

REPORTING TEMPLATE FOR THE EX POST EVALUATIONS OF RDPS 2014-2022

February 2023

Disclaimer: This technical template has been prepared as a basis for SFC 2014 reporting structure to be developed by DG Agri for the ex post evaluation of the RDPs 2014-2022. This document is non-binding and intended to facilitate the work of evaluators and managing authorities in the preparing for a structured reporting of the RDPs evaluation findings during the ex post evaluation of the RDPs 2014-2022.



Funded by
the European Union

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Section 1: Summary	2
Overall CAP objectives 1 - 3	2
Section 2: Common evaluation questions related to rural development focus areas	3
CEQs 1-18	3
Section 3: Common evaluation questions related to other RDP aspects	4
CEQ 19	4
CEQ 20	5
CEQ 21	6
Section 4: Common evaluation questions related to Union level objectives	7
CEQs 22-26	7
CEQs 27-29	8
CEQs 30.....	9
Section 5: Programme Specific Evaluation Questions, if relevant	10
Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas	10
Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic	11
Section 6: Tables	12
Section 6.1 Table of result / target indicators.....	12
Section 6.2 Table of complementary result indicators	16
Section 6.3 Table of additional and programme specific indicators used to support evaluation findings	19
Section 6.4 Table of CAP impact indicators.....	20



Introduction

This technical template has been collaboratively developed in order to provide the basis for preparing structured reporting of the Member States evaluation findings in relation to the ex post evaluation of RDPs 2014-2022. It will be used by DG AGRI as a basis to prepare the electronic SFC reporting format for the ex post evaluation, as well as to prepare the SFC Technical Guidance document.

In view of the transitional regulation, the date by which Member States will be required to submit an ex post evaluation report for each of the Rural Development Programmes, has been extended to the end of 2026.¹ Further to this submission, the Commission will prepare, by 31 December 2027, a synthesis report summarising the main conclusions of the ex post evaluations of the EAFRD provided for in Article 57(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013.²

The scope of the reporting template is to ensure that relevant evaluation findings are captured in a clear and concise manner. Answers to the Common Evaluation Questions (CEQs) listed in the Annex V to the Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 808/2014 should be based on sound evidence and provide an assessment for the ‘impact, effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of rural development policy interventions’ as highlighted in Article 68 of the Common Provisions Regulation (EU) No. 1305/2013. In answering the CEQs, guidance should be sought to publications by the European Evaluation Helpdesk on how to assess RDP achievements and impacts.^{3,4}

¹ Article 7(15) of Regulation (EU) No 2020/2220.

² Article 2(4) of Regulation (EU) No 2020/2220.

³ EUROPEAN COMMISSION – Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development – Unit E.4 (2016): Guidelines. Assessment of RDP results: How to prepare for reporting on evaluation in 2017. Brussels https://eu-cap-network.ec.europa.eu/publications/assessment-rdp-results-how-prepare-reporting-evaluation-2017_en

⁴ EUROPEAN COMMISSION – Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development – Unit C.4 (2018): Guidelines. Assessing RDP achievements and impacts in 2019. Brussels, August 2018 https://eu-cap-network.ec.europa.eu/publications/assessing-rdp-achievements-and-impacts-2019_en



Section 1: Summary

This section contains the key information and overall findings of the ex post evaluation in an easy understandable language for a wider audience.

Evaluation process

Content: Short and general overview of the ex post evaluation process (e.g. organisation, duration, contractor(s), quality assurance and limitations).

Technical features: A maximum of 6,000 characters = approx. 2 pages of text.

Link to the full ex post evaluation report

Overall CAP objectives 1 - 3⁵

Summary of key findings for CAP Objective 1: Fostering the competitiveness of agriculture

Content: Key findings of the ex post evaluation on the above CAP objective including a summary of the evaluators' main conclusions and recommendations.

Technical features: A maximum of 15,000 characters = approx. 5 pages of text.

Summary of key findings for CAP Objective 2: Ensuring the sustainable management of natural resources and climate action

Content: Key findings of the ex post evaluation on the above CAP objective including a summary of the evaluators' main conclusions and recommendations.

Technical features: A maximum of 15,000 characters = approx. 5 pages of text.

Summary of key findings for CAP Objective 3: Achieving a balanced territorial development of rural economies and communities including the creation and maintenance of employment

Content: Key findings of the ex post evaluation on the above CAP objective including a summary of the evaluators' main conclusions and recommendations.

