and its effects on the values of indicators.
Assess the potential additional contribution of operations to one or more focus areas (secondary effects) [13]	In case of sufficient RDP uptake report on actual additional contributions of measures to focus areas, under which they have not been programmed, based on collected information via payment requests and/or surveys and compare it with those expected during the programme design.
Set out the synthesis of evaluations of the programme, available during the previous financial year [14],	Report on evaluation or scientific studies, which have not been conducted in relation to RDP and ordered by the MA, but provide important findings with respect to the evaluation topics envisioned in the Evaluation plan or with respect to RDP objectives. For example, studies conducted by research & academia, various NGO or government agencies.
Asses the information and progress made towards achieving the objectives of the programme [15], and answer relevant (focus area related) evaluation questions [16]	Provide the information how it is ensured that the answers to evaluation equations are based on the robust quantitative and qualitative evidence, e.g. in the format of table from evaluation question to the collection of data and information.
Assess actions taken to ensure that objectives and implementation of EAFRD is in line with principles set out in Articles 6,7 and 8 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 [17]	Explain the approach to assess the gender equality/non-discrimination, the sustainable development, and the role of partners in the RDP implementation, including necessary arrangements with respect to data collection and the findings of the assessments.
Inform on progress made in the implementation of the sub-programmes (including common and programme specific indicators) and the progress achieved in relation to targets set in the indicator plan [18]	In case of sub-programmes are part of the RDP, explain how the values of indicators have been calculated.

[12] Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013, Art. 46
[13] Commission implementing regulation No 808/2014, Art.
[14] Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013, Art. 50 and Common implementing regulation No 808/2014, Annex VII, point 2 d)and e)
[15] Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013, Art.50
[16] Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013, Art. 50 and Commission implementing regulation No 808/2014, Annex VII, point 7
[17] Common implementing regulation No 808/2014, Annex VII, point 8
[18] Common implementing regulation No 808/2014, Annex VII, point 6

1.6 Annex 6 - Collection of data and information for evaluation on beneficiaries (micro-level) through monitoring system

Application forms (before project start), payment requests (after completion of a project) and other information sources (e.g. Business plans, confirmation/amendment on completion of operation etc.), which are part of the standard monitoring system are useful tools to collect evaluation related data and information on beneficiaries at micro-level (besides the standard monitoring data)[19].

The above-mentioned tools can be adjusted in line with the actual evaluation needs and collect also data for calculation of common[20] and programme specific result and impact indicators. Ideally, the decision to collect such data should be taken at early stages of the programming period, when the data management system is being built.

For collection of evaluation data at micro level (operations/beneficiaries) it is useful to establish a separate section in the application forms, payment requests or in another documents in the monitoring system (e.g. business plans, specific monitoring tables etc.). The structure of this section will depend on the specific data needs in relation to groups of indicators for which the planned operation is considered to contribute.

If the indicator shall be calculated in net values, the collection of additional information linked to beneficiaries´ characteristics, which allow to construct control groups, can be also done through application forms/payment requests/business plans. For example, the following information can be collected in this respect:

- Total utilized agricultural area (UAA)
- Rented U.A.A.
- Economic farm size
- Total inputs
- Total intermediate consumption
- Total subsidies (excluding on investment)
- Subsidies on investment
- Gross farm income and/or family farm income
- Farm net value added
- Total assets
- Gross investment on fixed assets Type of farm production: organic/conventional Tenure of farm
- Qualification of farmer
- Livestock units (by type)

[19] WD: Data item list for Pillar II operations database
[20] Commission implementing regulation (EU) No 808/2014, Art. 14.b and Annex IV

- Structure of plan production:
  - Arable land crops in ha
  - Permanent crops (e.g. horticulture) in ha
  - Pastures and meadows
- Milk yield
- Wheat/corn yield
- Woodland area
- Membership in producer organisation
- Funding received before 2014
- Location of the project

When using the monitoring system to collect data for evaluation, it is important:

- harmonise collected data with data from existing systems, such as IACS, FADN, FSS, national statistics etc. to avoid double collection and unnecessary costs.
- ensure the clarity of all terms used in specific sections of application forms, payment requests, business plans etc., as it is affecting the quality of collected data. The clearer and more straightforward are terms used in sections for collecting the evaluation data the bigger is the probability to obtain high quality of data for evaluation. In each case the collected data should be quality controlled once values are entered in the operation database.

