

Evaluation of Rural development programmes 2000-2006 supported from the European Agriculture Guidance and Guarantee Fund

Commission Guidelines and Common Evaluation Questions with Criteria and Indicators

Detlev Clemens

European Commission, DG Agriculture

e-mail: detlev.clemens@cec.eu.int

Rome, 12 March 2003

STRUCTURE OF PRESENTATION

- Overview of the evaluation process for the 2000-2006 programming period as a whole: strategy, consecutive steps, responsibilities of Member States and the Commission
- Presentation of the Evaluation Guidelines: purpose and structure
- Specific objectives of the mid-term evaluation within the evaluation process
- Application of common evaluations questions with related criteria and indicators
- Other issues like the application of the evaluation strategy to Objective 1 regions ...

EVALUATION CYCLE OF THE 2000-2006 RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES

(Art. 40-43 of Regulation 1260/1999 and 55-57 of 445/2002)

Timing:

- ☛ EX ANTE In the context of programme preparation
- ☛ MID TERM 3 years after adoption of programme
transmitted to the Commission by end
2003 at the latest
- ☛ MID TERM
UPDATE by end 2005
- ☛ EX POST transmitted to the Commission at the
latest two years after the end of the
programme period
Community level summary 3 years after
the end of the period

EVALUATION CYCLE OF THE 2000-2006 RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES

Responsibilities:

- ☞ 2000: ex-ante RD programmes: Member States/ regions
- ☞ 2003: mid-term evaluations: Member States/ regions
- ☞ 2004: Synthesis of mid-term evaluation: Commission
- ☞ 2005: mid-term evaluation update: "where appropriate
Member States/ regions
- ☞ 2008: ex-post evaluation: Member States/ regions
- ☞ 2009: Synthesis of ex-post evaluations

EVALUATION CYCLE OF THE 2000-2006 RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES

Purpose of each evaluation phase:

- ☞ EX ANTE Support the preparation of the programme and of the RD measures
- ☞ MID TERM Information on implementation and first results
Support possible revisions of the programme
Input to the policy discussion on post 2006 RD measures
- ☞ MID TERM UPDATE Support the preparation of later (2006->) interventions or programmes
- ☞ EX POST Accountability for impacts achieved and the effectiveness of the use of resources; conclusions on RD policy

CO-FINANCING OF EVALUATIONS

Art. 51 of EC Regulation 445/2002

- ◆ “The Community shall contribute to financing evaluations... *where they actually contribute to evaluation at Community level by virtue of their scope, through replies to common evaluation questions and their quality*”
- ◆ Co-financing not to exceed 50% of a ceiling of 1% of the total cost of the programme
- ◆ For each RDP, at least 40% of the co-financing shall concern *ex post* evaluation
 - In the context of the simplification exercise, this rule will be eliminated

EVALUATION CYCLE OF THE 2000-2006 RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES

Obligations:

Member States/ regions:

- ☛ Evaluations must be carried out by an independent evaluator
- ☛ Evaluations must comply with Guidelines
- ☛ Common questions to be answered; non-applicability has to be explained; report structure to be followed

Commission:

- ☛ Issue guidelines
- ☛ Will assess the quality of evaluations, which may, where applicable, have a bearing on the allocation of the performance reserve and the co-funding

EXISTING EVALUATION GUIDELINES

- ◆ Guidelines for the Evaluation of Rural Development Programmes supported from EAGGF (VI/8865/99)
- ◆ Common Evaluation Questions with Criteria and Indicators (VI/12004/00 final)
 - √ Part A: Introduction
 - √ Part B: The Set of Common Evaluation Questions with Criteria and Indicators
 - √ Part C: Economic Terminology
 - √ Part D: Explanatory Sheets
- ◆ Guidelines for the Mid-Term Evaluation of RD programmes (VI/43517/02)

4 Ex-post evaluations of RD-measures 1994-1999

- ◆ Regulation 950/97
 - ◆ Agra CEAS Consulting, UK
 - ◆ Final Report June 2003
- ◆ Regulation 951/97
 - ◆ Agra CEAS Consulting, UK
 - ◆ Final Report June 2003
- ◆ Objective 5b programmes
 - ◆ ADE s.a., Belgium
 - ◆ Final Report July 2003
- ◆ Leader II
 - ◆ Österreichisches Institut für Raumplanung (ÖIR) - Austria
 - ◆ Final Report September 2003

4 Ex-post evaluations of RD-measures 1994-1999

Number of evaluation reports available:

Measures	Reports received	Reports missing
950/97	17	from 2 MS
951/97	11	from 1 MS
Obj. 5b	55	from 16 regions
Leader II	78	

4 Ex-post evaluations of RD-measures 1994-1999

Percentage of responses to Common evaluation questions:

950/97: 75 % of core evaluation questions

951/97: 70 % of core evaluation questions

Obj. 5b: average of 45 % of evaluation questions

EVALUATION PROCESS 2000-2009

Overall Characteristics

- ☛ Continuity between evaluation phases
- ☛ Enable EU-level synthesis on the effectiveness of rural development policy
- ☛ Complementary to monitoring, control, and audit
- ☛ Analysis - not only description
- ☛ Pragmatic approach, focussed on utilization of results

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Kinds of evaluation questions:

- ♦ Measure-specific questions
- ♦ Crosscutting questions
- ♦ Programme-specific questions

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTIONS

- ◆ Pragmatic Approach
- ◆ To be answered within the evaluation continuum
- ◆ Evaluation questions to be answered where possible, using judgement criteria, but more flexibility with regard to indicators

MID-TERM EVALUATION

General Objectives

- ◆ Improve the quality and relevance of the programmes and their implementation
- ◆ Identify re-orientations to the programming and making adjustments possible
- ◆ Review implementation arrangements

MID-TERM EVALUATION

Specific Tasks

Definition of evaluation approach:

- ◆ Describe the detailed evaluation approach for the whole evaluation cycle
- ◆ Review appropriateness of evaluation questions, criteria, and indicators
- ◆ Identify programme-specific questions

MID-TERM EVALUATION

Specific Tasks

Revision of programming and implementation:

- ◆ Check continued appropriateness of ex-ante evaluation by reviewing contextual changes
- ◆ Describe inputs and outputs in relation to objectives
- ◆ Identify, where possible baselines, target levels, or indicators for comparison
- ◆ Describe results/ impacts as far as possible

OTHER ISSUES

- ◆ Guidelines applicable to measures co-financed by EAGGF-Guarantee (Rural Development Programmes)
- ◆ In Objective 1 areas, the common evaluation questions should as far as possible be answered in the evaluations of OPs/SPDs/CSFs
- ◆ Report structure to be followed