



The European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development:
Europe investing in rural areas

Annual implementation report

United Kingdom - Rural Development Programme (Regional) - Scotland

Annual implementation report	
Period	01/01/2016 - 31/12/2016
Version	2016.3
Status - Current Node	Accepted by EC - European Commission
National reference	SRDP 2014-2020 - AIR 2
Monitoring committee approval date	06/07/2017

Programme Version in force	
CCI	2014UK06RDRP003
Programme type	Rural Development Programme
Country	United Kingdom
Region	Scotland
Programming period	2014 - 2020
Version	2.2
Decision Number	C(2016)3620
Decision Date	06/06/2016
Managing authority	Scottish Government, Agriculture and Rural Development Division
Coordination body	UK Co-ordinating Body

Table of contents

1. KEY INFORMATION ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME AND ITS PRIORITIES	9
1.a) Financial Data	9
1.b) Common and programme-specific indicators and quantified target values	9
1.b1) Overview table.....	9
1.c) Key information on RDP implementation based on data from a) and b) by Focus Area.....	16
1.d) Key information on achievements towards the milestones set in the performance Framework based on Table F	25
1.e) Other RDP specific element [optional].....	29
1.f) Where appropriate, the contribution to macro-regional and sea basin strategies.....	29
1.g) Currency rate used for conversion AIR (non EUR countries).....	32
2. THE PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE EVALUATION PLAN.....	33
2.a) Description of any modifications made to the evaluation plan in the RDP during the year, with their justification	33
2.b) A description of the evaluation activities undertaken during the year (in relation to section 3 of the evaluation plan).....	33
2.c) A description of activities undertaken in relation to the provision and management of data (in relation to section 4 of the evaluation plan).....	34
2.d) A list of completed evaluations, including references to where they have been published on-line.....	35
2.e) A summary of completed evaluations, focussing on evaluation findings	36
2.f) A description of communication activities undertaken in relation to publicising evaluation findings (in relation to section 6 of the evaluation plan)	40
2.g) Description of the follow-up given to evaluation results (in relation to section 6 of the evaluation plan).....	42
3. ISSUES WHICH AFFECT THE PERFORMANCE OF THE PROGRAMME AND THE MEASURES TAKEN.....	43
3.a) Description of steps taken to ensure quality and effectiveness of programme implementation.....	43
3.b) Quality and efficient delivery mechanisms	43
4. STEPS TAKEN TO IMPLEMENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND PROGRAMME PUBLICITY REQUIREMENTS.....	45
4.a) Action taken and state of play as regards the establishment of the NRN and the implementation of its action plan.....	45
4.a1) Actions taken and state of play as regards establishment of the NRN (governance structure and network support unit).....	45
4.a2) Actions taken and state of play as regards the implementation of the action plan.....	45
4.b) Steps taken to ensure that the programme is publicised (Article 13 of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 808/2014)	46
5. ACTIONS TAKEN TO FULFIL EX ANTE CONDITIONALITIES.....	48
5.a) Unfulfilled criteria of general ex-ante conditionalities.....	48

5.b) Actions taken to fulfil applicable general ex-ante conditionalities	49
5.c) Unfulfilled criteria of priority-linked ex-ante conditionalities	50
5.d) Actions taken to fulfil applicable priority-linked ex-ante conditionalities.....	51
5.e) (Optional) additional information to complement the information provided on the 'actions taken' table.....	52
6. DESCRIPTION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF SUB-PROGRAMMES	53
7. ASSESSMENT OF THE INFORMATION AND PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING THE OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAMME	54
7.a) CEQ01-1A - To what extent have RDP interventions supported innovation, cooperation and the development of the knowledge base in rural areas?	54
7.a1) List of measures contributing to the FA	54
7.a2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ.....	54
7.a3) Methods applied.....	54
7.a4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources	54
7.a5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings	55
7.a6) Conclusions and recommendations.....	59
7.b) CEQ02-1B - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the strengthening of links between agriculture, food production and forestry and research and innovation, including for the purpose of improved environmental management and performance?	59
7.b1) List of measures contributing to the FA	60
7.b2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ.....	60
7.b3) Methods applied	60
7.b4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources.....	60
7.b5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings.....	61
7.b6) Conclusions and recommendations	62
7.c) CEQ03-1C - To what extent have RDP interventions supported lifelong learning and vocational training in the agriculture and forestry sectors?.....	62
7.c1) List of measures contributing to the FA	63
7.c2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ.....	63
7.c3) Methods applied.....	63
7.c4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources	63
7.c5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings	63
7.c6) Conclusions and recommendations.....	64
7.d) CEQ04-2A - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to improving the economic performance, restructuring and modernization of supported farms in particular through increasing their market participation and agricultural diversification?.....	65
7.d1) List of measures contributing to the FA	66
7.d2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ.....	66
7.d3) Methods applied	66

7.d4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources.....	66
7.d5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings.....	67
7.d6) Conclusions and recommendations	71
7.e) CEQ05-2B - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the entry of adequately skilled farmers into the agricultural sector and in particular, generational renewal?	71
7.e1) List of measures contributing to the FA	72
7.e2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ.....	72
7.e3) Methods applied.....	72
7.e4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources.....	72
7.e5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings.....	72
7.e6) Conclusions and recommendations.....	75
7.f) CEQ06-3A - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to improving the competitiveness of supported primary producers by better integrating them into the agri-food chain through quality schemes, adding value to the agricultural products, promoting local markets and short supply circuits, producer groups and inter-branch organization?.....	76
7.f1) List of measures contributing to the FA.....	77
7.f2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ.....	77
7.f3) Methods applied	77
7.f4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources	77
7.f5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings.....	78
7.f6) Conclusions and recommendations.....	79
7.g) CEQ07-3B - To what extent have RDP interventions supported farm risk prevention and management?	80
7.g1) List of measures contributing to the FA	81
7.g2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ.....	81
7.g3) Methods applied	81
7.g4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources.....	81
7.g5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings.....	81
7.g6) Conclusions and recommendations	83
7.h) CEQ08-4A - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the restoration, preservation and enhancement of biodiversity including in Natura 2000 areas, areas facing natural or other specific constraints and HNV farming, and the state of European landscape?.....	83
7.h1) List of measures contributing to the FA	84
7.h2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ.....	84
7.h3) Methods applied	84
7.h4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources.....	84
7.h5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings.....	85
7.h6) Conclusions and recommendations	89

7.i) CEQ09-4B - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the improvement of water management, including fertilizer and pesticide management?	89
7.i1) List of measures contributing to the FA	90
7.i2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ.....	90
7.i3) Methods applied	90
7.i4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources.....	90
7.i5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings.....	91
7.i6) Conclusions and recommendations	94
7.j) CEQ10-4C - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the prevention of soil erosion and improvement of soil management?	94
7.j1) List of measures contributing to the FA	95
7.j2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ.....	95
7.j3) Methods applied	95
7.j4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources.....	96
7.j5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings.....	96
7.j6) Conclusions and recommendations	98
7.k) CEQ11-5A - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to increasing efficiency in water use by agriculture?	99
7.l) CEQ12-5B - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to increasing efficiency in energy use in agriculture and food processing?	99
7.l1) List of measures contributing to the FA	100
7.l2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ.....	100
7.l3) Methods applied	100
7.l4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources.....	100
7.l5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings.....	101
7.l6) Conclusions and recommendations	102
7.m) CEQ13-5C - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to the supply and use of renewable sources of energy, of by-products, wastes, residues and other non-food raw material for purposes of the bio-economy?.....	102
7.m1) List of measures contributing to the FA	103
7.m2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ.....	103
7.m3) Methods applied	103
7.m4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources.....	103
7.m5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings.....	104
7.m6) Conclusions and recommendations	105
7.n) CEQ14-5D - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to reducing GHG and ammonia emissions from agriculture?	105
7.n1) List of measures contributing to the FA	106

7.n2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ.....	106
7.n3) Methods applied	106
7.n4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources.....	106
7.n5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings.....	107
7.n6) Conclusions and recommendations	109
7.o) CEQ15-5E - To what extent have RDP interventions supported carbon conservation and sequestration in agriculture and forestry?	109
7.o1) List of measures contributing to the FA	110
7.o2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ.....	110
7.o3) Methods applied	110
7.o4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources.....	110
7.o5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings.....	110
7.o6) Conclusions and recommendations	112
7.p) CEQ16-6A - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the diversification, creation and development of small enterprises and job creation?	113
7.p1) List of measures contributing to the FA	114
7.p2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ.....	114
7.p3) Methods applied	114
7.p4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources.....	114
7.p5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings.....	115
7.p6) Conclusions and recommendations	116
7.q) CEQ17-6B - To what extent have RDP interventions supported local development in rural areas?.....	116
7.q1) List of measures contributing to the FA	117
7.q2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ.....	117
7.q3) Methods applied	117
7.q4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources.....	117
7.q5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings.....	118
7.q6) Conclusions and recommendations	120
7.r) CEQ18-6C - To what extent have RDP interventions enhanced the accessibility, use and quality of information and communication technologies (ICT) in rural areas?.....	121
7.r1) List of measures contributing to the FA	122
7.r2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ.....	122
7.r3) Methods applied	122
7.r4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources	122
7.r5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings.....	122
7.r6) Conclusions and recommendations.....	124

7.s) CEQ19-PE - To what extent have the synergies among priorities and focus areas enhanced the effectiveness of the RDP?	124
7.s1) Programme synergies and transverse effect.....	125
7.s2) Methods applied	125
7.s3) Quantitative findings based on the calculation of secondary contributions of operations to focus areas	126
7.s4) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings	126
7.s5) Conclusions and recommendations.....	127
7.t) CEQ20-TA - To what extent has technical assistance contributed to achieving the objectives laid down in Art. 59(1) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 and Art. 51(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013?.....	127
7.t1) Support for technical assistance (other than NRN)	128
7.t2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ.....	128
7.t3) Methods applied	129
7.t4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources.....	129
7.t5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings.....	129
7.t6) Conclusions and recommendations	131
7.u) CEQ21-RN - To what extent has the national rural network contributed to achieving the objectives laid down in Art. 54(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013?.....	131
7.u1) Intervention logic of the NRN	132
7.u2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ.....	132
7.u3) Methods applied	133
7.u4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources.....	133
7.u5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings.....	133
7.u6) Conclusions and recommendations	136
7.v) PSEQ01-FA - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas	137
7.w) PSEQ02-FA - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas	137
7.x) PSEQ03-FA - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas	137
7.y) PSEQ04-FA - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas	137
7.z) PSEQ05-FA - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas..	137
7.aa) PSEQ01-TOPIC - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic	137
7.bb) PSEQ02-TOPIC - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic	138
7.cc) PSEQ03-TOPIC - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic	138
7.dd) PSEQ04-TOPIC - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic	138

7.ee) PSEQ05-TOPIC - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic	138
8. IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIONS TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE PRINCIPLES SET OUT IN ARTICLES 5, 7 AND 8 OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013.....	139
8.a) Promotion of equality between men and women and non-discrimination (Article 7 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013)	139
8.b) Sustainable development (Article 8 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013).....	139
8.c) The role of the partners referred to in Article 5 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 in the implementation of the programme.....	141
9. PROGRESS MADE IN ENSURING INTEGRATED APPROACH TO USE EAFRD AND OTHER UNION FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS.....	142
10. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS (ARTICLE 46 OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013).....	143
11. ENCODING TABLES FOR COMMON AND PROGRAMME-SPECIFIC INDICATORS AND QUANTIFIED TARGET VALUES.....	144
Annex II	145
Annex III.....	157
Documents	160

1. KEY INFORMATION ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME AND ITS PRIORITIES

1.a) Financial Data

See annexed documents

1.b) Common and programme-specific indicators and quantified target values

1.b1) Overview table

Focus Area 1A						
Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T1: percentage of expenditure under Articles 14, 15 and 35 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 in relation to the total expenditure for the RDP (focus area 1A)	2014-2016			0.19	5.03	3.78
	2014-2015			0.13	3.44	

Focus Area 1B						
Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T2: Total number of cooperation operations supported under the cooperation measure (Article 35 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013) (groups, networks/clusters, pilot projects...) (focus area 1B)	2014-2016			4.00	1.75	229.00
	2014-2015			1.00	0.44	

Focus Area 1C						
Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T3: Total number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (focus area 1C)	2014-2016			12,118.00	114.14	10,617.00
	2014-2015			9,227.00	86.91	

Focus Area 2A							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T4: percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP support for investments in restructuring or modernisation (focus area 2A)		2014-2016	3.09	18.90	3.09	18.90	16.35
		2014-2015	2.39	14.62	2.39	14.62	
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	1,569,790.70	114.79	1,409,139.39	103.04	1,367,508.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	1,476,068.22	24.60	116,309.33	1.94	6,000,000.00
M04	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	23,341,460.12	46.23	21,410,364.44	42.40	50,490,765.00
M06	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			206,717.66	8.61	2,400,000.00
M13	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	82,092,159.34	29.81	67,520,238.91	24.52	275,400,000.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	905,982.38	14.43	663,747.70	10.57	6,278,759.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	109,385,460.76	31.99	91,326,517.43	26.71	341,937,032.00

Focus Area 2B							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T5: percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP supported business development plan/investments for young farmers (focus area 2B)		2014-2016	0.31	113.41	0.31	113.41	0.27
		2014-2015	0.11	40.24	0.11	40.24	
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	240,000.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	369,017.05	30.75	29,077.33	2.42	1,200,000.00
M06	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	8,740,695.35	106.51	7,370,956.39	89.82	8,206,586.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016					960,000.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	9,109,712.40	85.89	7,400,033.72	69.77	10,606,586.00

Focus Area 3A							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T6: percentage of agricultural holdings receiving support for participating in quality schemes, local markets and short supply circuits, and producer groups/organisations (focus area 3A)		2014-2016	14.69	94.56			15.54
		2014-2015	14.69	94.56			
Percentage of total agri-food businesses supported under Article 17 of the Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (Percentage of total number of agri-food businesses)		2014-2016			6.29	48.38	13.00
		2014-2015					
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M03	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	960,652.73	115.31	954,324.72	114.55	833,124.00
M04	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	22,291,529.95	31.20	17,413,174.55	24.37	71,449,137.00
M14	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	5,514,031.74	86.98	5,260,959.18	82.99	6,339,147.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	789,774.76	6.27	908,296.08	7.21	12,600,000.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	29,555,989.18	32.40	24,536,754.53	26.90	91,221,408.00

Focus Area 3B							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
Number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (Number of participants trained)		2014-2016					530.00
		2014-2015					
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	366,167.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	184,508.53	15.38	14,538.66	1.21	1,200,000.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016					360,000.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	184,508.53	9.58	14,538.66	0.75	1,926,167.00

Priority P4							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T13: percentage of forestry land under management contracts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion (focus area 4C)		2014-2016			1.74	4.58	37.99
		2014-2015			1.03	2.71	
T11: percentage of forestry land under management contracts to improve water management (focus area 4B)		2014-2016			1.74	4.58	37.99
		2014-2015			1.03	2.71	
T8: percentage of forest/other wooded area under management contracts supporting biodiversity (focus area 4A)		2014-2016			1.74	4.58	37.99
		2014-2015			1.03	2.71	
T12: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion (focus area 4C)		2014-2016			11.78	61.57	19.13
		2014-2015			11.78	61.57	
T10: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts to improve water management (focus area 4B)		2014-2016			10.88	54.95	19.80
		2014-2015			10.88	54.95	
T9: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts supporting biodiversity and/or landscapes (focus area 4A)		2014-2016			12.63	55.56	22.73
		2014-2015			12.63	55.56	
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	720,000.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	1,107,051.16	11.53	87,232.00	0.91	9,600,000.00
M04	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	10,212,479.26	9.35	5,773,807.31	5.29	109,200,000.00
M08	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	56,889,082.04	55.42	50,717,595.82	49.40	102,660,000.00
M10	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	84,766,293.46	32.05	78,513,850.26	29.68	264,513,847.00
M11	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	7,647,673.49	50.98	5,374,139.10	35.83	15,000,000.00
M13	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	82,092,159.34	29.81	67,520,238.90	24.52	275,400,000.00
M15	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	8,016,497.58	31.07	7,604,891.88	29.48	25,800,000.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	14,130,000.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	250,731,236.33	30.69	215,591,755.27	26.39	817,023,847.00