Technical features: A maximum of 15,000 characters = approx. 5 pages of text.

⁵ Article 4 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013.



Section 2: Common evaluation questions related to rural development focus areas^{6,7,8}

CEQs 1-18

Template is replicated for each CEQ 1-18.

<p>Common Evaluation Question</p> <p>No 1 ‘To what extent have the RDP interventions supported innovation, cooperation and the development of the knowledge base in rural areas?’</p>
<p>Answer to evaluation question</p> <p>Content: A clear answer, structured around judgement criteria, addressing all relevant aspects of the CEQ and providing a judgement on the results achieved of the RDP (positive/negative).</p> <p>The answer may include the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contextual developments relevant for changes to the intervention logic, if any.• Explicit reference to quantified values of the CMES indicators, as well as other quantified evidence.• Reference to qualitative evidence such as interviews, focus groups, etc.• Limitations to the validity and reliability of results, if any. <p>Technical features: A maximum of 18,000 characters = approx. 6 pages.</p>
<p>Key conclusions and recommendations</p> <p>Content: A summary of the evaluators’ main conclusions and any recommendations.</p> <p>Technical features: A maximum of 6,000 characters = approx. 2 pages.</p>
<p>Supporting evidence</p> <p>Content: Optional references to relevant thematic evaluation reports as supporting evidence.</p>

⁶ EUROPEAN COMMISSION – Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development – Unit E.4 (2016): Guidelines. Assessment of RDP results: How to prepare for reporting on evaluation in 2017. Brussels https://eu-cap-network.ec.europa.eu/publications/assessment-rdp-results-how-prepare-reporting-evaluation-2017_en

⁷ For CEQ 17: EUROPEAN COMMISSION – Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development – Unit C.4 (2017): Guidelines. Evaluation of LEADER/CLLD. Brussels https://eu-cap-network.ec.europa.eu/publications/evaluation-leaderclld_en

⁸ Annex V to Regulation (EU) No 808/2014.



Section 3: Common evaluation questions related to other RDP aspects^{9,10}

CEQ 19

Common Evaluation Question

No 19 ‘To what extent have the synergies among priorities and focus areas enhanced the effectiveness of the RDP?’

Answer to evaluation question

Content: A clear answer, structured around judgement criteria, addressing all relevant aspects of the CEQ and providing a judgement on the effect achieved of the RDP (positive/negative). The answer may include the following elements:

Contextual developments relevant for changes to the intervention logic, if any.

- Explicit reference to quantified evidence (such as from secondary contributions).
- Reference to qualitative evidence such as interviews, focus groups, etc.
- Limitations to validity and reliability of results.

Technical features: A maximum of 18,000 characters = approx. 6 pages.

Key conclusions and recommendations

Content: A summary of the evaluators’ main conclusions and any recommendations.

Technical features: A maximum of 6,000 characters = approx. 2 pages.

Supporting evidence

Content: Optional references to relevant thematic evaluation reports as supporting evidence.

⁹ EUROPEAN COMMISSION – Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development – Unit E.4 (2016): Guidelines. Assessment of RDP results: How to prepare for reporting on evaluation in 2017. Brussels https://eu-cap-network.ec.europa.eu/publications/assessment-rdp-results-how-prepare-reporting-evaluation-2017_en

¹⁰ Annex V to Regulation (EU) No 808/2014.



CEQ 20

Common Evaluation Question

No 20 'To what extent has technical assistance contributed to achieving the objectives laid down in Art. 59(1) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 and Art. 51(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013?'

Answer to evaluation question

Content: A clear answer, structured around judgement criteria, addressing all relevant aspects of the CEQ and providing a judgement on achievements of the RDP (positive/negative). The answer may include the following elements:

- Explicit reference to quantified evidence.
- Reference to qualitative evidence such as interviews, focus groups, etc.
- Limitations to the validity and reliability of results.

Technical features: A maximum of 18,000 characters = approx. 6 pages.

Key conclusions and recommendations

Content: A summary of the evaluators' main conclusions and any recommendations.

Technical features: A maximum of 6,000 characters = approx. 2 pages.

Supporting evidence

Content: Optional references to relevant thematic evaluation reports as supporting evidence.



