

Part B

**The set of common evaluation questions
with criteria and indicators**

*The set of common evaluation questions with criteria and indicators
pursuant to Article 42(2) of Commission Regulation (EC) 1750/1997*

1. Chapter I - Investments in agricultural holdings

Questions	Criteria	Indicators
I.1. To what extent have supported investments improved the income of beneficiary farmers?	I.1-1. The income of beneficiary farmers has improved	I.1-1.1. 'Gross farm income' of assisted holdings (€)
I.2. To what extent have supported investments contributed to a better use of production factors on holdings?	I.2-1. Increase in factor productivity	I.2-1.1. Output per hectare on assisted holdings (€/ha) I.2-1.2. Output per hour of labour on assisted holdings (€/h) I.2-1.3. Cost (i.e. 'direct inputs') per unit of basic products sold (e.g. €/ton, €/m ³ , etc...) on assisted holdings
I.3. To what extent have supported investments contributed to the reorientation of farming activities?	I.3-1. Holdings redeploy production by moving out of surplus product lines or moving into products which have good market outlets	I.3-1.1. "Net change" in "surplus product" activity after the investment = holdings with sum of scores for all surplus lines > 0 <i>[the holding's score (per surplus product line) = +1 if [≥]10% decrease in annual average livestock numbers or crop area 0 if no change {between -10% and +10%} -1 if [≥]10% increase]</i> <i>[Surplus products = cereals of any type, beef, milk wine and olives/olive oil: except particular products with favourable market prospect]</i>
	I.3-2. Holdings take up more alternative activities	I.3-2.1. Number of assisted holdings introducing alternative activities I.3-2.2. Share of assisted holdings with a significant part of their turnover (≥10%) from alternative activities (%) I.3-2.3. Share of working time spent on alternative activities on the holding (%)

I.4. To what extent have supported investments improved the quality of farm products?	I.4-1. The quality of farm products has improved	I.4-1.1. Ratio of {price of assisted quality-improved basic products} to {average price for the commodity concerned} I.4-1.2. Gross sales of assisted quality-improved basic products (€)
	I.4-2. Farm products comply with quality standards, particularly at Community level	I.4-2.1. Share of assisted products sold with quality label (%) (a) of which EU-level labelling schemes (%) (b) of which national level labelling schemes (%) (c) of which other labelling schemes (%)
I.5. To what extent has the diversification of on-farm activities originating from supported alternative activities helped maintain employment?	I.5-1. Employment is maintained or increased through alternative activities on the holding	I.5-1.1. Number of full-time equivalent jobs maintained or created thanks to the assistance for alternative activities (FTE)
I.6. To what extent have supported investments facilitated environmentally friendly farming?	I.6-1. Integration of environmental concerns into farm investments	I.6-1.1. Share of beneficiary holdings introducing environmental improvements thanks to the co-financing (%) (a) of which with the environmental improvement as the direct aim of the investment (%) (b) of which as a collateral effect (e.g., due to new equipment acquired mainly for economic purposes) (%) (c) of which relating to waste and excess manure (%) (d) of which relating to on-farm water management (%) (e) of which relating to (other) benign farming practices/systems (%)

	I.6-2. Improved storage and landspreading of farm manure	<p>I.6-2.1. Share of assisted holdings improving storage/landspreading of farm manure (%)</p> <p>(a) of which co-financed from the assistance (%)</p> <p>(b) of which storage (%)</p> <p>(c) of which landspreading (%)</p> <p>I.6-2.2. Ratio of {storage capacity of farm manure on assisted holdings}to {total farm manure output on assisted holdings}</p> <p>I.6-2.3. Share of assisted holdings meeting standards concerning farm manure (%)</p>
I.7. To what extent have supported investments improved production conditions in terms of better working conditions and animal welfare?	I.7-1. Working conditions have improved	I.7-1.1. Evidence of significant reduction thanks to the assistance in exposure to any of the following: noxious substances, odours, dust, extreme climatic conditions outdoor/indoor, lifting of heavy loads, aberrant working hours (description)
	I.7-2. Animal welfare has improved	<p>I.7-2.1. Share animals on assisted holdings enjoying improved welfare thanks to assisted investments (%)</p> <p>(a) of which with animal welfare as a direct aim (%)</p> <p>(b) of which with animal welfare as a collateral effect (e.g., due to new housing or equipment acquired mainly for other reasons) (%)</p> <p>(c) of which related to welfare standards (%)</p> <p>(d) of which related to EU-welfare standards (%)</p>

2. Chapter II - Setting up of young farmers

Questions	Criteria	Indicators
II.1. To what extent has the aid for setting up covered the costs arising from setting up?	II.1-1. High incentive effect of the setting-up aid	II.1-1.1. Ratio between {setting-up aid} and {actual setting-up costs}
II.2. To what extent has the setting-up aid contributed to the earlier transfer of farms (to relatives versus non-relatives)?	II.2-1. Reduction of average age of transferees and/or transferors in assisted transfers	II.2-1.1. Average age of transferee in assisted setting up II.2-1.2. Average age of transferors in assisted setting up
II.2.A To what extent has the setting-up aid contributed to the earlier transfer of farms (to relatives versus non-relatives) ...in particular, how significant was the synergy with the aid for early retirement in achieving such an earlier transfer?	II.2.A-1. Simultaneous take-up of the two schemes	II.2.A-1.1 Ratio between {number of beneficiaries of setting-up aid replacing beneficiaries of early retirement aid} and {total number of farm transfers in period}
	II.2.A-2. Reduced average age of the transferee in the case of combined aid	II.2.A-2.1 Ratio between {average age of assisted transferees (young farmers receiving setting-up aid) replacing assisted transferors} and {average age of all young farmers receiving setting-up aid}
II.3. To what extent has the aid influenced the number of young farmers of either sex setting up?	II.3-1. More young farmers are installed	II.3-1.1. Number of assisted young farmers installed (by gender)
II.4. To what extent has the setting up of young farmers contributed to safeguarding employment?	II.4-1. Jobs are maintained or created	II.4-1.1. Number of full-time equivalent jobs maintained or created (FTE)
	II.4-2. Main-occupational farming is secured	II.4-2.1. Ratio between {% of assisted set ups resulting in main-occupational farming} and {% of all establishments resulting in main-occupational farming}