Focus Area 5B							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
Number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (Number of participants trained)		2014-2016					1,050.00
		2014-2015					
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	423,884.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	553,525.58	23.06	43,616.00	1.82	2,400,000.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	960,000.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	553,525.58	14.63	43,616.00	1.15	3,783,884.00

Focus Area 5C							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
Number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (Number of participants trained)		2014-2016					265.00
		2014-2015					
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	180,000.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016					1,200,000.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016					120,000.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	1,500,000.00

Focus Area 5D							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T18: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts targeting reduction of GHG and/or ammonia emissions (focus area 5D)		2014-2016			10.88	46.93	23.18
		2014-2015			10.88	46.93	
T17: percentage of LU concerned by investments in live-stock management in view of reducing GHG and/or ammonia emissions (focus area 5D)		2014-2016					1.32
		2014-2015					
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	180,000.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	1,200,000.00
M04	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	23,400,000.00
M10	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	54,000,000.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016					120,000.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	78,900,000.00

Focus Area 5E							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T19: percentage of agricultural and forest land under management contracts contributing to carbon sequestration and conservation (focus area 5E)		2014-2016			8.71	53.98	16.14
		2014-2015			8.70	53.92	
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	240,000.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016					1,200,000.00
M08	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	39,804,326.36	19.63	26,083,737.82	12.87	202,730,754.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	810,000.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	39,804,326.36	19.42	26,083,737.82	12.72	204,980,754.00

Focus Area 6A							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T20: Jobs created in supported projects (focus area 6A)		2014-2016			17.00	100.00	17.00
		2014-2015			17.00	100.00	
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M06	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	1,277,950.78	168.13	1,186,101.40	156.04	760,106.00
M08	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	264,145.92	22.01	171,109.53	14.26	1,200,000.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	1,542,096.70	78.67	1,357,210.93	69.24	1,960,106.00

Focus Area 6B							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T23: Jobs created in supported projects (Leader) (focus area 6B)		2014-2016					551.00
		2014-2015					
T22: percentage of rural population benefiting from improved services/infrastructures (focus area 6B)		2014-2016					10.14
		2014-2015					
T21: percentage of rural population covered by local development strategies (focus area 6B)		2014-2016			86.76	100.01	86.76
		2014-2015			86.76	100.01	
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M07	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	6,074,289.00	67.49	5,805,013.68	64.50	9,000,215.00
M19	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	16,642,824.70	16.13	12,849,619.12	12.45	103,200,000.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	22,717,113.70	20.25	18,654,632.80	16.63	112,200,215.00

Focus Area 6C							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T24: percentage of rural population benefiting from new or improved services/infrastructures (ICT) (focus area 6C)		2014-2016					0.88
		2014-2015					
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M07	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	10,800,000.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	10,800,000.00

1.c) Key information on RDP implementation based on data from a) and b) by Focus Area

This is the second Annual Implementation Report (AIR) on the Scotland Rural Development Programme (SRDP) 2014-2020 for the calendar year 2016.

This report is prepared for and submitted to the European Commission (EC) in accordance with Article 75 of Regulation (EC) No 1305/2013 and Article 50 Regulation (EC) No 1303/2013.

The SRDP was submitted for approval by the European Commission in October 2014 and approved on 26 May 2015 under Commission Decision C(2015)3489.

The Scottish Government's Agriculture, Food and Rural Communities Directorate (SGAFRC) is the Managing Authority for the SRDP. The Scottish Government's Rural Payments and Inspections Directorate (SGRPID) is the paying agency for the SRDP.

The SRDP 2014-2020 will be delivered by 16 schemes:

- Agri-Environment Climate Scheme – Measures 4, 8, 10, 11 and 15 under Focus Area 4, and Measure 4 under Focus Area 5D;
- Beef Efficiency Scheme – Measure 10 under Focus Area 5D;
- Broadband – Measure 7 under Focus Area 6C
- Crofting Agricultural Grant Scheme – Measures 4 and 16 under Focus Area 2A;
- Environmental Co-operation Action Fund – Measure 16 under Focus Area 4;
- Farm Advisory Service – Measure 2 under Focus Areas 2A, 2B, 3B, 4, 5B, 5C, 5D and 5E;
- Food Processing, Marketing and Co-operation – Measures 4 and 16 under Focus Area 3A;
- Forestry Grant Scheme – Measure 4 under Focus Area 2A, Measures 4, 15 and 16 under Focus Area 4, Measures 8 and 16 under Focus Area 5E and Measure 8 under Focus Area 6A;
- Improving Public Access – Measure 7 under Focus Area 6B;
- Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund – Measures 1 and 16 under Focus Areas 2A, 2B, 3B, 4, 5B, 5C, 5D and 5E;
- LEADER – Measure 19 under Focus Area 6B;
- Less Favoured Area Support Scheme – Measure 13 under Focus Areas 2A and 4;
- New Entrants Capital Grant Scheme – Measure 4 under Focus Area 2A;
- New Entrants Start-Up Grant Scheme – Measure 6 under Focus Area 2A;
- Small Farms Grant Scheme – Measure 4 under Focus Area 2A; and
- Young Farmers Start-Up Grant Scheme – Measure 6 under Focus Area 2B.

During 2016 the majority of schemes approved new projects under the 2014-2020 Programme. While projects were approved under the Beef Efficiency Scheme (BES), the Improving Public Access (IPA) Scheme and LEADER there was no expenditure on new projects in 2016. The expenditure will start in 2017 for these approved projects. While the Farm Advisor Service (FAS) launched in September 2016 the first beneficiaries will be advised in 2017.

Two schemes neither approved nor funded projects during 2016, they are the Broadband Scheme and the Environmental Co-operation Action Fund (ECAAF). Community Broadband Scotland, part of Highlands and Islands Enterprise, who deliver the scheme are currently working with 15 projects. It is expected that the first applications and approvals will occur during 2017.

The ECAAF was suspended during 2016. During a routine internal audit by one of the scheme's delivery

partners, concerns were raised regarding the compliance of this scheme with EU regulations. The ECAF is a new scheme being delivered under a new and extremely complex element of the Common Agricultural Policy. It is subject to stringent audit requirements, which the Scottish Government must comply with.

Every attempt was made to design a compliant scheme and throughout the design process the scheme team tried to balance making the scheme simple and flexible for applicants with making it compliant with EU legislation.

Feedback from recent audits both in Scotland and other member states made the Scottish Government aware that EC auditors were likely to interpret the legislation differently than had been expected during the design of the scheme. As a result there were concerns that sufficient evidence had not been gathered at the application stage of the ECAF.

At this point the Scottish Government wrote to applicants informing them that more information may be required, however, all parties involved in the delivery of the scheme were still very much focused on finding a way to go ahead with the projects already approved wherever possible.

The decision to withdraw the current round of the scheme was not taken lightly. Time was taken to thoroughly explore any possible actions to resolve the compliance issues and to determine if they would be accepted by EC auditors.

Ultimately the decision was reached that any mitigating actions would not be acceptable to EC auditors and that it was necessary to withdraw the ECAF funding for this round of applications. Had the contracts been issued and auditors had found them to be non-compliant the Scottish Government would have faced financial penalties and would have been expected to recover any monies paid out under non-compliant contracts.

The Scottish Government remain committed to the ECAF and are working to address the compliance issues. The aim is to relaunch the ECAF in 2017.

Around half of the realised expenditure in 2016 was for commitments made under the 2007-2013 Programme, when there were different reporting requirements. It has not therefore been possible to populate some of the tables with the required data. For example, for Measure 14 the number of livestock units supported is a reporting requirement for the 2014-2020 Programme. The expenditure under Measure 14 is an on-going commitment relating to Measure 215 from the 2007-2013 Programme. For Measure 215 there was no requirement to record the number of livestock units supported. In addition, for some indicators the Scottish Government was not able to report the required requirements under the 2007-2013 Programme and this will continue to be the case for these on-going commitments.

Also, each LEADER project has to be allocated a predominant Focus Area with a different reporting requirement attached to each of the Focus Areas. All the LEADER projects actually funded since the start of the 2014-2020 Programme period were on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme. As a result, these projects do not have a predominant Focus Area allocated to them. Therefore the LEADER data items that will be used to monitor contributions to all of the Focus Areas are not available for these projects.

Committed Expenditure

Table A shows that in 2016, all the 15 measures that have been programmed under the SRDP 2014-2020 have had been expenditure committed against them.

In 2016, there was a committed expenditure of €168.1. Of this expenditure 44% was committed to Measure 13, 19% to Measure 8 (over 80% of which has been committed to Sub-Measure 8.1), a further 12% to Measure 10, and 8% to Measure 4. All other measures have had less than 5% of total committed expenditure in 2016 committed to them.

The Financial Annex of this report shows the total public expenditure (EAFRD and national funding) paid during 2016, as opposed to the expenditure that has been committed. In total there has been a realised expenditure of €113.7 million. Of the total expenditure, 40% (€45.6 million) was on Measure 13. With a further 19% (€21.7 million) of expenditure on Measure 8, 14% (€16.0 million) on Measure 10 and 8% (€9.5 million) on Measure 4. As to be expected these figures are in line with the committed expenditure figures shown in Table A.

Common and Programme-Specific Indicators

Focus Area 1A

There is one target indicator under Focus Area 1A which is the percentage of expenditure under Measures 1, 2 and 16 in relation to the total planned expenditure of the Programme.

From the start of the 2014-2020 Programme period until the end of 2016, there was a total expenditure of just over €1.4 million under Measure 1, around €0.3 million under Measure 2 and a further €1.6 million under Measure 16.

In the first three years of the 2014-2020 Programme there has been a total expenditure of almost €3.3 million under Measures 1, 2 and 16. This is 0.19% of total planned expenditure of the Programme. This compares to a target value of 3.78%. This compares to 0.13% of planned expenditure in the first two years of the Programme. Of the expenditure under these three measures, 84% relate to commitments made under the 2007-2013 Programme. As more new projects are approved and funded under the 2014-2020 Programme greater progress will be made towards this target.

Focus Area 1B

The target indicator under Focus Area 1B relates to the total number of co-operation operations supported under Measure 16, which is the measure that support co-operation. The target is to support 229 co-operation projects during the lifetime of the Programme.

A number of schemes will be utilising Measure 16: the Crofting Agricultural Grant Scheme (CAGS), the Environmental Co-operation Action Fund (ECAAF), the Food Processing, Marketing and Co-operation (FPMC) Scheme, the Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS) and the Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF). In 2016, three new co-operation projects were funded under KTIF. In addition one co-operation project, which was a commitment made under the 2007-2013 Programme, has also been supported since the start of the Programme. This is 1.75% of the target of 229 co-operations to be supported.

Focus Area 1C

Under Focus Area 1C there is a target indicator to train 10,617 participants under Measure 1. It should be noted that individuals can be counted more than once if they participate in more than one training event.

In the first three years of the 2014-2020 Programme the target has been exceeded as 12,118 participants have been trained, this is 114% of the target. All of the training has been as a result of commitments made

under the previous Programme. The vast majority of which has been delivered by the KTIF (11,820 participants trained) through commitments made under the Skills Development Scheme (SDS), which is the predecessor to the KTIF. Going forward it is expected that the different delivery mechanisms of the KTIF (through Measures 1 and 16) will result in a slowing of the increase in the number of participants being trained in future years compared to the first two years of the Programme as commitments made under the 2007-2013 Programme come to an end. This is borne out by what was seen in 2016 where 2,891 participants were trained (2,887 as a result of KTIF) compared to the 9,227 participants were trained (8,933 as a result of KTIF) in 2014 and 2015.

Focus Area 2A

There is one target indicator under Focus Area 2A and it is the percentage of agriculture holdings that have been given support for investment in restructuring or modernisation. This will be delivered under Measure 4 by three schemes: the CAGS, the New Entrants Capital Grant Scheme and Small Farms Grant Scheme. There are also commitments that were made under the Rural Priorities (RP) and Land Managers Options (LMO) Scheme from the 2007-2013 Programme that will support investment in restructuring or modernisation to agriculture holdings in the 2014-2020 Programme period.

Under the 2014-2020 Programme, 1,614 agriculture holdings have been given support for investment in restructuring or modernisation so far, with 362 holdings being supported in 2016. This is 3.09% of the total number of agricultural holdings, with the target being to support 16.35% during the Programme. Just over 60% of the total number of holdings that have been supported so far have been supported though the CAGS (983 holdings supported).

All of the six measures programmed under Focus Area 2A have now had expenditure recorded against them. In total there has been a committed expenditure of €109.4 million and a realised expenditure of €91.3 million. Around three quarters of both the committed and realised expenditure has been on Measure 13.

It should be noted that the committed expenditure (€1.6 million) and realised expenditure (€1.4 million) for Measure 1 under Focus Area 2A are both higher than the current planned spend for this measure for the whole Programme period (€1.4 million). This is due to commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme being higher than expected. This will be taken into consideration when the Programme undergoes future review.

Focus Area 2B

There is also one target indicator under Focus Area 2B. This target is for the percentage of agriculture holdings that have been supported with business development plans/investment for young farmers. This support is delivered through the Young Farmers Start-up Grant Scheme (YFSUGS) as well as commitment made under the 2007-2013 Programme made under the RP Scheme.

By the end of 2016 support had been given to 164 young farmers. This is the 0.31% of the total number of agriculture holdings, compared to the target of 0.27%. The fact that the target has been exceeded after the first three years of the Programme is a result of a much higher than anticipated uptake of the YFSUGS. The uptake in the first three years of the Programme has been greater than the anticipated uptake for the whole Programme period. A higher than expected number of on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme has also contributed to the target having already been met.

There are four measures programmed under Focus Area 2B, but only two, Measure 2 and 6, have had any expenditure so far during the 2014-2020 Programme period.

There has been a committed expenditure of €0.4 million but only a realised expenditure of around €29,000 for Measure 2. While for Measure 6, there has been a committed expenditure of €8.7 million and a realised expenditure of €7.4 million.

It should be noted that the committed expenditure (€8.7 million) for Measure 6 under Focus Area 2B is higher than the current planned spend for this measure for the whole Programme period (€8.2 million). This is due to higher than expected level of uptake for support for young farmers. The realised expenditure is also already almost 90% of the planned expenditure during the Programme. This will be taken into consideration when the Programme undergoes future review.

Focus Area 3A

There are two targets that relate to Focus Area 3A, one of which is a Programme specific target. The first target is based on the percentage of agricultural holdings that receive support for participating in quality schemes, local markets and short supply chains, and producer groups/organisations.

The vast majority of agricultural holdings that will receive support for participating in quality schemes, local markets and short supply chains, and producer groups/organisations will be funded through commitments that were made under the 2007-2013 Programme by the LMO Scheme. These commitments are now starting to come to an end. The remaining few holdings will be supported by the FPMC Scheme, which has only supported one holding so far.

The percentage of agricultural holdings that have received support for participating in quality schemes, local markets and short supply chains, and producer groups/organisations during the 2014-2020 Programme period is 14.69%. This compares to the target value of 15.54%. Most of the holdings are being supported through commitments made during the 2007-2013 Programme via Measure 3. Measure 3 is not being supported by any of the new or continuing schemes that make up the SRDP 2014-2020. As a result it is to be expected that the target value has already nearly been achieved in the first three years of the Programme as the on-going commitments will lessen as the Programme period continues.

The Programme specific target is based on the percentage of total agri-food businesses supported under Measure 4. This Programme specific target was introduced as part of the second modification of the 2014-2020 Programme. As a result this is the first time the target will be reported against.