CEQ 21

Common Evaluation Question

No 21 'To what extent has the national rural network contributed to achieving the objectives laid down in Art. 54(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013'

Answer to evaluation question

Content: A clear answer, structured around judgement criteria, addressing all relevant aspects of the CEQ and providing a judgement on achievements of the RDP (positive/negative). The answer should focus on the achievement of the common objectives and tasks of National Rural Networks as listed in Article 54 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 and any common programme specific NRN objectives and groups of activities, if relevant.¹¹ The answer may include the following elements:

- Explicit reference to quantified evidence.
- Reference to qualitative evidence such as interviews, focus groups, etc.
- Challenges identified in the operational and procedural aspects related to NRN activities and in the management and evaluation.

Technical features: A maximum of 18,000 characters = approx. 6 pages.

Key conclusions and recommendations

Content: A summary of the evaluators' main conclusions and any recommendations.

Technical features: A maximum of 6,000 characters = approx. 2 pages.

Supporting evidence

Content: Optional references to relevant thematic evaluation reports as supporting evidence.

¹¹ For CEQ 21: EUROPEAN COMMISSION – Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development – Unit E.4 (2016): Guidelines Evaluation of National Rural Networks 2014-2020. Brussels. https://eu-cap-network.ec.europa.eu/publications/evaluation-national-rural-networks-2014-2020_en



Section 4: Common evaluation questions related to Union level objectives^{12,13,14}

CEQs 22-26¹⁵

Template is replicated for each CEQ 22-26.

<p>Common Evaluation Question No 22 'To what extent has the RDP contributed to achieving the EU 2020 headline target of raising the employment rate of the population aged 20 to 64 to at least 75%?'</p>
<p>Answer to evaluation question Content: A clear answer, structured around judgement criteria, addressing all relevant aspects of the CEQ and providing a judgement on the results and impacts achieved of the RDP (positive/negative). The answer may include the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contextual developments relevant for changes to the intervention logic, if any.• Assessment of programme's net contribution to changes in CAP impact indicators.¹⁶• Explicit reference to quantified values of the CMES indicators as well as other quantified evidence.• Reference to qualitative evidence such as interviews, focus groups, etc.• Limitations to the validity and reliability of results, if any. <p>Technical features: A maximum of 18,000 characters = approx. 6 pages.</p>
<p>Key conclusions and recommendations Content: A summary of the evaluator's main conclusions and any recommendations. Technical features: A maximum of 9,000 characters = approx. 3 pages.</p>
<p>Supporting evidence Content: Optional references to relevant thematic evaluation reports as supporting evidence.</p>

¹² EUROPEAN COMMISSION – Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development – Unit C.4 (2018): Guidelines. Assessing RDP achievements and impacts in 2019. Brussels, August 2018 https://eu-cap-network.ec.europa.eu/publications/assessing-rdp-achievements-and-impacts-2019_en

¹³ For CEQ 30: EUROPEAN COMMISSION – Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development – Unit C.4 (2017): Guidelines. Evaluation of innovation in rural development programmes 2014-2020. https://eu-cap-network.ec.europa.eu/publications/evaluation-innovation-rural-development-programmes-2014-2020_en

¹⁴ Annex V to Regulation (EU) No 808/2014.

¹⁵ Article 7 of Regulation 1303/2013 states that equality between men and women and the integration of gender perspective are to be taken into account in the implementation of the programme. Against this background, the answer to the CEQs relating to EU-level objectives are to consider the gender perspective. This is especially relevant to CEQ 22.

¹⁶ Annex VII point 7 to Regulation (EU) No 808/2014.



CEQs 27-29

Template is replicated for each CEQ 27-29.

Common Evaluation Question

No 27 'To what extent has the RDP contributed to the CAP objective of fostering the competitiveness of agriculture?'

Answer to evaluation question

Content: A clear answer, structured around judgement criteria, addressing all relevant aspects of the CEQ and providing a judgement on the results and impacts achieved of the RDP (positive/negative). The answer may include the following elements:

- Contextual developments relevant for changes to the intervention logic, if any.
- Assessment of programme's net contribution to changes in CAP impact indicators.¹⁷
- Explicit reference to quantified values of the CMES indicators as well as other quantified evidence.
- Reference to qualitative evidence such as interviews, focus groups, etc.
- Limitations to the validity and reliability of results, if any.

Technical features: A maximum of 18,000 characters = approx. 6 pages.

Key conclusions and recommendations

Content: A summary of the evaluator's main conclusions and any recommendations.

