



Draft Working Document¹

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)**

¹ Version of September 2016

1. Common evaluation questions related to rural development focus areas

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 1

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?”

1. List of measures contributing to the FA 1A

Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:

Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 1A²:

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

2. Link between judgment criteria, common and additional³ result indicators used to answer the CEQ

[Mandatory]

Judgment criteria⁴ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Common result indicators⁵ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Additional result indicators and information⁶ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>
RDP projects have been innovative and based on developed knowledge	T1: Percentage of expenditure under Articles 14, 15 and 35 of Regulation	Percentage of innovative projects out of all RDP supported projects

² 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.

³ 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.

⁴ 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 prefilled 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).

⁵ 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.

⁶ 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 ⁷ 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
3. Methods applied⁸ Quantitative methods⁹: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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)¹⁰ iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered Qualitative methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Reasons for using the method¹¹ ii. Description of methods used¹² iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered <p><i>[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]</i></p>		

⁷ 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.

⁸ 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.

⁹ 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.

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

¹¹ 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.

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

4. Quantitative values of indicators¹³ and data sources

[Mandatory]

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

¹³ Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

¹⁴ 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.

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

¹⁶ 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".

¹⁷ 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".

¹⁸ 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.

¹⁹ 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.

Common result indicators	T1 – Percent age of expenditure under Articles 14, 15 and 35 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 in relation to the total expenditure for the RDP					
Additional result indicators²⁰						
Common Context indicators²¹						

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

²¹ 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 findings²² <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
6. Answer to evaluation question²³ <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
7. Conclusions and recommendations²⁴	
Conclusion <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i>	Recommendation <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non - mandatory]</i>
C.1	R.1
C.2	R.2
C.3	R.3

²² 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.

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

²⁴ 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 1B²⁵:

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

2. Link between judgment criteria, common and additional²⁶ result indicators used to answer the CEQ

[Mandatory]

Judgment criteria²⁷ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Common result indicators²⁸ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Additional result indicators and information²⁹ <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

²⁵ 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.

²⁶ 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.

²⁷ 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).

²⁸ 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.

²⁹ 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 applied³⁰ Quantitative methods³¹: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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)³² iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered Qualitative methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Reasons for using the method³³ ii. Description of methods used³⁴ iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered <p><i>[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]</i></p>		

³⁰ 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.

³¹ 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.

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

³³ 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.

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

4. Quantitative values of indicators³⁵ and data sources

[Mandatory]

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

³⁵ Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

³⁶ 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.

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

³⁸ 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".

³⁹ 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".

⁴⁰ 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.

⁴¹ 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 ...)					
Addition al result indicators 42						
Common context indicators 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.

5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings⁴⁴ <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
6. Answer to evaluation question⁴⁵ <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
7. Conclusions and recommendations⁴⁶	
Conclusion <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i>	Recommendation <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

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 3: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS SUPPORTED LIFELONG LEARNING AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING IN THE AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY SECTORS?”

1. List of measures contributing to the FA 1C

Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:

Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 1C⁴⁷:

⁴⁴ 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.

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

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

⁴⁷ 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 additional⁴⁸ indicators used to answer the CEQ

[Mandatory]

Judgment criteria ⁴⁹ [Max. 255 characters]	Common result indicators ⁵⁰ [Max. 255 characters]	Additional result indicators and information ⁵¹ [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 applied⁵²

Quantitative methods:

- i. Reasons⁵³ 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)⁵⁴

⁴⁸ 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.

⁴⁹ 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).

⁵⁰ 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.

⁵¹ 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.

⁵² 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.

⁵³ 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 method⁵⁵
- ii. Description of methods used⁵⁶
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

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

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

⁵⁵ 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.

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

4. Quantitative values of indicators⁵⁷ and data sources

[Mandatory]

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

⁵⁷ Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

⁵⁸ 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.

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

⁶⁰ 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".

⁶¹ 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".

⁶² 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.

⁶³ 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.

Additional result indicators ⁶⁴						
Common Context indicators ⁶⁵						

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

⁶⁵ 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 findings⁶⁶ <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
6. Answer to evaluation question⁶⁷ <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
7. Conclusions and recommendations⁶⁸	
Conclusion <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Mandatory]</i>	Recommendation <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non - mandatory]</i>
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 2A⁶⁹:

⁶⁶ 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.

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

⁶⁸ 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 additional⁷⁰ result indicators used to answer the CEQ

[Mandatory]

Judgment criteria⁷¹ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Common result indicators⁷² <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Additional result indicators and information⁷³ <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 applied⁷⁴		
Quantitative methods⁷⁵:		

⁶⁹ 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.

