



 **LATTANZIO**
MONITORING & EVALUATION

Rome, July 2020

**Independent Evaluation Service of the 2014-2020 Rural
Development Program of the Campania Region from the
European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development
(EAFRD)**

CIG: 7205166314 - CUP: B29G17000550009

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT 2020

Non-technical synthesis



Unione Europea

Fondo europeo agricolo
per lo sviluppo rurale:
*l'Europa investe
nelle zone rurali*



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Progress of the Programme	2
3. Summary of main results	5
4. Evaluation focus on Measure 16 - Types of intervention 16.4.1-16.5.1-16.9.1	9
5. Summary of main conclusions and recommendations by type of intervention	12

1. Introduction

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT 2020 RDP 2014-2020

The **Annual Evaluation Report 2020 (AER)** concerns the analysis of the use of resources and the verification of the effectiveness and efficiency of the Rural Development Programme (RDP) 2014-2020 of the Campania Region, with reference to the state of implementation as at 31/12/2019

The document is structured according to the structure provided for in the Tender Reference for the Annual Evaluation Reports and in compliance with the Technical Offer and the Annual Evaluation Plan (AEP), with particular attention to the realization of the surveys and detection techniques provided.

In particular, some in-depth studies were carried out using "transversal" survey methods/instruments functional to the evaluation of different Focus Areas (FA) and applied the following techniques provided for in the Tender Reference:

- ▶ Techniques based on secondary data collection, including analysis of: regional/national monitoring systems/databases, scientific literature, official and unofficial statistical sources;
- ▶ Case studies;
- ▶ Territorial processing and cartographic analysis;
- ▶ Techniques based on primary data collection (sample type): survey with structured or semi-structured questionnaire to be carried out with CATI, CASI or CAWI method;
- ▶ Techniques based on primary and/or participatory data collection including: focus group, evaluation brainstorming, Delphi, Nominal Group Technique, check-list, Social network analysis;
- ▶ Counterfactual analysis.

2. Progress of the Programme

Below is an analytical illustration of the information and financial outputs related to the implementation of the Programme, by Priority / Focus Area. Due to the transversal nature of the Focus Area related to Priority 1, these are not treated separately, but the treatment of the interventions related to them is reported within the analyzes of the other Focus Area.

Priority 2 - Increasing the profitability of farms and competitiveness of agriculture

The overall spending capacity of Priority 2 is 41%: in the FA 2A, the commitment capacity shows an advance of 92% and a good spending capacity in particular for measures to support investment in agricultural holdings (**intervention 4.1.1**) and the creation and development of diversification of agricultural enterprises (**intervention 6.4.1**) while in the Focus Area 2B, both the commitment capacity and the spending capacity do not yet record fully performing values which stand at around 30% of the absolute values.

FA/ Priority	Planned	Commitments	Commitments capacity %	Payments	Budget %
--------------	---------	-------------	------------------------	----------	----------

	(A)	(B)	(B/A)	(C)	(C/A)
FA 2A	325.430.000,00	300.917.758,52	92%	173.247.240,17	53%
FA 2B	238.880.552,00	70.637.555,14	30%	56.806.776,77	24%
Total Priority 2	564.310.552,00	371.555.313,66	66%	230.054.016,94	41%

Priority 3 - Promote the organization of the agri-food supply chain and risk management

As regards the FA 3A, the total commitments of almost € 48 million bring the percentage of commitment capacity up to 37% with a good spending capacity especially for the intervention aimed at promoting the transformation, marketing and development of agricultural products on agro-industrial farms (**intervention 4.2.1**) which already has 29 out of 56 projects in progress (see table below). FA 3B is exclusively affected by interventions aimed at preventing damage or restoring production potential damaged by natural disasters, adverse climatic events and catastrophic events (**interventions 5.1.1 and 5.2.1**), which has a very good commitment and spending capacity (64 and 48% respectively). Overall, therefore, PR 3 reaches 39% of commitment capacity and 41% of spending capacity

FA/ Priority	Planned (A)	Commitments (B)	Commitments capacity % (B/A)	Payments (C)	Budget % (C/A)
FA 3A	128.636.190,00	47.799.395,96	37%	52.003.253,97	40%
FA 3B	10.500.000,00	6.768.196,85	64%	5.048.428,36	48%
Total Priority 3	139.136.190,00	54.567.592,81	39%	57.051.682,33	41%

Priority 4 Preserve, restore and enhance the ecosystems connected to agriculture and forestry

The commitments, in terms of expenditure required, for Measures linked to Priority 4 reach 56% of the programmed resources with a good level of payments at 53%.