3. Chapter III - Training

Questions	Criteria	Indicators
III.1. To what extent are the assisted training courses in accordance with needs and coherent with other measures of the programme?	III.1-1. The training responds to the needs and potential for adaptation (<i>conversion, reorientation, improvement</i>) at the level of individuals, sectors or regions (<i>including gaps/weaknesses or potential/opportunities identified during programming or ex-ante evaluation</i>)	III.1-1.1. Share of assisted training accommodating issues identified as gaps/weaknesses or potential/opportunities during programming/ex-ante evaluation (%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) of which thanks to the type/mix of participants (e.g., young people, women...) (%) (b) of which thanks to the topic/contents of the courses (%) (c) of which related to co-financed actions of other chapters of the programme (%)
III.2. To what extent have the acquired skills/competence helped improve the situation of the trainees and of the agricultural/forestry sector?	III.2-1. The skills/competence acquired by the trainees help improve their employment conditions	III.2-1.1. Share of assisted trainees (both holders and employees) experiencing job improvements related to the training (%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) of which farm/forest holders (%) (b) of which employees (%) (c) of which thanks to better remuneration (%) (d) of which thanks to non-pecuniary job quality (e.g., seasonal/contractual work security, exposure to risk and adverse conditions, job-variation/enrichment...) (%)
	III.2-2. The skills/competence acquired by the trainees facilitate the adaptation of agriculture and forestry (conversion/reorientation/improvement)	III.2-2.1. Share of holdings with an assisted trainee, initiating conversion/reorientation/improvement related to the assisted training (%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) of which new/additional activities (%) (b) of which improved quality/hygiene/added value concerning existing activities (%) (c) of which management related (%) (d) of which environmental benign methods/practices (%) (e) of which farming (%) (f) of which forestry (%)

4. Chapter IV - Early retirement

Questions	Criteria	Indicators
IV.1. To what extent has aid for early retirement contributed to the earlier transfer of farms?	IV.1-1. Released land is transferred to younger farmer(s)	IV.1-1.1. Average difference in age between transferor and transferee (years) IV.1-1.2. Surface area released early (hectares and number of holdings)
IV.1.A. To what extent has aid for early retirement contributed to the earlier transfer of farms ...in particular, to what extent has there been synergy between 'early retirement' and 'setting-up of young farmers' in terms of an earlier change of holders?	IV.1.A-1. There is a significant amount of simultaneous take-up of the two aid schemes	IV.1.A-1.1. Ratio of {number of beneficiaries of setting-up aid replacing beneficiaries of early retirement aid} to {all cases of assisted retirement}
	IV.1.A-2. There is an additional reduction of the average age of the beneficiaries of early retirement in the case of combined aid	IV.1.A-2.1. Ratio of {average age of the beneficiaries of early retirement aid replaced by beneficiaries of setting-up aid} to {average retirement age of all farmers receiving early retirement aid}
IV.2. To what extent has the economic viability of the remaining agricultural holdings improved?	IV.2-1. Improvement in the factors of production	IV.2-1.1. Ratio of {cost} to {turnover} on assisted holdings (<i>where costs = 'all inputs'</i>) (a) description of the indicator's relationship to the conditions mentioned in Article 11(2) 1 st indent: skill/competence, surface area, volume of work or income IV.2-1.2. Development of farm structures due to mergers: (a) increase in average size of all involved holdings remaining after transfer/merger (hectares and %) (b) decrease in number of holdings remaining after transfer/merger (number) (c) trend in specialisation of holdings (mixed production versus separate animal and arable...) (description)
	IV.2-2. Viable production conditions in relation to production restrictions	IV.2-2.1. Trend due to mergers in the production conditions in relationship to production restrictions (production rights, livestock density, manure restrictions, etc.) (description)

IV.3. Was the income offered to the transferors appropriate in terms of encouraging them to abandon farming and subsequently offering them a fair standard of living?	IV.3-1. The level of income is satisfactory and provides an incentive to stop farming	IV.3-1.1. Ratio of {premium + capital income (from sale of farm/land)} to {previous family farm income}
---	---	---

5. Chapter V - Less-favoured areas and areas with environmental restrictions

Questions	Criteria	Indicators
<p>V.1. To what extent has the scheme contributed to: (i) offsetting the natural handicaps in LFAs in terms of high production costs and low production potential, and: (ii) compensating for costs incurred and income foregone in areas with environmental restrictions?</p> <p><i>(concerns both LFA¹ and AER²)</i></p>	V.1-1. The income deficit due to natural handicaps or environmental restrictions is offset by compensatory allowances or payments	<p>V.1-1.1. Ratio of {premium} to {higher production costs + reduction in value of farm output}</p> <p>V.1-1.2. Share of compensated holdings where premium is</p> <p>(a) lower than 50% of {higher production costs + reduced value of farm output} (%)</p> <p>(b) between 50 and 90% of {higher production costs + reduced value of farm output} (%)</p> <p>(c) higher than 90% of {higher production costs + reduction in value of farm output} (%)</p>
<p>V.2. To what extent have compensatory allowances helped in ensuring continued agricultural land use?</p> <p><i>(concerns LFA)</i></p>	V.2-1. Agricultural land use continued	V.2-1.1. Change in Utilised Agricultural Area (UAA) in LFAs (hectares and %)
<p>V.3. To what extent have compensatory allowances contributed to the maintenance of a viable rural community?</p> <p><i>(concerns LFA)</i></p>	V.3-1. Continued agricultural land use is critical for the maintenance of a viable rural community	V.3-1.1. Evidence of continued agricultural land use as critical factor for the maintenance of a viable rural community (description)
	V.3-2. Fair standard of living for farmers	V.3-2.1. Ratio of {"family farm income" + off-farm income of holder and/or spouse} to {average family income in related area}

¹ Less-Favoured Areas

² Areas with Environmental Restrictions

<p>V.4.A. To what extent has the scheme contributed to the protection of the environment ...by maintaining or promoting sustainable farming that takes account of environmental protection requirements in LFAs?</p> <p>(concerns LFA)</p>	<p>V.4.A-1. Maintenance/promotion of sustainable farming</p>	<p>V.4.A-1.1. Share of UAA under environmentally benign farming systems (hectares and %)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) of which used for organic farming (hectares and %) (b) of which used for integrated farming or integrated pest management (hectares and %) (c) of which used as pasture with less than 2 LU/ha (or a specified regional variant) (hectares and %) <p>V.4.A-1.2. Share of UAA used for arable farming where the quantity of nitrogen applied (farm manure + synthetic) is less than 170 kg/ha per year (hectares and %)</p> <p>V.4.A-1.3. Share of UAA used for arable farming where the quantity of pesticides applied is less than a specified threshold (hectares and %)</p>
<p>V.4.B. To what extent has the scheme contributed to the protection of the environment ...by increasing the implementation and respect of environmental restrictions based on Community environmental protection rules?</p> <p>(concerns AER)</p>	<p>V.4.B-1. Increased implementation and respect of targeted environmental protection restrictions limiting agricultural use</p>	<p>V.4.B-1.1. Share of Utilised Agricultural Area (UAA) (within the region covered by the programme) covered by Environmental Restrictions that allow farmers to draw payments (hectares and %)</p> <p>V.4.B-1.2. Share of eligible holdings taking up payments for environmental restrictions (number and %)</p> <p>V.4.B-1.3. Ratio of {% of beneficiary holdings having faced action for non-compliance with restrictions} to {% of holdings not claiming payments having faced actions for non-compliance}</p>