⁷⁰ 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.

⁷¹ 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).

⁷² 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.

⁷³ 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.

⁷⁴ 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)⁷⁶
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

Qualitative methods:

- i. Reasons for using the method⁷⁷
- ii. Description of methods used⁷⁸
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

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

⁷⁵ 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.

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

⁷⁷ 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.

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

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

⁷⁹ Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

⁸⁰ 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.

⁸¹ 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".

⁸² 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.

⁸³ 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".

⁸⁴ 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.

⁸⁵ 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.

indicator s	agricultural holdings with RDP support for investments in restructuring or modernisation							
	R2 – Change in agricultural output on supported farms⁸⁶							
	R2 – AWU							
	R2 - Change in agricultural output on supported farms / AWU (numerator/de nominator)⁸⁷							
Additional result indicator s⁸⁸								

⁸⁶ Values of common complementary result indicators are collected separately for numerator and denominator.

⁸⁷ Will be automatically filled based on the data from the previous rows.

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

Common Context indicator s⁸⁹								
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

⁸⁹ 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 findings⁹⁰ <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
6. Answer to evaluation question⁹¹ <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
7. Conclusions and recommendations⁹²	
Conclusion <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i>	Recommendation <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non mandatory]</i>
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 2B⁹³:

⁹⁰ 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.

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

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

⁹³ 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 additional⁹⁴ result indicators used to answer the CEQ

[Mandatory]

Judgment criteria ⁹⁵ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Common result indicators ⁹⁶ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Additional result indicators and information ⁹⁷ <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 applied⁹⁸

Quantitative methods⁹⁹:

- 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

⁹⁴ 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.

⁹⁵ 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).

⁹⁶ 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.

⁹⁷ 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.

⁹⁸ 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.

⁹⁹ 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)¹⁰⁰
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

Qualitative methods:

- i. Reasons for using the method¹⁰¹
- ii. Description of methods used¹⁰²
- 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 indicators¹⁰³ and data sources

[Mandatory]

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

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

¹⁰¹ 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.

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

¹⁰³ Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

¹⁰⁴ 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.

¹⁰⁵ 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".

¹⁰⁶ 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".

¹⁰⁷ 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".

¹⁰⁸ 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.

¹⁰⁹ 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,

Common result indicators	R3/T5 – Percentage of agriculture holdings with RDP supported business development plan/investments for young farmers					
Additional result indicators¹¹⁰						
Common Context indicators¹¹¹						

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.

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

¹¹¹ 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).

5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings¹¹² <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
6. Answer to evaluation question¹¹³ <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
7. Conclusions and recommendations¹¹⁴	
Conclusion <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i>	Recommendation <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i>
C.1	R.1
C.2	R.2
C.3	R.3

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 6

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?”

1. List of measure contributing to the FA 3A

Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:

Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 3A¹¹⁵:

¹¹² 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.

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

¹¹⁴ 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 additional¹¹⁶ result indicators used to answer the CEQ

[Mandatory]

Judgment criteria¹¹⁷ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Common result indicators¹¹⁸ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Additional result indicators and information¹¹⁹ <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		

¹¹⁵ 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.

¹¹⁶ 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.

¹¹⁷ 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).

¹¹⁸ 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.

¹¹⁹ 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		

3. Methods applied¹²⁰

Quantitative methods¹²¹:

- 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)¹²²
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

Qualitative methods:

- i. Reasons for using the method¹²³
- ii. Description of methods used¹²⁴
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

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

¹²⁰ 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.

¹²¹ 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.

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

¹²³ 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.

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

4. Quantitative values of indicators¹²⁵ and data sources

[Mandatory]

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

¹²⁵ Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

¹²⁶ 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.

¹²⁷ 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".

¹²⁸ 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".

¹²⁹ 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".

¹³⁰ 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.

¹³¹ 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					
Additional result indicators ¹³²						
Common Context indicators ¹³³						

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

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

5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings¹³⁴ <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
6. Answer to evaluation question¹³⁵ <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
7. Conclusions and recommendations¹³⁶	
Conclusion <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i>	Recommendation <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i>
C.1	R.1
C.2	R.2
C.3	R.3

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 7

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 7: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS SUPPORTED FARM RISK PREVENTION AND MANAGEMENT?”

1. List of measures contributing to the FA 3B

Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:

Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 3B¹³⁷:

¹³⁴ 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.

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

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

¹³⁷ 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 additional¹³⁸ result indicators used to answer the CEQ

[Mandatory]

Judgment criteria¹³⁹ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Common result indicators¹⁴⁰ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Additional result indicators and information¹⁴¹ <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 applied¹⁴²

Quantitative methods¹⁴³:

- Reasons for using the method
- 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)¹⁴⁴
- Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

Qualitative methods:

- Reasons for using the method¹⁴⁵

¹³⁸ 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.