The highest progress is recorded by Measure relating to the compensatory payment for mountain areas (**intervention 13.1.1**) which has practically exhausted the financial envelope both in terms of commitments and in terms of payments and represents 30% of the entire financial envelope of the priority. The second Measure in terms of financial weight is Measure aimed at encouraging farmers to apply voluntary integrated production methods (**intervention 10.1.1**) which shows a 42% progress of the expenditure incurred compared to the programmed one.

The measure dedicated to organic agriculture (**Measure 11**), both in terms of conversion and maintenance, reaches 67% of the planned expenditure and involved 2,863 companies.

Measure 1 shows the transfer of knowledge and information actions (1%) and **Measure 16** Cooperation (2%), while **Measure 2** relating to consultancy services, replacement and management assistance services to farms does not record payments.

FA/ Priority	Planned	Commitments	Commitments capacity %	Payments	Budget %
--------------	---------	-------------	---------------------------	----------	----------

	(A)	(B)	(B/A)	(C)	(C/A)
Total Priority 4	698.896.000,00	392.892.667,68	56%	368.172.593,52	53%

Priority 5 - Encourage the efficient use of resources and the transition to a low CO2 economy

Priority 5, whose overall budget is the lowest of the whole Programme (4.96%), records low percentages of both commitment capacity and financial progress (10%): the main measures involved - "Investments for the construction of public plants for the production of energy from renewable sources" (**intervention 7.2.2**), "Investments for the reduction of gas emissions in livestock farms, greenhouse gases and ammonia" (**intervention 4.1.3**) and " Afforestation of agricultural and non-agricultural land "(**intervention 8.1.1**) - are subject to a certain delay in implementation and the M 1, 2 and 16 do not record any commitment.

FA/ Priority	Planned	Commitments	Commitments capacity %	Payments	Budget %
	(A)	(B)	(B/A)	(C)	(C/A)
FA 5A	36.170.000	6.123.107,46	17%	785.934,00	2%
FA 5C	11.747.359	796.689,98	7%	383.124,42	3%
FA 5D	9.885.000	1.601.919	16%	1.195.378	12%
FA 5E	21.715.000	4.447.470,71	20%	5.911.088,80	27%
Total Priority 5	79.517.359	12.969.187	16%	8.275.525,22	10%

Priority 6 - Promoting social inclusion, poverty reduction and economic development in rural areas

Finally, as regards Priority 6, both FA 6A and FA 6B have low spending capacity (38% and 25% respectively) and resource commitment (both at 12%). The only significant progress is recorded for the FA 6C with the intervention aimed at creating fiber optic access infrastructures (**intervention 7.3.1**) for the construction of broadband which accounts for 98% of the resources committed and 45% of the spending capacity.

FA/ Priority	Planned	Commitments	Commitments capacity %	Payments	Budget %
	(A)	(B)	(B/A)	(C)	(C/A)
FA 6A	155.880.259,69	58.778.777,63	38%	18.186.331,83	12%
FA 6B	109.778.557,02	27.968.154,33	25%	13.156.105,94	12%
FA 6C	20.799.999,97	20.400.000,00	98%	9.254.485,00	45%
Total Priority 6	286.458.816,68	107.146.931,96	37%	40.596.922,77	14%

3. Summary of main results

The main evaluation conclusions, formulated on the basis of the Annual Evaluation Report, are summarized below.

Priority 2 - Keywords: competitiveness, business development and youth

The development trajectories identified by the RDP Campania to support the competitiveness of companies, their development and encourage the supply chain, pursue the following specific strategic objectives:

Competitiveness
Business development
Youth

- ▶ to support the restructuring and modernization of farms in the Marche to improve their competitiveness through the improvement of agricultural production and diversification of activities;
- ▶ to encourage and support the start-up of new entrepreneurial activities by young farmers also using integrated planning.

The contribution of the RDP to the improvement of economic results on the farms benefiting from the subsidised investments in the focus area 2A (4.1.1, 6.4.1 and 8.6.1) is overall satisfactory. The projects financed are in the process of being completed and, therefore, their effects are still partial. However, 69.4% of the companies interviewed stated that they have improved their economic performance and increased the economic size of the company. As far as support to young farmers (FA 2B)- 468 beneficiaries as at 31/12/2019- most of the interviewees have invested in renewing crops and livestock (52.9%), joining quality systems (50.0%) and introducing innovations in products and production processes (41.2%). 23.5% of the farmers interviewed have developed direct sales to consumers and 20.6% have made investments in on-farm processing of agricultural products.