Examples below provide an illustration which data and information can be collected from beneficiaries through application forms, payment requests and other documents to obtain important inputs to assess specific evaluation topics and answer relevant evaluation questions.

Employment in rural areas

One typical evaluation need is to assess RDP effects on employment in rural areas. There are two common indicators to assess the effects on employment in the CMES:

- Common result and target indicator (R21/T20 and R24/T23) linked to Focus Areas 6A and 6B - “jobs created in supported projects”,
- Common impact indicator I.14 – “rural employment rate”

The indicator “jobs created in supported projects” is measured in relation to accomplished operations at the level of beneficiaries. This indicator is included in the *WD Data item list for Pillar II operation database* and data for the indicator are collected through the regular monitoring system from beneficiaries. Job effects could be further distinguished by gender and age (see example below).

Information to be collected for result Indicator R21/T20	Planned (before project start) in FTE	Actual achievement (after project completion) in FTE
No of jobs created through supported projects (in full time equivalents)	✓	✓
Age category	✓	✓
Gender (male/female)	✓	✓

The RDP interventions´ effects on employment rate in the programme area are measured with the impact indicator I14 “rural employment rate”. To calculate this impact indicator in net values at later stages (in the AIR submitted in 2019 and in the ex post) would require also information from the micro-level/ beneficiaries. Therefore it would be useful also to collect the general information on employment situation in supported entities (see example) from application forms, payment requests, and via monitoring tables at the time of evaluation (in case the evaluation is conducted long time after the project has been completed, e.g. ex post). This information and the data collected on unit´s characteristics (see example above on farm characteristics) will allow to generate samples of beneficiaries for counterfactual analysis. Example of data to be collected for the later assessment of respective impact indicator I.14 via application forms, payment requests and other documents as part of the monitoring system can be found in the table below:

Information to be collected for impact indicator I14[21]	Before project start (Application forms)	After project completion (Payment request)	At the time of evaluation (Monitoring tables)
Employed persons on an agricultural holding/ or other relevant entity defined by the RDP, which work at least one hour for pay or profit or are temporarily absent from such a work per week.	✓	✓	✓
Age category	✓	✓	✓
Gender (male/female)	✓	✓	✓
LAU (local administrative unit), where the entity and project is located	✓		

Farm economic performance

Farm economic performance as a competitiveness factor is a frequent evaluation topic. The change in standard output tells about the economic performance of supported farms and relates to the common complementary result indicator: agricultural output

[21] In line with the WD: impact indicators fiches, Fiche for I.14

per annual work unit (labour productivity). Agriculture output is calculated as output of crops (wheat, barley) and crops products (straw), livestock (calf, sheep) and livestock products (milk, eggs, meat etc.) and it is equal to value of sales + balance of stocks + own use or consumption. Subsidies are not taken into account.

Standard outputs are representative of the level of output that could be expected on the average farm under 'normal' conditions (i.e. no disease outbreaks or adverse weather).

To calculate this indicator in net values, as laid down in the *WD: Complementary result indicators for Pillar II*, requires to collect data at micro-level. The application forms and payment requests could be used for this purpose. The example of data to be collected through the monitoring system can be found in the table below:

Information to be collected for result Indicator R2	Before project start (Application forms)	After project completion (Payment request)
Total output of crops and crops products, livestock and livestock products (€), of it: • Value of sales • Balance of stocks • Own use or consumption	✓	✓
Annual work units	✓	✓

To construct the control groups the following data related to farm characteristics should be extracted from the operation database (application forms/payment requests):

- Total utilized agricultural area (UAA)
- Rented U.A.A.
- Total inputs
- Total intermediate consumption
- Total subsidies (excluding on investment)
- Subsidies on investment
- Gross farm income and/or family farm income
- Farm net value added
- Total assets
- Gross investment on fixed assets
- Milk yield
- Wheat/corn yield

