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Direct payments and Rural Development
31,18 Mio. € from 2007-2011

Direct Payments
46%
Rural Development
54%

Rural Development
16,97 Mio. € from 2007-2011

LAG’s Measure 8
1%
Vocational training Measure 1
1%
Physical Potential Measure 2
34%
Irrigation Measure 3
26%
Processing and Marketing Measure 4
30%
Agri-environment Measure 5
8%
Direct payments
14,21 Mio. € from 2007-2011

Fuel Support 12%
Heifers 2%
Sheep&Goats 23%
Winter Wheat 38%
Milk cows 16%
Maize 0.2%
Tables grapes 9%

Main Evaluation Criteria

Relevance
The extent to which an intervention’s objectives are pertinent to needs, problems and issues;

Effectiveness
The extent to which objectives pursued by an intervention are achieved;

Efficiency
Best relationship between resources employed and results achieved in pursuing given objectives through an intervention;
**Indicators**

**baseline**
situation at the outset of the programme or measure (starting point) and its evolvement over time in quantitative terms

**input**
public support payments

**outputs**
immediate outputs of a measure, i.e. the number of farms, beneficiaries, hectares, livestock units, projects etc. supported

**results**
changes which occurred or can be expected to occur at the level of the beneficiaries

**gross effects**
contribution of the measure to these changes

**impacts**
on rural areas and the wider economy (net effects)

---

**Baseline indicators related to objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AXIS</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(*) 1</td>
<td>Economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*) 2</td>
<td>Employment rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*) 3</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AXIS 1.**
Improving the competitiveness of the agricultural and forestry sector

| (*) 4 | Training and education in agriculture |
| (*) 5 | Age structure in agriculture |
| (*) 6 | Labour productivity in agriculture |
| (*) 7 | Gross fixed capital formation in agriculture |
| (*) 8 | Employment development of primary sector |
| (*) 9 | Economic development of primary sector |
| () 10 | Labour productivity in food industry |
| (*) 11 | Gross fixed capital formation in food industry |
| (*) 12 | Employment development in food industry |
| (*) 13 | Economic development of food industry |

Common Impact Indicators

IV. COMMON IMPACT INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Employment creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Labour productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reversing biodiversity decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Maintenance of high nature value farmland and forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Improvement in water quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Contribution to combating climate change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation questions (example)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Code</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Investments in agricultural holdings to restructure and to upgrade to Community standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income, competitiveness
Production factors
Product quality
Working conditions
EU Standards
Environment friendly
Methodology

Effect = (x_T - x_0) - (x_N - x_0) = (x_T - x_N)

Primary data collection

Stakeholder group discussions
- ministries, municipalities, schools, NGOs, donor organizations
  (rural areas, ARDP)

Interviews of implementing personnel
- MAFRD, Municipal Offices, Regional Offices
  (programming, management, applications, selection, …)

Interviews of beneficiaries
- project representatives
  (measures 4, 5 and 8)

Questionnaires (via interviews)
- beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries
  (measure 2, direct payments)
Sampling

Select one municipality per region (at random)
Select another municipality (at random)
until
for each of 4 (major) RD measures
  at least 20 applicants who were rejected have been selected
  at least 20 applicants who were accepted have been selected
In the selected municipalities
  visit 20 applicants who were rejected
  visit 20 applicants who were accepted
  ~ 160 questionnaires
Check how many of them got direct payments
Repeat the procedure for each of 4 direct payments until
for every DP measure there are 20 rejected and 20 accepted applicants

Secondary data

Reports and documents
  ARDP
  Implementation provisions
  Implementation reports
  Gap analysis report of previous Twinning project
ARDP monitoring tables
ARDP applications and payments (DP, M2)
FADN report
Statistics
  Agricultural Household Surveys
  Foreign Trade
  ..........
### Structure of report

1. **SWOT analysis and needs** if available
2. **Baseline** situation and recent developments (context)
3. **Objectives**, targets and achievements (table)
4. **Measure** design
5. **Implementation**
6. Allocation of **funds**, delivery, absorption, inputs and outputs
7. Intervention logic, data and **indicators**
8. Assessment of **effects**
9. Answers to **evaluation questions**
10. **Recommendations**

---

### Timetable Evaluation - Kosovo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Evaluation Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>SWOT Ex-ante-Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Mit-term Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Ex-post-Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work plan

Start: 27.2.2012

Implementations of Final Evaluation of ARDP 2007-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Package (WP) I. Project inception</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.1. Meet-up meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.2. Selection of local experts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.3. Project preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.4. Preparation and submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WP 2: Justification of interventions

Activity 2.1: SWOT Analysis (up date)
Activity 2.2: Baseline information (data collection)
Activity 2.3: Economic and sectoral analysis (development)
Activity 2.4: Target indicators

WP 3: Programme design and implementation

Activity 3.1: Allocation of funds, current status of delivery

WP 4: Measurements (Growth, Payments and Rural Development)

Activity 4.1: SWOT Analysis
Activity 4.2. Intervention logic and goals
Activity 4.3. Implementation arrangements
Activity 4.4. Preparation of survey
Activity 4.5. Survey (interviews, questionnaires, focus groups)
Activity 4.6. Data entry and processing from survey
Activity 4.7: Main contribution of measures
Activity 4.8: Judgement and recommendations

WP 5: Contributions and recommendations

Activity 5.1: Assessment of effects
Activity 5.2: Contribution to achievement of goals
Activity 5.3: Recommendations for improvements
Activity 5.4: Submissions final report
Activity 5.5: Responses and submission final report

Resources for MTE

Federal Institute of Agricultural Economics

**Karl M. Ortner**, team leader
Hubert Janetschek
Karl Heinz Pistrich
Christoph Tribl

Kastner International

Robert Kastner

Local experts
Muja Gjonbalaj, Local Senior Expert
5 Local Junior Experts

**Twinning** Project Act. 1.2

Michaela Pichler
Senior Experts
Achievements of Evaluation

- Identification and appraisal of needs for support
- Assessment of strategic orientation of policies and programme
- Assessment of quality, effectiveness and efficiency of measures and ARDP overall
- Support for programming and targeting
- Compliance with legal requirements and guidelines
- Accountancy of public money

Time for discussion