Young farmers also made investments in climate change mitigation and adaptation (29.4%), purchased machinery and equipment for the adoption of conservative farming techniques (29.4%), built plants for the production of energy from renewable sources (26.5%) and introduced high or medium efficiency irrigation systems (20.6%). Training, in which 58.8% of the young people interviewed participated, also contributed to the improvement of the environmental sustainability of production processes. Finally, some young people strengthened the link with the territory in which the company operates, through participation in campaigns to promote local agricultural products (17.6%), short supply chain projects for the development of local markets (14.7%) and local business networks for the development and coordinated supply of local products and services (11.8%). This aspect, i.e. the possibility of addressing with the integrated project the different aspects related to setting up and business development, was positively judged by 85.3% of the young farmers interviewed.

The implementation of the RDP strategy aimed at young farmers appears to be satisfactory overall, the projects financed are being completed and, therefore, their effects are still partial but 55.9% of those interviewed already judge positively the effects obtained from investments in the change of the farm into a competitive and sustainable one.

Priority 3- Key words: quality production, supply chains and risk management

The development of the quality of agricultural production and its certification are strongly supported by the PSR Campania within the agro-food production chains through the support to the participation of farmers in quality schemes, local markets, short supply chains and other producer associations/organisations to improve the competitiveness of the farm. A further specific objective of the RDP 3 is to facilitate the access of agricultural enterprises to risk management schemes and related exercises.

Quality production
Supply chains
Risk management

Type of intervention aimed at supporting the new adherence to quality schemes (intervention 3.1.1) supports the participation of farmers, individual or associated, in certified quality schemes: 62.5% of respondents claim that participation in quality schemes has had positive effects on competitiveness and the product market by increasing the quantities of agricultural products delivered to processors and

processors or sold directly on the market and by increasing the prices paid to farmers.

As far as cooperation is concerned - the subject of a specific in-depth study - the analyses conducted by the Evaluator on 3 Cooperation Groups financed in type of intervention aimed at horizontal and vertical cooperation for the creation, development and promotion of short supply chains and local markets (intervention 16.4.1), which have carried out the interventions, state that they have improved the management and organization of direct sales by making consumers aware of the quality of their products, production systems and the positive characteristics of the territories in which they operate. Further positive elements, to be evaluated above all in qualitative and immaterial terms, are recorded in the improvement of training, in the production of ideas and the exchange of experience and know-how.

Moving on to intervention 4.2.1 which incentivises 'investments aimed at improving the overall performance and sustainability of agro-industrial companies through process and product innovations favouring environmentally sustainable investments in a logic of integration between the agricultural and agro-industrial sectors', the effectiveness of the RDP in addressing the weakness of the system appears satisfactory. All the beneficiary companies interviewed by the Evaluator expressed positive judgements on the opportunity offered by the type of intervention 4.2.1 to solve the critical issues concerning the development of the processing and transformation of agricultural products.

All the investments started or made are aimed at the introduction of product and/or production process innovations and quality development. The effects of the investments made are still partial, however, 37.5% of the respondents indicate positive results in the increase in the quantities delivered and the prices paid to farmers.

With regard to M14 - Animal Welfare - the total number of applications allowed in 2019 was 865 for an amount of aid granted of €15.460 million, corresponding to 203,000 LU. These mainly concern Action C aimed at improving the health conditions of farms followed by actions for the increase of space (Action A) and for the continuation of natural lactation (Action B - specific for dairy buffalo breeding). With regard to Action D, dedicated to the improvement of health conditions and management of sheep and goat farms, the low, although significant, level of adhesion must be evaluated also in consideration of its new introduction in the current RDP.

Finally, as in the previous RDP, it is confirmed - as in the previous RDP - the very low adhesion of poultry farms, buffaloes and some types of beef cattle breeding (e.g. baby beef, late veal) whose causes will be the subject of future studies.

As regards risk management in the agricultural sector, in the type of intervention 5.1.1, have been admitted to funding - call 2018- 12 interventions located half in the province of Salerno, 4 in Caserta, 1 in Benevento and 1 in Avellino. Most (63.6%) of the companies involved in prevention interventions are specialized in the production of fresh fruit: the perception of the beneficiaries interviewed by the Evaluator on the improvement of prevention and management of business risks is generally positive.

The final ranking of projects admitted for the 2019 call for proposals is currently being defined.

With regard to typology 5.2.1 - 2016 call for proposals, floods 2015- 45 interventions have been approved: by 31 December 2019 the beneficiary farms that have carried out the interventions are 44, in addition to two beneficiaries (Land Reclamation Consortia) for interventions in the 2007-2013 programming period (Measure 126).

Priorities 4 and 5- Keyword: environment and sustainability

Priority 4 of the RDP pursues the objective of preserving, restoring and enhancing agricultural and forest ecosystems with particular reference to the conservation of biodiversity and the improvement of water and soil quality.