So far during the 2014-2020 Programme period, 55 operations holdings have been given support for investments in processing/marketing and/or development of agricultural products. All but two of these operations have been supported by the FPMC Scheme. The remaining two are commitments made under the 2007-2013 Programme made under the RP Scheme. This shows that 6.29% of agri-food businesses have been supported, with the target being to support 13.14% during the lifetime of the Programme.

All four of the measures programmed under Focus Area 3A have had expenditure in the first three years of the Programme. In total there has been a committed expenditure of €29.6 million and a realised expenditure of €24.5 million. Of the committed expenditure 75% has been against Measure 4. The percentage of realised expenditure for Measure 4 is slightly lower at 71%.

It should be noted that both the committed and realised expenditure (both approaching €1.0 million) for Measure 3 under Focus Area 3A are higher than the current planned spend for this measure for the whole Programme period (€0.8 million). This is due to commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme being higher than expected. This will be taken into consideration when the Programme undergoes future review.

Focus Area 3B

There is one Programme specific target indicator for Focus Area 3B, which is the number of participants trained under Measure 1. Measure 1 will be delivered by the KTIF. In the first three years of the 2014-2020 Programme, the KITF expenditure was only on on-going commitments made by the SDS under the 2007-2013 Programme, and this expenditure has solely been under Focus Area 2A. As a result there had been no participants trained under Measure 1 for Focus Area 3B by the end of 2016.

There are three measures programmed under Focus Area 3B, but only Measure 2 has had any committed or realised expenditure to date. The level of this expenditure has been low, with €0.2 million being committed and only around €14,500 being realised.

Priority 4

There are six target indicators for Priority 4. Three of which relate to agricultural land under management contracts and three that relate to forest/other wooded area under management contracts.

Agriculture:

- Percentage of agricultural land under managements contacts supporting biodiversity and/or landscapes;
- Percentage of agricultural land under managements contacts to improve water management; and
- Percentage of agricultural land under managements contacts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion.

The AECS scheme will fund all the agricultural land under management contracts that will contribute to these three targets. All of agricultural land that has been under management in the thirist years of the Programme has been due to on-going commitments made under the 2007-2013 Programme. In addition to the agricultural land under management via Measure 10, the agricultural land under management via Measure 11 will also contribute to the targets supporting biodiversity and soil management.

By the end of 2016, 701,939 Ha of agricultural land had been under management contracts that support biodiversity. The target of 22.73% of agricultural land has been more than half met in these two years, with it standing at 12.63%.

The target for the agricultural land under management contracts to improve water management has also been more than half met. With 10.88% (604,241 Ha) of agricultural land under management contracts compared to the target of 19.80%.

The area of agricultural land under management contacts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion is 654,300 Ha. This is 11.78% of the total agricultural land. As with the other two agricultural land indicators, the target of 19.13% has been more than half met so far during the 2014-2020 Programme period.

Forest:

- Percentage of forest/other wooded area under managements contacts supporting biodiversity and/or landscapes;
- Percentage of forestry land under managements contacts to improve water management; and
- Percentage of forestry land under managements contacts to improve soil management and/or prevent

soil erosion.

The same forest/other wooded area under management contracts contribute to the three forestry related target indicators under Priority 4. The majority of the forestry land under management will be funded by the FGS, with some additional funding coming from the AECS. Almost all of the forestry land that has been under management so far during the 2014-2020 Programme has been due to on-going commitments made under the 2007-2013 Programme; predominantly from the RP Scheme but with a smaller area of land under contract as a result of the LMO Scheme. In 2016, 582 ha started to be managed as a result of the FGS.

In total, 24,604 Ha of forestry land has been under management contracts during the 2014-2020 Programme period. This is 1.74% of the total forest and other wooded land. The target percentage for all three of the forestry target indicators is 37.99%. Only limited progress has been made towards these targets. The FGS scheme started to fund new projects in 2016 and as these projects start to be implemented, it is anticipated that more progress will be made toward achieving these three targets.

It should be noted that during the data collection process for the 2016 AIR an inconsistency was discovered in the data returns for the 2014 and 2015 AIR for Measure 8. In some case the Focus Area had been wrongly attributed. This has been adjusted in the data held by the Scottish Government and as a result the forestry area under management under Priority 4 has decreased. There has been a corresponding increase for Focus Area 5E. This has then resulted in a reduction in the percentage of forest under management in the period of 2014 to 2016 compared to the period of 2014 and 2015.

There are nine measures programmed under Priority 4, seven of which have had expenditure committed and programmed so far. There has been a committed expenditure of €250.7 million and a realised expenditure of €215.6 million. More than half of both the total overall committed expenditure and the total overall realised expenditure has been for Priority 4, with high levels of committed and realised expenditure for Measures 8, 10 and 13.

Focus Area 5A

No measures and therefore expenditure are programmed under Focus Area 5A in the 2014-2020 SRDP.

Focus Area 5B

There is one Programme specific target indicator for Focus Area 5B, which is the number of participants trained under Measure 1. Measure 1 will be delivered by the KTIF. In the first three years of the 2014-2020 Programme, the KITF expenditure was only on on-going commitments made by the SDS under the 2007-2013 Programme, and this expenditure has solely been under Focus Area 2A. As a result there had been no participants trained under Measure 1 for Focus Area 5B by the end of 2016.

There are three measures programmed under Focus Area 3B, but only Measure 2 has had any committed or realised expenditure to date. The level of this expenditure has been low, with €0.6 million being committed and only around €43,600 being realised.

Focus Area 5C

There is one Programme specific target indicator for Focus Area 5C, which is the number of participants trained under Measure 1. Measure 1 will be delivered by the KTIF. In the first three years of the 2014-2020 Programme, the KITF expenditure was only on on-going commitments made by the SDS under the 2007-2013 Programme, and this expenditure has solely been under Focus Area 2A. As a result there had been no

participants trained under Measure 1 for Focus Area 5C by the end of 2016.

There are three measures programmed under Focus Area 5C, but none of them have had either committed or realised expenditure to date.

Focus Area 5D

For Focus Area 5D there are two target indicators one relating to livestock units (LU) and the other to agricultural land under management contracts.

The LU target indicator is the percentage of LU concerned by investments in livestock management in view of reducing Greenhouse Gas GHG and/or ammonia emissions. This will be delivered by the AECS under Measure 4. There have been no operations supported under Measure 4 and Focus Area 5D by the end of 2016. As a consequence there have been no LU under management with a view of reducing GHG and/or ammonia emissions, so no progress towards the target value of 1.32% has been made.

The other target indicator is for the percentage of agricultural land under management contracts which targets the reduction of GHG and/or ammonia emissions. The agricultural land under management contracts that contributes to this target is the land under management contracts as a result of the Beef Efficiency Scheme (BES) as well as relevant agricultural land under management funded under Priority 4. While the BES was launched in 2016, no payments were made to beneficiaries so none of the land that will be under management as a result of the scheme has been recorded so far. Only the agricultural land under management contracts funded under Priority 4 has contributed towards achieving the target. So far the agricultural land under management under Priority 4 is all as a result of on-going commitments made under the 2007-2013 Programme.

In the first three years of the 2014-2020 Programme period, 604,660 Ha of agricultural land has been under management contracts which targets the reduction of GHG and/or ammonia emissions, 10.88% of the total agricultural land. This is approaching half of the target value of 23.18% of total agricultural land.

There are five measures programmed under Focus Area 5D, but none of them have had either committed or realised expenditure to date..

Focus Area 5E

For Focus Area 5E there is one target indicator which is the percentage of agricultural and forest land that is under management contracts to contribute to carbon sequestration and conservation. In addition to the area afforested under Sub-Measure 8.1 and the area to support agro-forestry systems under Sub-Measure 8.2 that are programmed under Focus Area 5E the relevant agricultural land under management funded under Priority 4 contributes to this target.

In the first three years of the 2014-2020 Programme, all the agricultural land that is under management contacts and is contributing to carbon sequestration and conservation are due to on-going commitments made under the 2007-2013 Programme. The vast majority of forest land under management contacts that is contributing to carbon sequestration and conservation is due to on-going commitments made under the 2007-2013 Programme, although 800 ha under management is a result of the FGS.

To date, 606,928 Ha of agricultural and forest land have been under management contacts and are contributing to carbon sequestration and conservation. This is 8.71% of the total agricultural and forest land. This compares to the target value of 16.14%. In the first three years of the Programme slightly more than

half of the target has been achieved.

There are four measures programmed under Focus Area 5E, but only Measure 8 have had any expenditure associated with it so far during the 2014-2020 Programme period. There has been a committed expenditure of €39.8 million and a realised expenditure of €26.1 million for Measure 8.

Focus Area 6A

The target indicator for Focus Area 6A is the number of jobs created in supported projects. In the first three years of the Programme, there were 17 jobs created in supported projects. Of the jobs created 15 were for males and two for females. There were no new jobs created in 2016.

The target was to create 17 jobs during the Programme, therefore the target has been attained. This target solely relates to commitments made under the previous Programme which will lessen and then stop as the 2014-2020 Programme period progresses. This is why the target was reached after the first two years of the Programme.

There are two measures programmed under Focus Area 6A, both of which have had expenditure to date. For Measure 6, there has been a committed expenditure of €1.3 million and a realised expenditure of €1.2 million. It should be noted that both the committed and realised expenditure for Measure 6 under Focus Area 6A are higher than the current planned spend for this measure for the whole Programme period (€0.8 million). This is due to commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme being higher than expected. This will be taken into consideration when the Programme undergoes future review.

The expenditure for Measure 8 has been at a lower level so far. To date there has been a committed expenditure of €0.3 million and a realised expenditure of €0.2 million.

Focus Area 6B

There are three target indicators under Focus Area 6B, two of which relate to LEADER. The LEADER focused targets indicators are the percentage of the rural population covered by local development strategies and the number of jobs created in projects supported by LEADER.

The 21 Local Actions Groups (LAGs) supported by the SRDP 2014-2020 cover a rural population of 2,100,000. This is equivalent to 86.76% of the total rural population. In the period covered by this report, there were no new LEADER projects funded. As a result there have been no new jobs created in LEADER supported projects.

The third target indicator relates to the Improving Public Access (IPA) Scheme and is the percentage of the rural population benefiting from improved services/infrastructure. In this case the support for new and upgraded paths for public use. By the end of 2016, while projects had been approved, there had been no projects where payments have been made to beneficiaries under the IPA Scheme. Therefore, there has been no progress made towards achieving the target.

There are two measures programmed under Focus Area 6B, both of which have expenditure recorded against them. The total committed expenditure under Focus Area 6B is €22.7 million, with the realised expenditure being €18.7 million. Just over two thirds of both the committed expenditure has been for Measure 19 with the remaining third being for Measure 7.

Focus Area 6C

The target indicator under Focus Area 6C relates to the Broadband Scheme and the percentage of the rural population benefiting from new or improved services/infrastructures on Information and Communications Technology (ICT). As there has been no expenditure on this scheme since the start of the Programme no progress has been made towards achieving the target.

Only Measure 7 is programmed under Focus Area 6C and all of the expenditure will be related Broadband Scheme. No projects had been approved under the scheme by the end of 2016, as such there has been no committed or realised expenditure to date.

1.d) Key information on achievements towards the milestones set in the performance Framework based on Table F

There are 13 Performance Framework Indicators but only 11 of them are applicable to the SRDP 2014-2020, due to what is programmed under the Programme. In addition the SRDP 2014-2020 has three Alternative Performance Framework Indicators. The Alternative Indicators highlight areas where the SRDP 2014-2020 is programmed but are not captured by the standard Performance Framework Indicators. The indicators are split between Priorities 2 to 6, there are no indicators recorded under Priority 1, as follows:

- Priority 2 – two Indicators and one Alternative Indicator
- Priority 3 – two Indicators and one Alternative Indicator
- Priority 4 – two Indicators and one Alternative Indicator
- Priority 5 – two Indicators
- Priority 6 – three Indicators

The performance against the milestones for the different indicators are as follows:

Priority 2

The first indicator for Priority 2 is the ‘Total Public Expenditure’. In the first three years of the Programme there has been a realised expenditure of €98.7 million, this 28.00% of the target. Good progress is being made towards the 2018 milestone of 40%. Now that all schemes that contribute to Priority 2 are operational progress towards achieving the overall target and the 2018 milestone should continue to be made in future years.

The second indicator for Priority 2 is the ‘Number of agricultural holdings with RDP support for investment in restructuring or modernisation (Focus Area 2A) and the Number of holdings with RDP supported business development plan/investment for young farmers (Focus Area 2B)’. In the first three years of the Programme, 1,778 holdings have been supported. Of this over 90% (1,614 holdings) have been supported for investment in restructuring or modernisation and 164 have been supported for business development plan/investment for young farmers. This is 20.45% of the target to support 8,696 holdings during the lifetime of the Programme. This compares to a 2018 milestone of 40%. Good progress has been made towards the milestone. With some of the schemes that will contribute towards the target first supporting beneficiaries in 2016, it is anticipated that progress towards the overall target, as well as the 2018 milestone, will continue in future years of the Programme.

The third indicator for Priority 2 is the first of the Alternative Indicators and it is the ‘Area supported under

Measure 13 (Focus Area 2A)'. There is a similar Alternative Indicator for Priority 4. In Scotland, Measure 13 is currently delivered by the Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS). The scheme is an area based scheme where land has to be designated as less favoured to be eligible to receive support. The target area to be supported is 1,400,000 ha and in the first three years of the Programme 1,152,951 ha have been supported. This is 82.35% of the target and compares to the 2018 milestone value of 90%, so good progress has been made to reaching the milestone value. The high level of take up can be attributed to the scheme being well established having been carried forward from the previous Programme.

Priority 3

The first indicator for Priority 3 is the 'Total Public Expenditure'. In the first three years of the Programme there has been a realised expenditure of €24.6 million, this 26.36% of the target. Progress towards the 2018 milestone of 30% has been good over the first three years of the Programme

Most of the realised expenditure for Priority 3 has been the result of commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme under the Food Processing, Marketing and Co-operation (FPMC) and Land Manager Options (LMO) Schemes. The commitments relating to LMO under Measures 3 and 14 are purely transitional ones. As would be expected, most of the realised expenditure for these commitments have come in the early years of the 2014-2020 Programme and will eventually stop. The majority of the future expenditure will be as a result of the FPMC, which is popular scheme with applicants, so it would be expected that the 2018 milestone will be reached.

The second indicator for Priority 3 is 'Number of supported agricultural holdings receiving support for participating in quality schemes, local markets/short supply circuits, and producer groups (Focus Area 3A)'. The vast majority of agricultural holdings that will receive support for participating in quality schemes, local markets and short supply chains, and producer groups/organisations will be funded under Measure 3 through commitments that were made under the 2007-2013 Programme. These commitments are now starting to come to an end. Measure 3 is not being used for any new commitments under the 2014-2020 Programme. As such in the first three years of the Programme the overall Programme target and not just the 2018 milestone have almost been reached. There have been 7,684 holdings supported. This is 94.55% of the overall target of 8,127 holdings and more than double the 2018 milestone target of 40%. Further progress toward the overall target will be made in the coming years as more holdings are supported for participating in co-operation among supply chain actors for the establishment and development of short supply chains and local markets, and for promotion activities under the FPMC Scheme.

The third indicator for Priority 3 is an Alternative Indicators and it is 'Number of operations supported for investment (Focus Area 3A)'. There have been 55 operations supported for investment in the first three years of the Programme, this is 47.83% of the overall target of 115 operations. The 2018 milestone value for this target is 30%, which has already been exceeded. This is due to the high number of on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme. Progress towards achieving the overall target for the number of operations will continue to be made in future years as new operations are supported by the FPMC Scheme.

