Welsh Government Rural Communities – Rural Development Programme 2014-2020

Evaluation Guidance for LEADER Local Action Groups

January 2017

Contents

Introduction

Section 1: Evaluation context 2014-2020

Section 2: Tools and techniques

Section 3: Planning, developing and implementing evaluation

List of Tables

Overview

- As a Local Action Group (LAG) you are aware that there is a requirement for an independent evaluation of the delivery of your Local Development Strategy. As part of this process Local Action Groups (LAGs) will need to:
  - o Plan evaluation activities for the programme period;
  - o Regularly collect sufficient, good quality monitoring data;
  - o Draft the Terms of Reference for independent evaluation activity; and
  - o Commission and manage evaluation contractors.

- This guidance document provides support for the above activities. It serves as an introduction to evaluation for LAGs within the context of the Welsh Government Rural Communities - Rural Development Programme 2014-2020 (WGRC-RDP 2014-2020).

- In response to information and feedback received in the previous programme, the Welsh Government has devised a change in approach to how monitoring and evaluation in the WGRC-RDP 2014-2020 will be undertaken. This document explains these changes.

- Ultimately, evaluation should be viewed as a tool to provide evidence for decision-making and improves effectiveness, usefulness and efficiency. The results and recommendations should inform programme management by improving the targeting of resources and allowing comparison of performance.

- Responsibilities for those involved in the monitoring and evaluation of CAP 2014 – 2020 are laid out under Article 110 of Regulation (EU) No 1306/2013. The Strategy Branch within WEFO (formerly the Research, Monitoring and Evaluation team) manages Programme level evaluations on behalf of the Managing Authority.

- The Strategy Branch can provide assistance with devising evaluation specifications, advising on methodologies, sitting on tender scoring panels for evaluation contracts, sitting on evaluation steering groups for meetings with appointed evaluators, and commenting on draft research reports.

Introduction

This document has been produced to provide support on evaluation for Local Action Groups (LAGs) funded by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD). It serves as an introduction to evaluation for LAGs within the context of the Welsh Government Rural Communities - Rural Development Programme 2014-2020 (WGRC-RDP 2014-2020).

This guidance contains three sections:

- **Section 1**: explains the rationale for evaluation of LEADER and places evaluation within the context of European Commission and Welsh Government requirements. It addresses common issues with evaluation which were identified in LAG Local Development Strategies (LDS) as being specific areas requiring additional support. These are then addressed through the report.

- **Section 2**: outlines practical approaches and tools for evaluation which should be considered during planning. These include: Common Evaluation Questions, and key methodologies relevant to rural development evaluation.

- **Section 3**: includes practical advice on designing, commissioning and implementing effective evaluations. This includes standardised specifications for mid-term and final evaluations, and an example report template.

This document is a revised and updated version of 'An Introduction to Monitoring and Evaluation for Local Action Groups', which was circulated to LAGs in late 2014. Guidance for monitoring and evaluation has now been split across two complementary documents. Bespoke monitoring guidance includes detailed fiches for the performance indicators specific to the whole WGRC-RDP 2014-2020, while this document details evaluation guidance specific for Local Action Groups.

Section 1: Evaluation context 2014-2020

In response to information and feedback received in the previous programme, the Welsh Government has devised a change in approach to how monitoring and evaluation in the WGRC-RDP 2014-2020 will be undertaken. This entails a streamlined indicator plan allowing for a focus on accurate data collection. Accurate beneficiary contact details will allow surveys to explore the reasons behind wider impacts of the interventions. Evaluations will become the key output for reporting the additional benefits that have arisen from LEADER. Standard templates ensure that the contents of these evaluations can be easily synthesized at a national or regional level. Additionally, the Wales Rural Network (WRN) will have an increased role in distributing and sharing the results of the programme.

It is anticipated that these changes will result in a proportionate monitoring and evaluation system which is able to more effectively capture the wider impacts of LEADER against the issues set out in LDS. This will result in easier collation of the strengths and weaknesses of interventions across Wales.

1.1.   Purpose of Evaluation

Evaluation has a wider scope than monitoring for examining project and programme achievements. It involves making an overall assessment of the achievements of a project or scheme. Although the monitoring system can help in this objective, it is limited because **some outcomes are not easily measured or evidenced by indicators**. Evaluations also enable project managers to improve the design and implementation of their programmes. For the Welsh Government, evaluations support decision makers to improve policy and strategy based on evidence.

Evaluation takes monitoring information further by investigating wider impacts and assessing the reasons for indicator results being what they are. Evaluations also address questions surrounding the quality of interventions and consider contextual factors. For example, indicator data may report 10 jobs created by a project. An evaluation will then be able to answer questions such as, would these jobs have

been created had the intervention not occurred, the quality of these jobs and whether the number of jobs created is high or low in comparison to other schemes?

Evaluations use indicators as a baseline and expand upon these through a range of robust research methods. For evaluation to be effective, it needs to be viewed as an ongoing process within which monitoring takes place, rather than a retrospective review of project's success. It is therefore essential to engage with monitoring and evaluation during the early stages of developing your operation.

Ultimately, evaluation should be viewed as a tool to provide evidence for decision-making and improves effectiveness, usefulness and efficiency. The results and recommendations should inform programme management by improving the targeting of resources and allowing comparison of performance. It can also provide an early indication of any issues which can allow the programme to change practices at an early stage if necessary.

1.2. Evaluation Plan 2014 - 2020

The 'Technical Handbook on the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) 2014-2020 [1] ' summarises the European Commission requirements for Rural Development Programme evaluation in the period 2014-2020. The Common Monitoring and Evaluation System (CMES) is currently not finalised.

Responsibilities for those involved in the monitoring and evaluation of CAP 2014 – 2020 are laid out under Article 110 of Regulation (EU) No 1306/2013. The Strategy Branch manages Programme level evaluations on behalf of the Managing Authority.

The Welsh Government will commission an Evaluation of the Added Value of LEADER and Community-led Local Development. This study will take place towards the end of the Programming period and will complement evaluations undertaken at a local level by LAGs of the achievements in their areas.