6. Chapter VI—Agri-environment

Questions	Criteria	Indicators
VI.1.A. To what extent have natural resources been protectedin terms of soil quality, as influenced by agri-environmental measures?	VI.1.A-1. Soil erosion has been reduced	VI.1.A-1.1. Farmland under agreements preventing/reducing soil loss (number and hectares) (a) of which reducing erosion from (mainly) water/wind/tillage respectively (%) (b) of which due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> land-use (pasture, other permanent crops...) (%) barriers or diversions (terraces, linear elements) (%) agricultural practices (reduced tillage, specific types of irrigation, contour cultivation, soil cover ...) (%) stocking density of grazing animals (%) (c) of which the object of assisted actions mainly/exclusively targeting erosion control (%)
	VI.1.A-2. Chemical contamination of soils has been prevented or reduced	VI.1.A-2.1. Farmland under agreements reducing soil contamination (number and hectares) (a) of which reduced use of plant protection substances (%) (b) of which reduced use of plant nutrient/manure (%) (c) of which the object of assisted actions explicitly targeting soil contamination (%)
	VI.1.A-3. The protected soil gives raise to further benefits at farm or societal level	VI.1.A-3.1. Farm and/or off-farm indirect impacts resulting from farmland under agreements (description)

VI.1.B. To what extent have natural resources been protected ...in terms of the quality of ground and surface water, as influenced by agri-environmental measures?	VI.1.B-1. Reduction of agricultural inputs potentially contaminating water	<p>VI.1.B-1.1. Area subject to input-reducing actions thanks to agreement (hectares)</p> <p>(a) of which with reduced application per hectare of chemical fertiliser (%)</p> <p>(b) of which with reduced application per hectare of manure or reduced livestock density (%)</p> <p>(c) of which with crops and/or rotations associated with low inputs or low nitrogen-surplus (in case of fertiliser) (%)</p> <p>(d) of which with reduced application per hectare of plant protection products (%)</p> <p>VI.1.B-1.2.^{*)} Reduction of agricultural inputs per hectare thanks to agreements (%)</p> <p>VI.1.B-1.3.^{*)} Nitrogen balance (kg/ha/year)</p> <p>^{*)} <i>It will only be worthwhile to calculate this indicator for programmes with a certain focus on water protection (e.g., where relevant actions are applied in catchment areas predominantly influenced by farming and forestry)</i></p>
	VI.1.B-2. The transport mechanisms (from field surface or rootzone to aquifers) for chemicals have been impeded (leaching, run-off, erosion)	<p>VI.1.B-2.1. Area subject to supported actions reducing the transport of pollutants to aquifers (through run-off, leaching or erosion) (hectares)</p> <p>(a) of which with particular cover/crop (%)</p> <p>(b) of which with non-crop barriers to run-off (field margins, hedgerows, contour cultivation, field size) (%)</p>
	VI.1.B-3. Improved quality of surface water and/or groundwater	<p>VI.1.B-3.1.^{*)} Concentration of (the relevant) pollutant in water flowing from areas under agreement = the proportion of surface/groundwater above the threshold concentration of the relevant substance (mg, µg, etc per litre)</p> <p>^{*)} <i>It will only be worthwhile to calculate this indicator for programmes with a certain focus on water protection (e.g., where relevant actions are applied in catchment areas predominantly influenced by farming and forestry)</i></p>
	VI.1.B-4. Water protection gives raise to further benefits at farm or societal level	VI.1.B-4.1. Farm and/or off-farm indirect impacts resulting from farmland under agreements (description)

VI.1.C. To what extent have natural resources been protected (or enhanced) ...in terms of the quantity of water resources, as influenced by agri-environmental measures?	VI.1.C-1. The utilisation (abstraction) of water for irrigation has been reduced or increase avoided	VI.1.C-1.1. Area not irrigated thanks to agreement (hectare) (a) of which due to direct limitation of irrigated area (%) (b) of which due to changed crop pattern/vegetation or farm practice (%) VI.1.C-1.2. Area with reduced rate of irrigation (consumption/hectare) thanks to agreement (hectare) (a) of which due to direct limitation of irrigation rate (%) (b) of which due to changed crop pattern/vegetation or farm practice (other than irrigation) (%) (c) of which due to improved irrigation methods (%) VI.1.C-1.3. Reduction in quantity of water used for irrigation thanks to agreement (m ³ , hectares concerned) VI.1.C-1.4. Efficiency of irrigation for key crops influenced by agreements, i.e., quantity of crop produced per unit of water (tons/m ³)
	VI.1.C-2. Water resources protected in terms of quantity	VI.1.C-2.1. Trend concerning the water levels in surface and ground water (description and/or indicator to be defined at programme level)
	VI.1.C-3. Protected water resources give raise to further benefits (farm or rural level, environment, other economic sectors)	VI.1.C-3.1 Global impacts arising thanks to the protection of the water levels of surface and ground water (description)
VI.2.A. To what extent has biodiversity (<i>species diversity</i>) been maintained or enhanced thanks to agri-environmental measures ...through the protection of flora and fauna on farmland?	VI.2.A-1. Reduction of agricultural inputs (or avoided increase) benefiting flora and fauna has been achieved	VI.2.A-1.1. Area with assisted input-reducing actions (hectares) (a) of which with reduced application per hectare of plant protection products (%) (b) of which with reduced application per hectare of fertiliser (%) (c) of which with avoidance of specific inputs at critical periods of the year (%) VI.2.A-1.2. Reduction of agricultural input per hectare thanks to agreement (%) VI.2.A-1.3. Evidence of a positive relationship between assisted input reduction measures on the targeted land and species diversity (description, where practical involving estimates of species abundance)

	<p>VI.2.A-2. Crop patterns [types of crops (including associated livestock), crop rotation, cover during critical periods, expanse of fields] benefiting flora and fauna have been maintained or reintroduced</p>	<p>VI.2.A-2.1. Area with beneficial lay out of crops [types of crop (including associated livestock), crop-combinations and size of uniform fields] maintained/reintroduced thanks to assisted actions (hectares)</p> <p>VI.2.A-2.2. Area with beneficial vegetation/crop-residues at critical periods thanks to assisted actions (hectares)</p> <p>VI.2.A-2.3. Evidence (by key type of farmland) of a positive relationship between the layout of crops or cover on the farmland under agreement and the impact on species diversity (description, and where practical, estimates of numbers of nest (of birds, mammals, etc) or species abundance (or observation frequency)</p>
	<p>VI.2.A-3. Species in need of protection have been successfully targeted by the supported actions</p>	<p>VI.2.A-3.1. Area of farmland under agreements targeting particular wildlife species or groups of species (hectares and specification of species)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) of which widespread species (%) (b) of which specialist species (%) (c) of which declining species (%) (d) of which stable or increasing species (%) (e) of which soil-organisms (%) (f) of which species figuring on international lists of endangered species (%) <p>VI.2.A-3.2. Trend in populations of target species on the specifically targeted farmland (cf., indicator 3.1) (where practical involving estimates of population size)</p> <p>or</p> <p>other evidence for a positive relationship between the supported actions and the abundance of the targeted species (description).</p>