¹³⁹ 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).

¹⁴⁰ 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.

¹⁴¹ 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.

¹⁴² 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.

¹⁴³ 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.

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

- ii. Description of methods used¹⁴⁶
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

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

¹⁴⁵ 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.

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

4. Quantitative values of indicators¹⁴⁷ and data sources

[Mandatory]

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

¹⁴⁷ Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

¹⁴⁸ 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.

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

¹⁵⁰ 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".

¹⁵¹ 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".

¹⁵² 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.

¹⁵³ 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.

indicators¹⁵⁴						
Common Context indicators¹⁵⁵						

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

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

5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings¹⁵⁶

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

6. Answer to evaluation question¹⁵⁷

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

7. Conclusions and recommendations¹⁵⁸

Conclusion

[Approx. 1,000 characters – Mandatory]

Recommendation

[Approx. 1,000 characters – Not-mandatory]

C.1

R.1

C.2

R.2

C.3

R.3

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 8

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?”

1. Intervention logic of the FA 4A

Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:

Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 4A¹⁵⁹:

¹⁵⁶ 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.

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

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

¹⁵⁹ 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 additional¹⁶⁰ result indicators used to answer the CEQ

[Mandatory]

Judgment criteria¹⁶¹ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Common result indicators¹⁶² <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Additional result indicators and information¹⁶³ <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 applied¹⁶⁴

Quantitative methods¹⁶⁵:

- 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

¹⁶⁰ 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.

¹⁶¹ 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).

¹⁶² 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.

¹⁶³ 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.

¹⁶⁴ 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.

¹⁶⁵ 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)¹⁶⁶
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

Qualitative methods:

- i. Reasons for using the method¹⁶⁷
- ii. Description of methods used¹⁶⁸
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

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

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

¹⁶⁷ 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.

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

4. Quantitative values of indicators¹⁶⁹ and data sources

[Mandatory]

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

¹⁶⁹ Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

¹⁷⁰ 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.

¹⁷¹ 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.

¹⁷² 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".

¹⁷³ 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".

¹⁷⁴ 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.

¹⁷⁵ 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					
Additional result indica tors 176						
Com mon Conte xt indica tors 177						

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

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

5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings¹⁷⁸ <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
6. Answer to evaluation question¹⁷⁹ <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
7. Conclusions and recommendations¹⁸⁰	
Conclusion <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Mandatory]</i>	Recommendation <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non mandatory]</i>
C.1	R.1
C.2	R.2
C.3	R.3

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 9

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 9: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS SUPPORTED THE IMPROVEMENT OF WATER MANAGEMENT, INCLUDING FERTILIZER AND PESTICIDE MANAGEMENT?”

1. List of measures contributing to the FA 4B

Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:

Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 4B¹⁸¹:

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

¹⁷⁸ 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.

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

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

¹⁸¹ 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 additional¹⁸² result indicators used to answer the CEQ

[Mandatory]

Judgment criteria¹⁸³ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Common result indicators¹⁸⁴ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Additional result indicators and information¹⁸⁵ <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 applied¹⁸⁶

Quantitative methods¹⁸⁷:

- 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)¹⁸⁸
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions

¹⁸² 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.

¹⁸³ 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).

¹⁸⁴ 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.

¹⁸⁵ 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.

¹⁸⁶ 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.

¹⁸⁷ 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.

¹⁸⁸ 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 method¹⁸⁹
- ii. Description of methods used¹⁹⁰
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

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

¹⁸⁹ 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.

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

4. Quantitative values of indicators¹⁹¹ and data sources

[Mandatory]

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

¹⁹¹ Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

¹⁹² 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.

¹⁹³ 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.

¹⁹⁴ 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".

¹⁹⁵ 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".

¹⁹⁶ 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.

¹⁹⁷ 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					
Additional result indica tors ¹⁹⁸						
Com mon Conte xt indica tors ¹⁹⁹						

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

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

5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings²⁰⁰ <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
6. Answer to evaluation question²⁰¹ <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
7. Conclusions and recommendations²⁰²	
Conclusion <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i>	Recommendation <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non - mandatory]</i>
C.1	R.1
C.2	R.2
C.3	R.3

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 10

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 10: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS SUPPORTED THE PREVENTION OF SOIL EROSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF SOIL MANAGEMENT?”
1. List of measures contributing to the FA 4C Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures: Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 4C²⁰³: <i>[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]</i>

²⁰⁰ 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.