---

[1]
http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert/index.cfm?do=groupDetail.groupDetailDoc&id=18200&no=17

1.3. Welsh Government evaluation requirements

LAGs are required to provide information on a programme's monitoring and evaluation and also carry out self-evaluations and monitor the development of the LDS. LAG participation in evaluations is important as they bring invaluable local knowledge and contacts, as well as a practical perspective on the monitoring and evaluation process in a specific area. LAGs will therefore:

- Participate in Programme evaluations of the WGRC-RDP 2014-2020[2];
- Contribute to the assessment of the added value of the LEADER approach;
- Undertake the monitoring and evaluation of their own LDS.

1.4. Evaluation support

In order to enable LAGs to contribute effectively, the Strategy Branch within WEFO (formerly the Research, Monitoring and Evaluation team) will provide support and capacity building. As a result of discussions with LAGs in the 2007-2013 programming period and the 'Wales Rural Network Event: Monitoring and Evaluation – Glancing back to plan ahead' the Welsh Government has put in place improved support for the monitoring and evaluation of LEADER.

The Strategy Branch can provide assistance with devising evaluation specifications, advising on methodologies, sitting on tender scoring panels for evaluation contracts, sitting on evaluation steering groups for meetings with appointed evaluators, and commenting on draft research reports.

Please contact the team directly via RDPM&E@wales.gsi.gov.uk.

---

[2] See Annex 3 for a list of Programme Evaluation Schedule 2014-2020

Section 2: Tools and techniques

Section 2 outlines the tools which can be applied in evaluations to effectively assess the effectiveness of the LAG interventions. Section 2.1 explains the Common Evaluation Questions required by the European Commission. Sections 2.3 and 2.4 introduce evaluation techniques which should be considered at the design stage of any research.

2.1.   Common Evaluation Questions for Rural Development

Evaluation questions are an important element of the EU Common Monitoring and Evaluation System. They help define the focus of evaluations and allow for examination of the progress, impact, and achievements of rural development interventions at various scales including Wales, the UK and other EU Member States.

CEQs are mandatory for the Welsh Government to report progress against to the EC. LAGs are encouraged to complete final evaluations post-2019, given the time it takes for impact to emerge. This will ensure findings are able to feed into the final Programme evaluation due to be submitted in 2024.

Annex 2 includes a set of indicative questions which LAGs may wish to include or adapt in mid-term and final evaluations. LAGs are encouraged to create additional evaluation questions which are relevant to their operations.

CEQs are answered using specific judgment criteria and indicators. The judgement criteria are used to link the indicators to the CEQ which help to collect the evidence to develop the answers. The judgement criteria set by the EC are only a starting point and additional judgement criteria should be developed by evaluators which are designed to address issues specific to each LAG. In total there are 30 CEQ which includes one for each of the 18 Focus Areas, with the remaining 12 assessing Horizontal priorities. A full list of the CEQs is available in Annex 1.

Similar to the Performance Indicators, LAGs should report against the CEQs which are relevant to the Focus Areas their activities are aligned to. For this reason, all LAGs should address the CEQ related to FA 6B; 'To what extent has the RDP intervention contributed to fostering local development in rural areas?'.

It is mandatory for LAGs to collect data on the Cross-Cutting Themes (equal opportunities, sustainable development and tackling poverty and social exclusion).

Table 1 provides key information on how to how to address the above evaluation question. Depending on the activities being delivered in the LAG area, you should then consult the full list of questions in Annex 1 and address the CEQ relevant to the Focus Areas for the activities being delivered in your area.

Table 1 – Common Evaluation Question example – Priority 6B

	Focus Area 6B - Fostering local development in rural areas
Focus Area-Related Common Evaluation Question	To what extent has the RDP intervention contributed to fostering local development in rural areas?
Judgement Criteria	- Services and local infrastructure in rural areas has improved - Access to services and local infrastructure has increased in rural areas - Rural people have participated in local actions - Rural people have benefited from local actions - Employment opportunities have been created via local development strategies - Rural territory and population covered by LAGs has increased
Common Rural Development Indicators	% of rural population covered by local development strategies *(FA 6B – Result indicator)* - Jobs created in supported projects (Leader) *(FA 6B – Result indicator)* % of rural population benefiting from improved services/ infrastructures *(FA 6B – Result indicator)*

Additional Information	• Number of projects/initiatives supported by the Local Development Strategy • % of RDP expenditure in Leader measures with respect to total RDP expenditure

2.2. Baseline data

For LAGs, baseline data provide an understanding of the context of the socio-economic conditions within the area of intervention, before operations begin. Where gaps in coverage of the baseline are identified, additional information could then be collected. Baseline data need to be focussed on areas that are directly related to the activities delivered by individual LAGs. This effective targeting is necessary because any changes which have occurred can confidently be attributed to the LAG activity, and not wider developments outside of LEADER.

Ensuring baseline data are available is important as it can be used by evaluators to compare findings during the lifetime and/or at the end of an operation, against the position before intervention began. Again, this is only if baseline data have been focused on key areas that can be attributed to LAG activity.

Baseline data can be collected from different sources, for example:

- **Baseline evaluation**: may be undertaken to collect data on the socio-economic characteristics of the population. The baseline is intended to provide a reference value against which targets are assessed.

- **Record beneficiary data at operation inception**: this method is more appropriate for individual business operations. Data such as turnover, and number of FTE jobs can be recorded at the inception of the project. By referring to this data in a final evaluation, evaluators can quote exact changes, as opposed to asking beneficiaries to recall the information during final fieldwork when they may not have exact information available.

- **Use existing data sources**: LAGs outlined in their LDS existing data sources available to measure success against. These included: existing data from the

2007 – 2013 RDP programme, existing evaluations, and current datasets such as those available on the Statistics for Wales website.

2.3. Monitoring systems

High quality monitoring data are needed for effective evaluation. Monitoring data include financial, performance indicators, and contact details data. It is essential that data are collected in a systematic way across LAGs and that the information being recorded is robust. **Without reliable data it is not possible to accurately understand the impacts of the interventions or whether they are meeting their targets.**

LAGs should maintain up to date contact detail electronic databases for all operations and for all beneficiaries of interventions. You should consider the level of data collection detail required, proportional to an operation. For example, if a training course is run, participant's details should be recorded and their consent received for further contact as part of evaluation. Due care should be taken not to duplicate records.

It is important to agree on responsibilities and processes for data collection early on. Advanced planning is essential as the whole process from evaluation planning to results dissemination can take up to three years. A lack of available data may lengthen the evaluation process considerably. It is very important to start planning an evaluation well in advance. **A crucial step is to collect reliable contact details (including accurate telephone and e-mail details) for beneficiaries and to store these in an electronic format.**

Before conducting community survey work, it is good practice to contact participants beforehand (where possible) to explain the importance of the survey work, stress confidentiality of the responses and allow them the opportunity to opt out of having their views recorded. This also evidences to interviewees that the evaluators are working on behalf of the LAG.