<p>VI.2.B. To what extent has biodiversity been maintained or enhanced thanks to agri-environmental measures ...through the conservation of high nature-value farmland habitats, protection or enhancement of environmental infrastructure or the protection of wetland or aquatic habitats adjacent to agricultural land (<i>habitat diversity</i>)?</p>	<p>VI.2.B-1. "High nature-value habitats" on farmed land have been conserved</p>	<p>VI.2.B-1.1. High nature-value farmland habitats that have been protected by supported actions (number of sites/agreements; total hectares, average size)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) of which resulting from specific land-uses or traditional farming systems (%) (b) of which resulting from prevention of encroachment (colonisation by scrub, etc) or abandonment (%) (c) of which located in Natura 2000 areas (%) (d) of which habitats that in particular benefit specific species or groups of species (%) (e) of which considered rare habitats at the relevant geographical level (%)
	<p>VI.2.B-2. Ecological infrastructure, including field boundaries (hedges...) or non-cultivated patches of farmland with habitat function have been protected or enhanced</p>	<p>VI.2.B-2.1. Assisted ecological infrastructure with habitat function or non-farmed patches of land linked to agriculture (hectares and/or kilometres and/or number of sites/agreements)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) of which linear features (hedges, walls, etc) (% , kilometres) (b) of which patches or areas of non-farmed land (i.e. ecological set-aside, other non-cropped areas, etc.) or partly non-cultivated land (unweeded and/or unfertilised edges of fields) (%) (c) of which isolated features (patches of trees, etc) (number) (d) of which enhancing existing high nature-value habitats by alleviating their fragmentation (%)
	<p>VI.2.B-3. Valuable wetland (often uncultivated) or aquatic habitats have been protected from leeching, run-off or sediments originating from adjacent farmland</p>	<p>VI.2.B-3.1. Area under assisted farming systems or practices that reduce/prevent leeching, run-off or sedimentation of farm inputs/soil in adjacent valuable wetland or aquatic habitats (hectares)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) of which input reduction techniques (%) (b) of which run-off and/or erosion prevention (%) (c) of which reduction of leaching (%) <p>VI.2.B-3.2. Adjacent valuable wetland or aquatic habitats that have been protected thanks to the assisted actions (hectares)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) of which protected from eutrophication and/or sediment flows (%) (b) of which protected from toxic substances (%) (c) of which in Natura 2000 areas (d) of which habitats that particularly benefit specific species or groups of species (%) (e) of which considered rare habitats at the relevant geographical level (%)

<p>VI.2.C. To what extent has biodiversity (<i>genetic diversity</i>) been maintained or enhanced thanks to agri-environmental measures ...through the safeguarding of endangered animal breeds or plant varieties?</p>	<p>VI.2.C-1. Endangered breeds/varieties are conserved</p>	<p>VI.2.C-1.1. Animals/plants reared/cultivated under agreement (number of individuals or hectares broken down to breed/variety) (a) of which figuring on EU or international lists: World Watch List of FAO; International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (pending) (b) of which conserved within the farming system they traditionally are part of (%)</p>
<p>VI.3. To what extent have landscapes been maintained or enhanced by agri-environmental measures?</p>	<p>VI.3-1. The perceptive/cognitive (visual, etc) <u>coherence</u> between the farmland and the natural/biophysical characteristics of the zone has been maintained or enhanced</p>	<p>VI.3-1.1. Farmland under agreement contributing to <u>coherence</u> with the natural/biophysical characteristics of the zone (number of sites and hectares) (a) of which due to land-use patterns as influenced by the supported actions (where relevant specified to type, such as grassland, etc...) (%) (b) of which due to environmental features such as flora, fauna or habitats directly/indirectly resulting from the supported actions (%) (c) of which due to the preservation of landforms such as relief or contours (%) (d) of which due to the preservation, resulting from supported actions, of water levels and the contours of water bodies (stemming, irrigation restrictions, etc) (%)</p>
	<p>VI.3-2. The perceptive/cognitive (visual, etc) <u>differentiation</u> (homogeneity/diversity) of farmland has been maintained or enhanced</p>	<p>VI.3-2.1. Farmland under agreement contributing to perceptive/cognitive, in particular visual, <u>differentiation</u> (homogeneity/diversity) in the landscape (number of sites and hectares/ kilometres) (a) of which due to the visual complexity resulting from land-use/crop patterns influenced by the supported actions (extent, spatial arrangement including height, colours) (%) (b) of which due to environmental features such as flora, fauna or habitats directly/indirectly resulting from the supported actions (%) (c) of which due to man-made objects (hedgerows, ditches, tracks) introduced/preserved by the supported actions or the possibility, thanks to support for vegetation management, of viewing the landscape differentiation (homogeneity/diversity) (%)</p>

	VI.3-3. The <u>cultural identity</u> of farmland has been maintained or enhanced	<p>VI.3-3.1. Farmland under agreement contributing to the maintenance/enhancement of cultural/historical characteristics of the zone (number of sites/objects, and hectares/ kilometres)</p> <p>(a) of which due to the presence of traditional crops or traditional domestic animals as influenced by the supported actions (%)</p> <p>(b) of which due to man-made linear objects (hedgerows, ditches, tracks) reintroduced/preserved by the supported actions (%)</p> <p>(c) of which due to man-made point/singular features reintroduced/preserved by the supported actions (e.g., presence of patches of trees or the possibility of viewing heritage thanks to vegetation management, etc) (%)</p> <p>(d) of which due to opportunities for experiencing traditional farm activities (herding, transhumance, haymaking, etc) reintroduced/preserved by the supported actions (%)</p>
	VI.3-4. The protection/improvement of landscape structures and functions relating to farmland results in societal benefits/values (amenity values)	VI.3-4.1. Evidence of societal benefits/value resulting from the protected/improved landscape structures and functions (description)