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

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

²⁰³ 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 additional²⁰⁴ result indicators used to answer the CEQ

[Mandatory]

Judgment criteria²⁰⁵ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Common result indicators²⁰⁶ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Additional result indicators and information²⁰⁷ <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 applied²⁰⁸

Quantitative methods²⁰⁹:

²⁰⁴ 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.

²⁰⁵ 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).

²⁰⁶ 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.

²⁰⁷ 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.

²⁰⁸ 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.

²⁰⁹ 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)²¹⁰
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

Qualitative methods:

- i. Reasons for using the method²¹¹
- ii. Description of methods used²¹²
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

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

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

²¹¹ 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.

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

4. Quantitative values of indicators²¹³ and data sources

[Mandatory]

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

²¹³ Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

²¹⁴ 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.

²¹⁵ 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.

²¹⁶ 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".

²¹⁷ 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".

²¹⁸ 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.

²¹⁹ 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.

	gement					
	R11/T13 – Percentage of forest land under management contracts to improve soil management					
Additional result indicators ²²⁰						
Common Context indicators ²²¹						

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

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

5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings²²² <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
6. Answer to evaluation question²²³ <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
7. Conclusions and recommendations²²⁴	
Conclusion <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Mandatory]</i>	Recommendation <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i>
C.1	R.1
C.2	R.2
C.3	R.3

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 11

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 11: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS CONTRIBUTED TO INCREASING EFFICIENCY IN WATER USE BY AGRICULTURE?”

1. List of measures contributing to the FA 5A

Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:

Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 5A²²⁵:

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

²²² 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.

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

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

²²⁵ 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 additional²²⁶ result indicators used to answer the CEQ

[Mandatory]

Judgment criteria ²²⁷ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Common result indicators ²²⁸ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Additional result indicators and information ²²⁹ <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 applied²³⁰

Quantitative methods²³¹:

- 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)²³²
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

Qualitative methods:

²²⁶ 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.

²²⁷ 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).

²²⁸ 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.

²²⁹ 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.

²³⁰ 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.

²³¹ 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.

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

- i. Reasons for using the method²³³
- ii. Description of methods used²³⁴
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

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

²³³ 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.

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

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

²³⁵ Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

²³⁶ 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.

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

²³⁸ 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.

²³⁹ 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".

²⁴⁰ 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.

²⁴¹ 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)							
Additional result indicators ²⁴²								
Common Context indicators ²⁴³								

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

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

5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings²⁴⁴ <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
6. Answer to evaluation question²⁴⁵ <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
7. Conclusions and recommendations²⁴⁶	
Conclusion <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i>	Recommendation <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i>
C.1	R.1
C.2	R.2
C.3	R.3

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 12

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 12: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS CONTRIBUTED TO INCREASING EFFICIENCY IN ENERGY USE IN AGRICULTURE AND FOOD PROCESSING?”

1. List of measures contributing to the FA 5B

Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:

Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 5B²⁴⁷:

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

²⁴⁴ 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.

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

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

²⁴⁷ 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 additional²⁴⁸ result indicators used to answer the CEQ

[Mandatory]

Judgment criteria²⁴⁹ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Common result indicators²⁵⁰ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Additional result indicators and information²⁵¹ <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 applied²⁵²

Quantitative methods²⁵³:

- 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)²⁵⁴
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

Qualitative methods:

²⁴⁸ 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.

²⁴⁹ 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 prefilled 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).

²⁵⁰ 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.

²⁵¹ 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.

²⁵² 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.

²⁵³ 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.

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

- i. Reasons for using the method²⁵⁵
- ii. Description of methods used²⁵⁶
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

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

²⁵⁵ 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.

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

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

²⁵⁷ Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

²⁵⁸ 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.

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

²⁶⁰ 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.

²⁶¹ 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".

²⁶² 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.

²⁶³ 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)							
Additional result indicators ²⁶⁴								

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

Common Context indicators²⁶⁵								
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings²⁶⁶ <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
6. Answer to evaluation question²⁶⁷ <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
7. Conclusions and recommendations²⁶⁸	
Conclusion <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Mandatory]</i>	Recommendation <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i>
C.1	R.1
C.2	R.2
C.3	R.3

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 13

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?”

1. List of measures contributing to the FA 5C

Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:

Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 5C²⁶⁹:

²⁶⁶ 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.

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

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

²⁶⁹ 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 additional²⁷⁰ result indicators used to answer the CEQ

[Mandatory]

Judgment criteria²⁷¹ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Common result indicators²⁷² <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Additional result indicators and information²⁷³ <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 applied²⁷⁴

Quantitative methods²⁷⁵:

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

²⁷⁰ 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.