Technical features: A maximum of 9,000 characters = approx. 3 pages.

Supporting evidence

Content: Optional references to relevant thematic evaluation reports as supporting evidence.

¹⁷ Annex VII point 7 to Regulation (EU) No 808/2014.



CEQs 30

Common Evaluation Question

No 30 'To what extent has the RDP contributed to fostering innovation?'

Answer to evaluation question

Content: A clear answer, structured around judgement criteria, addressing all relevant aspects of the CEQ and providing a judgement on achievements of the RDP (positive/negative). The answer may include the following elements:

- Contextual developments relevant for changes to the intervention logic, if any.
- Explicit reference to quantified evidence.
- Reference to qualitative evidence such as interviews, focus groups, etc.
- Limitations to the validity and reliability of results, if any.

Technical features: A maximum of 18,000 characters = approx. 6 pages.

Key conclusions and recommendations

Content: A summary of the evaluator's main conclusions and any recommendations.

Technical features: A maximum of 9,000 characters = approx. 3 pages.

Supporting evidence

Content: Optional references to relevant thematic evaluation reports as supporting evidence.



Section 5: Programme Specific Evaluation Questions, if relevant

Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas

Template is replicated for each PSEQ linked to programme specific focus area.

Programme specific focus area:

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

Programme specific evaluation question (PSEQ) No ...:

Insert the title of the programme specific evaluation question.

Answer to programme specific evaluation question

Content: A clear answer, structured around judgement criteria, addressing all aspects of the EQ and providing a judgement on the results achieved of the RDP (positive/negative). The answer may include the following elements:

- Contextual developments relevant for changes to the intervention logic, if any.
- Explicit reference to quantified values of the CMES indicators, if relevant, as well as other quantified evidence.
- Reference to qualitative evidence such as interviews, focus groups, etc.
- Limitations to the validity and reliability of results, if any.

Technical features: A maximum of 18,000 characters = approx. 6 pages.

Key conclusions and recommendations

Content: A summary of the evaluator’s main conclusions and any recommendations.

Technical features: A maximum of 6,000 characters = approx. 2 pages.

Supporting evidence

Content: Optional references to relevant thematic evaluation reports as supporting evidence.



Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic

Template is replicated for each PSEQ linked to programme specific evaluation topic.

Evaluation topic:

Insert the evaluation topic, e.g. 'Programme Delivery'.

Programme specific evaluation question No ...:

Insert the title of the programme specific evaluation question linked to the evaluation topic, e.g. 'To what extent has the programme delivery contributed to the effective RDP implementation?'

Answer to programme specific evaluation question

Content: A clear answer, structured around judgment criteria, addressing all aspects of the EQ and providing a judgement on achievements of the RDP (positive/negative). The answer may include the following elements:

- Contextual developments relevant for changes to the intervention logic, if any.
- Explicit reference to quantified values of the CMES indicators, if relevant, as well as other quantified evidence.
- Reference to qualitative evidence such as interviews, focus groups, etc.
- Limitations to the validity and reliability of results, if any.

Technical features: A maximum of 18,000 characters = approx. 6 pages.

Key conclusions and recommendations

Content: A summary of the evaluator's main conclusions and recommendations, if any.

Technical features: A maximum of 6,000 characters = approx. 2 pages.

Supporting evidence

Content: Optional references to relevant thematic evaluation reports as supporting evidence



Section 6: Tables

Section 6.1 Table of result / target indicators

Result indicator name, Unit of measurement	Target value	Primary contribution	Secondary contribution	LEADER/ CLLD contribution	Total	Comments
		1	2	3	4 = 1+2+3	
Technical features: Cells (in grey) with prefilled values retrieved from the SFC template submitted in June 2026 as part of the last Annual Implementation Report.		Automatically generated from the information included in the Table D of AIR.	N/A – not applicable.	Automatically generated from the information included in the Table B 2.2 of AIR.		Technical features: A maximum of 1,000 characters. Content: Additional information on the values provided for the result / target indicators including the interpretation of the result and/or methodological limitations in the derivation of the respective values.
R1/T4: % of agricultural holdings with RDP support for investment in restructuring or modernisation (FA 2A) (%)	From RDP Chapter 11	From AIR Table D	N/A	From AIR Table B 2.2	Calculated automatically	
R3/T5: % of agricultural holdings with RDP supported business development plans / investment for young farmers (FA 2B) (%)	From RDP Chapter 11	From AIR Table D	N/A	From AIR Table B 2.2	Calculated automatically	



