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Mid Term Evaluation
Key Components

• explain the methodologies applied, including the implications for the quality of the data and the findings

• examine first results covering evaluation questions
  – relevance and consistency with the rural development plan (revise ex-ante)
  – adequacy of the common evaluation questions, criteria and indicators (adjustments necessary?)

• continued relevance of the objectives in relation to the needs?

• Continued validity of the analysis of disparities, gaps and potentials?

• examine the actions undertaken in order to launch the programme
  – financial management
  – quality of implementation and monitoring
Cross-cutting evaluation questions

• To what extent has the programme helped **stabilising** the **rural population**?

• To what extent has the programme been conducive to **securing employment** both **on and off holdings**?

• To what extent has the programme been conducive to maintaining or **improving** the **income level** of the **rural community**?

• To what extent has the programme **improved** the **market situation** for basic **agricultural/forestry products**?

• To what extent has the programme been conducive to the **protection and improvement** of the **environment**?

• To what extent have the **implementing arrangements** contributed to **maximising the intended effects** of the programme?
Chapter specific questions
Chapter VII: Improving processing procedures and marketing of agricultural products

• To what extent have the supported investments helped to increase the competitiveness of agricultural products through improved and rationalised processing and marketing of agricultural products?

• To what extent have the supported investments helped to increase the added value and competitiveness of agricultural products by improving their quality?

• To what extent have the supported investments improved the situation of the basic agricultural production sector?

• To what extent have the supported investments improved health and welfare?

• To what extent have the supported investments protected the environment?
The logic of intervention
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Financing schemes to improve the structure of agricultural and food markets in Germany

measures to improve

I

national programmes/ financing

I a

programmes only with national financing by one Bundesland

top up Art. 52

II

programmes/ financing with EU participation

II a

programmes with national co-financing only by one Bundesland

II b

programmes with national co-financing by GAK (40% by the Bundesland, 60% by Federal Government)

I b

only by GAK funding

II b

co-financing by EU
Importance of measures in context of Reg. (EC) 1257/1999 in Germany

- Agri-environment
- Renovation and development of villages
- Investment in agricultural holdings
- Less-favored areas
- Reparcelling
- Restoring agr. production potential damaged by natural desaster
- Improving processing and marketing
- Forestry measures
- Diversification of agr. activities
- Marketing of quality agr. Products
- Other

%
Methodology: Preliminary considerations

- Generation of strong realistic data on a homogeneous basis early enough

- answers to common evaluation questions
  - chapter specific questions
  - cross cutting questions

- comparison of firms with and without support
  --> difficult

- comparison of results of supported firms before and after support  --> envisaged

- comparison of results wanted / achieved of supported firms
  --> envisaged
Questionnaire


• Who?
  - applicant, beneficiary
  - approval authority

• Where?
  - firm / enterprise
  - establishment/ plant

• How?
  - manual ( printed questionnaire)
  - EXCEL - file
    --> input only on IT-basis
When?
Dates of data surveying

Alternatives

• initial situation (one year before application: year “t-0”)
• effects intended by the investment (completion: year “+1”; t-1a)

• results achieved (1 business year) after completion of the investment (completion: year “+1”; t-1b)

• effects intended by the investment (completion: year “+3”)
• results achieved (1 business year) after completion of the investment (completion: year “+3”; initial difficulties, sustainable)

- Ideal: 3 times data survey “-1”; “+1”; “+3”
Example for the structure and content of the chapter specific evaluation questions
(Document VI/12004/00 endg.)

Question
➢ To what extent have the supported investments improved the situation of the basic agricultural production sector?

Criteria
➢ Demand for and price of basic agricultural products (assured or improved)
➢ Co-operation developed between the producers of basic agricultural products and the processing/marketing stages

Indicators
➢ Trend (in terms of quantity and price) in purchases of raw materials by assisted production/marketing lines
➢ Share (within area of programme) of gross sales of basic agricultural products that are sold to outlets safeguarded or created thanks to the assistance (%)
Carry out workable Indicators to answer chapter-specific Questions

**Question**: To what extent have the supported investments improved the situation of the basic agricultural production sector?