The agricultural area subject by commitments (SOI) of the RDP contributing to the improvement of **biodiversity** is approximately 296,793 hectares of which 66.84% is compensatory allowance ("Compensation for areas subject to natural constraints to other specific constraints", M13), 22.45% integrated farming (M.10.1.1), 10.62% organic agriculture (M11). The committed area in Protected Areas (71,845.72 ha) and in the subset of Natura 2000 Areas (60,625.69 ha) determines a higher concentration (SOI/SAU ratio) of the intervention area in these areas (43.17% and 51.21% respectively) compared to the regional total, amplifying the positive effect on biodiversity in these areas with higher protection. They also contribute to the maintenance of areas with high and very high naturalistic value (HNV) 62,486 hectares of agricultural area, 32.71% of the UAA in these areas.

Environment Sustainability

The forest areas eligible for funding under Submeasure 15.1 amount to a total of 48,528 HA, the location of these areas shows high rates of implementation of commitments in areas where the environmental effect is maximized by strengthening both the biodiversity protection system and the connectivity between habitats to the benefit of wildlife.

The committed area (SOI) that contributes to the improvement of **water quality** is about 98,125 hectares, 14.8% of the regional Used Agricultural Area (UAA), of the total SOI 68% is committed to integrated agriculture and the remaining 32% to organic agriculture. Differentiating the values of the Result Indicator from a territorial point of view, it is evident that in nitrate vulnerable zones (NZN perimeter of 2003) the committed area is equal to 8.87% of the regional agricultural area (UAA), this figure being lower than the average regional incidence (14.8%), shows a low intervention capacity of the RDP in the areas where there is a greater need. The effectiveness of the measures in reducing the nitrogen surplus is high and greater than for phosphorus, overall in the regional UAA the reductions of the two macronutrients are 10 % for nitrogen and 2.6 % for phosphorus.

The committed area (SOI) contributing to **soil quality** improvement is 110,938 hectares, 16.75% of the agricultural area; 60% is integrated agriculture, 28.4% is organic agriculture, 11% are involved in the intervention aimed at increasing organic matter, in areas at risk of erosion tolerable (> 11.2 t / ha per year) the SOI / SAU concentration ratio of 17.9% shows a good effectiveness of the measures on the erosive phenomenon. The RDP commitments reduce erosion by about 47% of the total erosion present in the 109,593 hectares involved. It is therefore estimated that the reduction in erosion is 7.2 Mg/ha/year. The RDP measures do not seem to have a concrete impact on the increase of Organic Substance in soils as this increase due to the measures is only 0.074%.

Priority 5 aims to promote resource efficiency and the shift to a low-carbon and climate-resilient economy in the agri-food and forestry sector. The sustainability of agri-food production is aimed in particular in the RDP Campania, to determine the saving of water resources, to increase the use and production of renewable energy, to reduce climate altering gases and to preserve and implement carbon sequestration.

The main lines of intervention foreseen by the RDP Campania in relation to irrigation and **water saving** are: operation 4.1.4 which finances the company's investments aimed at making the use of water in agriculture more efficient, through interventions on irrigation systems and practices, the operation 4.3.2 which subsidizes consortium infrastructure investments for the construction, extension and modernization of reservoirs and basins for irrigation, for the replacement and/or modernization of old irrigation networks and for the transformation of open-surface networks into pressure piped networks, and some types of investments of the operation 4.1.1. as they provide for the construction/improvement of irrigation systems at the service of new greenhouses and new tree plants. The state of progress shows some delays, with only 8 projects started for operation 4.1.4 (for 785,934 euro of liquidated amounts), while for operation 4.3.2, the preliminary investigation procedures are being completed. For operation 4.1.1, out of the 653 projects launched, only 24

involve investments in irrigation systems (for a total of 908,581 euro of eligible expenditure). Beyond the implementation delays, the interesting potential offered by investments to modernize corporate structures must be noted, which, in addition to contributing to the saving of water resources and the environmental sustainability of production, allow an economic strengthening of companies thanks to the quantitative and qualitative improvement of the productions.

The state of progress of the operations aimed at favoring **the supply and use of renewable energy sources** registers to date only registers applications settled for operations 4.1.1 and 4.1.2, aimed at improving the competitiveness of the beneficiary farms through the production of energy from renewable sources, these are 329 projects, for a total investment of 3.736 million euros. 90% of the interventions concluded are intended for the construction of solar energy systems, while the interventions on biomass plants take on a completely secondary weight both in terms of size (12%) and, above all, of activated investment (only 6% of the total). Overall, the plants built will be able to guarantee the production of energy from renewable sources of about 3,139 Mw/year, equal to almost 270 tep/year. This total production represents only 0.1% of the region's renewable energy production from the agricultural and forestry sector.