Priority 4

The first indicator for Priority 4 is the 'Total Public Expenditure'. In the first three years of the Programme there has been a realised expenditure of €215.6 million, this 26.78% of the target. This compares to a 2018 milestone value of 40%. As most of the expenditure for Priority 4 relates to annual recurrent payments, Measures 8, 10, 11, 13 and 15, it is to be expected that good progress towards the 2018 milestone has been made. Realised expenditure for LFASS (Measure 13) should again be high in 2017 and as other new

projects are approved and funded under Priority 4, particularly the Agri-Environment Climate and Forestry Grant Schemes, progress will continue to be made towards the 2018 milestone as well as the overall target in future years.

The second indicator for Priority 4 is the 'Agricultural land under management contracts contributing to biodiversity (Focus Area 4A), the Agricultural land under management contracts contributing to improving water management (Focus Area 4B) and the Agricultural land under management contracts contributing to improving soil management and/preventing soil erosion (Focus Area 4C)'. In the first three years of the Programme all the land under management that contributes to this indicator was as a result of on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme. From 2017 onwards area should start to be under management as a result of the Agri-Environment Climate Scheme (AECS). As the area under management is the result of multi-annual commitments the area will likely differ year on year as contracts expire and new ones come into effect.

In 2016, 606,907 ha were under management that contribute to this Indicator. This is 48.05% of the overall target of 1,263,000 ha. This compares to a 2018 milestone target of 40%. The 2018 milestone has been reached as this is due to the large number of on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme. In 2015, 1,192,566.63 ha were supported which illustrates that the commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme are decreasing. Once the new AECS contracts come into force the area under management should increase again towards the overall target of 1,263,000 ha to be under management.

The third indicator for Priority 4 is an Alternative Indicator and it is 'Area supported under Measure 13 (Priority 4)'. As seen previously, there is a similar Alternative Indicator for Priority 2. In Scotland, Measure 13 is currently delivered by the Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS). The scheme is an area based scheme where land has to be designated as less favoured to be eligible to receive support. The target area to be supported is 1,400,000 ha and in the first years of the Programme 1,152,951 ha has been supported. This is 82.35% of the target and compares to the 2018 milestone value of 90%, so good progress has been made to reaching the milestone value. The high level of take up can be attributed to the scheme being well established having been carried forward from the previous programme.

Priority 5

The first indicator for Priority 5 is the 'Total Public Expenditure'. In the first three years of the Programme there has been a realised expenditure of €26.1 million, this 9.04% of the target. Progress towards the milestone of 40% has been slow over the first three years of the Programme. As new projects are approved and supported under Priority 5, particularly with regard to the Agri-Environment Climate, Beef Efficiency and Forestry Grant Schemes, the realised expenditure under Priority 5 should increase in future years of the Programme starting in 2017. Thus allowing the 2018 milestone target to be met and then the overall target.

The second indicator for Priority 5 is the 'Agricultural and forest land under management to foster carbon sequestration/conservation (Focus Area 5E), the Agricultural land under management contracts targeting reduction of GHG and/or ammonia emissions (Focus Area 5D) and the Irrigated land switching to more efficient irrigation system (Focus Area 5A)'. Focus Area 5A is not programmed as part of the SRDP 2014-2020 so only the first two parts are applicable for Scotland.

By the end of 2016 3,568 ha of land was under management, all of which was forestry land. This is 1.76% of the total area to be supported. The 2018 milestone value is 40%. Over 80% of the overall land target to be under management of 202,600 ha relates to the BES. Once payments have been made to beneficiaries of the BES and the area under management is then recorded, due to be in 2017, progress towards the 2018

milestone target will be greatly increased.

Priority 6

The first indicator for Priority 6 is the ‘Number of operations supported to improve basic services and infrastructure in rural areas (Focus Areas 6B and 6C)’. These operations will be supported as a result of the IPA and Broadband Schemes as well as commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme. There have been a much larger number of operations supported as a result commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme that anticipated. Despite the fact that no operations have been supported by either the Improving Public Access (IPA) or Broadband Schemes yet, 1,102 operations have been supported in the first three years of the Programme. This is equivalent to 104.16% of the target. The anticipated number of operations that commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme was going to support was 881. In future years very few additional operations should be supported as a result of commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme. As the target has been reached already the 2018 milestone of 35% has also been greatly exceeded.

The second indicator for Priority 6 is the ‘Total Public Expenditure’. In the first three years of the Programme there has been a realised expenditure of €20.0 million, this 16.01% of the target. From 2017 onwards, as new LEADER projects start to be funded, as well as IPA and Broadband projects, this should increase realised expenditure under Priority 6 and result in improvement progress towards the 2018 milestone of 35%.

The third indicator for Priority 6 is for the ‘Population covered by Local Action Groups (LAGs) (Focus Area 6B)’. All 21 LAGs are in place and operational so the full 2.1 million of the Scottish population expected to be covered by LAGs are being covered. As a result the overall target, as well as the 2018 milestone, of 100% has been met.

1.e) Other RDP specific element [optional]

Not applicable.

1.f) Where appropriate, the contribution to macro-regional and sea basin strategies

As stipulated by the Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013, article 27(3) on the "content of programmes", article 96(3)(e) on the "content, adoption and amendment of operational programmes under the Investment for growth and jobs goal", article 111(3), article 111(4)(d) on "implementation reports for the Investment for growth and jobs goal", and Annex 1, section 7.3 on "contribution of mainstream programmes to macro-regional and sea-basin strategies, this programme contributes to MRS(s) and/or SBS:

- EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (EUSBSR)
- EU Strategy for the Danube Region (EUSDR)
- EU Strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian Region (EUSAIR)
- EU Strategy for the Alpine Region (EUSALP)
- Atlantic Sea Basin Strategy (ATLSBS)

1.g) Currency rate used for conversion AIR (non EUR countries)

--

2. THE PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE EVALUATION PLAN.

2.a) Description of any modifications made to the evaluation plan in the RDP during the year, with their justification

There were no modifications to the evaluation plan during the year.

2.b) A description of the evaluation activities undertaken during the year (in relation to section 3 of the evaluation plan)

During the third year of the programme activity continued to be undertaken to ensure the right data are collected so as to inform monitoring of the programme, and that there is appropriate oversight to inform the range of monitoring and evaluation activities to be undertaken throughout the programme.

The Monitoring & Evaluation Steering Group, established in 2015, has continued. Membership of the group includes Scheme Managers, the internal team (RESAS) overseeing programme evaluation activity and key external stakeholders who are particularly interested in monitoring and evaluation.

The Monitoring & Evaluation Steering Group held one meeting in April 2016 with an email update being sent to members of the Group in October 2016. The remit of the group is to oversee the range of monitoring and evaluation activity which will help ensure that information is available in a timely fashion to not only meet the reporting requirements of the EC, but to inform future decisions on the programme.

Part of the Monitoring & Evaluation Steering Group meeting held in April 2016 was a workshop on the Ex Post Evaluation of the Scotland Rural Development Programme 2007-2013, where members of the Group were able to contribute their views on the 2007-2013 Programme.

Given the scale of the agri-environment scheme within the Programme, a separate Monitoring and Evaluation sub-group has been established. Its primary focus in 2016 was the continued development of a framework for assessing agri-environment activity in the 2014-2020 Programme, building on the evidence developed throughout the 2007-2013 Programme. The second meeting of the Agri-Environment Sub-Group took place in January 2016. There are three different strands of work which are being taken forward:

- A multi-annual monitoring project. A contract was issued to the James Hutton Institute in June 2016 to monitor the effectiveness of Agri-Environment Climate Scheme (AECS) in delivering its intended environmental outcomes. The contract was terminated due to issues that arose in relation to the project methodology. However, the intention is to commission a replacement project.
- Bespoke projects to assess the likely effectiveness of AECS design in delivering key policy priorities.
- Identification of a set of indicators of success which can be used to supplement the indicators required by the EC which will demonstrate that the actions within the programme are having an impact.

In preparation for the move to Areas of Natural Constraint (ANC) in 2018, the Scottish Government undertook a review to inform the future design of ANC which will replace the existing Less Favoured Areas Support Scheme (LFASS). A range of specific projects looked at various aspects of the current LFASS

scheme and issues on moving towards ANC. This has drawn heavily on existing scientific work commissioned by the Scottish Government in recent years, and we specifically commissioned a panel of external experts who assessed the range of evidence being pulled together. This project was concluded in the Summer of 2016.

The Scottish Rural Network has a monitoring and evaluation plan, which sets out indicators linked to each of the SRN's objectives and details how the data for each indicator is captured and recorded. A database was developed in 2015 to record and report on data for all the common indicators. A complementary monitoring and evaluation spreadsheet was developed in 2016 to record data for all other indicators.

LEADER Monitoring is undertaken through the LARCs system which contains a series of common indicators alongside indicators specific to individual Local Development Strategies. The Scottish Rural Network has almost completed a Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit for Local Action Groups to help them ensure that their own Monitoring and Evaluation frameworks are fit for purpose.

2.c) A description of activities undertaken in relation to the provision and management of data (in relation to section 4 of the evaluation plan)

The programme of work, that started in the first two years of the Programme period, has continued to be undertaken to ensure that the right systems are in place and that the right information is collected and can be used in a timely manner to inform progress of the programme.

The Scottish Government's Information for Customers and Employees (ICE) team has continued to support Scheme Mangers, implementation colleagues and interested parties to develop an understanding of the performance data that they need to collect and store in the IT systems being developed. It remains the Scheme Mangers and implementation colleagues responsibility to ensure data are actually captured.

Once that data have been captured, ICE will make this data available to the schemes through the ICE reporting Hub. The work relating to this has progressed and data reports are now in development that will enable on-going scheme monitoring. These reports should provide data for AIRs as well as allow performance to be more easily reported, for example to the Rural Development operational Committee (RDOC).

This programme of work has sought to address some of the challenges at the beginning of the previous Programme where certain essential information was not collected. Furthermore, it is also starting to address the problem experienced in the previous Programme around being unable to draw out timely monitoring information which is essential to inform decisions over changes to the programme.

2.d) A list of completed evaluations, including references to where they have been published on-line

Publisher/Editor	The Scottish Government
Author(s)	EKOS
Title	Ex-Post Evaluation of the Scotland Rural Development Programme 2007-2013
Abstract	<p>This report presents the findings of the ex-post evaluation of the Scotland Rural Development Programme 2007-2013.</p> <p>The study was commissioned by the Scottish Government in December 2015 and was undertaken by EKOS Limited in collaboration with the Rural Development Company, P&L Cook and Partners, and Prof. Bill Slee.</p>
URL	http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2017/01/6318

Publisher/Editor	The Scottish Government
Author(s)	Rural Development Company
Title	Evaluation of Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS)/Development of Areas of Natural Constraint (ANC)
Abstract	<p>In anticipation of the transition from Less Favoured Areas (LFAs) to Areas of Natural Constraint (ANCs), the Scottish Government commissioned a desk-based evaluation of the Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS). The aim was to establish how LFASS currently meets the goals of the Rural Development Regulation and ANC working guiding principles, and to review the evidence and provide proposals for the development of the new ANC scheme.</p>
URL	http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2016/07/7247

2.e) A summary of completed evaluations, focussing on evaluation findings

There were two evaluations completed in 2016 – the Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS) review and the Ex-Post Evaluation of the Scotland Rural Development Programme (SRDP) 2007-2013. While the Ex-Post Evaluation of the SRDP 2007-2013 was completed and submitted to the EC in 2016 it was not published on the Scottish Government’s website until January 2017.

The findings of the LFASS review were as follows:

Land Abandonment

Agricultural abandonment of land has potential implications for commodity production, rural communities and environmental conditions. Although the pattern is uneven, agricultural census data and LFASS payment data indicate that abandonment has occurred in recent years, predominantly on poorer quality land and in more remote areas, both at field level and whole farm level.

This is despite on-going and increased support and reflects a number of factors, including market pressures, the decoupled nature of most payments and broader socio-economic changes. In some cases, abandonment may be temporary, in others more permanent. Moreover, whilst some instances of abandonment may generate additional environmental or recreational benefits, widespread abandonment is generally viewed as undesirable.

Payment distributions

Reflecting the historical headage basis for livestock support payments, per ha payment rates for both LFASS and the Single Farm Payment (SFP) have been higher on better quality land within the LFA than on poorer quality land. Although this remains the case, payment rates on poorer land have risen as a result of changes to LFASS and through the introduction of the new Pillar I Basic Payment Scheme (BPS). Consequently, total funding to more remote areas with poorer quality land has increased and will continue to do so as the BPS is phased in (provided that land is actually claimed). Funding to better quality land in more accessible areas within the LFA will, generally, decrease (unless it was lightly stocked historically).

Although the three-region model adopted for the BPS limits the degree of redistribution, the switch away from the historical SFP means that more extensive LFA cattle and sheep farms (in any region) will gain funding at the expense of more intensive LFA and non-LFA farms. Within each BPS region, the area-based nature of payments means that larger farms will receive higher total payments.

Sustainable Farming Systems

Excluding support payments, the net margins for livestock grazing enterprises across the LFA (and elsewhere) are typically negative. Moreover, gross margins are also often negative. This reflects underlying challenges to achieving profitability everywhere, but also variation across farms in terms of size and skills - lower quartile performers are markedly less efficient than upper quartile performers (indicating scope to improve through management and/or structural adjustments).

Hence, many LFA farm enterprises would not be sustainable in the absence of support payments - including LFASS but also other Pillar II schemes and, especially, Pillar I payments. However, care should be taken to distinguish between individual enterprises and their host farm businesses/households which may have multiple sources of income. Size also matters in that small-scale enterprises can contribute only modestly (via revenues or area payments) to total income, even if run efficiently.

Income Foregone and Additional Costs

Concepts of income foregone and additional costs arising from operating in an LFA are intuitively appealing. Indeed, the absence of certain farming activities from the LFA reflects the relative profitability of different enterprises. However, this means that types of activities observed within an LFA have evolved endogenously to suit their circumstances. As such, their cost structure cannot be easily compared with activities elsewhere that have evolved under different circumstances - they are different enterprises.

For example, whilst it is apparent that transportation distances and limited scope for producing fodder and straw locally can raise the unit costs of some inputs, the effect is not only on those unit costs but also on the type of management system adopted in terms of the intensity and mix of inputs deployed and of outputs generated. Consequently, systems may have different cost structures, but (reflecting the principle of equi-marginal returns) profitability may be more similar if expressed in terms of net (rather than gross) margins and if consideration is given to different denominators. For example, per animal, per ha, per labour unit or per £ of capital investment.

Conclusions

The advent of ANC is forcing many of the questions raised by previous debates about LFA policy to be revisited and presents an opportunity to address a number of unresolved concerns. However, broader rural development objectives and SG National Performance Framework outcomes, plus overarching EU objectives such as economic growth, social cohesion and climate change, all now have greater prominence. As such, any future LFA-type policy should be shaped less by previous policies and more by intervention logic and commitment to delivering against clear and justifiable objectives.

Unfortunately, decoupled payments are at best a weak and blunt tool for influencing land management in ways likely to deliver on the stated policy objectives. Specifically, by imposing only weak conditionality on how land is managed, LFA/ANC policy has little leverage on the occurrence or intensity of management activities or their knock-on effects with respect to production, retaining jobs and skills or delivering environmental benefits. Moreover, a focus on biophysical constraints alone is insufficient to calculate the "appropriate level of support" through additional cost/income foregone calculations. Notwithstanding EU-level endorsement of ANCs, their underlying logic is itself also not compelling if considered in a broader context.

Consequently, given budget limits and ANC rules, although various design options for designations and payment rates can be constructed, none are likely to deliver satisfactorily on policy aims nor to avoid significant redistribution from existing support patterns. Ultimately, if the European Commission's rules around ANCs do not permit the degree of targeting and conditionality required to address specific policy objectives and redistribution is unavoidable anyway, it may be that other policy instruments available under both Pillars of the CAP would be more suitable and that at least a proportion of funding currently directed through LFASS could be better deployed in other ways. Sustainable rural development is unlikely to be secured through denial of the pressures for structural adjustments and continuation of the existing approach.

