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Structure of the Draft Guidelines

Part I: Requirements
Part II: Approaches for assessing RDP impacts
Part III: Fiches for answering the CEQ no. 22-30
Part VI: Technical Annex
  • Additional indicators
  • Descriptions of methods
  • Adequateness of approaches

Final Draft under consultation with Expert Group on M&E the CAP until end of June 2018!
PART I: What needs to be reported on evaluation in the AIR in 2019
Main focus of evaluation in 2019

- **ALL AIRs**: 2015 - 2020
- **AIRs Submitted in 2017**: 2015 - 2016
- **AIRs Submitted in 2019**: 2015 - 2018

**The progress in implementing the Evaluation Plan**

**Quantification of programme achievements in particular through the assessment of the Complementary Result Indicator and the relevant Evaluation Questions**

**Guidelines: Assessment of RDP Results: how to prepare for reporting on evaluation in 2017**

**Progress towards objectives of the programme and its contribution to achieving the Union Strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, inter alia assessment of the programmes’s net contributions to changes in the CAP impact indicator values and relevant Evaluation Questions**

**Guidelines: Reporting on RDP Achievements and impacts in 2019**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.01</td>
<td>Agricultural entrepreneurial income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.02</td>
<td>Agricultural factor income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.03</td>
<td>Total factor productivity in agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.07</td>
<td>Emissions from agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.08</td>
<td>Farmland bird index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.09</td>
<td>High nature value (HNV) farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.10</td>
<td>Water abstraction in agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.11</td>
<td>Water quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12</td>
<td>Soil organic matter in arable land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.13</td>
<td>Soil erosion by water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.14</td>
<td>Rural employment rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.15</td>
<td>Rural employment rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.16</td>
<td>Rural GDP per capita</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART II: Choosing appropriate evaluation approaches
How to choose adequate evaluation approaches?

Logic models

- Serve as decision tools (to match methods with data)
- Underlying decision trees provide flexibility to consider diversity across MS
- Guide to new approaches
- Help to plan and predict evaluation outcomes in a given context

For more information on logic models see FP7-project Envieval (https://www.envieval.eu/)
What approaches do the guidelines suggest?

- **Approach A:** example of optimal evaluation approach
  - To be used if high quality data are available.
  - Should be the aim for ex post evaluation (when data gaps are closed)

- **Approach B:** example of approach acceptable in 2019
  - less data-demanding.
  - To be used in case of low programme uptake, small programmes, or if other factors hinder application of optimal approach (data, resource-gaps)
PART II: Approaches for assessing RDP achievements in 2019 and ex post – sector impacts
CAP Objective: Fostering the competitiveness of agriculture

CEQ 27: To what extent has the RDP contributed to the CAP objective of fostering the competitiveness of agriculture?

Additional impact indicators:
- Family farm income per family work unit = Family Farm Income/FWU
- Farm net value added per Annual Work Unit = Farm net value added/AWU
- Total output per work unit = Total Output/AWU
- Total output per unit of land = Total Output/land area
- Costs as % of output

Primary contributions
Secondary contributions

Other RDP measures programmed under the P 4,5 and 6 affecting agriculture income and productivity
Unit of assessment

Micro-level assessment

Agriculture holding(s) which received a support and its counterpart holding(s) which did not get such support.

Macro-level assessment

Agriculture sector within the RDP territory
* Assuming used indicator causally matched to the unit of analysis, farm.
** Requires common underlying population between farms under comparison and statistically representative samples.
Next steps

- **June**: Guidelines are being commented by the members of the Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP
- **July**: Guidelines are revised by Helpdesk and validated by EC
- **August**: Guidelines are published
- **September**: Helpdesk finalizes Yearly Capacity Building material related to TWG-5 Guidelines
- **Oct/Nov.**: A Good Practice Workshop „Methods for assessing RDP impacts” is conducted
- **Oct.-Dec.**: Yearly Capacity Building events are carried out in Member States
Thank you for your attention!
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