The committed area (SOI) that contributes to the **reduction of climate altering gases is 109,000 hectares**, 16.5% of the agricultural area of the region. 61% of the SOI is associated to the integrated agriculture operation, 29% to organic agriculture and the remaining 10% for operation 10.1.2 (increase of organic matter). Overall, the actions of the RDP Campania do not significantly affect the reduction of emissions, this reduction mainly due to the decrease in the use of mineral fertilizers and the absorption of C-sink in agricultural soils can be estimated at about 109,026 Mg of CO₂ equivalent per year. The interventions of operation 4.1.3, which provide for the purchase of machinery for the sub-surface spreading of sewage and the construction of nitro-dinitro plants for the reduction of the nitrogen content, so far carried out have resulted in a minimum reduction of CO₂ equivalent of 278 Mg.

The interventions of the RDP Campania directly related to the **conservation and sequestration of the carbon** are represented by Submeasure 8.1. aimed at the realization of afforestation and arboriculture plants from wood on agricultural and non-agricultural land in order to contribute to the mitigation of climate change. On the basis of the state of implementation of the Measures to date, only the areas related to the dragging from previous programming periods are affected by this issue, (while for Measure 8.1, 7 projects and an expenditure of € 268,214 have been launched) for 6,955 ha of land 1.56% of the total regional forest area.

Considering the areas subject to afforestation carried over from the previous programming period, it is estimated that they lead to an absorption of atmospheric CO₂ and organic carbon storage in woody biomass of about 17,049 tCO₂eq/year, 0.1% of total regional emissions. The absorption values are expected to increase significantly as soon as the data relating to the surfaces inherent in measure 8.1 are available.

Priority 6- keywords: local development and LEADER

Priority 6 has the general objective of making the rural territory a "supportive" territory suitable for families, ensuring an adequate quality of life, and suitable for the development of local businesses.

Local Development LEADER

The various measures planned within the 3 activated FAs still record a certain implementation delay which does not allow to fully evaluate the results achieved by the individual interventions. However, it is possible to affirm that, with respect to the first progress of the activities, the paths identified for business and local development / diversification, cooperation

and infrastructure improvement - including the implementation of the Broadband connection- are consistent with the Programme Strategy. It also highlights the importance of starting the self-assessment activity with the 15 Local Action Groups (LAG) from Campania, which are waiting to develop the further phases of deepening and collective discussion.

4. Evaluation focus on Measure 16 - Types of intervention 16.4.1-16.5.1-16.9.1

Evaluation focus on Measure 16 - Types of intervention 16.4.1-16.5.1-16.9.1

The evaluation focus created for the 2014-2020 RDP Annual Assessment Report of the Campania Region, focused on cooperation projects that can be activated through three specific types of intervention of Measure 16 (Cooperation):

**EVALUATION FOCUS ON
MEASURE 16 - TYPES OF
INTERVENTION 16.4.1-16.5.1-
16.9.1**

16.4.1 Horizontal and vertical cooperation for the creation, development and promotion of short supply chains and local markets;

16.5.1 Joint actions for climate change mitigation and adaptation and for ongoing environmental practices;

16.9.1 Social agriculture, food and environmental education on farms, cooperation with public / private entities.

In the three typologies of Measure 16, the collective approach creates, firstly, conditions aimed at improving the effectiveness of the interventions with respect to their individual management. This is a consequence of the synergies that (potentially) result from the integration of actions and related subjects (partners) diversified but competing with specific common targets, in defined sectoral and / or territorial contexts.

The other potentially qualifying element of collective projects is the growth of the relational capital that they determine in terms of contacts, information exchanges, common experiences, prospects for further collaboration between partners, especially when they come from initially different areas of activity.

The analyses carried out were mainly aimed at assessing the relevance with respect to the needs and the effectiveness with respect to the objectives of the cooperation projects carried out - or in progress although close to their conclusion - in December 2019.

The types of cooperation projects in question are characterized and differentiated according to needs (needs) - which emerged from the SWOT analysis of the regional context in which the RDP intervenes - to which the projects themselves intend to provide positive answers.