2.4. Evaluation methodologies

As well as internal project reviews, LAGs are encouraged to commission external contractors to undertake project evaluations in their area. This section acts as an introduction to the common methods employed to evaluate LEADER. The Strategy Branch is available to provide support on research methods. Additional links to detailed sources on methodology are available in Appendix 1.

When developing the specification for an evaluation contract it is essential to outline the methods you would expect an evaluator to employ. If this is not clear, the bids you receive may not cover methodologies you require to capture all the aspects of your programme that you would like. Further detail on the evaluation design and specifications is available in Section 3.

Due to the nature of LEADER, with its participatory approach and strong socio-economic focus, it is recommended that evaluations explore the perceptions of local communities in LEADER areas. Active participation of LEADER beneficiaries and stakeholders in the evaluation process strengthens its relevance and the understanding and ownership of the outcomes. This in turn can strengthen the trust within the partnership and between the LAGs and the beneficiaries. The use of mixed-methods are favoured to address the need to capture different aspects of the effects of LEADER[3].

Examples of best practice methods to evaluate LEADER include:
- Analysis of monitoring and financial data – All evaluations should include a section that reviews the indicator information that has been collected by the LAG. This data should be included in a clear table in the evaluation to allow easy comparison of similar projects' results across Wales.

- Community surveys – involves conducting a survey with wider community groups, rather than direct beneficiaries of the RDP. These are best managed at a local level as LAGs are best placed to understand the issues which should be investigated. This may include both beneficiaries of community-type

---

[3] https://enrd.ec.europa.eu/sites/enrd/files/uploaded-files/twg-05-ep-june2015_0.pdf

projects, as well as wider community groups. This assists in the assessment of the wider benefits of the operations. For example, surveys may investigate local perceptions of community and what they feel LEADER funding has, or has not, achieved. A well designed questionnaire can explore the reasons behind Performance Indicator figures results. To assess the longevity of results you may wish to ask respondents what they perceive the likely impacts to be after a period of three years. The Strategy Branch will undertake surveys with businesses and share relevant data with each LAG for secondary analysis as part of evaluations.

- Case studies – are a beneficial way of collecting and presenting data on an in-depth or specific topic. Case studies will most often investigate an individual project, collection of similar projects with common issues, or a small geographical area. As well as presenting examples of good practice, case studies can also explore specific issues which may have been encountered, and how they have been dealt with and overcome. Case studies are best managed at a LAG level and are useful for capturing the community benefits.

- Snowball sampling – is the process of identifying additional interviewees to interview, or use as case studies based on the recommendations of existing contacts. This is useful in the context of LEADER as it may allow an investigation of the wider benefits of operations, especially towards evaluating the tacking poverty cross cutting theme.

- Interviews – Semi-structured interviews provide qualitative data and give a good insight into reasons behind results. Interviews are most often undertaken either over the phone or face-to-face.

- Focus Groups – Similar to interviews, focus groups involve a facilitator who stimulates discussion within a group meeting of between six to eight people. This approach is useful to obtain a range of views and perspectives in a shorter time than interviews. However, focus groups are not ethically suitable for discussing more sensitive topics.

- Situational Analysis – Involves researching the relevant background policy and the wider socio-economic context in which projects operate. This process

improves the benchmark from which evaluators can assess the improvement to an area due to LEADER intervention. Similarly to baseline data collection, care should be taken to ensure situational analysis covers areas specific to LEADER, so external factors are not wrongly attributed to change.

In addition to the specific research methods, the most appropriate type of evaluation approach should be considered. This will differ depending on the stage at which the programme is at (mid-term or final). See Section 3.3 for information on appropriate approaches.

The results from the research should be analysed and presented clearly in the final reports. Evaluations should not simply serve as a presentation and description of project achievements, but rather they should focus on explaining the reasons for the impacts and exploring the reasons for any less successful aspects of the project. Evaluation reports should also make a series of evidence-based recommendations for future activity. The evaluation recommendations should be communicated to those involved in the LAG and (where relevant) delivering projects. Each recommendation should be considered by the LAG after the evaluation, and reviewed at a future point for actions that may need to be taken as a result of the recommendations.

It is important for projects to circulate participant consent forms at the start of the programme to allow evaluators to contact them in the future for their contributions. The Strategy Branch will develop a consent form template for Local Action Groups to circulate.

Section 3: Planning, developing and implementing evaluation

3.1. Evaluation Design

During the preliminary stages of programme development it is necessary for LAGs to consider their evaluation requirements. Planning what activities will need to be undertaken ensures evaluation deadlines are not missed and evaluations have the appropriate amount of time to be completed to a satisfactory quality. It is recommended, as a minimum, LAGs schedule to undertake on-going or mid term evaluation and a final evaluation.

Activities linked to evaluation preparation comprise:
- Review of the Common Evaluation Questions;

- Develop programme-specific evaluation questions linked to the aims and objectives of LDS/projects, definition of judgment criteria and links to indicators;

- Define the policy objectives, audience for the evaluation and intended outcomes;

- Review potential approaches to the assessment of results and impacts (for final evaluations) and select proposed evaluation methods/ approach;

- Agree data requirements and availability with data providers. Data should be collected in an electronic format, stored and shared securely;

- Prepare privacy notices and agreements which allow the data to be shared as required for the evaluation;

- Identify the resources required and project governance arrangements;

- Prepare a specification and plan tendering procedures (if external evaluators are conducting the evaluation). A specification template is available in Section 3.3; and

- Create a communication plan for sharing evaluation findings and recommendations.

The sub-sections below provide additional detail on evaluation design issues and address items identified in the LDS as requiring guidance.

3.1.1. Regional Evaluation

Co-operation among LAGs is highly encouraged and the sharing of evaluation results and findings is good practice.

The LDS for some LAGs outline proposals for undertaking joint, regional evaluations. It is not recommended that regional evaluations are conducted in lieu of LAG level evaluations. Aggregating results at this scale may cause a dilution of findings. Given the local nature of LEADER, it is important that evaluations focus on localised findings and LAG specific outcomes.

