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LESSONS LEARNED
Programme-related CEQs 9
To what extent has the RDP contributed to improving the quality of life in rural areas and encouraging diversification of the rural economy? (Community strategic priority)

Current status of evaluation ON GOING
Start date First phase (T0) carried out in 2011/2012/2013
Second phase (T1) on going
Participatory approach
Evaluation technique based on expert assessment

Territorial strategic approach
Selection of micro areas interested by the RDP in which evaluate the evolution of quality of life during the programming period

Integration of the system of indicators with multidimensional indicators relative to perceived quality of life

Assessment of a multidimensional baseline of quality of life at the local level in two periods

Time zero (T0) at the beginning of the RDP
Time one (T1) at the end of the RDP

Contribution of RDP to the quality of life indicators through the analysis of satisfaction of beneficiaries and stakeholders regarding the RDP Measures.
WORKING STEP 1 SELECTION OF INDICATORS

Criteria for the selection

A restricted number of indicators
Easily understandable by the people
Related and not related with the RDP

QUALITY OF LIFE

- FACILITIES
- ECONOMY
- INFRASTRUCTURE
- ENVIRONMENT
- CULTURE
- SOCIAL DYNAMICS

Education, welfare, security, enterprises, agriculture, tourism, business, labour market, cost of living, infrastructures, transports, broadband, houses and buildings, environment, cultural production and initiatives, associations, social inclusion, participation........
WORKING STEP 2. SELECTION OF TARGET AREAS

- Target areas are included in rural areas C and D
- Micro-territories inside Leader areas which share common and well-recognizable history, identity and traditions
- Presence of financed projects, especially focused on Axis 3 measures
- Availability of people collaborating with the evaluator
WORKING STEP 3. SELECTION OF STAKEHOLDERS

275 STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED

WHO ARE THEM?
Main criteria

Different type of stakeholders (technicians, farmers, administrators, etc) representing the social system with good knowledge of investigated indicators coming from different Municipalities
WORKING STEP 4. DATA COLLECTION AT T0

PERCEPTIVE EVALUATION OF INDICATORS

ASSESSMENT OF 25 INDICATORS MEASURING THE STAKEHOLDERS’ SATISFACTION THROUGH A SCALE FROM 1 TO 5

APPLYING NOMINAL GROUP TECHNIQUE TO ACHIEVE QUALITATIVE INFORMATION, GUARANTEE DISCUSSION AND SHARE JUDGMENTS AND OPINIONS
DATA & INFORMATION SOURCES

LACKNESS OF STATISTICAL DATA AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

32 FOCUS GROUPS

QUALITATIVE DATA COLLECTED WITH NOMINAL GROUP TECHNIQUE

INDICATORS ARE MEASURED WITH A NUMBER (1 TO 5) IN RELATION TO OPINIONS FROM BENEFICIARIES AND STAKEHOLDERS

VALUES ARE BASED ON STAKEHOLDERS EXPERIENCES AND JUSTIFIED BY THE GROUP
MAJOR FINDINGS

ASSESSMENT OF A MULTIDIMENSIONAL BASELINE OF QUALITY OF LIFE AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

EVERY AREA HAS SPECIFIC CHARACTERISTICS. MAIN PROBLEMS ON ECONOMIC INDICATORS

CAPTURING IMPACTS OF MEASURES TO IMPROVE QUALITY OF LIFE IN RURAL AREAS - QUALITATIVE METHOD

On going
STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSESS OF THE METHOD

**STRENGTHS**
- Innovativeness of the method
- Feasibility when secondary data are scarce and unavailable at the local level (Municipalities)
- Useful to promote discussion and to share information at the local level
- Active and full participation

**WEAKNESSES**
- Target area selection before RDP implementation
- Lack of secondary data to support qualitative stakeholders perceptions
- Unavailability of same stakeholders from T0 to T1. For example LAGS could not be selected in the new programming period.
- An hard work is necessary to guarantee active participation
- Site specific information. Results not transferable
All the Rural areas are involved in Local Development Programme

Most of the supported projects on Axis 3 and 4 are still going

Highly variable concentration DRP financed projects in different LAG areas

Quality of life dimensions are intercepted by Axis 1 and 2 too
Correlations between quality of life indicators and RDP are identified by the Evaluator Team on the basis of measures’ targets, priority criteria, beneficiaries’ targets, output and result indicators and other effects from Mid Term and on going evaluation.
### WORKING STEP 5.2: LINKING RDP TO THE QUALITY OF LIFE