**Indicators proposed by the EU**

- Trend (in terms of quantity and price) in purchases of raw materials by assisted production/marketing lines
- Share (within area of programme) of gross sales of basic agricultural products that are sold to outlets safeguarded or created thanks to the assistance (%)

**Transformation in the questionnaire**

- Covering quantity and value of 5 main agricultural raw products
- Share of raw products under contract
- Share of organically grown products
- Supply by producer group / producers' organisation
- Running time of contracts
- Shares of raw products with fixed prices, market prices, price markup
- Quality markup of producer price (in %) y/n
- Price gap of the average market prices (in %)
# Project Data Forms and their Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Share in all 471 projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>approved Projects, state 31-Dec. 2002</td>
<td>471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project data forms received and checked, March 2003</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which returned for adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twice</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>triple</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fully acceptable and suitable for analysis currently</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not checked until today</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project data forms received, August 2003</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which could be used for this first evaluation</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Attributes of project data forms in relation to official database

(projects data forms; status: August 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Official financial database</th>
<th>Analysable data from project data forms</th>
<th>Project data forms as part of financial database</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan. 00 - Dez. 02</td>
<td>Jan. 00 - Aug. 03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total investment</td>
<td>900.6 Mio. €</td>
<td>461.5 Mio. €</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment eligible for support (B)</td>
<td>848.7 Mio. €</td>
<td>415.9 Mio. €</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public commitments (C)</td>
<td>246.1 Mio. €</td>
<td>117.2 Mio. €</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support intensity (C/B)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of projects</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary results: Envisaged objectives
(project data forms; status: August 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z1 (market trends)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z2 (new outlets)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z3 (ration. marketing)</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z4 (ration.processing)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z5 (presentation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z6 (elemin. waste)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z7 (new technology)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z8 (innov. investment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z9 (quality)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z10 (health)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z11 (environment)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Share of the aim on total investment of all projects = 460 Mio. €
Quotation rate on all projects (234)
Share of purchases bound to contracts
(t-0 versus t-1a)

contract share in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Share of contracts t-0</th>
<th>Share of contracts t-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>36 pro.</td>
<td>36 pro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F&amp;P</td>
<td>10 pro.</td>
<td>10 pro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P</td>
<td>21 pro.</td>
<td>21 pro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>33 pro.</td>
<td>33 pro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>41 pro.</td>
<td>41 pro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>18 pro.</td>
<td>18 pro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F&amp;V</td>
<td>6 pro.</td>
<td>6 pro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15 pro.</td>
<td>15 pro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;P</td>
<td>50 pro.</td>
<td>50 pro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W&amp;A</td>
<td>234 pro.</td>
<td>234 pro.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MI = Milk; F&P = Flowers and plants; E&P = Eggs and poultry; ME = Meat; CE = Cereals; PO = Potatoes; F&V = Fruit and vegetables; S&P = Seeds and plants; W&A = Wines and alcohol
# Ranking criteria with respect to competitiveness

(projects data forms; status: August 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>criteria</th>
<th>valuation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>→ positive employment trend</td>
<td>= 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ positive trend in value added</td>
<td>= 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ use of quality management systems</td>
<td>= 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ make use of newly developed products</td>
<td>= 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ investment in obj. 7 (new technique) and or obj. 8 (innovation)</td>
<td>= 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own composition.
Ranking of projects according to 5 criteria defined here

(project data forms; status: August 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

- Start before support scheme begins!
- Assure encouragement of all actors (facilitate input procedures as far as possible, training, workshops)
- Don’t give up if forms are inadequately filled out
- Try to keep cool at least until the end of the support period in 2008 to collect relevant data

- It is possible to get information of the current support period and also of the second following period which are of considerable value for evaluation. But it is rather difficult to get sufficient information for the subsequent period.
- You can get information to answer chapter specific questions (e.g. objectives of the investments supported, the profit of the farmers)
- It seems to be possible to develop a benchmarking scheme to make RDP measures more effective
Thank you for your attention!
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