3.1.2. On-going evaluators

LAGs may wish to consider commissioning an on-going evaluation programme with an external contractor. Evidence suggests that on-going evaluators acting as a 'critical friend' [4] during the course of programme implementation can be highly beneficial. They are able to provide on-going assistance and advice in a pro-active manner, rather than viewing the programme achievements at a fixed point in time.

On-going evaluators are also able to recommend, at the inception of the programme, what data are required for the final evaluation. This means the LAG can be confident that sufficient data will be available at the end of the programme to conduct the Final evaluation. Additional data collected need to be directly relevant to the activities delivered by the LAG. Additionally, the LAG has more time available to discuss their requirements. LAGs may find value in appointing the same evaluator to undertake both the mid-term and final evaluations.

The inherent risk of appointing an on-going evaluator is that it may not be the most cost effective approach, as tendering for individual evaluations may mean LAGs receive more cost effective options for the work.

---

[4] http://llyw.cymru/funding/eu-funds/previous/project-evaluations/supplychain-efficiency/?lang=en

3.1.3. Resources

Appropriate and sufficient resources should be provided for monitoring and evaluation. The costs of having independent, external evaluation of the projects and the operation of the LAG and its Administrative Body can be met from LEADER. Up to 15% of LAGs allocated funding will be set aside for 'Animation and evaluation' and is funded 100%, with no match funding necessary.

Budgets for externally commissioned evaluations should be proportionate to the aims and objectives of the operation. However, inadequately resourced evaluations are likely to lead to poor quality evidence or even false conclusions and may not provide the evidence base needed for future project planning.

3.1.4. Evaluation Steering Group

Before commissioning an evaluation, LAGs should create a steering group to oversee the project. This should be comprised of: stakeholders interested in the final results of the evaluation, individuals in the organisation who have knowledge of the projects (including monitoring data) and, representatives from project deliverers. Please contact the Strategy Branch to request a member of the team to sit on your evaluation steering group.

Governance arrangements will set out who is responsible for which task, which could include the project manager, senior responsible owner, project director or steering group.

Version 2

Table 2 - Evaluation quality control responsibilities

Internal Project Manager	Senior Responsible Owner/Project Director	Steering Group
Drafting specification	Ensuring appropriate resources	Ensuring quality and relevance
Obtaining necessary data and security clearance	Ensuring necessary information is collected and available to evaluators / WEFO	Facilitating work of external evaluators
Day to day management of risks		Access to information and contacts
Ensuring on track, meets objectives, is on time and within budget		Quality assurance: design, questions, methods, research tools
Contractors: advice and responding timely to issues arising		Assist in analysis and interpretation
Quality assurance		
Feedback findings to relevant audience		

Source: Magenta Book (Table 5c)

The governance arrangements should also be clear as to who is responsible, as data controller, under the Data Protection Act (1998)[5].

---

[5] http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1998/29/contents

3.2. Commissioning and management

Mostly, LAGs will commission an external, specialist evaluation company to undertake their evaluations. LAGs should adhere to local or company protocol but it is advised that the evaluations are put out to open tender on the sell2wales[6] website.

Tasks to consider when planning an evaluation include:

- Engage with key stakeholders to identify requirements;

- Allocate necessary resources for the work. Up to 15% of LAGs allocated funding will be set aside for 'Animation and evaluation' and is funded 100% with no match funding necessary;

- Decide who will produce the evaluation. It is recommended LAGs employ an external contractor to complete the work; and

- Produce associated documents including; an evaluation plan, and tender specification. Once the evaluation is awarded, the specification will serve as the contract for the work.

The successful evaluators should be independent of the project and should not include any of the project stakeholders. Maintaining this good practice aims to eliminate bias in the evaluation that can sometimes arise from a familiar LAG/ evaluator relationship. Members of the Strategy Branch team are available to comment and score evaluation tenders.

3.3. Specification

The specification is a crucial stage in the evaluation process. It will be used as the reference document over the course of the project to measure progress and ensure the successful evaluator is conducting the work required. It is important that the aims, objectives, and required methodology are clearly and comprehensively outlined. If the scope of an evaluation is poorly defined from the start, the final result will likely be of poor quality also.

---

[6] For advice on procuring services in Wales please contact the National Procurement Service; http://nps.gov.wales/?skip=1&lang=en

When designing specifications for contracts internal governance arrangements should be followed. Table 3 below may be used as a guide of the sections which are useful to consider including in draft specifications.

Table 3 – Specification template

Specification section	Guidance note
Background	Set out the background to the evaluation, both in terms of the policy area (e.g. the background to LEADER, the LDS and its implementation by the LAG, background to the WGRC-RDP 2014-2020) and the wider context within which the evaluation will operate (e.g. why is the evaluation being commissioned at this time, how will the results be used). This section should answer the question of why you are commissioning the research project. Explain the importance of the Local Development Strategy.
Aims and Objectives	The broad aims given in this section should answer, in broad terms, the question of what you want to achieve as a result of the project. Depending on the nature of the project, the objectives might set out the specific research questions that need to be addressed/ issues against which evidence is needed or for a feasibility study, set out the steps to be taken in achieving these. It is important that this section incudes the key areas

	that you would like the evaluators to examinee as it provides the contractual basis upon which the work will take place.
Methodology	Clearly set out the methods you wish the contractor to employ. Explain any challenges you foresee (e.g. timescales for completion, methods) should be explained here.
	Potential bidders should have a clear understanding of what the commissioner is trying to achieve but should feel free to suggest the best method of achieving it.
	If you want a specific method/s to be employed ensure you include it here.
Tender deadlines and contract award criteria	The timetable section should set out the milestones for the project tendering from advertising the specification, through to project award.
	This section should clearly set out the award criteria that the bids will be scored against, including the weighting for each section. The cost of the contract should be included as part of the total award score. Example scoring criteria could be: 1. Understanding of the research context and response to brief (1,500 word limit - 20%) 2. Methodological approach; including rationale, suitability of methods proposed, timescales for delivery and anticipated risks and proposed mitigation (3,000 word limit – 40%) 3. Details of the project team; relevant prior experience, roles and responsibilities within this contract (1,500 word limit – 20%) 4. Cost (20%)

	It is advisable to set word limits for each section.
Timescales and duration of contract	Outline contract start and end date as well as table outlining key deliverables and deadlines. Key stages of delivery could be: • Inception report • Fieldwork • Draft final report • Presentation to client • Final report However, these should be appropriate for each LAG. Timetables should allow for the turnaround of reports from draft to sign off so that tenderers account for this time in their planning.
Budget and price schedule	This section should set out the budget for the work. It is recommended to propose a cost range, which gives a broad indication of the costs of the evaluation to encourage competitiveness whilst providing an idea to tenderers as to the expected cost of contract. A price schedule should be included outlining the milestones at which invoices will be paid. These could link to the key stages of delivery identified above.
Welsh language and translation requirements	The Contractor should note the requirement to ensure that the Welsh and English languages are treated equally. This includes the capacity to undertake the fieldwork bilingually, such as interviews and community surveys.