Correlations between quality of life indicators and RDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asse 1</th>
<th>Misura 111; Misura 114; Misura 112; 121; 123; 124; 132; 133; 125 A/B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mis. 111: 1845 Number of participants that successfully ended a training activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mis 114: IO 308 farmers supported;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mis 112: 1641 assisted young farmers;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mis 121: 2595 supported investments _ 80% introduces innovation_ (+40% GP ) and + 30.732 euro/farm. Added Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mis. 123: 110 beneficiaries ; Mis 124: 52 supported operations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mis 132: 1529 operations_ 160 Meuro PCV;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mis 125: 72 projects supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asse 2: Mis 211; 212; 213; 214</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mis 211  2800 beneficiaries; 212: 810 __ 213: 700 ;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mis 214: 14.000 operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Asse 3 | Misura 311; Misura 321/A; Mis 331 |
|---|
| Mis. 311: 452 projects_ (+ 26.100 €/farm A.V ==2,66 Meuro; |
| Mis. 321 A: 72 market areas _ Rural Population benefiting from new or improved services / infrastructures and IT infrastructures |
| Mis 331: 240 participants that successfully ended a training activity |
To overview about potential effects of RDP projects focusing in **LAG areas**
Collecting opinions between LAG board and staff, regional officials and other experts about RDP capability to change performance of Quality of life indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension and Indicator of Quality of life</th>
<th>Axis / Measures linked to indicator by Evaluator</th>
<th>Axis / Measures linked to indicator by Stakeholder</th>
<th>Judgement From 0 to 3</th>
<th>Supporting information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9) Touristic infrastructures and services are adequates to attract tourists and contribute to the local wealth</td>
<td>Mis. 311, 312, 313</td>
<td></td>
<td>0= no effects 1= effects on beneficiaries level 2=effects on micro level 3= effects on LAG area or productive chain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATA & INFORMATION SOURCES

CONTRIBUTION OF RDP MEASURES TO THE QUALITY OF LIFE INDICATORS - SICILY

Monitoring system information; Mid Term and on going evaluation analysis

14 LAE INVOLVED _ REGIONAL OFFICIALS AND OTHER EXPERTS;
27 STAKEHOLDERS/EXPERTS

QUALITATIVE DATA COLLECTED VIA MAIL

CONTRIBUTE OF RDP TO CHANGES INDICATORS ARE EVALUATED WITH A SCORE (FROM 0 TO 3)

VALUES ARE BASED ON STAKEHOLDERS EXPERIENCES
MAJOR FINDINGS

CONTRIBUTION OF RDP MEASURES TO THE QUALITY OF LIFE INDICATORS
APPLICATION IN SICILY (2016, ON GOING)

Stakeholders’ Perception _ T0

- Very Low performance of economics indicators
- Need to innovate a monocultural, incompetent productive system incapable to create job opportunities
- Inadequate protection and enhancement of natural resources for touristic activities
- Lack of local tourist network and system interventions to ensure visibility on international market

Stakeholders’ perception on effects of RDP

- Low impacts od DRP on economic sustainability of the agricultural sector employment
- Moderate (at beneficiaries and micro level) positive contribute of diversification activities (M312) and market aeras (Mis. 321.A)
- Positive effects on enhancement tourist infrastructure at micro territorial level
- Generally lack of local network but with some positive evidence
MAJOR FINDINGS

CONTRIBUTION OF RDP MEASURES TO THE QUALITY OF LIFE INDICATORS
APPLICATION IN SICILY (2016, ON GOING)

Perception stakeholders _ T0

- Negative judgement on public administration activities, at different level, to support business system
- Satisfaction about services, quality of housing, cultural heritage but critical issues for infrastructure (connecting network)
- Criticism in governance processes both local and multilevel

Perception stakeholders on RDP effects

- Slightly positive judgement mainly due to the local Administration work
- High criticity on connecting network including broad band infrastructure; only one evidence of positive contribute of broad band investments (Mis 321)
- Positive role of LAGS
LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATION ON THE APPLICATION OF THE METHOD

Share the method and the aims with the stakeholders in order to ensure the engagement of representative people with appropriate knowledge.

Share monitoring information about RDP implementation (all measures) with stakeholders/local experts in order to improve their awareness about the RDP.
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