The findings of the Ex-Post Evaluation of the SRDP 2007-2013 are as follows:

The SRDP intervention logic was considered by most stakeholders to be appropriate to the needs identified in rural Scotland. The logic was robust, especially at Programme level. Most Measures were well chosen to address some of the key weaknesses identified at the outset and during the Programme period. The consistency of the SRDP with national rural policy priorities was also confirmed.

The SRDP 2007-2013 spent a public sector budget of €1,425m (99% of its allocated resources), making a

100% use of its EAFRD allocations (€678m).

The 2008 Spending Review and a depreciation of Sterling against the Euro resulted in a significant reduction of financial allocation to the Programme, which was reduced by a third (33%) of its original public sector resources. The European Economic Recovery Plan later added funding to selected Measures to address some of the needs of the rural economy following the economic crisis. As all available funding was taken up, the demand for SRDP funding was confirmed and was widely felt of having contributed significantly to sustaining employment in agricultural holdings.

The significant strategic emphasis of the Programme on environmental interventions (74% of total SRDP spend) was a direct response to the long-term decline in farmland biodiversity and the condition of many designated sites and was in close strategic alignment with Scottish policy direction thereby addressing important current needs.

Through the budget alterations the SRDP experienced a narrowing of focus on four individual Measures (spending nearly three quarters (72%) of total SRDP budget). This set clear strategic priorities focusing on: the modernisation of agricultural holdings; payments to farmers in areas with handicaps; agri-environment payments; and first forest afforestation of agricultural land.

Regarding those interventions targeted at improving the rural economy, the SRDP was largely seen as a vitally important support mechanism for farm and forestry holdings and rural businesses in difficult and uncertain times when confidence levels were low.

The inclusion of farm and forestry holdings as well as rural businesses was relevant and appropriate with a focus on supporting diversification and growth.

The delivery mechanism of the SRDP utilised a number of established schemes, but also tried to implement new integrated approaches through schemes such as Rural Priorities and tried to address regionalisation of resource allocations through new RPAC bodies.

Although the rationale of the implementation approach to link established support schemes with an integrated SRDP approach was good, it proved ambitious in light of the complexity of the online application processes in place. The approach could have been transformational but needed to be much better targeted and more actively facilitated to achieve this aspiration. At the end, the complexity of the approach potentially hindered more people from applying rather than supported a learning process.

Similarly, the RPAC approach was seen as highly beneficial in joining up agency interventions, but was largely ineffective due to lack of devolved decision-making powers and weaknesses in the appraisal of applications.

A further major challenge for the ex-post evaluation was the quality of the monitoring data sets and particularly the target setting, which was one of the Programme's greatest weaknesses. This limited the extent to which an assessment could be made regarding the Programme's effectiveness in achieving its outputs and results effectively and efficiently.

The calculation of unit costs, for example, demonstrates that in a number of cases, the SRDP seemed to have changed its original approach towards supporting more people but in a more light-touch manner (although other areas of the Programme evidence the opposite approach particularly in Axis 3 for non-agricultural businesses).

Despite the weaknesses, there was consensus that the SRDP has been substantially important to the

participating businesses and rural communities and a number of aspects were thought to have worked particularly well, including the Programme's focus on the Food and Drink sector and the Monitor Farm Programme.

Primary research findings indicate that the aims and objectives of the SRDP, particularly with regard to introducing innovative approaches and helping the agricultural and forestry industries to restructure and modernise, were achieved successfully by increasing businesses' capacities and productivity and therefore influencing business sustainability.

Apart from LFASS the bureaucracy of the SRDP was perceived as a key obstacle and challenge for most applicants/beneficiaries, raising questions over the Programme's efficiency in delivery.

Also with regard to LEADER, the efficiency of the programme suffered considerably from a heavy policy compliance burden which in turn placed demands on LAG staff's capacity to work more intensively with their rural communities.

In terms of achieving results, the importance of the SRDP in sustaining and safeguarding jobs was emphasised by respondents throughout the ex-post evaluation primary research.

Surveys of beneficiaries throughout the Programme period showed that the majority of respondents reported positive effects on their business efficiency, output, quality and competitiveness. Much of the SRDP investment was considered effective in terms of additionality.

The support was relevant to beneficiary needs and the results of the support were substantial but were not clearly evidenced by the CMEF indicators as they were unable to capture the range of results achieved. Over and above performance of LEADER was not added to the monitoring data, thereby remaining under-reported.

Regarding impact, economic impact assessment estimates that the SRDP has created or safeguarded between 30,400 to 33,400 jobs and between £1.03bn and £1.12bn of GVA. The wider primary research suggests that the majority of jobs were safeguarded rather than created.

Axis 1 and Axis 3 interventions had a direct focus on creating and maintaining economic growth and job impact and have achieved this with an average cost per job between £11,000 and £11,800 for Axis 1, and between £18,700 and £21,200 for Axis 3.

In terms of environmental impact, limited monitoring and survey data availability necessitated to draw from perceptions of stakeholders and previous studies. Here, it was thought that some agri-environment options of the SRDP were well used and almost certainly contributed to species recovery (e.g. Corn bunting). A significant number of new hedgerows were established. However, the Farmland Bird Index, the key impact indicator, declined slightly over the period, with some component species, especially upland waders, faring very badly.

It is also thought that new afforestation will most likely reduce GHG emissions, but other Axis 2 measures, especially LFASS might counteract this and may well increase emissions. LFASS was a major contributor to protecting jobs in remote areas but its environmental benefits are more questionable. NPIs are likely to have enhanced water quality in priority catchments. Soil quality remains compromised by falling soil carbon levels and erosion risk over significant areas.

Regarding targets, one of the main issues was the basis and realism of the targets, which was acknowledged by the Managing Authority but never fully resolved. The issue was more about the determination of targets

than the performance itself.

Finally, the conclusions of the ex-post evaluation note, that while there was little time to address failings during the Programme period, the evaluation team and stakeholders feel that lessons have been learnt and that the new SRDP is currently benefiting from a new system and better guidance.

2.f) A description of communication activities undertaken in relation to publicising evaluation findings (in relation to section 6 of the evaluation plan)

Reference shall be made to the evaluation plan, any difficulties encountered in implementation shall be described, together with solutions adopted or proposed.

Date / Period	13/10/2016
Title of communication activity/event & topic of evaluation findings discussed/ disseminated	Publication and promotion of ‘Summary for Citizens’ for Annual Implementation Report for 2014 and 2015.
Overall organiser of activity/ event	The summary was produced by the Scottish Government and shared/promoted by the Scottish Rural Network.
Information channels/ format used	Published on Scottish Government website, article on Scottish Rural Network website and shared through the weekly Rural Network newsletter
Type of target audience	Key stakeholders, beneficiaries and members of the public. The SRN newsletter was issued to 1,126 people. Article on SRN website - https://www.ruralnetwork.scot/news-and-events/news/summary-citizens-report-srdp-available
Approximate number of stakeholders reached	1126
URL	http://createsend.com/t/i-060E91423DCE00B1

Date / Period	16/06/2016
Title of communication activity/event & topic of evaluation findings discussed/ disseminated	ANC Stakeholder Workshop which included a presentation on the Evaluation of Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS)/Development of Areas of Natural Constraint (ANC).
Overall organiser of activity/ event	The event was hosted by the Scottish Government and organised and facilitated by the SRN.

Information channels/ format used	Presentation and workshops to discuss options for future ANC support. In addition the evaluation, and the summary of the event were promoted by the SRN.
Type of target audience	Around thirty attendees from targeted key stakeholder groups were invited to participate, covering a full range of background and interests including farming, land, environment, crofting, enterprise, and local authorities.
Approximate number of stakeholders reached	30
URL	http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0050/00503441.pdf

2.g) Description of the follow-up given to evaluation results (in relation to section 6 of the evaluation plan)

Reference shall be made to the evaluation plan, any difficulties encountered in implementation shall be described, together with solutions adopted or proposed.

<p>Evaluation result relevant for follow-up (Describe finding & mention source in brackets)</p>	<p>Since the ANC workshop Ministers have taken the decision to continue with LFASS payment, using the opting within the regulation to deliver 80% LFASS payments from 2018. Prior to taking this decision Ministers took on board the variety of view and stakeholder position prepared at the ANC workshop, listening closely to their views, and then held further dialogue with industry representatives to consider the impacts of ANC and LFASS parachute payments before making this decision.</p>
<p>Follow-up carried out</p>	<p>As above.</p>
<p>Responsible authority for follow-up</p>	<p>Managing authority</p>

3. ISSUES WHICH AFFECT THE PERFORMANCE OF THE PROGRAMME AND THE MEASURES TAKEN

3.a) Description of steps taken to ensure quality and effectiveness of programme implementation

The SRDP 2014-2020 will remain under continual review throughout the Programme period. As part of the governance procedures, key aspects of the Programme are reported to and considered by the Rural Development Operational Committee (RDOC) and Joint Programme Monitoring Committee (JPMC) which each meet twice a year. Standing items on the agenda for the RDOC (the technical committee to the JPMC) include the provision of scheme information, communications, finance and monitoring and evaluation. It is intended that the recommendations from the Ex-post Evaluation of the SRDP 2007 - 2013 will also become part of the the consideration of the RDOC. RDOC papers are made publically available of the SG SRDP web pages.

The second modification to the programme was submitted to the EC in December 2016. The main focus of this was to allow technical changes to the text and rates for the Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme (AECS); to refine and clarify the support offered. These changes were identified as issues through the delivery of the scheme. The modification included some clarifications of the text for AECS rates following an audit of the scheme. A number of the changes were introduced to provide more detailed information for inspectors and applicants. Changes to the rates were undertaken to avoid the risk of overcompensation where a rate appeared to be high; or revised in the case of winter stubbles to reflect average rates for spring and autumn sowing. The Programme was also updated to provide new information about State Aid cover for the Broadband and Forestry Grant schemes and had some editorial changes to correct. The RDOC and JPMC were both advised of the proposed amendments.

The Information and Publicity Strategy, agreed in 2015, was updated in 2016. Scheme information is available on the Rural Payment and Inspections website (RPID, where guidance is presented in a consistent and customer friendly way. More information on the Information and Publicity Strategy can be found in section 4 of the AIR.

A particular issue for programme implementation is the Error Rate Action Plan, which was originally agreed with the Commission in September 2014 and reflected the root causes of the high error rates during the 2007-2013 programme period and the actions planned to address these. The Plan has been updated iteratively to include new risks identified and further audit findings of EC and ECA missions.

Whilst many aspects of the original Action Plan are complete, a number of the actions taken will only improve error rates once they have had the time to 'bed in'.

The Plan will continue to be updated and dialogue is ongoing with the European Commission.

3.b) Quality and efficient delivery mechanisms

Simplified Cost Options (SCOs) ¹, proxy automatically calculated

	Total RDP financial allocation [EAFRD]	[%] planned SCO coverage out of the	[%] realised expenditure through SCO out of total RDP

		total RDP allocation ²	allocation (cumulative ³)
Fund specific methods CPR Article 67(5)(e)	844,685,131.00	59.90	16.06

¹ Simplified Cost Options shall be intended as unit cost/flat rates/lumps sums CPR Article 67(5) including the EAFRD specific methods under point (e) of that article such as business start-up lump sums, flat rate payments to producers organisations and area and animal related unit costs.

² Automatically calculated from programme version's measures 06, 09, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18

³ Automatically calculated from declarations of expenditure's measures 06, 09, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18

E-management for beneficiaries [optional]

	[%] EAFRD funding	[%] Operations concerned
Application for support		
Payment claims		
Controls and compliance		
Monitoring and reporting to the MA/PA		

Average time limits for beneficiaries to receive payments [optional]

[Days] Where applicable, MS deadline for payments to beneficiaries	[Days] Average time for payments to beneficiaries	Comments

4. STEPS TAKEN TO IMPLEMENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND PROGRAMME PUBLICITY REQUIREMENTS

4.a) Action taken and state of play as regards the establishment of the NRN and the implementation of its action plan

4.a1) Actions taken and state of play as regards establishment of the NRN (governance structure and network support unit)

The Head of the Scottish Rural Network has strategic oversight of the NRN and the Network Support Unit. The EU Rural Development Policy Team in Scottish Government operates as the Managing Authority (MA), with responsibility for signing off the plans, monitoring delivery and performance and participating in NRN activities, where appropriate.

The Action Plan for 2014-2020 was approved by the Rural Development Operational Committee (RDOC) in April 2015, with an updated Plan agreed by the RDOC in October 2016.

An annual planning cycle has now been established, involving stakeholder engagement to help identify priorities for the annual work programme. Each annual work programme is approved by the MA, with the RDOC and JPMC having an opportunity to offer comments and feedback on it.

Network Support Unit

The Network Support Unit (NSU), based within Scottish Government, has been set up to provide a dedicated staff resource for the successful delivery of the NRN's Action Plan and individual activities. The new NSU was established in April 2015. There are six members of staff in the NSU funded under Technical Assistance:

- Network Manager
- Event Coordinator
- Website and Social Media Officer
- Communications Officer
- Cooperation and LEADER Development Officer
- Finance and Business Manager

The Head of Unit is also involved in supporting and delivering some of the NRN's activities, but their salary is not funded under Technical Assistance.

4.a2) Actions taken and state of play as regards the implementation of the action plan

An Annual Work Programme was drawn up which set out the planned activities of the Scottish Rural Network (SRN) for 2016-17, and this was supported by the SRN Communication and Monitoring and Evaluation Plans. The Work Programme forms part of the SRDP Annual Communications Strategy, with a single activity planner that sits across the SRN and all the SRDP schemes.

Some of the key activities undertaken by the NRN in 2016 are outlined below:

- Production of a film about the LEADER programme (<https://vimeo.com/158084555>), featuring six

LEADER projects;

- Areas facing Natural Constraint (ANC) stakeholder workshop (<https://www.ruralnetwork.scot/news-and-events/news/papers-areas-facing-natural-constraint-event-available>) in June;
- Publication of 17 SRDP project case studies (<https://www.ruralnetwork.scot/case-studies>), including projects funded under LEADER, KTIF, FPMC and FGS;
- Production of short animation about the SRDP (<https://vimeo.com/171831498>);
- Development day for the new Moray Local Action Group (<https://www.ruralnetwork.scot/news-and-events/news/event-report-moray-lag-development-day>) in September;
- Rural Parliament project visits (<https://www.ruralnetwork.scot/news-and-events/news/broadband-priority-following-scottish-rural-parliament>) and ‘Celebrate Rural Scotland’ (<https://www.ruralnetwork.scot/news-and-events/news/photo-competition-winner-revealed>) photo competition October;
- Launch of new SRN Funding Search (<https://www.ruralnetwork.scot/funding/srn-funding-search>) in December (provides information on more than 1,000 funds available in rural areas);
- Organised exhibition space to promote the SRDP and LEADER programme at the Rural Parliament in October and at the Gathering in February; and
- Continued to issue weekly rural newsletter to just under 1,200 subscribers and monthly LEADER newsletter to 230 subscribers.

In addition the SRN has undertaken networking and engagement at a UK and EU level:

- UK - we have continued to work with the other UK NRNs and the Irish NRN to share knowledge and good practice and to identify opportunities for harmonisation across the RDPs, particularly in relation to LEADER cooperation. The SRN convened and chaired two meetings of UK NRNs – in June and in December 2016.
- Europe – The SRN participated in 21 ENRD and EIP events in 2016. The SRN also coordinated the attendance of stakeholders from Scotland at a number of international events related to rural development, including LINC2016 in Hungary and the Swedish Rural Parliament.

4.b) Steps taken to ensure that the programme is publicised (Article 13 of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 808/2014)

The Information and Publicity Strategy was established in early 2015, prior to the approval of the SRDP and alongside the launch of the first schemes, to ensure that communications plans were in place to inform stakeholders, customers, potential beneficiaries and all delivery partners of progress with the SRDP. The Strategy was presented to the Joint Programme Monitoring Committee (JPMC) at their meeting in May 2015, and then again for formal approval in November 2015 after Commission approval of the SRDP, as required by Article 13 of EU Regulation No 808/2014. The Information and Publicity strategy was updated in 2016 and shared with members of the JPMC in May 2016.