Contract monitoring	Contact points for client and contractor and non-compliance arrangements.
Data security	Contracts must be compliant with the 1998 Data Protection Act.
	Appropriate arrangements need to be in place to ensure that data are transmitted securely between evaluation contractors and the client/beneficiary.

There will be differences between the specifications for the mid-term and final evaluations. Specifically, the aims and objectives, and methods sections will need to reflect the differences in approach to reflect the difference in the research given the period of time the evaluation is taking place. Broad differences to consider include:

- **Mid-term Evaluations**: will place an emphasis on addressing the administration or *process* of delivering the RDP funds in your area with objectives that aim to investigate the efficiency of monitoring systems in place, delivery progress, monitoring data analysis, interviews with key stakeholders, and progress against CEQs. At this stage LAGs may wish to investigate the effectiveness of communication, stakeholders' views, whether the balance of activities against the LDS is appropriate, and whether there are changes in the socio-economic circumstances since the drafting of the LDS. In addition, the mid-term evaluation should make recommendations for the remainder of the Programme period.

- **Final Evaluations**: will examine the impact of the programme once the interventions have been delivered. It will also, however want to provide information to the LAG on the lessons which may need to be taken forward in future to implement similar activity more effectively. In addition, a final assessment will need to be made regarding the effectiveness of the programme activities at meeting the priorities that were set out in the LDS. In practice, a mixture of these approaches is likely to be employed.

Please send any specifications you wish to receive comments on to RDPM&E@wales.gsi.gov.uk. In addition, Style Guidance and a Government Social Research (GSR) report template are available also.

3.4. Report template

In an effort to standardise and create common features within LAG evaluations the example template below gives an indication of the sections that should be included. This template will vary depending on the size of the projects being evaluated and the scale of the evaluation. The Strategy Branch may be consulted during the process for advice and comments on evaluation tenders and proposed structure. Below is an outline example of the structure of an evaluation report:

<u>Executive Summary</u>
- Main findings of the evaluation; and
- Conclusions and recommendations.

<u>Introduction</u>
- Purpose of the report; and
- Structure of the report.

<u>Context</u>
- Brief contextual information about the programme;
- Discussion of previous evaluations related to the programme;
- Description of the project/ programme being evaluated; and
- Programme implementation; actors involved, institutional context.

<u>Methodological approach</u>
- Explanation of the evaluation design and the methods used;
- Sources of data, and information on how indicators were calculated to be able to assess the quality of the data; and
- Problems or limitations of the methodological approach.

Financial and Indicator information

- Uptake and budget actually spent, with detailed tables of the breakdown of how much money specific projects received; and

- Tables of all monitoring indicator data that have been collected over the course of the project. These data should form the basis for further evaluation to explain the results.

Results of primary research

- Analysis and results of the research undertaken;

- Emphasis should be placed on the analysis of the data rather than presenting the results; and

- Discussion of relevant Common Evaluation Questions for Rural Development Programmes 2014-2020 to allow for cross-examination of results across Wales.

Conclusions and Recommendations

- Presentation of the overall conclusions of the programme which take into account programme-specific and national strategy objectives; and

- Recommendations based on the evaluation findings, including, if relevant, proposals for the adaptation of programmes.

A full template and style guidance is available from the Strategy Branch. In addition, it is advisable to provide the Strategy Branch with copies of the draft reports to comment on before evaluation reports are finalised.

3.5.   Effective use of results

Undertaking an evaluation should not be viewed as a 'tick-box' exercise. They are active documents that should influence project implementation decisions. As well as effectively using the information in reports, it is strongly recommended LAGs review other evaluations undertaken by LAGs to identify best practice elsewhere and lessons learnt in the delivery of activities under the previous Programme.

The evaluation recommendations are a key element of the report. LAGs may wish to publish their response to the report recommendations, alongside the publication of the report.

While appraising applications for projects in the coming programme period it is recommended to consult previous evaluations of your LAG area so you can remain abreast of the issues that may have affected a similar area. These findings should then be provided to the relevant project managers. Evaluation has a role in identifying best practice so that it can be built upon and replicated.

The main audience for the evaluations produced are the LAGs. However, the project board, organisational stakeholders, other LAGs conducting similar projects, and the Welsh Government should all also receive copies of all evaluations undertaken. Final evaluation reports should also be published online.

Before an evaluation report is finalised it is often useful to arrange for the contractor to present the key findings to staff working on the Programmes in the LAG, LAG members, and stakeholders. It's a useful way for those involved in the LAG to discuss the evaluation findings and recommendations with the evaluators, ask questions, and to consider what the findings and recommendations mean to them and future activity.

To communicate the findings effectively to wider interested parties LAGs may wish to use methods such as: online bulletins, local seminars, conferences, workshops and published papers. It is also recommended LAGs stay abreast of events run by the Wales Rural Network Support Unit (WRNSU) and the UK National Rural Network. The Strategy Branch will also be holding workshops on monitoring and evaluation for LAGs. The WRNSU is contactable through their mailbox - ruralnetwork@wales.gsi.gov.uk.

To ensure that learning opportunities presented by evaluations are implemented it may be appropriate to conduct a review some time following the completion of the evaluation to consider progress against any recommendations made in an evaluation.