Production of renewable energy

The assessment of the renewable energy production is measured with the common complementary result indicator R15 – Renewable energy production from supported projects. In order to evaluate the effects of created or improved biomass plants thoroughly, more evaluation data is required, for example on the used fuels for the production of renewable energy and transportation distance. Tables below provide examples of data to be collected via application forms and payment requests to assess the RDP effects of the production of renewable energy:

A. Characteristics of biomass plants

Information to be collected	Before project start (Application forms)	After project completion (Payment request)
T.O.E. generated by the facility	✓	✓
Thermal capacity [kW]	✓	✓
Nominal thermal capacity of the boiler [kW]	✓	✓
Electrical Power [kW]	✓	✓
Heat generation amount [MWh / a]	✓	✓
Electric power generated [MWh / a]	✓	✓
Seasonal efficiency [%]	✓	✓
Annual full load hours [h]	✓	✓
Heat generated, which is fed into a superordinate network [MWh / a]	✓	✓

B. Used fuels for the production of renewable energy

Information to be collected	Before project start (Application forms)		After project completion (Payment request)	
	Y/N	Transport distance in km	Y/N	Transport distance in km
Wood chips (softwood)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Wood chips (hardwood)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bark	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sawmill by-products	✓	✓	✓	✓
Straw	✓	✓	✓	✓
Others	✓	✓	✓	✓

Emissions from agriculture

In case the evaluation need is to assess the reduction of emissions of greenhouse gas (e.g. methane, nitrous oxide, CO2) and ammonia from agriculture in RDP supported projects, the common complementary result indicator R18 - Reduced emissions of methane and nitrous oxide should be used. In order to calculate the common complementary result indicators it is important to collect data on changes in land management in a systematic way and the monitoring system is suitable for this purpose. All factors which may have an impact on the reduction of greenhouse gas should be considered and quantified. Monitoring can collect information on changes in relevant land management practice whereas at a later stage evaluation will transform changes into emission savings. The table below shows examples of information, which can be collected via application forms and payment requests.

Information to be collected on agriculture practice (examples)	Before project start (Application forms)	After project completion (Payment request)
Use of pesticide (kg/ha)	✓	✓
Use of readily soluble fertilizers (kg/ha)	✓	✓
Livestock units (number pre area)	✓	✓
Pollutants in surface water (kg/m^3, mg/l)	✓	✓
Crop rotation (crops in rotation)	✓	✓
Use of mulch and direct seeding (ha and % of UAA on farm)	✓	✓
Greening of arable land (ha and % of arable land on the farm)	✓	✓
Use of soil cultivation methods (list methods and ha, % of UAA on farm)	✓	✓
Use of silage (tons)	✓	✓
Preventive surface protection on arable land (ha and % of UAA on farm)	✓	✓
Conversion of arable land into grassland(ha and % of UAA on farm)	✓	✓
Environmentally-friendly and biodiversity promoting land management	✓	✓

Local development

The monitoring system could also be used to collect qualitative information, e.g. to assess effects of the RDP intervention on local development via application of Leader approach. The collection of information can be predefined in the table and the beneficiary can tick “yes” or “no” when filling the table. Example of such a table is below:

Information to be collected (e.g. with respect to local development principles)	Before project start (Application forms) Y/N	After project completion (Payment request) Y/N
A Bottom-up approach (opposed to top-down approaches from national and/or regional authorities)		
not applied		
local actors participate in project development		
B Setting up partnerships for project development		
No partnership established		
Partnership between private actors established		
Partnership between private and public actors established		
Partnership between public actors established		
C Facilitating innovation in the regional context		
Introduction of a new product, a new process, a new organisation or a new market		
Transfer and adaptation of innovations developed elsewhere, modernisation of traditional forms of know-how		
Innovation in policy-making which may generate innovative actions		
D Integrated and multi-sectoral actions		
Not applied		
Establishing/strengthening links between the different economic, social, cultural, environmental players and sectors involved		
Establishing/strengthening links between agriculture and processing and marketing		
Establishing/Strengthening links with the service sector (e.g. tourism)		
E Networking activities		
Not applied		
in the community		
in the region		
on national scope		
on a transnational scope		
F Local socio economic effects of the activities		
No socio economic effects expected		
Use of regional resources		
New product		