²⁷¹ 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).

²⁷² 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.

²⁷³ 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.

²⁷⁴ 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.

²⁷⁵ 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)²⁷⁶

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

Qualitative methods:

- i. Reasons for using the method²⁷⁷
- ii. Description of methods used²⁷⁸
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

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

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

²⁷⁷ 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.

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

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

²⁷⁹ Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

²⁸⁰ 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.

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

²⁸² 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.

²⁸³ 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".

²⁸⁴ 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.

²⁸⁵ 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.

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

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

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

5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings²⁸⁸ <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
6. Answer to evaluation question²⁸⁹ <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
7. Conclusions and recommendations²⁹⁰	
Conclusion <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i>	Recommendation <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i>
C.1	R.1
C.2	R.2
C.3	R.3

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 14

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 14: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS CONTRIBUTED TO REDUCING GHG AND AMMONIA EMISSIONS FROM AGRICULTURE?”

1. List of measures contributing to the FA 5D

Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:

Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 5D²⁹¹:

²⁸⁸ 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.

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

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

²⁹¹ 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 additional²⁹² result indicators used to answer the CEQ

[Mandatory]

Judgment criteria²⁹³ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Common result indicators²⁹⁴ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Additional result indicators and information²⁹⁵ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>
GHG and ammonia emissions from agriculture has been reduced	<p>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;</p> <p>R17/T18: Percentage of agricultural land under management contracts targeting reduction of GHG and/or ammonia emissions;</p> <p>R18: Reduced emissions of methane and nitrous oxide;</p> <p>R19: Reduced ammonia emissions.</p>	

3. Methods applied²⁹⁶

²⁹² 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.

²⁹³ 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).

²⁹⁴ 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.

²⁹⁵ 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.

²⁹⁶ 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 methods²⁹⁷:

- 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)²⁹⁸
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

Qualitative methods:

- i. Reasons for using the method²⁹⁹
- ii. Description of methods used³⁰⁰
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

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

²⁹⁷ 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.

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

²⁹⁹ 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.

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

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

³⁰¹ Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

³⁰² 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.

³⁰³ 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.

³⁰⁴ 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.

³⁰⁵ 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".

³⁰⁶ 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.

³⁰⁷ 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.

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

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

	agriculture (Tonnes of ammonia)							
Additional result indicators 308								
Common Context indicators 309								

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

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

5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings³¹⁰ <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
6. Answer to evaluation question³¹¹ <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
7. Conclusions and recommendations³¹²	
Conclusion <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i>	Recommendation <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i>
C.1	R.1
C.2	R.2
C.3	R.3

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 15

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 15: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS SUPPORTED CARBON CONSERVATION AND SEQUESTRATION IN AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY?”
1. List of measures contributing to the FA 5E Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures: Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 5E³¹³: <i>[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]</i>

³¹⁰ 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.

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

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

³¹³ 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 additional³¹⁴ result indicators used to answer the CEQ

[Mandatory]

Judgment criteria³¹⁵ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Common result indicators³¹⁶ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Additional result indicators and information³¹⁷ <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 applied³¹⁸

Quantitative methods³¹⁹:

- 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)³²⁰
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions

³¹⁴ 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.

³¹⁵ 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).

³¹⁶ 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.

³¹⁷ 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.

³¹⁸ 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.

³¹⁹ 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.

³²⁰ 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 method³²¹
- ii. Description of methods used³²²
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

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

³²¹ 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.

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

4. Quantitative values of indicators ³²³ and data sources						
[Mandatory]						
Indicator		Absolute value ³²⁴	Ratio value ³²⁵	Calculated gross value ³²⁶	Calculated net value ³²⁷	Data and information sources ³²⁸
Common output indicators ³²⁹						
Common result indicators	R20/T19 – Percentage of agricultural and forest land under management contracts contributing to					

³²³ Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

³²⁴ 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.

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

³²⁶ 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".

³²⁷ 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".

³²⁸ 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.

³²⁹ 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.

	carbon sequestration and conservation					
Additional result indicators ³³⁰						
Common Context indicators ³³¹						

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

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

5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings³³² <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
6. Answer to evaluation question³³³ <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
7. Conclusions and recommendations³³⁴	
Conclusion <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i>	Recommendation <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i>
C.1	R.1
C.2	R.2
C.3	R.3

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 16

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 16: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS SUPPORTED THE DIVERSIFICATION, CREATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF SMALL ENTERPRISES AND JOB CREATION?”
1. List of measures contributing to the FA 6A Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures: Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 6A³³⁵: <i>[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]</i>

³³² 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.