Communications in 2016 continued to raise the awareness of each of the schemes, the procedures of applying, selection criteria, process and timetables for approvals and payments. The UK referendum on EU membership required good communications to all stakeholders to ensure that they understood how this impacted on the SRDP, and to provide reassurance that the SRDP continued to operate. Two separate funding guarantees for EU funding, including the SRDP, were provided by the UK Government in August and October. Significant effort was put into explaining the impact of these to stakeholders, and after the second guarantee promoting the SRDP as ‘business as usual’. EU and UK level engagement has continued

through regular informal meetings, bilaterals and formal meetings such as the Rural Development Council and the Annual Examination Meeting.

Over 40 press releases or news articles that are relevant to the SDRP have been produced by the Scottish Government to ensure stakeholders, applicants and potential beneficiaries are aware of information relating to individual schemes, the Single Application form and updates following the EU referendum in June 2016.

In addition, to this two Parliamentary debates have been held to look at the future of the rural economy and rural funding.

The Farm Advisory Service (FAS) (<https://www.fas.scot/>) was launched in September 2016 and was widely promoted. There are two elements to the FAS: the Advice line and one-to-many advice; and the One-to-one advice. Since the launch the process for providing advice and training for advisors has been established. FAS will deliver Integrated Land Management Plans, specialist advice, carbon audits and mentoring.

The SRDP was launched alongside wider CAP Reforms, which drew resources towards the delivery of Pillar 1 payments. This has continued to impact on the processing and delivery of SRDP grant schemes despite concerted efforts to minimise delays, and ensure customers and stakeholders were aware of these challenges. This communication included the loan provision put into place for LFASS 2015 to provide security to farming and crofting businesses.

In addition to the specific communications around the SRDP, the Rural Payments and Services website (<https://www.ruralpayments.org/publicsite/futures/>) has been available from January 2015; providing a single point of information for all CAP support, including scheme guidance and information on inspections, breaches and penalties and appeals and complaints. The Rural Payments and Services SRDP scheme pages (<https://www.ruralpayments.org/publicsite/futures/topics/all-schemes/>) have around 248,000 page views with Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme and Forestry Grant Scheme pages being the most visited pages. The Scottish Government's SRPD webpages (<http://www.gov.scot/Topics/farmingrural/SRDP>) have received over 224,000 page views.

Other avenues for ensuring customers are updated include:

- Royal Highland Show wider engagement with the agricultural community in June 2016. The Royal Highland Show has over 150,000 visitors each year and is an excellent platform to inform customers of the strategic plans for CAP delivery.
- The Rural Payments and Inspections Division: Communications team established a process which streamlined existing communications processes and centralised guidance following staff feedback. The site captures staff feedback for continuous improvement and, for audit purposes creates a Comms archive to ensure that staff are equipped to provide the most updated lines to share with customers.
- Customer mailings – communication team co-ordination to ensure consistency of messaging, focus on customer centric approach.

5. ACTIONS TAKEN TO FULFIL EX ANTE CONDITIONALITIES

5.a) Unfulfilled criteria of general ex-ante conditionalities

General ex-ante conditionality	Criterion
--------------------------------	-----------

5.b) Actions taken to fulfil applicable general ex-ante conditionalities

General ex-ante conditionality	Criterion	Actions to be taken	Deadline	Body responsible for fulfilment	Actions taken	Date of fulfilment of the action	Commission position	Comments
--------------------------------	-----------	---------------------	----------	---------------------------------	---------------	----------------------------------	---------------------	----------

5.c) Unfulfilled criteria of priority-linked ex-ante conditionalities

Priority-linked ex-ante conditionality	Criterion
--	-----------

5.d) Actions taken to fulfil applicable priority-linked ex-ante conditionalities

Priority-linked ex-ante conditionality	Criterion	Actions to be taken	Deadline	Body responsible for fulfilment	Actions taken	Date of fulfilment of the action	Commission position	Comments
---	------------------	----------------------------	-----------------	--	----------------------	---	----------------------------	-----------------

5.e) (Optional) additional information to complement the information provided on the 'actions taken' table

No unfulfilled criteria of general ex-ante conditionalities are defined in the RDP

6. DESCRIPTION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF SUB-PROGRAMMES

The SRDP 2014-2020 does not include any sub-programmes.

7. ASSESSMENT OF THE INFORMATION AND PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING THE OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAMME

7.a) CEQ01-1A - To what extent have RDP interventions supported innovation, cooperation and the development of the knowledge base in rural areas?

7.a1) List of measures contributing to the FA

There are no measures programmed under this Focus Area.

Measures programmed under other Focus Areas, but which contribute to the objectives of this Focus Area, are:

- M01 - Knowledge transfer and information actions (art 14);
- M02 - Advisory services, farm management and farm relief services (art 15); and
- M16 - Co-operation (art 35).

7.a2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ

Judgment criteria	Common result indicator	Additional result indicator
RDP projects have been innovative and based on developed knowledge	T1: percentage of expenditure under Articles 14, 15 and 35 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 in relation to the total expenditure for the RDP (focus area 1A)	
Operational groups have been created		
Variety of partners involved in EIP operational groups		Number and types of partners involved in cooperation projects
Innovative actions have been implemented and disseminated by the EIP operational groups		Number of supported innovative actions implemented and disseminated by EIP operational groups

7.a3) Methods applied

This CEQ has been answered using a combination of monitoring data provided to the evaluators by the Scottish Government and qualitative input from interviews carried out with relevant Scottish Government officials and/or written submissions from them. Stakeholders were requested to provide written feedback based on a set of questions developed from the judgement criteria and qualitative adaptations of the indicators. This information has been used to provide additional context.

7.a4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources

Indicator type	Indicator code and name (unit)	Ratio	Indicator value	Calculated gross	Calculated net value	Data and information sources
----------------	--------------------------------	-------	-----------------	------------------	----------------------	------------------------------

				value		
Common result indicator	T1: percentage of expenditure under Articles 14, 15 and 35 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 in relation to the total expenditure for the RDP (focus area 1A)	Yes	0.19%			
Result	Number of supported innovative actions implemented and disseminated by EIP operational groups	No	13.00			Indicator O16: 13 operations performed by 3 group. The groups have 15 members: 4 advisors, 8 NGOs, 2 research institutes, and 1 other (other public bodies).
Result	Number and types of partners involved in cooperation projects	No	1.00			Indicator O17 (non-EIP): 'Measure 16.4 - support for co-operation among supply chain actors for the establishment and development of short supply chains and local markets, ...'. Partners are across the Scottish crop sector, including farmers and processors.

7.a5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings

The impacts in this Focus Area have been indirect in that the Measures are programmed elsewhere. This makes assigning impacts imprecise as it is not clear what proportion of impacts from Measures programmed elsewhere should be recorded here.

7.a5.a) Answer to evaluation question

According to the Scottish Government, the following schemes contribute to the objectives of this Focus Area, although none are programmed under it:

- M01: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF);
- M02: Farm Advisory Service (FAS);
- M16: Environmental Co-operation Action Fund (ECAAF);
- M16: Crofting Agricultural Grants Scheme (CAGS);
- M16: Food Processing, Marketing and Co-operation Scheme (FPMC);
- M16: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS);
- Rural Priorities (2007-2013) (RP); and
- Land Managers Options (2007-2013) (LMO).

Financial inputs and output data

A total of €1,409,139 has been spent to the end of 2016 under Measure 1 (allocated to Focus Area 2A) which is relevant to supporting innovation, cooperation and the development of the knowledge base in rural areas (O1). Of this, €1,282,563 has been spent under the KTIF, €17,193 under RP and €109,383 under LMO. The KTIF therefore accounted for 91% of relevant expenditure.

Some €290,773 has been spent under Measure 2 (allocated to various Focus Areas) to the end of 2016.

A further €1,572,044 has been spent under Measure 16 (Focus Areas 2A and 3A) to the end of 2016.

It is not possible to determine what proportion of the money allocated under other Focus Areas is linked to activities which are relevant to Focus Area 1A.

Measure 1.1 has supported 2,252 actions/operations relevant to support for vocational training and skills acquisition out of a total of 2,252 (1,967 of these, 87%, related to KTIF). Some 285 actions were supported under Measure 1.1 legacy schemes from the 2007-2013 programming period (33 under RP and 252 under LMO (O3)).

The combined number of training days offered to the end of 2016 under Measure 1.1 was 16,121, 15,797 of which were offered under KTIF (98%) (O11). Some 324 training days were offered under the legacy schemes (72 under RP and 252 under LMO).

These training days were utilised by 12,118 participants (these are not necessarily unique participants and it is likely that some beneficiaries attended more than one course; unique beneficiary data are not collected). In line with the distribution of resources and training days, the majority (98%) of participants were trained under the KTIF (O12). No support has been recorded for demonstration activities and information actions under Measure 1.2 or for short-term farm and forest management exchange, including farm and forest visits (Measure 1.3); the evaluators were told by the Scottish Government that these sub-measures were originally programmed, but it is likely they will be removed in a future modification.

Measure 2 (sub-measure 2.3: FAS) offered support for the training of advisors through 12 actions/operations, programmed under various Focus Areas to the end of 2016 (O3). Through these actions, training was provided to 416 advisors (O14).

Measure 16 (non-European Innovation Partnership (EIP)) has so far supported 1 holding (O9) in 1 co-operation activity (O17) (Measure 16.4 - support for co-operation among supply chain actors for the establishment and development of short supply chains and local markets, and for promotion activities).

With respect to EIP activity, Measure 16 has supported 1 group undertake 3 co-operation operations to the end of 2016.

Qualitative assessment

Discussions and submissions from Scottish Government and agency staff have focused in the extent to which their particular schemes have supported innovation, cooperation and development of the knowledge base in rural areas. The material collected has been arranged by scheme.

Measure 1: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

KTIF is funded under Measure 1, which covers skills development and knowledge transfer, and Measure 16, sub-measure 16.1 (cooperation).

Innovation is supported by the KTIF through grants to operational groups which fall under the European Innovation Partnership (EIP) initiative (operational support rather than capital items). The total KTIF budget was €14.4 million for the 2014-2020 period, €2.4 million of which covered legacy agreements. According to a Scottish Government official, this is a relatively small pot of money. To date, seven operational groups have been formed corresponding with seven projects (out of a total of 15) related to innovation and to economic performance. The total value of the 15 projects approved to date is €5.46 million, of which €2.65 million relates to innovation (100% funded for operational costs). Innovation projects can relate to completely new ideas or to existing ideas used in a new context. All aspects of innovation are covered (economic, social, environmental). Most projects are of three or four years'

duration, and Scottish Government officials pointed out that there is a lag time before benefits will be seen.

A summary of the projects supported was provided to the evaluators. Examples of innovation projects include: **Live lambs**, where the objective is to increase lamb survival rates; **Skinny milk**, where the intention is to utilise lean management techniques in dairy farms which have formed an association with a dairy in Dumfries where they are trying to optimise their relationship to produce the right quality content rather than focusing on quantity (this is also an example of both horizontal and vertical cooperation); and, **Monitor farms**, where some €1.5 million has been allocated to the nine monitor farms across Scotland.

A stakeholder confirmed that KTIF has provided for some innovative projects. A further example of the Farming with Nature project, contracted to the Soil Association, was provided. This is aimed at enhancing advice to and awareness of the importance of nature to farming. Innovative events under this project include ‘worming your way to profit’ (healthy farms and enhanced animal welfare leading to nature benefits) and ‘buzzing about grasslands’ (the importance of species rich grassland for pollinators). No information on the actual impact of supported initiatives was made available to the evaluators.

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

Projects under the one-to-many farm advisory service have sought to promote innovation by demonstrating novel and new practices. Examples include the use of laminar strips in soils to identify soil microbial activity; this provides a measure of soil biodiversity. Other examples include demonstrations of solar powered water pumps for livestock waterings, etc. (FAS has itself demonstrated an innovative approach by its use of modern social media techniques for distribution of information, including the FAS website in addition to on-farm meetings and events.) Again, evidence on impacts is not available at this point in time.

The ideas behind innovative projects have been drawn from a range of sources, mainly from existing/past research and consultancy experience. The more innovative ideas and novel practices are based on the latest research findings from main research providers in Scotland and further afield, and also from field work undertaken on focus farms as part of the FAS delivery. It is demonstrated on-farm and, where taken up by attendees at events, can bring benefits, although these have not been quantified at this stage.

The type and content of innovation is very broad. This can encompass the “tried and tested” which is innovative for some beneficiaries, but already practised by others. The use of soil analysis, soil profiling and soil biodiversity measures is one clear example of this type of innovation. In the area of new entrants to farming, there have been innovative discussions and presentations on joint-ventures, business management, etc. to inform potential new entrants of latest technologies and business practices. Other examples of the types of innovation used by beneficiaries include: precision farming techniques; the use of Estimated Breeding Values (EBV) for animal breeding and selection; the provision of electronic benchmarking data (farm management handbook); the use of milk recording techniques to improve animal welfare and performance; and, the promotion and demonstration of integrated pest management techniques. The impacts of these will need to be investigated in future evaluations.

The key factor determining the extent to which innovation and cooperation are taken up is the manner in which information is presented to beneficiaries. Knowledge transfer is achieved in many different forms, mainly by on-farm demonstration in events, workshops, seminars, etc., but also through the provision of technical notes, guidance notes, case studies as well as information on social media and websites. The dissemination of active and current datasets in a clear manner should be accompanied by benchmarks to encourage beneficiaries to measure their own performance. The extent to which this is done is unclear at this stage.

There are initiatives for both horizontal and vertical co-operation. Discussion groups and local meetings

with local attendance encourages cooperation between beneficiaries. Meetings are open to other parts of the supply chain, thereby encouraging and developing vertical cooperation.

In addition to the one-to-many activities under FAS, there are one-to-one services operated by a different delivery agent (RICARDO). These too can be expected to promote innovation.

Lantra manages the registration and quality assurance of professional advisors (under the Farm Business Advisor Accreditation Scheme for Scotland (FBAASS)) and these helped to develop the knowledge base of farmers under the Whole Farm Review Scheme. Under the new Scottish FAS they continue to do so, supported by specialist advisors, and benefit from online learning modules in support of their own continuous professional development. These advisors have impacts that relate to a large majority of Focus Areas.

Measure 16: Environmental Co-operation Action Fund (ECAF)

Sub-measure 16.5, ECAF, is intended to use a subject expert to bring land managers together to undertake co-operative activity, share knowledge and best practice. However, the scheme is undergoing a redesign and this redesigned form has not been launched yet.

A stakeholder told the evaluators that a key factor contributing to innovation, cooperation and the development of the knowledge base in rural areas is considered to be the relationship built between facilitator/adviser and farmer and the knowledge exchange that takes place. Excellent facilitators can bring about a sea change in the way in which landscape-scale outcomes are achieved and can motivate farmers to make a permanent change in their behaviour. This applies equally to the delivery of other parts of the SRDP. The ECAF model will test this approach in the delivery of seven key policy outcomes, such as vulnerable priority species; deer management; invasive non-native species; and, ecosystem restoration.

Measure 16: Forestry Grant Scheme

The link between sub-measure 16.5 and innovation and development of the knowledge base is relatively weak and no expenditure had been made to the end of 2016. However, the evaluators were told about innovative projects, for example, a solar drying kiln, which are under way. The main area where innovation takes place in the forestry isector is in harvesting and processing. Beneficiaries are also being encouraged to explore new market opportunities. Most of the support (which is spent on woodland creation) and also the woodland management element are less innovative.

There is a specific cooperation element under FGS. This is small-scale, but where a project requires to be delivered over multiple ownership, funding is available to facilitate this. This sort of cooperation also applies to roadbuilding which crosses multiple ownership.