7. Chapter VII - Improving processing procedures and marketing of agricultural products

Questions	Criteria	Indicators
VII.1. To what extent have the supported investments helped to increase the competitiveness of agricultural products through improved and rationalised processing and marketing of agricultural products?	VII.1-1. Rational procedures in assisted processing & marketing lines	VII.1-1.1. Evidence of more rational processing and marketing procedures (description, e.g., including the trend in beneficiaries having ISO 9000)
	VII.1-2. Better use of production factors in assisted processing & marketing lines	VII.1-2.1. Capacity-use in assisted processing & marketing lines (%)
	VII.1-3. Lower costs in assisted processing & marketing lines	VII.1-3.1. Change in processing/marketing costs per unit of basic product thanks to assistance (%)
VII.2. To what extent have the supported investments helped to increase the added value and competitiveness of agricultural products by improving their quality?	VII.2-1. The intrinsic quality of processed/marketed agricultural products is improved	VII.2-1.1. Share of agricultural basic products contained in processed/marketed products with improved intrinsic quality from assisted processing/marketing lines (%) (a) of which subject to systematic quality monitoring thanks to assistance (%) (b) of which with improved homogeneity within and/or between batches (%)
	VII.2-2. Uptake of quality labels has increased	VII.2-2.1. Share of marketed products from assisted processing/marketing lines sold with quality label (number of products and %) (a) of which EU-level labelling schemes (%) (b) of which national-level labelling schemes (%) (c) of which other labelling schemes (%)
	VII.2-3. Higher added value in financial terms thanks to improved quality	VII.2-3.1. Added value in assisted processing & marketing lines (%)
VII.3. To what extent have the supported investments improved the situation of the basic agricultural production sector?	VII.3-1. Demand for and price of basic agricultural products assured or improved	VII.3-1.1. Trend (in terms of quantity and price) in purchases of raw materials by assisted production/marketing lines VII.3-1.2. Share (within area of programme) of gross sales of basic agricultural products that are sold to outlets safeguarded or created thanks to the assistance (%)
	VII.3-2. Co-operation developed between the producers of basic agricultural products and the processing/marketing stages	VII.3-2.1. Share of supply of basic products to beneficiary producers (processing) or marketers that depends on multi-annual contracts or equivalent instruments (%)

VII.4. To what extent have the supported investments improved health and welfare?	VII.4-1. Health and welfare concerns are appropriately integrated into the programme	VII.4-1.1. Share of assisted investments in processing and marketing related to health and welfare (%) (a) of which aiming to improve of the nutritive and hygiene quality of products for human consumption (%) (b) of which aiming to improve the nutritive and hygiene quality of animal feed (%) (c) of which aiming to improve workplace safety (%) (d) of which aiming to improve animal welfare (%)
	VII.4-2. Animals transported or handled for slaughter do not infect live animals	VII.4-2.1. Trend in spread of contagious diseases during handling and transport of animals for slaughter related to assistance (description, e.g., frequency of incidents)
	VII.4-3. Workplace conditions improved for persons involved in processing and marketing	VII.4-3.1. Trend in workplace conditions related to assistance (description, e.g., frequency of reported incidents)
VII.5. To what extent have the supported investments protected the environment?	VII.5-1. Profitable outlets for basic agricultural products that are linked to environmentally benign farming have been provided	VII.5-1.1. Capacity created or upgraded thanks to assistance for processing/marketing of basic agricultural products resulting from environmentally benign farming (tons) (a) of which processing/marketing of products produced by farmers respecting environmental obligations that are verified by public authorities or regulated by contractual obligations or an equivalent instrument (e.g. organic products, integrated production, etc.) (tons) (b) of which processing/marketing of crops for renewable energy or traditional non-food land uses (e.g. cork) (ton)
	VII.5-2. The assisted operations relating to processing or marketing exceed minimum environmental standards	VII.5- 2.1. Share of processing and marketing lines introducing environmental improvements thanks to co-financing (%) (a) of which with environmental improvement as the direct aim (%) (b) of which with environmental improvement as a collateral effect (e.g., due to new technology mainly for other purposes (%) (c) of which assisted investments going beyond standards concerning emissions (waste, sewage, smoke) directly from the processing and marketing sites ('end of pipe') (%) (d) of which assisted investments concerning resource use (water, energy...) and environmental effects of the products after leaving the processing/marketing site (transport, packaging...) (%)

8. Chapter VIII - Forestry

Questions	Criteria	Indicators
VIII.1.A. To what extent are forest resources being maintained and enhanced through the programme ...particularly by influencing land-use and the structure and quality of growing stock?	VIII.1.A-1. Increase of wooded area on previous agricultural and non-agricultural land	VIII.1.A-1.1. Area of assisted plantings (hectares)
	VIII.1.A-2. Anticipated increase of volume of growing stock thanks to planting of new woodland and improvement of existing woodlands	VIII.1.A-2.1. Anticipated additional average annual increment thanks to assistance (m ³ /hectare/year) (a) of which in new plantings (% and hectares concerned) (b) of which due to improvement of existing woodlands (% and hectares concerned)
	VIII.1.A-3. Anticipated improvement in quality (assortment, diameter...) and structure of growing stock thanks to forest improvement	VIII.1.A-3.1. Trend in structure/quality parameters (description, e.g., including hardwood/softwood, diameter-evolution, straightness, knots...)
VIII.1.B. To what extent are forest resources being maintained and enhanced through the programme ...particularly by influencing the total carbon storage in forest stands?	VIII.1.B-1. There is additional build up of carbon in the growing stock of new and existing woodlands	VIII.1.B-1.1. Average annual net carbon storage from 2000-2012 thanks to assistance (millions of tons/year)
		VIII.1.B-1.2. Trend in average annual net carbon storage beyond 2012 thanks to assistance (millions of tons/year)
VIII.2.A. To what extent have the assisted actions enabled forestry to contribute to the economic and social aspects of rural development ...by maintenance and encouragement of the productive functions on forests holdings?	VIII.2.A-1. More rational production of forest products (or services)	VIII.2.A-1.1. Short/medium term change in annual costs for silviculture, harvesting and transport/collection, stocking operations thanks to the assistance (€/m ³) VIII.2.A-1.2. Share of holdings being connected to associations of forest holders or similar organisation thanks to assistance (%)
	VIII.2.A-2. Enhancement of outlets for forest products	VIII.2.A-2.1. Additional assisted outlets, in particular for products of small dimension/low quality (m ³)