Result indicator name, Unit of measurement	Target value	Primary contribution	Secondary contribution	LEADER/ CLLD contribution	Total	Comments
		1	2	3	4 = 1+2+3	
R4/T6: % of agricultural holdings receiving support for participating in quality schemes, local markets and short supply circuits, and producer groups/organisations (FA 3A) (%)	From RDP Chapter 11	From AIR Table D	N/A	From AIR Table B 2.2	Calculated automatically	
R5/T7: % of farms participating in risk management schemes (FA 3B) (%)	From RDP Chapter 11	From AIR Table D	N/A	From AIR Table B 2.2	Calculated automatically	
R6/T8: % of forest or other wooded areas under management contracts supporting biodiversity (FA 4A) (%)	From RDP Chapter 11	From AIR Table D	N/A	From AIR Table B 2.2	Calculated automatically	
R7/T9: % of agricultural land under management contracts supporting biodiversity and/or landscapes (FA 4A) (%)	From RDP Chapter 11	From AIR Table D	N/A	From AIR Table B 2.2	Calculated automatically	
R8/T10: % of agricultural land under management contracts to improve water management (FA 4B) (%)	From RDP Chapter 11	From AIR Table D	N/A	From AIR Table B 2.2	Calculated automatically	
R9/T11: % of forestry land under management contracts to improve water management (FA 4B) (%)	From RDP Chapter 11	From AIR Table D	N/A	From AIR Table B 2.2	Calculated automatically	
R10/T12: % of agricultural land under management contracts to improve soil management and/or	From RDP Chapter 11	From AIR Table D	N/A	From AIR Table B 2.2	Calculated automatically	



Result indicator name, Unit of measurement	Target value	Primary contribution	Secondary contribution	LEADER/ CLLD contribution	Total	Comments
		1	2	3	4 = 1+2+3	
prevent soil erosion (FA 4C) (%)						
R11/T13: % of forestry land under management contracts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion (FA 4C) (%)	From RDP Chapter 11	From AIR Table D	N/A	From AIR Table B 2.2	Calculated automatically	
R12/T14: % of irrigated land switching to more efficient irrigation systems (FA 5A) (%)	From RDP Chapter 11	From AIR Table D	N/A	From AIR Table B 2.2	Calculated automatically	
R16/T17: % of LU (Live-stock Unit) concerned by investments in live-stock management in view of reducing GHG and/or ammonia emissions (FA 5D) (%)	From RDP Chapter 11	From AIR Table D	N/A	From AIR Table B 2.2	Calculated automatically	
R17/T18: % of agricultural land under management contracts targeting reduction of GHG and/or ammonia emissions (FA 5D) (%)	From RDP Chapter 11	From AIR Table D	N/A	From AIR Table B 2.2	Calculated automatically	
R20/T19: % of agricultural and forest land under management contracts contributing to carbon sequestration or conservation (FA 5E) (%)	From RDP Chapter 11	From AIR Table D	N/A	From AIR Table B 2.2	Calculated automatically	
R21/T20: Jobs created in supported projects (FA 6A) (Number)	From RDP Chapter 11	From AIR Table D		From AIR Table B 2.2	Calculated automatically	



Result indicator name, Unit of measurement	Target value	Primary contribution	Secondary contribution	LEADER/ CLLD contribution	Total	Comments
		1	2	3	4 = 1+2+3	
R22/T21: % of rural population covered by LDS (FA 6B) (%)	From RDP Chapter 11	From AIR Table D	N/A	N/A as it should be the same as the value for primary contribution	Calculated automatically	
R23/T22: % of rural population benefiting from improved services/infrastructures (FA 6B) (%)	From RDP Chapter 11	From AIR Table D	N/A	From AIR Table B 2.2	Calculated automatically	
R24/T23: Jobs created in supported projects (LEADER) (FA 6B) (Number)	From RDP Chapter 11	From AIR Table D	N/A	N/A as it should be the same as the value from primary contribution	Calculated automatically	
R25/T24: % of rural population benefiting from new or improved services/infrastructures (ICT) (FA 6C) (%)	From RDP Chapter 11	From AIR Table D	N/A	From AIR Table B 2.2	Calculated automatically	