Measure 16: Crofting Agricultural Grants Scheme (CAGS)

Funding under Measure 16 for CAGS will be used to facilitate the establishment of properly constituted common grazings committees. These committees will be responsible for managing and maintaining common grazing and committee members will be elected by the crofters themselves. This scheme therefore contributes to co-operation. There is no explicit link with innovation.

7.a6) Conclusions and recommendations

7.a6.a) Conclusion / Recommendation 1

Conclusion:

Though no Measures are programmed under this Focus Area, it is clear that there are expected impacts of SRDP interventions on innovation, cooperation and the development of the knowledge base in rural areas. However, it is difficult to quantify the impact on innovation at this stage, as many projects will take several years before outcomes will become evident.

Recommendation:

Steps should be taken so that the impact of innovation, cooperation and the development of the knowledge base in rural areas can be assessed by the time of the 2019 Enhanced AIR and the proposed *ex-post* evaluation. Attention should also be given to how impacts of Measures are allocated to this Focus Area given that none are programmed under it. For example, it would be useful to know the areas in which beneficiaries have received training.

7.b) CEQ02-1B - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the strengthening of links between agriculture, food production and forestry and research and innovation, including for the purpose of improved environmental management and performance?

7.b1) List of measures contributing to the FA

There are no measures programmed under this Focus Area.

Measures programmed under other Areas, but which contribute to the objectives of this Area, are:

- M16 - Co-operation (art 35).

7.b2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ

Judgment criteria	Common result indicator	Additional result indicator
		Number and types of partners involved in cooperation projects
Long term collaboration between agriculture, food production and forestry entities and institutions for research and innovation has been established	T2: Total number of cooperation operations supported under the cooperation measure (Article 35 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013) (groups, networks/clusters, pilot projects...) (focus area 1B)	
Cooperation operations between agriculture, food production and forestry and research and innovation for the purpose of improved environmental management and performance have been implemented		

7.b3) Methods applied

This CEQ has been answered using a combination of monitoring data provided to the evaluators by the Scottish Government and qualitative input from interviews carried out with relevant Scottish Government officials and/or written submissions from them. Stakeholders were requested to provide written feedback based on a set of questions developed from the judgement criteria and qualitative adaptations of the indicators. However, no responses relevant to this CEQ were received.

7.b4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources

Indicator type	Indicator code and name (unit)	Ratio	Indicator value	Calculated gross value	Calculated net value	Data and information sources
Common result indicator	T2: Total number of cooperation operations supported under the cooperation measure (Article 35 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013) (groups, networks/clusters, pilot projects...) (focus area 1B)	No	4.00			
Result	Number and types of partners involved in cooperation projects	No	16.00			Indicator O16: 13 operations performed by 3 groups. The groups have 15 members: 4 advisors, 8 NGOs, 2 research institutes, and 1 other (other public bodies).

						Indicator O17 (non-EIP): one industry body, who partners with farmers and processors.
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

7.b5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings

The main problem in answering this CEQ, which is very much to do with the links between agriculture and the research and innovation community, is that cooperation can contribute to this, but is not the entirety of the link. This means that schemes which draw funding under Measure 16 can also contribute to this link using funds drawn from other Measures. The answer provided here considers the schemes in the round and does not attempt strictly to relate only to the Measure 16 element.

Although stakeholders were asked to comment on this CEQ, no answers were submitted. This means that it has not been possible to contextualise and validate the information provided by the Scottish Government.

7.b5.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this Focus Area, although none are programmed under it:

M16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund; Food Processing, Marketing and Co-operation Scheme; Crofting Agricultural Grants Scheme (no payments made to date under this Measure); Forestry Grant Scheme (no payments made to date under this Measure); Environmental Co-operation Action Fund (no payments made to date under this Measure).

Financial inputs and output data

A total of €1,572,044 has been spent to the end of 2016 under Measure 16 relevant to the strengthening of links between agriculture, food production and forestry and research and innovation, including for the purpose of improved environmental management and performance. Of this, €693,495.58 was spent under KTIF (EIP, allocated to Focus Area 2A) and €878,548 under FPMC (sub-measures 16.2, 16.3 and 16.4, allocated to Focus Area 3A) (O1).

It should be noted that, because these expenditures are not programmed under this Focus Area, it is not possible to determine what proportion of the spend is actually linked to activities which are relevant here.

A total of 4 cooperation operations have been supported under the cooperation measure to the end of 2016.

Qualitative assessment

Measure 16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

The scheme, through its projects, helps fill gaps by better linking research outputs to tangible agricultural practice on the ground. The objective here is to make more use of research reports which often go unused. The emphasis is on encouraging the uptake of research on the ground. Some of the lessons learned are from research in Scotland, some are from best practice elsewhere. There is no specific attempt to link the stages of the agri-food sectors, the focus is very much on the utilisation of research. There have been no projects

covering vertical integration in the food sector.

Measure 16: Food Processing, Marketing and Co-operation Scheme

One activity has been supported to date under sub-measure 16.4 (see financial contribution above). A Scottish Government official told the evaluators that trade bodies, such as Quality Meat Scotland, are generally necessary to bring research and producers together. However, even these bodies only reach around a quarter of producers.

No funding has been disbursed under any of the other Measure 16 schemes and therefore no impact in this area can be expected.

Although not listed as relevant to this CEQ, discussions with Scottish Government officials suggested to the evaluators that some activities under the Farm Advisory Service were in fact relevant.

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

For many decades, agricultural advisory services have acted as an intermediary between the generators of knowledge and its practice by the farmers, crofters and the foresters, though in the UK the degree of state involvement and finance has varied. Responses from Farm Advisory Service staff indicate that they act as a link between farmers and the research/innovation community and act as a conduit of knowledge. It is clear that, without this link, the agricultural community would not benefit as much as its existence implies, though it is not clear as to the extent to which the SRDP has strengthened that link.

7.b6) Conclusions and recommendations

7.b6.a) Conclusion / Recommendation 1

Conclusion:

The SRDP does provide links between primary production and research and innovation, but there is no evidence at this stage that these links are being strengthened through activities undertaken.

Recommendation:

Greater attention is needed to monitor links between, on the one hand, the agriculture and forestry community (broadly defined) and, on the other, the research and innovation community. It would also be useful to consider the evidence that might be collected to demonstrate the impact of the link for the 2019 and *ex-post* evaluations.

7.c) CEQ03-1C - To what extent have RDP interventions supported lifelong learning and vocational training in the agriculture and forestry sectors?

7.c1) List of measures contributing to the FA

There are no measures programmed under this Focus Area.

Measures programmed under other Focus Areas, but which contribute to the objectives of this Focus Area, are:

- M01 - Knowledge transfer and information actions (art 14).

7.c2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ

Judgment criteria	Common result indicator	Additional result indicator
The number of rural people who have finalised lifelong learning and vocational training in the agriculture and forestry sectors has increased	T3: Total number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (focus area 1C)	

7.c3) Methods applied

This CEQ has been answered using a combination of monitoring data provided to the evaluators by the Scottish Government and qualitative input from interviews carried out with relevant Scottish Government officials and/or written submissions from them. Stakeholders were requested to provide written feedback based on a set of questions developed from the judgement criteria and qualitative adaptations of the indicators. However, no responses relevant to this CEQ were received.

7.c4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources

Indicator type	Indicator code and name (unit)	Ratio	Indicator value	Calculated gross value	Calculated net value	Data and information sources
Common result indicator	T3: Total number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (focus area 1C)	No	12,118.00			

7.c5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings

There were no specific difficulties in answering this CEQ, although, as constructed, this CEQ does not question the delivery process of training or the impacts which follow.

Although stakeholders were asked to comment on this CEQ, no answers were submitted. This means that it has not been possible to contextualise and validate the information provided by the Scottish Government.

7.c5.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this Focus Area, although none are programmed under it:

- M01: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF);
- Rural Priorities (2007-2013); and
- Land Managers Options (2007-2013).

Financial inputs and output data

A total of €1,409,139 has been spent to the end of 2016 under Measure 1 (allocated to Focus Area 2A) which is relevant to supporting lifelong learning and vocational training in the agriculture and forestry sectors (O1). As noted under CEQ 1, 91% of relevant expenditure has been under the KTIF scheme.

Some 12,118 people have been recorded as having received training to the end of 2016. These are not unique beneficiaries and some will have benefitted from more than one training activity.

Qualitative assessment

Measure 1: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund

According to a Scottish Government official, the total value of the 15 projects covering skills development and knowledge transfer approved to date (as opposed to money disbursed, see above) is €5.46 million, of which, €2.81 million is committed to skills development (8 projects, 75% intervention rate); the remaining €2.65 million relate to innovation (100% funded for operational costs). The eight projects link directly to lifelong learning and vocational training and a number of different organisations are involved in delivery. One example is the funding of the Scottish Crofting Federation (Crofters Skills Boost, €343,200). This provides training for 1,200 small holders and crofters and over 1,260 training days.

7.c6) Conclusions and recommendations

7.c6.a) Conclusion / Recommendation 1

Conclusion:

The common results indicator on the number of recipients trained is available. Therefore it can be concluded that RDP interventions, in the form of the schemes mentioned, have supported lifelong learning and vocational training in the agriculture and forestry sector (together).

Recommendation:

That details of the breakdown of the results indicator into agriculture and forestry is made available, and that an evaluation is carried out to assess the additionality of this training. We note that the impact of training on beneficiaries and the businesses in which they work is not relevant to this CEQ, but a proper evaluation should examine these issues as these are more important to the SRDP objectives than the simple result indicator.

--

7.d) CEQ04-2A - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to improving the economic performance, restructuring and modernization of supported farms in particular through increasing their market participation and agricultural diversification?

7.d1) List of measures contributing to the FA

Measures programmed under this Focus Area are:

- M01 - Knowledge transfer and information actions (art 14);
- M02 - Advisory services, farm management and farm relief services (art 15);
- M04 - Investments in physical assets (art 17);
- M06 - Farm and business development (art 19);
- M13 - Payments to areas facing natural or other specific constraints (art 31); and
- M16 - Co-operation (art 35).

7.d2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ

Judgment criteria	Common result indicator	Additional result indicator
		Economic farm size structure of supported farms
Agricultural output per annual working unit of supported agricultural holdings has increased	R2: Change in Agricultural output on supported farms/AWU (Annual Work Unit) (focus area 2A)*	
Farms have been modernized	R1 / T4: percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP support for investments in restructuring or modernisation (focus area 2A)	
Farms have been restructured	R1 / T4: percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP support for investments in restructuring or modernisation (focus area 2A)	

7.d3) Methods applied

This CEQ has been answered using a combination of monitoring data provided to the evaluators by the Scottish Government and qualitative input from interviews carried out with relevant Scottish Government officials and/or written submissions from them. Stakeholders were requested to provide written feedback based on a set of questions developed from the judgement criteria and qualitative adaptations of the indicators. However, no specific responses were provided.

7.d4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources

Indicator type	Indicator code and name (unit)	Ratio	Indicator value	Calculated gross value	Calculated gross value out of which Primary contribution	Calculated gross value out of which Secondary contribution, including LEADER/CLLD contribution	Calculated net value	Data and information sources
Common result	R2: Change in Agricultural output on	No						Data are not available for this Common Result Indicator.

indicator	supported farms/AWU (Annual Work Unit) (focus area 2A)*							
Common result indicator	R2: Change in Agricultural output on supported farms (focus area 2A)*	No						Data are not available for this Common Result Indicator.
Common result indicator	R2: AWU (Annual Work Unit) (focus area 2A)	No						Data are not available for this Common Result Indicator.
Common result indicator	R1 / T4: percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP support for investments in restructuring or modernisation (focus area 2A)	Yes	3.09%					
Result	Economic farm size structure of supported farms	No						Data are not available for this Additional Result Indicator.

7.d5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings

Data are available for only one of the common result indicators, leaving three common and one additional indicator unpopulated. This means *inter alia* that while it is possible to understand the percentage of holdings supported, it is not possible to quantitatively assess the impact that this support has had on agricultural output.

7.d5.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes are programmed under this Focus Area:

- M01: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF);
- M02: Farm Advisory Service (FAS);
- M04: Crofting Agricultural Grants Scheme (CAGS); New Entrants Capital Grants Scheme (NECGS); Small Farms Capital Grants Scheme (SFCGS);
- M06: New Entrants Start-Up Grants (NESUG);
- M13: Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS);
- M16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF); Crofting Agricultural Grants Scheme (CAGS, no payments made to date under this Measure);
- Rural Priorities (2007-2013); and
- Land Managers Options (2007-2013).

The Young Farmers Start-Up Grant (YESUG), although programmed under Focus Area 2B, is also relevant to Focus Area 2A.

Financial inputs and output data

A total of €1,409,139 has been spent to the end of 2016 under Measure 1 under Focus Area 2A (O1). Of this, €1,282,563 has been spent under the KTIF, €17,193 under RP and €109,383 under LMO. The KTIF therefore accounted for 91% of relevant expenditure.

Some €72,693 of public money has been spent under Measure 2 under Focus Area 2A (O1) and a further €21,410,365 under Measure 4. The majority of spend under Measure 4 has been under legacy schemes from the 2007-2013 programming period (Rural Priorities €14,863,003, 69% and Land Manager Options €349,330, 2%). Some €5,285,182 has been spent to the end of 2016 under the Crofting Agricultural Grants Scheme (25%) with €720,832 spent under the New Entrants Capital Grant Scheme (3%), €144,343 (1%) under the Forestry Grant Scheme and €47,675 (<1%) under the Small Farms Capital Grant Scheme.

Total public expenditure to the end of 2016 has been €206,718 under Measure 6 (New Entrants Start-Up Grants).

Some €67,520,239 had been spent under Focus Area 2A under Measure 13 (Less Favoured Area Support Scheme) by the end of 2016.

The percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP support for investments in restructuring or modernisation to the end of 2016 is 3.09%. As noted above, quantitative data are not available for the other relevant indicators.

Measure 1.1 has supported 2,252 actions/operations under Focus Area 2A out of a total of 2,252 (1,967 of these, 87%, related to KTIF). Some 285 actions were supported under Measure 1.1 legacy schemes from the 2007-2013 programming period (33 under RP and 252 under LMO (O3)).

The combined number of training days offered to the end of 2016 under Measure 1.1 was 16,121, 15,797 of which were offered under KTIF (98%) (O11). Some 324 training days were offered under the legacy schemes (72 under RP and 252 under LMO).

These training days were utilised by 12,118 participants (these are not necessarily unique participants and it is likely that some beneficiaries attended more than one course; unique beneficiary data are not collected). In line with the distribution of resources and training days, the majority (98%) of participants were trained under the KTIF (O12). No support has been offered to date for demonstration activities and information actions (Measure 1.2) or for short-term farm and forest management exchange, including farm and forest visits (Measure 1.3); the evaluators were told by the Scottish Government that these sub-measures were originally programmed, but it is likely they will be removed in a future modification.

Measure 2 (Measure 2.3: FAS) offered support for the training of advisors through 1 action/operation under Focus Area 2A to the end of 2016 (O3). Through these actions, training relevant to Focus Area 2A was provided to 76 advisors (O14).

With respect to EIP activity, Measure 16 has supported 1 group undertake 3 co-operation operations to the end of 2016 under Focus Area 2A (O16).

A total of 1,614 holdings had been supported to the end of 2016 under Measure 4 (O4). The main means of support was the Crofting Agricultural Grants Scheme, under which 983 holdings were supported (61% of the total under this measure). A further 590 holdings were supported under legacy schemes (402 under Land Manager Options, 25%, and 188, 12%, under Rural Priorities). The New Entrants Capital Grants Scheme provided support to 35 holdings (2%) to the end of 2016 and the Small Farms Capital Grants Scheme supported a further 6 holdings (<1%).

The New Entrants Start-Up Grants under Measure 6 had supported 17 holdings by the end of 2016. Some 5,744 holdings had been supported to the end of 2016 under Measure 13, the Less Favoured Area Support Scheme, under Focus Area 2A.