VIII.2.B. To what extent have the assisted actions enabled forestry to contribute to the economic and social aspects of rural development ...by maintenance and development of employment and other socio-economic functions and conditions?	VIII.2.B-1. More activities/employment on holdings	VIII.2.B-1.1. Activity on holdings from {own execution of assisted planting/improvement works} plus {anticipated work at the holding deriving from the assisted action in the short/mid term} (hours/hectare/year) (a) of which falling in periods where agricultural activity level is below the capacity on combined farm/forest holdings (hours/holding/year + number of holdings concerned) (b) of which leading to additional or maintained employment on holdings (full time equivalents/year)
	VIII.2.B-2. More activities in rural community, due to primary or secondary production on holdings or due to initial processing and marketing stages	VIII.2.B-2.1. Volume of short/medium term supply of basic forest products for small scale, local processing (m ³ /year) VIII.2.B-2.2. Employment in the short/medium term outside holdings (logging, initial processing and marketing, and further local, small scale processing and marketing) directly or indirectly depending on assisted actions (full time equivalents/year)
	VIII.2.B-3. Greater attractiveness of area for local population or rural tourists	VIII.2.B-3.1. Additional attractive/valuable area or sites due to assistance [description, taking into account the concepts of perceptive/cognitive coherence, differentiation (homogeneity/diversity) and cultural identity as well as the number of hectares involved (c.f., Question VI.3.)]
	VIII.2.B-4. Maintaining or increasing income in rural areas	VIII.2.B-4.1. Income in the short/medium term due to assisted activities (€/year, number of beneficiaries) (a) of which additional sustainable income on holdings (% and hectare) (b) of which due to knock-on activities or assisted off-farm activities (%) VIII.2.B-4.2. Ratio of {premium for loss of income} to {net-income from previous land use} (i.e., previous 'gross margin')
VIII.2.C. To what extent have the assisted actions enabled forestry to contribute to the economic and social aspects of rural development ...by maintenance and appropriate enhancement of protective functions of forest management?	VIII.2.C-1. Appropriate protection actions undertaken	VIII.2.C-1.1. Area planted/managed with a view to protective functions (hectares)
	VIII.2.C-2. Non-woodland and socio-economic interests are protected	VIII.2.C-2.1. Resources/assets enjoying improved protection due to assisted forest actions (hectare): (a) of which agricultural land (%) (b) of which water bodies (%) (c) of which villages, tourist facilities (% plus type & magnitude of interest – e.g., expressed approximately as number of inhabitants, night beds, etc)

VIII.3.A. To what extent have the assisted actions contributed to the ecological functions of forests ...by maintenance, conservation and appropriate enhancement of biological diversity?	VIII.3.A-1. Genetic and/or species diversity protected/improved by using indigenous tree species or mixtures in assisted actions	VIII.3.A-1.1. Area planted/regenerated/improved with indigenous tree species (hectares) (a) of which in mixture (hectares) (b) of which providing in situ conservation of genetic resources (hectares)
	VIII.3.A-2. Protection/improvement of habitat diversity through the upkeep of representative, rare or vulnerable forest ecosystems/habitats that depend on specific assisted forest structures or silvicultural practices	VIII.3.A-2.1. Critical sites maintained/improved due to assistance (hectares) (a) of which in or linked to Natura 2000 areas (hectares) (b) of which protected/restored from natural hazards (hectares) VIII.3.A-2.2. Trend in protection of vulnerable non-commercial (i.e., non-traded forest products) species/varieties of flora & fauna on land subject to assisted actions (description, e.g., number of different species/varieties affected and where possible change in the abundance of key species)
	VIII.3.A-3. Protection/improvement of habitat diversity through beneficial interaction between assisted areas and the surrounding landscape/countryside	VIII.3.A-3.1. Area planted in zones with low or missing forest cover (hectares) (a) of which in or linked to Natura 2000 areas (hectares) (b) of which forming corridors between isolated, precarious habitats (hectares) VIII.3.A-3.2. 'Ecotones' established (forest edge...) of significant value for wild flora and fauna (kilometres)
VIII.3.B. To what extent have the assisted actions contributed to the ecological functions of forests ...by maintenance of their health and vitality?	VIII.3.B-1. Less damage to soil and growing stock from silvicultural or harvesting operations	VIII.3.B-1.1. Volume of growing stock subject to reduced damage thanks to assisted equipment or infrastructure (m ³ /year)
	VIII.3.B-2. Prevention of calamities (particularly pests and diseases) through appropriate forest structure and silvicultural practice	VIII.3.B-2.1. Area where improved forest structure or silvicultural practice relevant to the prevention of calamities has been introduced (hectares)
	VIII.3.B-3. Production potential protected or restored from damage arising from natural hazards	VIII.3.B-3.1. Area protected or restored from damage arising from natural hazards (including fire) (hectares)

9. Chapter IX –Promoting the adaptation and development of rural areas

Questions	Criteria	Indicators
IX.1. To what extent has the income of the rural population been maintained or improved?	IX.1-1. Farm income maintained/improved	IX.1-1.1. Share of farming population's income generated by assisted actions (€/beneficiary, no. concerned) a) of which gross farm income (from improved agriculture or from transactions generated by off-farm assistance) (%) b) of which from pluriactivity generated by off-farm assistance (%) IX.1-1.2. Ratio of {costs} to { turnover } for assisted farm-related activities (where costs = 'all inputs')
	IX.1-2. Off-farm income maintained/improved	IX.1-2.1. Share of gross income of off-farm beneficiaries generated by the assistance (€/beneficiary, no. concerned) a) of which relating to tourism (%) b) of which relating to crafts and local products (%) IX.1-2.2. Share of rural non-farming population having an income from transactions/employment generated by off-farm assistance (%)
IX.2. To what extent have the living conditions and welfare of the rural population been maintained as a result of social and cultural activities, better amenities or by the alleviation of remoteness?	IX.2-1. Remoteness has been alleviated	IX.2-1.1. Share of holdings/households/businesses having access to assisted telecommunication facilities/services (% , no.) IX.2-1.2. Transport/journeys facilitated or avoided due to assisted actions (description and kilometres and/or hours avoided per year) a) of which concerning agricultural holdings (kilometres and/or hours avoided per year) b) of which concerning the rural community (kilometres and/or hours avoided per year) IX.2-1.3. Evidence of economic activity resulting from assisted, enhanced telecommunications or transport facilities (description)
	IX.2-2. Social and cultural facilities have been maintained/enhanced, particularly for young people and young families	IX.2-2.1. Share of rural population with access to social/cultural activities that depend on assisted facilities (%) a) of which farmers taking leave-days thanks to assisted relief services (% , and number of days) b) of which young people and young families (%)

	IX.2-3. Neighbourhood amenities and housing conditions maintained/improved	IX.2-3.1. Share of rural population enjoying access to amenity land/nature or conserved rural heritage/sites thanks to assisted actions (%) IX.2-3.2. Share of rural accommodation that has improved due to assistance (no. and %) a) of which for rural tourism (%) b) of which providing an incentive for remaining/settling in area (%)
IX.3. To what extent has employment in rural areas been maintained?	IX.3-1. Employment of the farming population maintained/increased	IX.3-1.1. Farm employment created/maintained by assisted actions (FTE, no. of holdings concerned) a) of which from improved agriculture or transactions, generated by assisted activities off-farm (%) b) of which from pluriactivity generated by assisted activities off-farm (%) c) of which concerning farming population younger than 30 years of age (%) d) of which concerning women (%) IX.3-1.2. Cost per job maintained/created for the farming population (€/FTE)
	IX.3-2. Seasonal variation of activities is more effectively balanced	IX.3-2.1. Workforce obtaining employment during periods of low agricultural activity thanks to assistance (FTE, no. of persons concerned) IX.3-2.2. Prolongation of the tourist season (days/year)
	IX.3-3. Diversification of activities contributes to employment of the non-farming population	IX.3-3.1. Employment for off-farm beneficiaries maintained/created by the assistance (FTE, no of persons concerned) a) of which relating to tourism (%) b) of which relating to crafts and local products (%) c) of which relating to agri-business (%) d) of which concerning persons younger than 30 years of age (%) e) of which concerning women (%) IX.3-3.2. Cost per job maintained/created for the non-farming population (€/FTE)