Appendix 1 – Further Guidance

Common Evaluation Questions for Rural Development Programmes 2014-2020:
https://enrd.ec.europa.eu/sites/enrd/files/uploaded-files/wp_evaluation_questions_2015.pdf

Working Paper on Capturing impacts of LEADER and of measures to improve Quality of Life in rural areas:
http://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0ahUKEwjXt_a0odLMAhWjIcAKHc1aBokQFggjMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fec.europa.eu%2Fagriculture%2Frurdev%2Feval%2Fwp-leader_en.pdf&usg=AFQjCNG7Q867iDJO1g0esJEQ5GAcGb6cUg

Evaluation of Axes 3 & 4 of the Rural Development Plan Wales 2007-2013:
http://gov.wales/funding/eu-funds/previous/project-evaluations/rural-development/?lang=en

European Evaluation Helpdesk for Rural Development:
https://enrd.ec.europa.eu/en/evaluation

EC Impact Evaluation Centre:
http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/index.cfm/en/policy/evaluations/guidance/impact_faq_theor

NAO – Evaluation in Government:
https://www.nao.org.uk/report/evaluation-government/

HM Treasury Magenta Book:
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-magenta-book

HM Treasury Green Book:
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-green-book-appraisal-and-evaluation-in-central-governent

ESRC Framework for Research Ethics 2010 (revised September 2012) (PDF, 480Kb):   http://www.esrc.ac.uk/_images/framework-for-research-ethics-09-12_tcm8-4586.pdf

Social Research Association Ethical Guidelines:
 http://the-sra.org.uk/research-ethics/ethics-guidelines/

GSR Ethical Assurance for Social Research in Government:
http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/networks/gsr/publications

Appendix 2 - Glossary

Baseline	For monitoring and evaluation purposes, the baseline provides a measure of a certain (set of) indicator(s) prior to an intervention taking place. This can then be used to assess achievement of the outcomes and impact by comparing the value for the same set of indicators at some point during or after implementation of the intervention with the baseline. However, any changes observed in the baseline may not have been caused the intervention, as external factors may have had an influence. Therefore, the baseline needs to be complemented by additional research to capture the extent to which any changes are attributable to the intervention e.g. beneficiary interviews.
Common Evaluation Questions	Each Focus Area (FA) links to a Common Evaluation Question. Using them consistently in the evaluations of the corresponding FA throughout Europe helps ensure comparability of the results. The Common Evaluation Questions are linked to rural development policy objectives.
Community Surveys	Involve conducting a survey with wider community groups, rather than direct beneficiaries of the RDP. This may include both beneficiaries of community-type projects, as well as wider community groups. This assists in the assessment of the wider benefits of the operations.

Council Regulation	A regulation is a European Union binding legislative act. The EU's rural development policy is formulated in the form of Council regulations that set out how the policy will be implemented.
Focus Groups	Similar to interviews, focus groups involve a facilitator who stimulates discussion within a group meeting of between six to eight people. This approach is useful to obtain a range of views and perspectives in a shorter time than interviews.
Interviews	Semi-structured interviews provide qualitative data and give a good insight into reasons behind results. Interviews are most often undertaken either over the phone or face-to-face.
Local Development Strategies	Local Development Strategies were completed by each Local Action Group at the start of the programming period. They set out a coherent set of operations to meet local objectives and needs, which contribute to meeting the European Union strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth and which are implemented in partnership at the appropriate level.
LEADER	LEADER is a French acronym, standing for 'Liaison Entre Actions de Développement de l'Économie Rurale', meaning 'Links between the rural economy and development actions'.

Research framework	A research framework provides context and creates a theoretical frame of reference for research tasks. It serves as a guide for the research design to systematically identify relationships and interdependencies among variables.
Situational Analysis	Involves researching the relevant background policy and the wider socio-economic context in which projects operate. This process improves the benchmark from which evaluators can assess the improvement to an area.
Snowball sampling	The process of identifying additional interviewees to interview, or use as case studies, based on the recommendations of existing contacts.
Specification	The specification is a document which clearly, accurately and completely describes the essential requirements of the research being purchased.
Theory of Change	Approach used to establish the sequence of different outcomes that needed to be achieved to secure the long-term goals of an intervention.

Annex 1 – List of Common Evaluation Questions

A full list of the Common Evaluation Questions for rural development is provided below. For detailed information on the judgement criteria, linked common indicators, and additional information for each CEQ please see: https://enrd.ec.europa.eu/sites/enrd/files/uploaded-files/wp_evaluation_questions_2015.pdf

Focus Area related evaluation questions

	Focus Area	Evaluation Question
P1A	Fostering innovation, cooperation, and the development of the knowledge base in rural areas	**1.** To what extent have RDP interventions supported innovation, cooperation and the development of the knowledge base in rural areas?
P1B	Strengthening the links between agriculture, food production and forestry and research and innovation, including for the purpose of improved environmental management and performance	**2.** To what extent have RDP interventions supported the strengthening of links between agriculture, food production and forestry and research and innovation, including for the purpose of improved environmental management and performance?
P1C	Fostering lifelong learning and vocational training in the agricultural and forestry sectors	**3.** To what extent have RDP interventions supported lifelong learning and vocational training in the agriculture and forestry sectors?
P2A	Improving the economic performance of all farms and facilitating farm restructuring and modernisation, notably with a view to increasing market participation and orientation as well as agricultural diversification	**4.** To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to improving the economic performance, restructuring and modernization of supported farms in particular through increasing their market participation and agricultural diversification?
P2B	Facilitating the entry of	**5**. To what extent have RDP interventions

	adequately skilled farmers into the agricultural sector and, in particular, generational renewal	supported the entry of adequately skilled farmers into the agricultural sector and in particular, generational renewal?
P3A	Improving competitiveness of primary producers by better integrating them into the agri-food chain through quality schemes, adding value to agricultural products, promotion in local markets and short supply circuits, producer groups and organisations and inter-branch organisations	**6**. To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to improving the competitiveness of supported primary producers by better integrating them into the agri-food chain through quality schemes, adding value to the agricultural products, promoting local markets and short supply circuits, producer groups and inter-branch organization?
P3B	Supporting farm risk prevention and management	**7**. To what extent have RDP interventions supported farm risk prevention and management?
P4A	Restoring, preserving and enhancing biodiversity, including in Natura 2000 areas, and in areas facing natural or other specific constraints, and high nature value farming, as well as the state of European landscapes	**8.** To what extent have RDP interventions supported the restoration, preservation and enhancement of biodiversity including in Natura 2000 areas, areas facing natural or other specific constraints and HNV farming, and the state of European landscape?
P4B	Improving water management, including fertiliser and pesticide management	**9**. To what extent have RDP interventions supported the improvement of water management, including fertilizer and pesticide management?
P4C	Preventing soil erosion and improving soil management	**10**. To what extent have RDP interventions supported the prevention of soil erosion and improvement of soil management?
P5A	Increasing efficiency in water use by agriculture	**11**. To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to increasing efficiency in water use by agriculture?

