



Good Practice Workshop: “How to report on evaluation in the Annual Implementation Reports: experiences and outlook”



Alena Kubů has been working at the Department of RDP Managing Authority since 2005, and is responsible for monitoring and evaluation. Currently Ms. Kubů is working as the Head of Unit for strategy, analysis, monitoring and evaluation. Ms. Kubů is responsible for coordinating the work of the AIR and sending it to the European Commission.

Experiences from the Czech Republic in *preparing* for the evaluation in AIR 2017



Challenges

One of the main challenges faced by the Czech Managing Authority was to design an Evaluation Plan before the submission of RPD applications and the contracting of an independent evaluator.



Solutions

This challenge was overcome by collaborating with UZEI (Institute of Agricultural Economics and Information) to draft the official Evaluation Plan, including an internal version, which further describes in details: the timeline, judgment criteria, indicators, data sources, and the methods suitable for answering each Common Evaluation Question.



Recommendation

Managing Authorities could similarly develop a more detailed internal version of the evaluation plan and update it on a yearly basis. This could be complemented with other external evaluation studies related to agriculture and rural development.

Building the capacity to manage evaluation activities within the Managing Authority

This challenge was addressed by the Managing Authority with the establishment of an internal Evaluation Unit responsible for the evaluation across all RDP Focus Areas. Additionally, the Managing Authority participates in Thematic Working Groups within the National Rural Network to work on different evaluation studies, methodologies, and findings together with multiple stakeholders.

Provide specific Evaluation Helpdesk capacity building activities in Member States on “evaluation methods”, as well as workshops to share best methodological practices from other Member States.

Drafting a Terms of Reference to contract an independent evaluator for the whole RDP programming period.

The Managing Authority and UZEI has set up minimum quality standards for each methodology that need to be accomplished by the independent evaluator to answer the Common Evaluation Questions (e.g. cost, robustness, data requirements and timing).

Managing Authorities could develop minimum quality standards for evaluation, and ensure their application. This can be achieved, for example, through the organisation of trimestral reporting periods or meetings with the evaluator to follow up evaluation activities and solve possible problems.



Good Practice Workshop: “How to report on evaluation in the Annual Implementation Reports: experiences and outlook”



María Coto is a consulting project manager, who has been involved in rural development programme evaluation since 2006. Ms. Coto has gained experience through working with 10 of the 17 Spanish regions, the national coordination authority, the National Rural Network and several Local Action Groups. Concerning the AIRS submitted in 2017, Ms. Coto has been involved in the evaluation of three RDPs, and has carried out the screening of 9 Spanish RDPs for the Evaluation Helpdesk.

Experiences from Spain in *reporting* on the evaluation in the AIR 2017



Challenges

Reporting results to different stakeholders through user-friendly formats.



Solutions

In Spain, different regions have overcome this challenge through: 1.) producing more visual and understandable additional evaluation reports 2.) drafting specific summaries of the AIR sections or preparing brief presentations 3.) planning instructive presentations 4.) filling the AIR in a more straightforward and clear way for the Monitoring Committee.



Recommendation

- 1.) Managing Authorities/evaluators should try to tailor their dissemination products to different stakeholders they are trying to reach;
- 2.) Consolidate the SFC information (e.g. avoid repetition, exclude irrelevant information, add complementary annexes).

Finding support and technical assistance on how to fill each SFC section.

This challenge was partially overcome with the establishment of a prompt and efficient information network among relevant actors (e.g. evaluator, Regional Authorities, National Ministry, Evaluation Helpdesk). Several RDP evaluators have made use of a prefilled SFC template provided by the MA, while adapting it to their own individual case.

- 1.) Managing Authorities can provide the SFC structure to the evaluator in order to facilitate better reporting.
- 2.) Provide further support to the Managing Authorities and evaluator on how to fill the SFC (e.g. video tutorial, online consultation forum and webinars).

Report results in case of low RDP uptake.

Describe the main limitations for reporting RDP results in the AIR (e.g. low uptake, methodological flaws, preparatory problems) and explain how to address them in the future.

- 1.) Managing Authorities/evaluators should study the reporting limitations to address them in time for the AIR submitted in 2019.
- 2.) Create an overview table to show the RDP uptake. This will help Managing Authorities/evaluators to prioritise the assessment on those Focus Areas where results are most likely expected.