IX.4. To what extent have the structural characteristics of the rural economy been maintained or improved?	IX.4-1. Productive structures linked to agriculture have been maintained or improved	IX.4-1.1. Share of farms enjoying agricultural improvements thanks to assisted actions (no. and % of holdings and hectares) a) of which land improvement (no. and % of hectares) b) of which improved irrigation (no. and % of hectares) c) of which relating to farm/field structure (foncière) (no. and % of holdings) d) of which more professional farm management (no. and % of holdings) IX.4-1.2. Assisted new/improved production related activities connected to agriculture including marketing of quality agricultural products (description) IX.4-1.3. Capacity-use for assisted off-farm facilities (%)
	IX.4-2. Agricultural production potential has been protected/restored regarding natural hazards	IX.4-2.1. Share of threatened land protected thanks to assisted actions (hectares and %) IX.4-2.2. Share of damaged land restored thanks to assistance (hectares and %)
	IX.4-3. Dynamism of rural actors promoted and potential for endogenous development mobilised in rural areas	IX.4-3.1. Evidence of improved dynamism/potential thanks to assisted actions (description, e.g., relevant networks, financial engineering...)
IX.5. To what extent has the rural environment been protected or improved?	IX.5-1. Agricultural improvements generate environmental benefits	IX.5-1.1. Share of land where soil protection has improved, particularly by reducing erosion thanks to assisted action (hectares and %) IX.5-1.2. Reduced water loss from irrigation infrastructure thanks to assistance (hectares benefiting and m ³ /tons of crop) IX.5-1.3. Evidence of positive environmentally related trends in farming systems, practices, ecological infrastructure or land-use due to assisted actions (description)
	IX.5-2. Pollution/emissions prevented and better use of natural/non-renewable resources	IX.5-2.1. Waste/sewage collected/treated thanks to assisted actions (% of waste/sewage and % of farms/households served) IX.5-2.2. Share of farms/households having access to renewable energy thanks to assisted actions (%)
	IX.5-3. Non-agricultural land has been maintained/improved in terms of biodiversity, landscapes or natural resources	IX.5-3.1. Evidence of improvements on non-agricultural land in terms of biodiversity/ landscape/natural resources thanks to assistance (description)
	IX.5-4. Increased knowledge/awareness about rural environmental problems and solutions	IX.5-4.1. Rural actors having improved exchange of or access to information concerning environmentally benign activities thanks to assisted actions (number, %) a) of which concerning agricultural techniques/practices and systems (no. and %) b) of which concerning non-farming activities (no. and %)

10. Cross-cutting evaluation questions

Questions	Criteria	Indicators
Transv.1. To what extent has the programme helped stabilising the rural population?	Transv.1-1. Age profile of population benefiting from assistance contributes towards maintaining/promoting a balanced population structure	Transv.1-1.1. Share of persons working on beneficiary farm/forest holdings, and aged: (i) < 30 years (%); (ii) 30-39 years (%); (iii) > 40 years(%) <i>[also use other evidence including information from existing common indicators relating to age profile in chapters II, III, IV and IX]</i>
	Transv.1-2. Gender profile of population benefiting from assistance contributes towards maintaining/promoting a balanced population structure	Transv.1-2.1. Ratio of {female} to {male} for persons benefiting from assistance <i>[also use other evidence including information from existing common indicators relating to gender in chapters II, III and IX]</i>
	Transv.1-3. Rural depopulation has been reduced	Transv.1-3.1. Evidence of positive influences of the programme on reduction of rural depopulation (description, including change in farming population and other rural population) <i>[also use other evidence including information from existing common indicators relating to migration in chapter IX]</i>
Transv.2. To what extent has the programme been conducive to securing employment both on and off holdings?	Transv.2-1. Employment is created or maintained, directly and indirectly by the programme, on farm/forestry holdings.	Transv.2-1.1. Employment maintained/created on directly/indirectly benefiting farm/forestry holdings (FTE) (a) of which holders (%) (b) of which non-family labour (%) (c) of which women(%) (d) of which concerning full-time employment (%) (e) of which concerning gainful activities other than the production of basic agricultural/forestry products (%) (f) of which indirectly as a result of supplier effects (%) <i>[also use other evidence including information from existing common indicators relating to employment in chapters I, II, (VII,) VIII and IX]</i>

	Transv.2-2. Employment is created or maintained, directly and indirectly by the programme, in enterprises (other than holdings) in rural areas or in branches connected with agriculture.	<p>Transv.2-2.1. Employment maintained/created in directly/indirectly benefiting enterprises (other than holdings) (FTE)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) of which women (b) of which young people (under the age of 30) (c) of which concerning the pluriactivity of part-time farmers (d) of which indirectly as a result of supplier and income multiplier effects <p><i>[also use other evidence including information from existing common indicators relating to employment in chapter IX]</i></p>
Transv.3. To what extent has the programme been conducive to maintaining or improving the income level of the rural community?	Transv.3-1. Income of the farming population maintained or improved, directly or indirectly by the programme	<p>Transv.3-1.1. Income of directly/indirectly assisted farming population (€/person, number concerned)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) of which 'family farm income' (%) (b) of which income of non-family workforce on holdings (%) (c) of which relating to pluriactivity of part-time farmers or to gainful activities on holdings other than the production of basic agricultural/forestry products (%) (d) of which indirectly as a result of supplier effects (%) <p><i>[also use other evidence including information from existing common indicators relating to income in chapters I, II, III, IV, V, VII, VIII and IX]</i></p>
	Transv.3-2. Income of non-farming population maintained or improved, directly or indirectly, by the programme	<p>Transv.3-2.1. Income of directly/indirectly assisted non-farming population (€/person, number concerned)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) of which relating to rural tourism (%) (b) of which relating to local crafts/products (%) (c) of which indirectly as a result of supplier and multiplier effects (%) <p><i>[also use other evidence including information from existing common indicators relating to income in chapters VIII and IX]</i></p>
Transv.4. To what extent has the programme improved the market situation for basic agricultural/forestry products?	Transv.4-1. Productivity has been improved and/or costs reduced in key production chains thanks to the programme	<p>Transv.4-1.1. Ratio {turnover} to {cost} in key benefiting production chains (filières)</p> <p><i>[also use other evidence including information from existing common indicators relating to productivity/costs in chapters I, III, IV, VIII and IX]</i></p>