Section 6.2 Table of complementary result indicators

Result indicator name, Unit of measurement	Calculated GROSS value				Calculated NET value ¹⁸	Comments
	Primary contribution	Secondary contribution ¹⁹	LEADER/ CLLD contribution ²⁰	Total		
	<p>Content: Only calculated (!) values should be inputted in these fields. Therefore, a value of '0' is interpreted as a calculated value which has resulted in a nil effect.</p> <p>Technical features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cells (in Orange) – mandatory input. • N/A - if the result indicator has NOT been calculated (e.g. as the respective focus areas are not relevant for the Programme or due to other reasons justified in the comments box). 					<p>Technical features: A maximum of 2,000 characters.</p> <p>Content: Complementary information on the provided values, and/or methodological limitations in the calculation. If NO value has been estimated a justification should be presented. Use of any proxy indicators and respective values should also be provided in this column.</p>
<p>R2: Change in agricultural output on supported farms / AWU (FA 2A) (EUR / Annual Work Unit)</p> <p>Note: Negative value reported indicates a negative change. Refer to fiche for the complementary result indicator 2 (2014)</p>						<p>Technical note: Manual input.</p>

¹⁸ Net refers to the value which is attributed to the change of the indicator value due to the RDP interventions.

¹⁹ According to the Working Document on Evaluation-related Queries (March 2021), while it is not compulsory, evaluators should, if possible, calculate / assess the complementary result indicator of a specific focus area, taking into account both, primarily programmed operations and the operations which have secondary contributions to that specific focus area.

²⁰ Similarly, while it is compulsory to flag the projects with secondary contributions (Article 14 (4) of Regulation 808/2014), the quantification of secondary contributions, in this case of LEADER, are not compulsory.



Result indicator name, Unit of measurement	Calculated GROSS value				Calculated NET value ¹⁸	Comments
	Primary contribution	Secondary contribution ¹⁹	LEADER/ CLLD contribution ²⁰	Total		
<p>R13: Increase in efficiency of water use in agriculture in RDP supported projects (FA 5A) <i>(Change in water efficiency for irrigation in m3 water / standard unit of output in EUR)</i></p> <p>Note: Negative value reported refers to a decrease in the efficiency of water use in irrigation. Refer to updated fiche for the complementary result indicator 13 (2020).</p>				<p>Technical note: Manual input.</p>		
<p>R14: Increase in efficiency of energy use in agriculture and food-processing in RDP supported projects (FA 5B) <i>(Increase in efficiency in T.O.E / standard unit of output in Million EUR, per year)</i></p> <p>Note: Negative value reported refers to a decrease in the efficiency of energy use in agriculture and food processing. Refer to updated fiche for the complementary result indicator 14 (2020).</p>				<p>Technical note: Manual input.</p>		
<p>R15: Renewable energy produced from supported projects (FA 5C) <i>(Created capacity in T.O.E)</i></p> <p>Note: Capacity is the maximum output of energy that a generator has the ability to create. Refer to updated fiche for the</p>				<p>Technical note: Calculated automatically</p>		



Result indicator name, Unit of measurement	Calculated GROSS value				Calculated NET value ¹⁸	Comments
	Primary contribution	Secondary contribution ¹⁹	LEADER/ CLLD contribution ²⁰	Total		
complementary result indicator 15 (2020).						
R15: Renewable energy produced from supported projects (FA 5C) <i>(Energy generated annually in T.O.E)</i>						
Note: Energy generated is the amount of energy actually produced over a year by a specific generator. Refer to updated fiche for the complementary result indicator 15 (2020).						
R18: Reduced emissions of methane and nitrous oxide (FA 5D) <i>(Tonnes of CO2 Equivalent)</i>						
Note: Negative value reported refers to increased emissions of methane and nitrous oxide. Refer to updated fiche for the complementary result indicator 18 (2020).						
R19: Reduced ammonia emissions (FA 5D) <i>(Tonnes of ammonia)</i>						
Note: Negative value reported refers to increased ammonia emissions. Refers to updated fiche for the complementary result indicator 19 (2020).						



Section 6.3 Table of additional and programme specific indicators used to support evaluation findings

Please fill in the table, if any additional and/or programme specific indicators were established and used to support evaluation findings and to answer common and/or programme specific evaluation questions.