P5B	Increasing efficiency in energy use in agriculture and food processing	**12**. To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to increasing efficiency in energy use in agriculture and food processing?
P5C	Facilitating the supply and use of renewable sources of energy, of by-products, wastes and residues and of other non food raw material, for the purposes of the bio- economy	**13**. To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to the supply and use of renewable sources of energy, of by-products, wastes, residues and other non-food raw material for purposes of the bio-economy?
P5D	Reducing green house gas and ammonia emissions from agriculture	**14**. To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to reducing GHG and ammonia emissions from agriculture?
P5E	Fostering carbon conservation and sequestration in agriculture and forestry	**15**. To what extent have RDP interventions supported carbon conservation and sequestration in agriculture and forestry?
P6A	Facilitating diversification, creation and development of small enterprises, as well as job creation	**16**. To what extent have RDP interventions supported the diversification, creation and development of small enterprises and job creation?
P6B	Fostering local development in rural areas	**17**. To what extent have RDP interventions supported local development in rural areas?
P6C	Enhancing the accessibility, use and quality of information and communication technologies (ICT) in rural areas	**18.** To what extent have RDP interventions enhanced the accessibility, use and quality of information and communication technologies (ICT) in rural areas?

Evaluation questions related to other aspects of the RDP

Other RDP aspect	**Evaluation Question**
Operational	**19**. To what extent have the synergies among priorities and

Performance	focus areas enhanced the effectiveness of the RDP?
Technical Assistance	**20**. To what extent has technical assistance contributed to achieving the objectives laid down in Art. 59(1) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 and Art. 51(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013?
National Rural Networks	**21**. To what extent has the national rural network contributed to achieving the objectives laid down in Art. 54(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013?

Evaluation questions related to EU level objectives

EU Objective	Evaluation Question
EU 2020 Headline Targets	**22**. To what extent has the RDP contributed to achieving the EU 2020 headline target of raising the employment rate of the population aged 20-64 to at least 75%? **23**. To what extent has the RDP contributed to achieving the EU 2020 headline target of investing 3% of EU's GDP in research and development and innovation? **24**. To what extent has the RDP contributed to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to achieving the EU 2020 headline target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by at least 20% compared to 1990 levels, or by 30% if the conditions are right, to increasing the share of renewable energy in final energy consumption to 20%, and achieving 20% increase in energy efficiency? **25**. To what extent has the RDP contributed to achieving the EU 2020 headline target of reducing the number of Europeans living below the national poverty line? **26**. To what extent has the RDP contributed to improving the environment and to achieving the EU Biodiversity strategy target of halting the loss of biodiversity and the degradation of ecosystem services, and to restore them?
CAP Objectives	**27**. To what extent has the RDP contributed to the CAP objective of fostering the competitiveness of agriculture?

	28. To what extent has the RDP contributed to the CAP objective of ensuring sustainable management of natural resources and climate action? **29**. To what extent has the RDP contributed to the CAP objective of achieving a balanced territorial development of rural economies and communities including the creation and maintenance of employment? **30.** To what extent has the RDP contributed to fostering innovation?

Annex 2 - Suggested questions for mid-term and final evaluations

Mid-term Evaluation

Aim

To examine the effectiveness of [**insert LAG name**] Local Action Group's LEADER implementation in the 2014 - 2020 Welsh Government Rural Communities: Rural Development Programme; covering [**insert key areas of interest**]. The evaluation will inform any potential changes for the second half of the programming period.

Objectives

Specific objectives under each component are as follows:

Local Development Strategy[7]

To assess:

- Whether and to what extent the Local Development Strategy is still relevant to the socio-economic circumstances of the area;
- The effectiveness of the Local Development Strategy as an enabler of a strategic approach to LEADER[8] delivery;
- The effectiveness of the Local Development Strategy in engaging project sponsor organisations;
- The extent to which the Local Development Strategy has promoted collaboration in project development;
- The extent to which emerging projects have been influenced by the Local Development Strategies;
- The effectiveness of the Local Development Strategy as a management tool which contributes effectively to realising the Local Action Group's aims and objectives;
- The extent to which the Local Development Strategy has enabled effective spatial targeting of the Programmes, including Upland areas;

---

[7] As these are a broad set of suggested evaluation questions, LAGs are encouraged to add in some additional questions which capture specific issues addressed in their LDS or to gather evidence on specific issues that they might have faced in implementing and delivering their LDS.

[8] This objective, and all others that examine the LEADER approach, evaluators should consider how the seven aspects of LEADER have been delivered.

- Whether there is anything within the Local Development Strategy that might be deterring potential project sponsors;

- Investigate how the Local Development Strategy is interacting with other relevant strategies in the Local Action Group area;

- Assess the extent to which the LAG has implemented and is delivering activities which are adding value to local identity and natural and cultural resources[9];

- Assess the extent to which the LAG has implemented and is delivering activities which are facilitating pre-commercial development, business partnerships and short supply chains;

- Assess the extent to which the LAG has implemented and is delivering activities which are exploring new ways of providing non-statutory local services;

- Assess the extent to which the LAG has implemented and is delivering activities which relate to renewable energy at community level; and

- Assess the extent to which the LAG has implemented and is delivering activities to exploit IT.

Implementation

To assess:

- The quality and effectiveness of the Local Action Group's implementation and management of LEADER;

- The extent to which local resources have been mobilised in the development phase; and

- Provide an assessment of the appropriateness of the delivery model(s) for working in Welsh/local contexts

Strategic Fit:

- Identify how funded projects fit into the wider policy context, and to identify any policy developments that may impact upon the Local Development Strategy for the remainder of the Programming period;

---

[9] This objective and the four objectives below it should only be included where the LDS is delivering against the theme.

- Assess the extent to which the LAG's activities are integrated with: other Welsh Government Programmes; other RDP schemes and activities; the projects and activities of other LAGs; and other European Programmes and funding streams;

- Assess the sustainability of activity funded under the Local Development Strategy, in terms of the likely effects on future policy and practice (mainstreaming); and

- To identify any areas of eligible activity that the Local Action Group should seek to prioritise for the remainder of the current Programming period.