	Transv.4-2. Market positioning (quality, etc) has improved for key production chains (filières) thanks to the programme	<p>Transv.4-2.1. Change in added value per unit of basic agricultural/forestry product for key benefiting production chains (filières) (%)</p> <p>Transv.4-2.2. Share of basic agricultural product being subject to quality improvement at any level along benefiting production chains (filières) thanks to programme (%)</p> <p>Transv.4-2.3. Evidence of better market positioning (description)</p> <p><i>[also use other evidence including information from existing common indicators relating to market positioning in chapters I, III, IV, VI, VII, VIII and IX]</i></p>
	Transv.4-3. There is a positive development in the turnover and price for key production chains (filières) thanks to the programme	<p>Transv.4-3.1. Change in annual gross sales for key benefiting production chains (filières) (%)</p> <p>Transv.4-3.2. Evolution in price per unit of standardised product for key benefiting production chains (filières) (%)</p> <p><i>[also use other evidence including information from existing common indicators relating to turnover/price in chapters I, VII, VIII and IX]</i></p>
Transv.5. To what extent has the programme been conducive to the protection and improvement of the environment?	Transv.5-1. The combination of supported actions (from within and between different chapters) focusing on production/development and/or on the environment generates positive environmental effects	<p>Transv.5-1.1. Share of supported actions entirely/mainly intended for environmental protection or enhancement (% of programme costs; % of projects)</p> <p>Transv.5-1.2. Share of supported actions focusing on production and development aspects generating positive environmental spin-offs (% of programme costs; % of projects)</p> <p>(a) of which thanks to cleaner technology (%)</p> <p>(b) of which thanks to improved agricultural practices or change/maintenance of land-use patterns (incl. location/concentration of livestock) (%)</p> <p>Transv.5-1.3. Share of supported actions having generated negative environmental effects (% of programme costs; % of projects)</p> <p>(a) of which during the establishment/investment/construction phase (%)</p> <p>(b) of which during the operational phase (%)</p> <p><i>[also use other evidence including information from existing common indicators relating to the environment in chapters I, III, V, VI, VII, VIII and IX]</i></p>
	Transv.5-2. Land-use patterns (incl. the location/concentration of livestock) have been maintained or have developed in a way which is environmentally beneficial	<p>Transv.5-2.1. Share of area within zone covered by the programme with beneficial (or prevented negative) land-use changes related to the programme (%)</p> <p>(a) of which concerning permanent crops (grassland, orchards, woodland...) (%)</p> <p>(b) of which concerning arable land (organic farming, rotation) (%)</p> <p>(c) of which concerning non-cultivated or semi-natural land (%)</p> <p><i>[also use other evidence including information from existing common indicators relating to land-use in chapters I, V, VI, VII, VIII and IX]</i></p>

	Transv.5-3. Unsustainable use or pollution of natural resources has been avoided or minimised	<p>Transv.5-3.1. Share of water resources subject to reduced depletion (or better replenishment) thanks to programme (%)</p> <p>(a) of which related to basic agricultural (or forestry) production (%)</p> <p>Transv.5-3.2. Share of water resources subject to reduced/stabilised pollution levels thanks to programme (%)</p> <p>(a) of which related to basic agricultural (or forestry) production (%)</p> <p>Transv.5-3.3. Trend in annual greenhouse gas emission (tons of carbon equivalents) due to programme (approximate estimates)</p> <p>(a) of which from carbon dioxide (%)</p> <p>(b) of which from nitrous oxide (%)</p> <p>(c) of which from methane (%)</p> <p><i>[also use other evidence including information from existing common indicators relating to natural resources in chapters V, VI, VIII and IX]</i></p>
	Transv.5-4. Rural landscapes have been maintained or enhanced	<p>Transv.5-4.1. Share of area within zone covered by the programme with beneficial (or prevented negative) landscape effects (%)</p> <p>(a) of which classified as contributing to respectively:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - landscape coherence (%); - landscape differentiation (homogeneity/diversity) (%) - cultural identity (%) <p>(b) of which concerning permanent crops (grassland, orchards, woodland...) (%)</p> <p><i>[also use other evidence including information from existing common indicators relating to landscapes in chapters VI, VIII and IX]</i></p>

Transv.6. To what extent have the implementing arrangements contributed to maximising the intended effects of the programme?	Transv.6-1. The assisted actions are concerted and complementary so as to produce synergy through their interaction on different aspects of rural development problems/opportunities	Transv.6-1.1. Frequency of groups/combinations of actions/projects, from within and/or between chapters, targeting rural development problems/opportunities (i) at different levels along agricultural/forestry <u>production chains</u> (filières); (ii) different aspects of particular <u>bottlenecks</u> and/or (iii) jointly creating <u>critical mass</u> (%)
--	--	---

	Transv.6-2. The <u>uptake</u> within the programme (by holdings, enterprises, associations...) involves those having the biggest <u>need</u> and/or <u>potential</u> for rural development in the area concerned by the programme (needy, capable, initiating good projects ...), thanks to a combination of implementing arrangements such as (i) publicity about the support opportunities, (ii) eligibility criteria, (iii) premium differentiation and/or (iv) procedures/criteria for selection of projects as well as (v) the absence of unnecessary delays and bureaucratic costs for these beneficiaries	Transv.6-2.1. Main <u>types of direct beneficiaries and operators</u> (e.g., holdings, enterprises, associations, networks; owners/holders, processors/marketers; arable/pastoral; small/large) involved in the programme (typology) Transv.6-2.2. Evidence of discouraging, unnecessary <u>delays or costs</u> for the direct beneficiaries/operators (description)
	Transv.6-3. <u>Leverage</u> effects have been maximised through a combination of eligibility criteria, premium differentiation or procedures/criteria for selection of projects	Transv.6-3.1. <u>Leverage rate</u> = {total spending by direct beneficiaries on assisted actions} to {public co-financing}
	Transv.6-4. <u>Dead-weight</u> effects have been avoided through a combination of eligibility criteria, premium differentiation and/or procedures/criteria for selection of projects	Transv.6-4.1. Evidence of <u>dead-weight</u> (description and approximate quantification)
	Transv.6-5. <u>Beneficial indirect effects</u> (especially supplier effects) have been maximised	Transv.6-5.1. Evidence of actions/projects resulting in <u>beneficial indirect effects</u> (description)

11. Programme adjustment at the mid term stage

(overarching conclusions)

Question
<p>Does the programme need adjustment at the <i>mid-term</i> stage...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ in terms of its eligible actions and/or the budget allocation to different parts of the programme? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • due to changes in the contextual situation since the design/starting phase of the programme • due to other reasons ➤ in terms of its implementing arrangements? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • due to changes in the contextual situation since the design/starting phase of the programme • due to other reasons