Needs addressed by the types of intervention 16.4.1, 16.5.1, 16.9.1

Needs	16.4.1	16.5.1	16.9.1
F03 Improving the economic performance of the agricultural, food and forestry sector	X		
F04 Safeguard income and employment levels in agriculture and rural areas			X
F05 Promoting the aggregation of primary producers	X		
F06 Promoting better organisation of the agri-food and forestry sectors	X		
F07 Improving and enhancing the quality of agricultural, food and forestry production	X		
F12 Improving waste management on farms		X	
F13 Safeguarding the heritage of animal and plant biodiversity		X	
F14 Protecting and enhancing the natural, historical and cultural heritage		X	
F16 Reducing the impact of agricultural and forestry activities on water resources		X	

Needs	16.4.1	16.5.1	16.9.1
F17 Reducing the impact of agricultural and forestry activities on the soil environmental matrix		X	
F18 Preventing soil loss due to erosion and hydrogeological instability		X	
F21 Reducing GHG emissions from food and forestry activities and increasing carbon sequestration capacity		X	
F23 Improving the quality of life in rural areas			X

In relation to these needs, the three types of intervention have been programmed in the RDP to contribute to the European Union's rural development objectives, pursued through priority 2- focus area 2A (16.9.1), priority 3 focus area 3A (16.4.1) and priority 4 focus area 4A, 4B, 4C (16.5.1).

In the focus area 2A, the type of intervention 16.9.1 encourages the diversification of activities in agricultural enterprises into cultural, educational, care, training and employment services for the benefit of the weak, carried out in cooperation with schools and educational institutions, public institutions and research organizations, public bodies in the social and health sector and third sector enterprises.

The type of intervention 16.4.1, programmed in the focus area 3A, supports activities carried out by Cooperation Groups (GC) formed mainly by agricultural enterprises and / or agricultural enterprises and processing or marketing of agricultural products, aimed at promoting products in local markets and the development of short supply chains.

The type of intervention 16.5.1 contributes to the specific aspects of Priority 4, through the support to partnerships that come together to carry out activities in the field of biodiversity, soil protection from erosion, management and protection of water resources, the reduction of greenhouse gas and ammonia emissions, protection and enhancement of natural but also historical and cultural heritage.

The type of intervention 16.4.1, programmed in the focus area 3A, supports activities carried out by Cooperation Groups (CGs) formed mainly by agricultural enterprises and/or enterprises processing or marketing agricultural products, aimed at the promotion of products in local markets and the development of short supply chains.

Analysis phases

The analyses carried out for each of the three types of intervention were divided into three parts:

- ▶ General overview of approved and financed projects;
- ▶ In-depth analysis of 8 projects completed or nearing completion (2 for the 16.4.1, 3 for the 16.5.1 and 3 for the 16.9.1) selected by the Evaluation Group in agreement with the Measurement Manager;
- ▶ Conclusions of the analyses carried out by type of Intervention.

Methods and information sources used for the analyses

Below is a **summary of the techniques and information sources used** in the analysis process, indicating the specific cognitive purposes and the period of execution.

Techniques, sources and purposes of the information used: summary framework

Techniques-information sources	Purposes	Period-date		
		SM 16.4	SM 16.5	SM16.9
Acquisition of the programmatic and implementation documentation (Calls, rankings) of the SM 16.4, 16.5, 16.9 <i>(Technique based on the collection of secondary data)</i>	Analysis of the objectives, of the types of intervention and of the methods of implementation of the SM, for setting evaluative analyzes	March 2020		
Focus group between Evaluation Group members, Representatives of the Management Authority and the Managers of the SM 16.4, 16.5, 16.9 <i>(Technique based on the collection of primary and / or participatory data)</i>	Presentation, adaptation and sharing of the evaluator's proposals concerning: the specific objectives of the analysis, the expected out-puts, the general selection criteria of the projects subject to further analysis	April 8, 2020		
Acquisition of the Technical Annexes from the Submeasure Managers relating to the n.43 projects of the SM 16.4 (n.4) 16.5 (n.24) 16.9 (n.15) <i>(Technique based on secondary data collection)</i>	General evaluative analysis of the projects eligible and financed for MS - First proposal for selecting the projects subject to further analysis	April 23, 2020	April 23, 2020	April 23, 2020
Interviews / exchange of information and evaluations between Evaluation Group and Measurement Manager of 16.4., 16.5 and 16.9 <i>(Technique based on the collection of primary and / or participatory data)</i>	Comparison and sharing of the first analyzes carried out (based on the documentation acquired) of the eligible and financed projects. Final selection of the projects subject to in-depth analysis and sharing of the Questionnaire to be used for the interviews (*)	May 4, 2020	May 4, 2020	May 4, 2020
Interviews with the Leads of the n. 8 projects of the SM 16.4 (n.2) 16.5 (n.3) 16.9 (n.3) - followed by shared review of the project reports <i>(Technique based on primary data collection)</i>	Collect information and judgments relating to the motivations and objectives of the project, the results achieved, any difficulties encountered, future prospects	April 28, 2020	April 28, 2020	April 28, 2020
Sending the analyzes for SM (in draft) to the Measurement Managers; implementation of any proposals for integration or adaptation; drafting of the final version of the analyzes	Promote an exhaustive description and evaluation of the relevance and effectiveness of the projects	April 27, 2020	April 27, 2020	April 27, 2020
Focus group between Evaluation Group members, Representatives of the Management Authority and the Managers of the SM 16.4, 16.5, 16.9 <i>(Technique based on the collection of primary and / or participatory data)</i>	Presentation and comparison on the main conclusions and recommendations that emerged from the analysis and their subsequent adaptation and integration.666.	11-12ay 2020		