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

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

³³⁵ 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 additional³³⁶ result indicators used to answer the CEQ

[Mandatory]

Judgment criteria ³³⁷ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Common result indicators ³³⁸ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Additional result indicators and information ³³⁹ <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 applied³⁴⁰

Quantitative methods³⁴¹:

- 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)³⁴²
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

³³⁶ 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.

³³⁷ 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).

³³⁸ 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.

³³⁹ 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.

³⁴⁰ 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.

³⁴¹ 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.

³⁴² 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 method³⁴³
- ii. Description of methods used³⁴⁴
- 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 indicators³⁴⁵ and data sources

[Mandatory]

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

³⁴³ 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.

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

³⁴⁵ Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

³⁴⁶ 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.

³⁴⁷ 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".

³⁴⁸ 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".

³⁴⁹ 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".

³⁵⁰ 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.

³⁵¹ 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.

Common result indicators	R21/T20 - Jobs created in supported projects					
Additional result indicators³⁵²						
Common Context indicators³⁵³						

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

³⁵³ 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).

5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings³⁵⁴ <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
6. Answer to evaluation question³⁵⁵ <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
7. Conclusions and recommendations³⁵⁶	
Conclusion <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i>	Recommendation <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non - Mandatory]</i>
C.1	R.1
C.2	R.2
C.3	R.3

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 17

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 17: “TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE RDP INTERVENTIONS SUPPORTED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT IN RURAL AREAS?”
1. List of measures contributing to the FA 6B Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures: Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 6B³⁵⁷: <i>[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]</i>

³⁵⁴ 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.

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

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

³⁵⁷ 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 additional³⁵⁸ result indicators used to answer the CEQ

[Mandatory]

Judgment criteria³⁵⁹ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Common result indicators³⁶⁰ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Additional result indicators and information³⁶¹ <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		

³⁵⁸ 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.

³⁵⁹ 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).

³⁶⁰ 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.

³⁶¹ 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		

3. Methods applied³⁶²

Quantitative methods³⁶³:

- Reasons for using the method
- 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)³⁶⁴
- Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

Qualitative methods:

- Reasons for using the method³⁶⁵
- Description of methods used³⁶⁶
- Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

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

³⁶² 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.

³⁶³ 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.

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

³⁶⁵ 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.

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

4. Quantitative values of indicators ³⁶⁷ and data sources						
<i>[Mandatory]</i>						
Indicator		Absolute value ³⁶⁸	Ratio value ³⁶⁹	Calculated gross value ³⁷⁰	Calculated net value ³⁷¹	Data and information sources ³⁷²
Common output indicators ³⁷³						
Common result indicators	R24/T23 - Jobs created in supported projects (Leader)					
	R22/T21 - percentage of					

³⁶⁷ Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

³⁶⁸ 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.

³⁶⁹ 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".

³⁷⁰ 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".

³⁷¹ 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".

³⁷² 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.

³⁷³ 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					
Additional result indicators ³⁷⁴						
Common Context indicators ³⁷⁵						

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

³⁷⁵ 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).

5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings³⁷⁶ <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
6. Answer to evaluation question³⁷⁷ <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
7. Conclusions and recommendations³⁷⁸	
Conclusion <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters- Mandatory]</i>	Recommendation <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i>
C.1	R.1
C.2	R.2
C.3	R.3

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 18

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?”

1. List of measures contributing to the FA 6C

Primarily programmed measures/sub-measures:

Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs which show secondary contributions to FA 6C³⁷⁹:

³⁷⁶ 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.

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

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

³⁷⁹ 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 additional³⁸⁰ result indicators used to answer the CEQ

[Mandatory]

Judgment criteria³⁸¹ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Common result indicators³⁸² <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Additional result indicators and information³⁸³ <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 applied³⁸⁴

Quantitative methods³⁸⁵:

- 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)³⁸⁶
- iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions

³⁸⁰ 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.

³⁸¹ 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).

³⁸² 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.

³⁸³ 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.

³⁸⁴ 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.

³⁸⁵ 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.

³⁸⁶ 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 method³⁸⁷
- ii. Description of methods used³⁸⁸
- 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 indicators³⁸⁹ and data sources

[Mandatory]

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

³⁸⁷ 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.

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

³⁸⁹ Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

³⁹⁰ 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.

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

³⁹² 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".

³⁹³ 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".

³⁹⁴ 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.

³⁹⁵ 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.

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

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

³⁹⁷ 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 findings³⁹⁸ <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
6. Answer to evaluation question³⁹⁹ <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
7. Conclusions and recommendations⁴⁰⁰	
Conclusion <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i>	Recommendation <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i>
C.1	R.1
C.2	R.2
C.3	R.3

³⁹⁸ 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.

