



Community-led Local Development workshop

Session 3

How to measure the performance and added value of CLLD?

Summary Notes

Brussels, 01 June 2012

Funded by the



ENRD *Connecting Rural Europe*
<http://enrd.ec.europa.eu>

LSC workshop on Community-led Local Development, Brussels, 1 June 2012 – Session 3

Introduction

Session 3: How to measure the performance and added value of CLLD?

The third afternoon session of the CLLD workshop titled "How to measure the performance and added value of Community-led Local Development?" had the objective to share first ideas on how better organise the monitoring and evaluation process for the future programming period, in relation to the need to measure the performance of the future CLLD and LDS. After two presentations that gave an overview of the overall programme architecture and CLLD in 2014-2020 and the requirements specific related to monitoring and evaluation, the participants were involved in group conversations in order to exchange ideas on how better design the monitoring and evaluation system for CLLD.

Agenda Item

Link to presentation:
http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/app_templates/filedownload.cfm?id=BC479FF1-FE82-70DF-B25B-75F58AA5E630

Presentations

How to measure the performance and added value of CLLD? *by Christophe Derzelle, DG AGRI*

The presentation provided a reminder of the programme architecture and CLLD in 2014-2020 and explored how contributions of CLLD to the objectives of the RD programme and Partnership Contracts could be programmed, monitored and evaluated.

The approach proposed was based on:

- a programming of Leader under the Focus area 6B "Fostering local development in rural areas";
- a monitoring based on a thematic typology of projects (linked to relevant focus areas/CSF objectives) and a few indicators reflecting the specific LEADER approach (governance, innovation...);
- guidance for evaluation and self-evaluation.

The presentation pointed out a number of outstanding issues to be further examined and discussed.

Brief reminder (oral presentation) on key recommendations made by Focus Group (FG) 4 on 'Better Local Development Strategies', by John Grieve, ENRD CP.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) needs to be planned for as integral part of the preparation of the Local Development Strategy (LDS). LAGs should design data collection in an effective way, i.e. ensuring that information provided is useful for them, their authorities and the EC.

Preparing for M&E as part of LDS development process is beneficial for LAGs, as it carries the same effects as the conduct of an ex ante evaluation, i.e. it will help clarifying whether the proposed strategy meets the region's needs. It will also help forming a view whether the proposed LDS objectives

are likely to be achieved.

Selected FG4 survey findings:

- LAGs try hard and in many different ways to conduct M&E. There is usually a focus on quantitative indicators displaying financials (LAG or project budget performance) and numbers of projects.
- LAGs constantly invent new indicators, but they often are designed to measure what projects do and not what the achievements vis-à-vis the LDS are. Inconsistent use leads to loss of key data.
- most of the information collected is exploited at LAG level, but little of the data goes through to other levels as one would expect in a common M&E framework (CMEF). 37% make no use of CMEF indicators.
- in addition other area/LEADER specific indicators or RDP specific indicators are reportedly used. Qualitative indicators were judged a 'better' fit to provide relevant info;
- evaluation similarly displays a lack of consistency. There is no common approach, which prevents from an analysis that goes beyond the demonstration of achievement and learning;
- more dissemination of evaluation results is needed, to clarify and justify future LAG activities.

Main needs identified by FG4:

- better definition of M&E;
- better indicators, which are objectively quantifiable;
- stronger support to establish common understanding (clarity, consistency) about the requirements/use of M&E.

Agenda Item

Working in groups

Method

Participants split into small groups to discuss the questions specified below.

After each round, the small groups shared their insights and all findings were elaborated in a joint discussion. The results of the session were then shared with the wider audience in the plenary session which closed the workshop.

Outcomes

http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/app_templates/filedownload.cfm?id=BD4DE174-F4A8-995D-27D9-28733F9BF4BA

Question 1: How to measure the contribution of CLLD to the objectives of the RD programme and the Partnership Contract?

(a) Prior to answering to the question, it was proposed to screen the RD focus areas for which Leader was likely to contribute. The following were identified:

Priority I: knowledge transfer and innovation

- 1.A Fostering innovation and knowledge base in rural areas
- 1.C Fostering lifelong learning and vocational training in the agricultural

and forestry sectors

Priority II: food chain organization / risk management

- 3.A Better integrating primary producers into the food chain

Priority IV: restoring, preserving and enhancing ecosystems

- 4.A Restoring and preserving biodiversity, including Nat. 2000 areas and HNV farming and the state of European landscapes
- 4.B Improving water management
- 4.C improving soil management

Priority V: resource efficiency / low carbon / climate

- 5.C Facilitating the supply and use of renewable resources for energy, of by-products, wastes, residues and other non-food raw material for purposes of bio-economy

Priority VI: social inclusion / poverty / reduction / economic development

- 6.A Facilitating diversification from the agricultural sector, creating new small enterprises and other forms of job creation;
- 6.B Fostering local development in rural areas;
- 6.C Enhancing accessibility to use and quality of ICT in rural areas.

(b) Ways of measuring the contribution to RD objectives / focus areas

Proposed output indicators: capture also qualitative elements of information:

- Number and type (topic) of projects
- Number and type of partner involved

Proposed result indicators: capture also qualitative elements of information

- Number of micro-business created
- Number of jobs created per thematic area / business sector
- Type of micro-businesses created
- Type of jobs created per thematic area / business sector

Evaluation: per thematic area

- Clarify the way jobs are created
- Establish that projects were relevant, leading to effective results

Question 2: Which indicators could show the specific added value of the Leader approach (governance, innovation)

- Number and type of rural actors involved
- Number of young people initiating projects
- Numbers of thematic clusters

Question 3: What more is needed at LAG level to properly monitor and evaluate the LDS?

LDS implementation:

- Types of actors involved per thematic cluster
- Complementarity of themes: ex-ante evaluation - consistency of LAG area approach with functional / development areas; ex-post evaluation: were all projects aligned to the LDS; were all themes covered to reflect multi-sectoral approach of LDS?)

Participation:

- Board meeting attendance
- Membership fees payments
- Level of participation of the local community in LAG governance / consultation processes
- The extent to which the LAG participates as an entity in other decision making bodies
- Numbers of new networks generated

Survey on 'additionally':

- Extent to which LAG activity is reported / effects of LDS implementation are made known in the media