5. Summary of main conclusions and recommendations by type of intervention

Analysis of horizontal and vertical Cooperation interventions for creation, development and promotion of short supply chains and local markets (Intervention 16.4.1)

The elements collected through the analysis of the projects carried out by the Cooperation Groups (CG) and interviews with the lead actors provided sufficient information to extrapolate general evaluations, conclusions and recommendations:

- ▶ A general difficulty in attracting potential beneficiaries and stable cooperation groups was found. In fact, despite the communication made by the Region to inform potential beneficiaries about the call, 15 applications for support were received, of which 6 were eligible for funding;
- ▶ On the other hand, the funded GCs demonstrated a high relevance of the objectives pursued and of the actions carried out to meet the needs, providing concrete answers to the widespread needs of farms to enhance the quality of products and improve the economic performance and environmental sustainability of agriculture, this question is increasingly frequent in society.

More specifically, the 3 GCs examined, with the technological, managerial and organisational development of direct sales, have increased consumer confidence by making them aware of the quality of their products, production systems and the positive characteristics of the territories in which they operate. The requirement of relevance (the needs) explains the participation of small farms (priority target) in the cooperation, to be evaluated especially in qualitative terms, in the development of human capital through training, meetings, production of ideas, exchanges of experience and know-how, etc., thus giving perspectives of continuity to the project and, above all, enhancing the experience accumulated by the network of partners and the contacts between them and other subjects (relational capital).

Analysis of the interventions of joint Actions for the mitigation of climate change and adaptation to them and for ongoing environmental practices (Intervention 16.5.1)

From the results of the analyses of the three collective projects it is possible to extrapolate evaluation elements of a general nature:

- ▶ among the **main strengths common** to the experiences analyzed, the **high relevance of the objectives pursued and the issues addressed with respect to the needs** present in the respective territorial/sectoral areas of intervention is highlighted.
- ▶ The requirement of relevance (in relation to needs) of the activities carried out in the projects explains the achievement of a second common result: **the high level of participation of the "target" subjects**, the agricultural enterprises. Not only in quantitative terms but also, in the opinion of the Lead Partners, in qualitative terms, that is, of interest of the participants in the topics addressed in the animation / dissemination activities, which in many cases has also translated into the request for further study and specifications.

The above mentioned strengths of the projects (relevance and participation) also contribute to their good "reproducibility" - for issues addressed and methods/tools used- in other territories with similar problems and potential, in subsequent specific interventions, in more far-reaching programmes.

However, some **critical elements have been highlighted, mainly related to the rules/methods of implementation of the projects** - project flexibility and animation activities and 70% public funding rate - the exceeding of which could have increased the overall effectiveness and which will be useful to take into account in the next programming phases.

**Conclusions of the analyzes for the interventions of social agriculture, food education, environmental in farms, cooperation with public / private subjects.
(Intervention 16.9.1)**

The analysis of the funded projects and the interviews with the lead subjects, provided sufficient information to extrapolate assessments, conclusions and general recommendations:

- ▶ good response from potential beneficiaries: 17 requests for support were received, 15 of which were eligible and financed. The majority of the proposals have a high relevance to the effectiveness requirements of the intervention, identified above all in the participation of agricultural companies in the partnership, experience in the social and/or educational field and in activities aimed at including the weaker sections of the population. The participation of agricultural enterprises is indicative of the interest in farmers for diversification actions in the areas of social agriculture and food and environmental education.
- ▶ The projects concluded in Action A have provided a wealth of experience, studies and models that can be used to encourage the changes needed to improve their social and economic sustainability on farms.
- ▶ The added value of the type of intervention 16.9.1 is therefore be identified above all in the growth of human capital and in the network of relationships created in the territory between subjects operating in the various sectors of social policies, as a heritage to be disseminated and extended at the regional level, able to provide concrete answers to the needs of economic and social progress spread in the community.

In the future, harmonization in the implementation procedures and in the contents of the RDP Measures competing for the same objectives is desirable, in order to give agricultural businesses, the opportunity to put into practice the information, experiments and methods acquired with the experience of the cooperation.