Information to be collected (e.g. with respect to local development principles)	Before project start (Application forms) Y/N	After project completion (Payment request) Y/N
Strengthen regional competitiveness		
New service		
Improving the employment situation		
New enterprises established		
Combination of products and services		
Increasing the employment rate of women		
Connection between different sectors of the economy		
Improving the social and cultural development of the region		
Increased participation of the population		
Improved services		
Regional networking		
Strengthening regional identity		

1.7 Annex 7 - Tool for qualitative appraisal of RDP interventions´ effects (measure, FA and RD priorities)

The RDP intervention logic is made to produce primary/secondary, direct, expected and intended intervention effects to address the identified needs of the programme area and to contribute to EU and RDP specific policy objectives. However, the programme´ interventions at measure, focus area and RD priority level can produce also indirect effects, which go beyond the objectives or address various issues. These effects can be intended, unintended, expected or unexpected. Measures, focus areas and priorities can also influence each other and produce transverse effects, both negative and positive (synergies) (read more in PART II, chapter 6.1. Revisiting the intervention logic).

The excel table below is a tool for the qualitative appraisal of various effects of programme interventions at measure, focus area and RD priority level. The tool can help to identify for example the primary and secondary measure effects both intended and unintended, it can help to discover indirect effects, and transverse effects between focus areas and priorities.

This tool can be used by evaluation stakeholders – mainly evaluators or evaluation experts within the ministry responsible for RDP, prior to the evaluation in order to see what types of effects can be expected with the RDP specific selection and composition of measures, focus areas and priorities. For this purpose the table can be adjusted to the actual RDP intervention logic.

The table in the EXCEL format is provided in a separate file.

	Transverse effects (positive and negative) between priorities - marked by arrows																		
	Synergy																		
Measures´ codes, Reg. 808/2014 Annex 1, part 5	RD Priority 1 (P1)			RD Priority 2 (P2)		RD Priority 3 (P3)		RD Priority 4 (P4)			RD Priority 5 (P5)						RD Priority 6 (P6)		
	Transverse effects between focus areas (positive and negative) and effects of the FA towards priorities - market by arrows																		
	Negative transverse effects																		
	FA 1A	FA 1B	FA 1C	FA 2A	FA 2B	FA 3A	FA 3B	FA 4A	FA 4B	FA 4C	FA 5A	FA 5B	FA 5C	FA 5D	FA 5D	FA 5E	FA 6A	FA 6B	FA 6C
1	P, D, E, I																		
2																			
3																			
4																			
5																			
6																			
7																			
8																			
9																			
10																			
11																			
12																			
13																			
14																			
15																			
16																			
17																			
18																			
19																			
20																			

Effects			Code of effect
Primary			**P**
Secondary			**S**
Direct			**D**
Indirect	leverage		**ID -lev**
	deadweight		**ID - dead**
	general equilibrium effects	multiplier	**ID GEE-multi**
		displacement	**ID GEE - displ**
		substitution	**ID GEE- subst**
Expected			**E**
Unexpected			**UE**
Intended			**I**
Unintended			**UI**

Table should be filled manualy by evaluator (or evaluation experts wihin the ministry)

Effects of measures to FA are marked with code in respective window for the measure, see example for measure 1 and FA 1A in the table above.

Transverse effects (negative or positive = synergies) between FA and priorities are marked with
See example in the table above: for positive between RD priority 2 and 3 and negative between FA 2A and 4A

Note: various effects´ codes can be written in the table in various colors, which will allow to animate effects of masures

European Evaluation Helpdesk
Boulevard Saint-Michel 77-79
B - 1040 BRUSSELS
T: +32 2 737 51 30
Email: info@ruralevaluation.eu
http://enrd.ec.europa.eu