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

⁴⁰⁰ 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 priorities⁴⁰¹:

[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 method⁴⁰²
- 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 areas⁴⁰³

[Mandatory]

⁴⁰¹ 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.

⁴⁰² Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the RDP synergies.

⁴⁰³ 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.

4. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings⁴⁰⁴ <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>	
5. Answer to evaluation question⁴⁰⁵ <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
6. Conclusions and recommendations⁴⁰⁶	
Conclusion <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i>	Recommendation <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i>
C.1	R.1
C.2	R.2
C.3	R.3

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 20

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?”
1. Support for technical assistance (other than NRN) Activities under the TA:⁴⁰⁷ <i>[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]</i>
2. Link between judgment criteria and additional indicators used to answer the

⁴⁰⁴ 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.

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

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

⁴⁰⁷ Activities envisioned to be implemented via technical assistance other than NRN are listed here

CEQ	
[Mandatory]	
Judgment criteria ⁴⁰⁸ [Max. 255 characters]	Additional indicators ⁴⁰⁹ [Max. 255 characters]
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	
3. Methods applied Quantitative methods⁴¹⁰: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Reasons for using the method ii. Description of method iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered Qualitative methods:	

⁴⁰⁸ 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.

⁴⁰⁹ 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.

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

i. Reasons for using the method ⁴¹¹ ii. Description of methods used iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered <i>[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]</i>				
4. Quantitative values of indicators⁴¹² and data sources <i>[Mandatory]</i>				
Indicator		Absolute value⁴¹³	Ratio value⁴¹⁴	Data information sources⁴¹⁵ and
Common output indicators⁴¹⁶				
Additional indicators⁴¹⁷				
5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings⁴¹⁸ <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>				
6. Answer to evaluation question⁴¹⁹ <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>				
7. Conclusions and recommendations⁴²⁰				

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

⁴¹² Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

⁴¹³ 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.

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

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

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

⁴¹⁷ Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation question.

⁴¹⁸ 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.

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

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

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

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION NO 21

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?”

1. Intervention logic of the NRN

Common objectives and linked group of activities (both common and NRN specific):⁴²¹

- **Group of activity:**

NRN specific objectives and linked groups of activities (both common and NRN specific):⁴²²

- **Group of activity:**

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

2. Link between judgment criteria and additional NRN specific indicators used to answer the CEQ

[Mandatory]

⁴²¹ 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

⁴²² 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

Judgment criteria ⁴²³ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>	Additional NRN specific result indicators ⁴²⁴ <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"> • Improved capacity of RDP beneficiaries • Improved evaluation awareness • Lessons from evaluations are taken into account in programme implementation 	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)
3. Methods applied Quantitative methods ⁴²⁵ : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Reasons for using the method ii. Description of methods to assess additional indicators iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered Qualitative methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Reasons for using the method⁴²⁶ ii. Description of methods used iii. Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered 	

⁴²³ 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.

⁴²⁴ 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.

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

⁴²⁶ Explain the reasons why qualitative methods have been used to assess the NRN results.

<i>[A maximum of 7,000 characters = approx. 2 pages – Mandatory]</i>						
4. Quantitative values of indicators⁴²⁷ and data sources <i>[Mandatory]</i>						
Indicator		Absolute value⁴²⁸	Ratio value⁴²⁹	Calculated gross value⁴³⁰	Calculated net value⁴³¹	Data information sources⁴³² and
Output indicators (common and NRN specific) ⁴³³						
Additional result indicators ⁴³⁴						
5. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings⁴³⁵ <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>						
6. Answer to evaluation question⁴³⁶						

⁴²⁷ Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

⁴²⁸ 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.

⁴²⁹ This column is filled for the additional indicators with ratio value.

⁴³⁰ 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.

⁴³¹ 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

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

⁴³³ 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.

⁴³⁴ Additional indicators are optional and developed in MS to answer common evaluation question.

⁴³⁵ 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.

⁴³⁶ 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 recommendations⁴³⁷

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

⁴³⁷ 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 AREAS⁴³⁸

PROGRAMME SPECIFIC FOCUS AREA (PSEQ):⁴³⁹ PROGRAMME SPECIFIC EVALUATION QUESTION NO:⁴⁴⁰		
1. Rational for programme specific focus area⁴⁴¹ <i>[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]</i>		
2. List of measures contributing to the programme specific FA Programmed measures/sub-measures: Measures/sub-measures programmed under the other FAs (common and programme specific) which show secondary contributions to programme specific FA⁴⁴²: <i>[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]</i>		
3. Link between judgment criteria and common and /or programme specific result indicators⁴⁴³ used to answer the PSEQ <i>[Mandatory]</i>		
Programme specific judgment criteria⁴⁴⁴	Common result indicators⁴⁴⁵	Programme specific result indicators⁴⁴⁶

⁴³⁸ 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.