The Cross Cutting Themes

To assess:

- The extent to which projects are integrating the Cross Cutting Themes into their delivery of activities;

- The extent to which projects are taking actions to promote and facilitate the Welsh language;

- What barriers, if any, are preventing projects from integrating the Cross Cutting Themes to their full potential;

- Provide an assessment of whether any action is required to support a more effective integration of the Cross Cutting Themes and identify what action/s could be taken to support this integration;

- Provide an assessment of whether the requirement and commitment made to deliver Cross Cutting Themes activity is impacting on the overall delivery of projects; and

- Assess the effectiveness of the addition of the Cross Cutting Themes Case (project) Level indicators as a mechanism for identifying the integration of the Themes.

Communications

To assess:

- Awareness and perception of LEADER among key Local Action Group stakeholders and opinion formers;

- Stakeholders' views on the appropriateness of messages communicated about LEADER in the Local Action Group area;

- Provide an assessment of project sponsor and deliverers' views on the effectiveness of communication of LEADER in their delivery of activities;

- The extent to which local communities and people have been engaged by the LAG; and

- The effectiveness of the Local Action Group and projects' publicity and the consistency of message throughout publicity and information material.

Delivery:

- Establish the progress which the portfolio of projects are making toward achieving the objectives set out in the Local Development Strategy;

- Examine the progress that projects funded under the Local Development Strategy are making towards both project and Local Development Strategy indicators;

- Assess the extent to which the LEADER approach has been delivered;

- Identify emerging areas of innovation in funded projects; and

- Identify examples of best practice in funded projects.

Final Evaluation

Aim

To assess the outcomes and added value of **[insert LAG name]** Local Action Group's delivery of LEADER activities in the 2014 - 2020 Welsh Government Rural Communities: Rural Development Programme; covering [**insert key areas of interest].** The evaluation findings and conclusions will provide a series of evidence-based recommendations in order to improve the quality and delivery of future interventions in rural communities of this nature.

Objectives

Specific objectives under each component are as follows:

Outcomes and benefits delivered:

- Assess the potential of LEADER funding to deliver wider benefits to the local rural economy in terms of: social sustainability, co-operative action and delivery of public goods and services[10];

- Examine the extent to which any outcomes can be clearly attributed to LEADER;

- Explore any additional effects (positive or negative) delivered that are attributable to LEADER;

- To what extent can wider changes in the LAG area be attributed to the activities delivered?

- Examine the extent to which the LAG delivered against the core components of LEADER methodology, including: partnership, 'bottom-up' territorial development, innovation and co-operation; and

- To what extent has the LAG worked across geographical and administrative boundaries?

Performance:
- Identify what activities of each implemented LDS theme are effective at a local level in relation to the aims and objectives of the LDS;

- Provide an assessment against indicators of their performance;

- Assess whether, and to what extent, added value has been achieved; and

- Provide an appraisal of how relevant these achievements are in building sustainable rural communities.

Relevance
- To what extent have the Local Development Strategy's objectives, activities and resource allocation been addressing the most important needs of the LAG area over the time of Programme implementation?

- To what extent have the activities implemented generated changes which address the LAG area's needs?

- To what extent are the activities and outputs of the LAG consistent with the attainment of the LDS's overall objectives?

---

[10] This objective, and all others that examine the LEADER approach, evaluators should consider how the seven aspects of LEADER have been delivered.

- To what extent are the activities and outputs of the LAG's activities consistent with the intended results and impacts of the LDS?

Results in terms of LAG achievements with direct Programme beneficiaries:

- To what extent have the LAG's activities addressed the needs of direct programme beneficiaries?
- To what extent were the LDS objectives achieved for the group of direct beneficiaries?

Lessons learnt:

- Identify lessons learnt in the implementation and delivery of the LDS, including its sustainability;
- What were the major factors in the LAG's activities, which positively influenced the achievement of the objectives?
- What were the major factors in the LAG's activities, which negatively influenced the achievement of objectives?
- To what extent have the LAG's activities addressed new challenges that arose during the programming period?
- Identify instances of best practice in the implementation and delivery of LEADER;
- Identify examples of innovation in the LAG's implementation and delivery of LEADER, to include: working in new ways, developing new products and services, and adapting proven approaches to new circumstances; and
- Assess the extent to which the LAG's activities have helped to develop trust and positive working relationships amongst local communities and businesses.

Communications: [**if neither a Mid Term Evaluation, nor ongoing evaluation activity that has looked at communications has been carried out, then the final evaluation should assess communications activity**]

- Examine the effectiveness of the LAGs communication plan;

- Establish the effectiveness with which the LAG publicised the results and impact of their operations;

- To what extent has the LAG communicated examples of best practice;

- Awareness and perception of LEADER among key Local Action Group stakeholders and opinion formers;

- Stakeholders' views on the appropriateness of messages communicated about LEADER in the Local Action Group area;

- Provide an assessment of project sponsor and deliverers' views on the effectiveness of communication of LEADER in their delivery of activities; and

- The effectiveness of the Local Action Group and projects' publicity and the consistency of message throughout publicity and information material.

[**If the LAG has carried out a Mid Term Evaluation, or ongoing evaluation activity explored communications, then a full assessment of communications is not required as part of the final evaluation. It's suggested that the bullet point below is included on communications activity**]

- Provide an assessment of the extent to which the Mid Term Evaluation's/Ongoing Evaluation [**delete as necessary**] activity's recommendations on communications activity have been implemented by the LAG.

Cross Cutting Themes

To assess:

- The extent to which projects have integrated the Cross Cutting Themes into their delivered activities;

- Identify instances of best practice in integrating the Cross Cutting Themes;

- The extent to which projects have taken actions which have promoted and facilitated the Welsh language; and

- Whether the requirement and commitment made to deliver Cross Cutting Themes activity has impacted on the overall delivery of projects; and

- Whether any action is required to support a more effective integration of the Cross Cutting Themes and identify what actions could be taken to support their integration into any interventions delivered in rural communities post-EU Transition.

Annex 3 – Evaluation Schedule 2014-2020 RDP

Evaluation Schedule - 2014-2020 RDP										
% Spend										
0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100

Research summaries

Evaluation of Programme implementation	
Evaluation of likelihood of meeting perf reserve targets	
Evaluation of effectiveness of MA Communications	
	Mid Term Evaluation
	Integration of CCTs

Beneficiary Surveys

Impact Evaluation
Ex-post evaluation
Evaluation of LDS and the LEADER Approach
Evaluation of the Wales Rural Network
Ex-Ante Evaluations post 2020