Finally, the administrative criticalities concerned above all the presentation of questions in the IT applications on the SIAN portal. The constructive dialogue with the regional Administration and the willingness to provide answers to doubts and uncertainties, on the other hand, contributed to making the management of the subsequent cost reporting phases less problematic.

Main conclusions and recommendations

The response of potential beneficiaries to the opportunities offered by the types of RDP intervention examined (16.4.1, 16.5.1, 16.9.1) was on the whole more than satisfactory, as was their **ability to plan and thus implement interventions** consistent with the policy objectives.

The main and common characteristics of the projects funded in the three types of intervention are their high relevance and usefulness. The specific objectives, the themes addressed, the working methods used and the actions carried out are, together, able to provide an adequate "response" to the "demand" for knowledge, orientation and change expressed by the various social and economic actors active in the territories involved, contributing to the construction of local development models with high utility, i.e. able to produce effects suitable to meet the priority needs present.

The above characteristics are probably at the origin of **the high participation of agricultural enterprises** in the activities carried out in the implementation of collective projects, which can be evaluated both in quantitative and qualitative terms.

Another element of success derived from the analyses is the ability of the projects to build and propose, thanks to the collective and participatory approaches adopted **sustainable business and territorial development models** (in environmental, economic and social terms) **and more effective** than individual interventions, and as such perceived by those directly or indirectly involved. This

perception derives from an **increased awareness** of the synergistic effects potentially deriving from the integration and complementarity of different types of interventions and partners (i.e. skills, competences, experiences) within a common organic work path.

Finally, beyond the immediate results achieved and already visible today, the collective projects have facilitated contacts and exchanges of experiences/information/opinions between different subjects, within and outside the partnership and with different "backgrounds", ultimately the birth and/or strengthening of a **"relational capital"** able to foster further forms of collaboration and therefore the continuity of the cooperation experience started with the RDP project.

Therefore, the main programmatic motivation set in the RDP underlying the adoption of cooperation between subjects operating in different sectors in Measure 16 appears confirmed by an early "ex-post" analysis of the projects: its "added value" in terms of effectiveness with respect to the dissemination of results, as a consequence of the synergistic effects and the relational capital that this approach determines.

The above mentioned results of the projects evaluated so far, in particular the confirmation of their relevance/ usefulness and the capacity to produce relational capital, also contribute on the whole to the **good reproducibility** of the projects themselves, in other territories or productive sectors with similar problems and potential. Reproducibility both of the themes and development strategies proposed and, above all, of the methods/tools used for their treatment.

Given the good quality of the projects carried out - presumably consequence of a coherent programmatic construction of the types of intervention - **some issues concerning their implementation and management** have been reported by the subjects directly involved. At the same time, **the support and guidance provided by the central and territorial structures of the Region** should be highlighted, which as reported first and foremost by the project leaders, has strongly favored the correct interpretation of the implementation rules / procedures and the positive overcoming problems related to their application.

The greatest **margins for improvement** - compared to the experience carried out - can be found in the creation of programmatic and implementation conditions aimed at promoting greater integration (and potential synergy) between the cooperation projects and the other RDP support measures potentially connected to them as competing for common goals and priorities; these measures should ensure support for the operational "use" phase of the skills, knowledge and planning acquired with the cooperation project. This requires a coordinated programmatic construction of the different measures of the RDP, capable of predicting and enhancing their potential additions, followed by the definition of rules and implementation procedures that favor their concrete manifestation.

The conclusions of the evaluation analyzes summarized so far already anticipate or in any case prelude to **"recommendations" aimed at improving future planning:**

- ▶ **the safeguarding and further enhancement of the numerous "successful" elements that manifested themselves in the cooperation projects**, concerning: the wealth of knowledge deriving from the initial contextual analyzes; the relevance and usefulness of the business, sectoral and territorial development models proposed with respect to the current needs of the communities; the methods and tools (participatory and collective approach) proposed for the construction and implementation of these models;
- ▶ **the creation of programmatic and implementation conditions aimed at improving the effective functional integrations** (at the achievement of the common specific objectives) between the cooperation projects and the other support measures of the RDP;
- ▶ above all, **the safeguarding and further enhancement of "relational capital" between the partners**, to be taken as the main result of the experiences they have developed in participating in cooperation projects and as a predisposing factor for their future continuity;
- ▶ finally, **the overcoming of some critical elements, encountered mainly in the implementation phase** and related to some management aspects of the payment requests, with respect to which to "treasure" the competence and experience of the central and peripheral regional structures.

The above conclusions and recommendations, in addition to performing the necessary function (assigned to the Evaluation) of "reporting" the results obtained to the community, can provide elements of knowledge, judgment or even "reflection", which can be used in the setting phase of the next period of rural development policy programming.