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

⁴⁴⁰ 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?”

⁴⁴¹ 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.

⁴⁴² 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.

⁴⁴³ 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>

4. Methods applied⁴⁴⁷

Quantitative methods⁴⁴⁸:

- Reasons for using the method
- Description of methods to calculate ratios, gross or net (if applicable) values of common and programme specific indicators⁴⁴⁹
- Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

Qualitative methods:

- Reasons for using the method⁴⁵⁰
- Description of methods used⁴⁵¹
- Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

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

5. Quantitative values of indicators⁴⁵² and data sources

[Mandatory]

⁴⁴⁴ 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

⁴⁴⁵ 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.

⁴⁴⁶ 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.

⁴⁴⁷ 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.

⁴⁴⁸ 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.

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

⁴⁵⁰ 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.

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

⁴⁵² Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

Indicator		Absolute value ⁴⁵³	Ratio value ⁴⁵⁴	Calculated gross value ⁴⁵⁵	Calculated net value ⁴⁵⁶	Data and information sources ⁴⁵⁷
Common output indicators ⁴⁵⁸						
Programme specific output indicators ⁴⁵⁹						
Common indicators ⁴⁶⁰						
Programme specific indicators ⁴⁶¹						
6. Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings⁴⁶² <i>[A maximum of 1,750 characters = approx. ½ page – Non-mandatory]</i>						

⁴⁵³ 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.

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

⁴⁵⁵ This column is filled for gross values of common and programme specific indicators, if applicable. The gross value is inserted here also if 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".

⁴⁵⁶ 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".

⁴⁵⁷ 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.

⁴⁵⁸ 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.

⁴⁵⁹ The MS can also apply programme specific output indicators to answer the PSEQ.

⁴⁶⁰ The common indicators can be also used to answer PSEQ. Decision which common indicators could be used is done in MS.

⁴⁶¹ PSEQ is answered with programme specific indicators which are developed in MS.

⁴⁶² 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.

7. Answer to evaluation question⁴⁶³ <i>[A maximum of 10,500 characters = approx. 3 pages – Mandatory]</i>	
8. Conclusions and recommendations⁴⁶⁴	
Conclusion <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters - Mandatory]</i>	Recommendation <i>[Approx. 1,000 characters – Non-mandatory]</i>
C.1	R.1
C.2	R.2
C.3	R.3

PROGRAMME SPECIFIC EVALUATION QUESTION LINKED TO PROGRAMME SPECIFIC EVALUATION TOPIC⁴⁶⁵

EVALUATION TOPIC⁴⁶⁶: PROGRAMME SPECIFIC EVALUATION QUESTION NO⁴⁶⁷:
1. Rational for choosing the programme specific evaluation topic⁴⁶⁸ <i>[A maximum of 1,000 characters = approx. ¼ page – Mandatory]</i>
2. Link between judgment criteria and programme specific indicators⁴⁶⁹ used to answer the PSEQ

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

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

⁴⁶⁵ 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.

⁴⁶⁶ Insert here the evaluation topic, e.g. „Programme delivery“

⁴⁶⁷ 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?”

⁴⁶⁸ Explain the reason why the programme specific evaluation topic has been chosen.

⁴⁶⁹ 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>					
Programme specific judgment criteria ⁴⁷⁰ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>			Programme specific result indicators ⁴⁷¹ <i>[Max. 255 characters]</i>		

3. Methods applied

(b) Quantitative methods⁴⁷²:

- Reasons for using the method
- Description of methods to assess programme specific indicators
- Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

(c) Qualitative methods:

- Reasons for using the method⁴⁷³
- Description of methods used
- Challenges in the application of described methods and solutions encountered

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

4. Quantitative values of indicators⁴⁷⁴ **and data sources**

[Mandatory]

Indicator	Absolute value ⁴⁷⁵	Ratio value ⁴⁷⁶	Calculated gross value ⁴⁷⁷	Calculated net value ⁴⁷⁸	Data information sources ⁴⁷⁹ and
-----------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---

⁴⁷⁰ 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.

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

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

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

⁴⁷⁴ Values are based on the quantitative methods described above.

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

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

⁴⁷⁷ 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.

⁴⁷⁸ 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.

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

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

⁴⁸⁰ Programme specific are developed in MS to answer PSEQ.

⁴⁸¹ 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.

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

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

DRAFT