Indicator type	Indicator name	Focus Area	Indicator unit of measurement	Value	Comments
<p>Technical feature: <i>(Drop down menu.)</i> Indicate if this is an output, result or impact indicator.</p>		<p>Technical feature: <i>(Drop down menu.)</i> Indicate the FA, multiple FAs, horizontal areas (e.g. NRN, innovation) or programme specific FA.</p>		<p>Technical feature: N/A - if the indicator has not been calculated.</p> <p>Content: Only calculated (!) values should be inputted in these fields. Therefore, a value of '0' is interpreted as a calculated value which has resulted in a nil effect.</p>	<p>Technical feature: A maximum of 1,000 characters.</p> <p>Content: Definition of the indicator and/or a brief description of the methodology and/or formula.</p> <p>Complementary information on the provided values, and/or methodological limitations in the calculation, or a justification why the value has NOT been calculated.</p>



Section 6.4 Table of CAP impact indicators

Name of common impact indicator	Unit of measurement	Updated indicator value of the CCI	Year	Net RDP contribution	Data source	Comments
<p>Technical features: Cells (in Orange) – mandatory input.</p>				<p>Content: This column refers to the respective contribution of the RDP to the indicator. To the extent possible evaluations should provide a quantified estimation of the NET impact of RDP on the value of the impact indicator. Only calculated (!) values should be inputted in these fields. Therefore, a value of '0' is interpreted as a calculated value which has resulted in a nil effect. If the Gross value has been estimated, please input the value in the comments section.</p> <p>Technical notes: N/A - if the indicator has not been calculated</p>	<p>Content: This column refers to the data source of the indicator value. Specify if the indicator value refers to national or regional data.</p>	<p>Content: Complementary information on the provided values including methodology, and methodological limitations in the calculation of the indicator should be provided in each of the respective CEQs for which the impact indicator has been used. Please flag in the comments box, where relevant the following: (1) Justification why the value has NOT been calculated. 2) Specific reference should also be made on whether the impact is positive / negative or neutral. 3) If a proxy indicator is used.</p> <p>Technical note: A maximum of 1,000 characters per indicator.</p>



Name of common impact indicator		Unit of measurement	Updated indicator value of the CCI	Year	Net RDP contribution	Data source	Comments
1. Agricultural entrepreneurial income		EUR (in real terms) / AWU (non-salaried)					
2. Agricultural factor income		EUR (in real terms) / AWU					
3. Total factor productivity in agriculture		Index					
7. Emissions from agriculture	Greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture	1 000 t of CO2 equivalent					
		% of total GHG emissions					
	Ammonia emissions from agriculture	1 000 t of NH3					
8. Farmland bird index		Index 2000 = 100					
9. High Nature Value farming		% HNV of total UAA					
10. Water abstraction in agriculture		1 000 m3					
11. Water quality	Gross Nutrient Balance – potential surplus of	Kg N / ha / year					



Name of common impact indicator		Unit of measurement	Updated indicator value of the CCI	Year	Net RDP contribution	Data source	Comments
	nitrogen (GNB-N)						
	Gross Nutrient Balance – potential surplus of phosphorus	Kg P / ha / year					
	Nitrates in freshwater – surface water	% of monitoring sites - high quality					
		% of monitoring sites - moderate quality					
		% of monitoring sites - poor quality					
	Nitrates in freshwater - groundwater	% of monitoring sites - high quality					
		% of monitoring sites - moderate quality					



Name of common impact indicator		Unit of measurement	Updated indicator value of the CCI	Year	Net RDP contribution	Data source	Comments
		% of monitoring sites - poor quality					
12. Soil organic matter in arable land	Total	Mega tones					
	Mean SOC concentration	g/kg					
13. Soil erosion by water	Estimated rate of soil loss by water erosion	t / ha / year					
	Estimated agricultural area affected by a certain rate of soil erosion by water	1000 ha					
% of the total agricultural area							
14. Rural employment rate	15-64 years	%					
	20-64 years	%					
15. Degree of rural poverty	Total poverty rate	% of total population					
	Poverty rate in rural areas	% of total population					



<p>16. Rural GDP Note: For Member States which do not have the 'rural area' classification (e.g. Cyprus, Luxembourg, Malta), the most similar typology of 'thinly populated areas' or 'intermediate' areas should be used.</p>	<p>PPS</p>					
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------	--	--	--	--	--



European Evaluation Helpdesk for the CAP

Rue Belliard 12,
1040 Brussels, Belgium
+32 2 808 10 24

evaluation@eucapnetwork.eu



Funded by
the European Union