Data are not available at the time of writing on the change in agricultural output on supported farms/AWU (Annual Work Unit) (R2) or on the economic farm size structure of supported farms. However, interviews with staff responsible for some of the schemes, or written submissions from them, suggest that schemes funded from the relevant measures have contributed to improving the economic performance, restructuring and modernization of supported farms, in particular through increasing their market participation and agricultural diversification.

Qualitative assessment

Measure 1: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

This scheme works through grants to operational groups which fall under the European Innovation Partnership (EIP) initiative (operational support rather than capital items). Scottish Government officials told the evaluators that the operational groups introducing innovation (monitor farms) are relevant to this question. To date, seven operational groups have been formed corresponding with seven projects (out of a total of 15) related to innovation and to economic performance. The total value of the 15 projects approved to date is €5.46 million, of which €2.65 million relates to innovation (100% funded for operational costs). Each KTIF project has to provide interim and final reports which comment on performance metrics as well. These reports will be a source of (at least some) quantitative results in time. Most projects are of three to four years' duration, and then there is a lag time before benefits will be seen. The monitor farm programme was assessed during the last programming period and this evaluation has been used to inform the current implementation.

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service – FAS

Increasing profitability of farms and crofts in Scotland is a clear aim of the FAS, with a focus on technical and environmental performance designed to build resilience in all beneficiaries in order that these businesses can be financially and environmentally sustainable and viable. The economic performance of farms is expected to have improved through the activities of the FAS interventions, such as knowledge transfer. Farm Business Income measures are reported annually, but are also heavily influenced by external factors such as exchange rates, weather, and global market forces. Building resilience in modern farming businesses is a key aim of the FAS and this should provide improved financial performance. Modernisation on individual units has taken place where there is uptake of new practices following the demonstration of new techniques on demonstration farms and focus farms. Some practices are straightforward; others involve more fundamental change in the business, particularly in terms of enterprise management and enterprise structure. Evidence for significant farm restructuring is limited. However, the current economic climate, and the financial performance of many of the main farm enterprises means that beneficiaries have sought to improve performance and in some cases changed enterprises and restructured their business. Major restructuring will take some time to be reflected in improved economic performance.

In terms of market participation, the FAS has encouraged this by providing significant volumes of market data to the industry which is accessible to all via the FAS website. According to a Scottish Government official, this improved market intelligence, both in terms of product and input will have improved market participation, though this cannot be evidenced definitively at this stage.

Agricultural diversification is excluded from the delivery of the FAS, and is dealt with under other delivery aspects of the SRDP. For example, diversification into woodland is encouraged under Measure 8 by the

Forestry Grant Scheme, and is reported in the answer to CEQ 16.

Measure 4: Crofting Agricultural Grants Scheme (CAGS); New Entrants Capital Grants Scheme (NECGS); Small Farms Capital Grants Scheme (SFCGS)

Restructuring is addressed through the new entrant schemes, both the capital grants schemes (Measure 4) and the start-up grant schemes (Measure 6, see below). These two groups of schemes are expected to work together, in that beneficiaries are expected to use different grants for different purposes. The evaluators have been told that the Scottish Government distinguishes between “genuine new entrants” and new entrants taking over a family business; the Government’s intention is to support genuine new entrants. All applications funded so far have been scored and funds allocated accordingly. Three-quarters (75%) have been classified as genuine new entrants. The remaining 25% are effectively successors and therefore have had an impact on restructuring at the sector level.

The NECGS is relevant for restructuring and modernisation. CAGS is a similar scheme; the difference is in the targeting.

Measure 6: New Entrants Start-Up Grants (NESUG) and Young Farmers Start-Up Grants (YESUG)

These were originally one scheme, but this was split into two before the SRDP was finalised. NESUG (programmed under Focus Area 2A) is designed for smaller farms and has no upper age limit, YFSUG (programmed under Focus Area 2B, but also relevant here) is designed for higher output farms. Both NESUG and YFSUG are concerned with helping farmers into the industry; there is no use made of the provision to assist diversification. These businesses are starting from scratch and so they are bringing new business activity into the market; by definition there is therefore more market participation. Most business development plans for entrants aim to increase the standard output over the period of time reflected in the plans. However, the schemes are not themselves aimed at improving businesses and the impacts they have are therefore indirect. Similarly, with respect to modernisation, new businesses tend to be relatively modern anyway.

There has been some restructuring in aggregate for the sector through the encouragement of new entrants or through succession planning with existing businesses, but this is not related to the specific supported business. Also, there is no diversification element within these schemes; the focus is on core agricultural activities. It is though possible that there are diversified activities within supported farms.

Scottish Government officials told the evaluators that an electronic system is being developed to capture information from the application form. Business development plans will be reviewed before the final instalment of grant is paid. This inspection process should be able to gather information in terms of performance against the plan. It should also be possible to collect standard output at the start and standard output at the end of the business development plan.

Measure 19: LEADER

Though not listed among the Measure/Schemes directly relevant to this question, LEADER provides the main support for diversification under the SRDP; some €12 million is allocated to diversification projects which are determined at the local level through the LAGs.

7.d6) Conclusions and recommendations

7.d6.a) Conclusion / Recommendation 1

Conclusion:

Spending under the relevant measures has contributed to improving the economic performance, restructuring and modernization of supported farms, in particular through increasing their market participation (diversification is supported under Measure 19 through LEADER). However, the extent of this improvement cannot be quantified at present.

Recommendation:

The lack of data to populate results indicators is an issue that will need to be addressed in time for the 2019 evaluation and again in the ex-post evaluation. The Scottish Government should give consideration as to how this information would best be collected in the interim. It appears that the NESUG and YFSUG schemes are preparing to collect data via application forms in respect of business development plans, and this should be monitored.

7.e) CEQ05-2B - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the entry of adequately skilled farmers into the agricultural sector and in particular, generational renewal?

7.e1) List of measures contributing to the FA

Measures programmed under this Focus Area are:

- M01 - Knowledge transfer and information actions (art 14);
- M02 - Advisory services, farm management and farm relief services (art 15);
- M06 - Farm and business development (art 19); and
- M16 - Co-operation (art 35).

7.e2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ

Judgment criteria	Common result indicator	Additional result indicator
The share of adequately skilled young farmers in the agricultural sector has increased	R3 / T5: percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP supported business development plan/investments for young farmers (focus area 2B)	
Adequately skilled farmers have entered into the agricultural sector		Percentage of adequately skilled farmers in the agricultural sector of the RDP territory

7.e3) Methods applied

This CEQ has been answered using a combination of monitoring data provided to the evaluators by the Scottish Government and qualitative input from interviews carried out with relevant Scottish Government officials and/or written submissions from them. Stakeholders were requested to provide written feedback based on a set of questions developed from the judgement criteria and qualitative adaptations of the indicators. This information has been used to provide additional context.

7.e4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources

Indicator type	Indicator code and name (unit)	Ratio	Indicator value	Calculated gross value	Calculated net value	Data and information sources
Common result indicator	R3 / T5: percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP supported business development plan/investments for young farmers (focus area 2B)	Yes	0.31%			
Result	Percentage of adequately skilled farmers in the agricultural sector of the RDP territory	No				Data are not available for this Additional Result Indicator.

7.e5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings

At the present time, the impact on individual beneficiaries of the SRDP interventions has not been

evaluated. The additional results indicator is not populated, but this is in any case unlikely to reflect the skills brought in by new entrants, including those associated with succession, because of the demographics of the farming community in Scotland.

7.e5.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this Focus Area:

- M01: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund;
- M02: Farm Advisory Service;
- M06: Young Farmers Start-Up Grants;
- M16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund; and
- Rural Priorities (2007-2013).

Financial input and output data

A total of €1,282,563 was spent to the end of 2016 under Measure 1 (Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund). This spend was programmed under Focus Area 2A, but is indirectly relevant to Focus Area 2B.

Some €14,539 had been spent under Measure 2 (Farm Advisory Service) to the end of 2016 under Focus Area 2B. most public expenditure in this Focus Area was under Measure 6 where €7,370,956 had been spent to the end of 2016. The majority of this (€6,624,938, 90%) was spent under Young Farmers Start-Up Grants with the remainder committed under the Rural Priorities scheme in the 2007-2013 programming period.

By the end of 2016, 0.31% of agricultural holdings had RDP supported business development plan/investments for young farmers (R3/T5).

Some 164 holdings/beneficiaries had been supported to the end of 2016 under Measure 6 (O4). Just under two-thirds (64%) of these were supported under Young Farmers Start-Up Grants with the balance supported under the Rural Priorities scheme from the 2007-2013 programming period.

To date there have been no holdings/beneficiaries supported by Measures 1 or 2 under Focus Area 2B.

Qualitative assessment

This answer is structured differently from others, in that interventions are ordered by relevance rather than Measure number.

Measure 6: Young Farmers Start-Up Grants scheme (YFSUGS) and New Entrants Start-Up Grants scheme (NESUGS)

These were originally one scheme, but this was split into two before the SRDP was finalised. NESUG is targeted at small farms and has no upper age limit, YFSUGS is targeted at higher output farms. The evaluators were told that these schemes are aimed at providing money up front which makes them unique within the SRDP; other schemes require work to be carried out before support is released. It is possible for beneficiaries of these schemes to also apply for capital grants, and, according to the Scottish Government, there could be synergies here. The support drawn from different schemes must be for different initiatives to

avoid double funding. There is no formal linkage with the FAS (or KTIF), but supported farmers could be directed towards these schemes for relevant training.

Both NESUG and YFSUG are concerned with helping farmers into the industry. We were told that most beneficiaries (both schemes) are genuine new entrants, but some are successors to an established business (generational renewal). Over both schemes, some 75% of successful applicants are genuine new entrants (no involvement in the previous business and farm bought on open market) while 10% are successors to an existing business. The remaining 15% are new businesses with land not acquired on the open market, i.e. taken from existing businesses; this group is closer to successors than to genuine new entrants.

One of the basic eligibility criteria is that applicants must have at least an SVQ level 2 qualification or provide evidence that they intend to attend a course with a view to obtaining an agricultural qualification to at least SVQ level 2 within three years of being approved under the scheme. A final alternative is to provide evidence of five years' agricultural experience (including independent testimony) if no formal agricultural qualifications are held. The evaluators have been told that most farmers' children will have this sort of qualification at least. The Scottish Government's preference is that qualifications are relevant to the enterprises and activities to be undertaken. If they are not, there may be a requirement to obtain an appropriate qualification. The scoring system encourages training; the application form asks what training is required in the future. There is no formal link with either KTIF or FAS, but training under both can be relevant. This lack of formal link could though be a design weakness.

It is difficult to determine whether more young farmers have entered the sector with the support provided, but we have been told that the support is very important in helping young farmers develop a successful business. The scoring system tries to avoid deadweight by weighting towards genuinely new entrants, who must not have been head of any business for 18 months and should have acquired the land on the open market, though the system is not foolproof. It should though be noted that successors contribute to generational renewal. The EU legislation refers to "successors", which means that it is not possible for the Scottish Government entirely to exclude family members from receiving support; deadweight cannot be completely avoided. The Scottish Government attempts to make sure that there is no family relationship between the applicant and the seller of the business, although this would seem to work against generational renewal. So far, 460 applications have been received, of which 148 have been approved. Those not successful in their application are still likely to enter the industry, but will not have the financial support. The scheme is regarded by the Scottish Government as being effective for genuine new entrants.

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

A significant component of the FAS one-to-many delivery activities is the new entrants programme. This is a distinct and focused initiative that utilises around 7% of the FAS one-to-many budget and the evaluators have been told that this has been well received by the industry in the widest sense.

A total of 14 groups with over 200 direct beneficiaries (mostly young farmers) have been established around Scotland with the intention of equipping new entrants to the sector with a broad range of business and technical skills to enable them to enter the industry fully equipped with knowledge and ability. According to the operator of FAS, a significant proportion have been genuinely new entrants, with some form of experience, but without a family farm or holding to inherit or to help manage. Some were previously contractors with seasonal grazing enterprises and who were looking to expand this activity as fully fledged farmers. It is estimated that around 50% to 70% of the beneficiaries would come into the category of being genuinely new with around 30% to 50% having the opportunity to more actively participate in the family farm.

Although many of the workshops run for new entrants include exercises and assessments to see that

principles and practices have been understood, there is no formal testing. No certificates have been awarded as a result of the FAS delivery. The FAS one-to-one programme includes mentoring, which will also help encourage the acquisition of skills to an adequate level.

The evaluators have been told that so far there has been no significant impact on the age profile of farmers at the aggregate level, nor is this expected; the budget is not considered to be sufficient to result in major change for the sector. The demographics reported annually for farmers are such that the share of activity that is being undertaken by young farmers is not increasing rapidly. The SRDP, and the FAS in particular, seeks to address this by providing skills and helping young farmers to identify opportunities. There are many other factors, notably land tenure regulations, that provide other barriers to entry for young farmers.

Measures 1 and 16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

No additional information was provided from the KTIF, though it would be expected that knowledge transfer will have a generic impact on skills and generational renewal. The Measure 6 new entrants' start-up grants include an eligibility criterion that farmers must have appropriate agricultural qualifications. The infrastructure is therefore in place to allow new entrants to gain adequate skills if they do not already possess these.

According to a stakeholder, the SRDP has helped to raise the quality of new entrants to Scottish agriculture and this complements Lantra's work in the same direction, such as the annual Land-Based and Aquaculture Learner of the Year Awards. The introduction of support for 'industry champions' will help to ensure that new entrants can also act as ambassadors for the industry (for example, as speakers at industry engagement and school careers events). However, this stakeholder has a concern that the focus on entrants from outside the farming community will under-value the contribution to skills development in the sector by successors taking over family farms.

7.e6) Conclusions and recommendations

7.e6.a) *Conclusion / Recommendation 1*

Conclusion:

SRDP interventions are continuing to support the entry of adequately skilled farmers into the agricultural sector. Whilst there is some support for generational renewal, the focus on genuine new entrants may work against the objective of general renewal. However, the demographics are such that the impact on the skills levels of the sector can only be slight.

Recommendation:

That the monitoring system is capable of populating the additional result indicator, and that information is gathered, based on business development plans, that can show the impact of the SRDP interventions on individual economic circumstances. In order to assess the impact on generational renewal it would be helpful to assess the age profile of beneficiaries of the NESUG.

7.f) CEQ06-3A - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to improving the competitiveness of supported primary producers by better integrating them into the agri-food chain through quality schemes, adding value to the agricultural products, promoting local markets and short supply circuits, producer groups and inter-branch organization?

7.f1) List of measures contributing to the FA

Measures programmed under this Focus Area are:

- M03 - Quality schemes for agricultural products and foodstuffs (art 16);
- M04 - Investments in physical assets (art 17);
- M14 - Animal welfare (art 33); and
- M16 - Co-operation (art 35).

7.f2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ

Judgment criteria	Common result indicator	Additional result indicator
Implementation of quality schemes by primary producers has increased	R4 / T6: percentage of agricultural holdings receiving support for participating in quality schemes, local markets and short supply circuits, and producer groups/organisations (focus area 3A)	
Participation of primary producers in short circuit schemes, quality-oriented producer group and/or interbranch organization has increased	R4 / T6: percentage of agricultural holdings receiving support for participating in quality schemes, local markets and short supply circuits, and producer groups/organisations (focus area 3A)	
Competitiveness of supported primary producers has improved		Agricultural output on supported farms
The share of the final price of agriculture products retained with primary producers has increased		Margin of primary producers in the final price of agricultural products
The added value of agricultural products of primary producers has increased		

7.f3) Methods applied

This CEQ has been answered using a combination of monitoring data provided to the evaluators by the Scottish Government and qualitative input from interviews carried out with relevant Scottish Government officials. Stakeholders were requested to provide written feedback based on a set of questions developed from the judgement criteria and qualitative adaptations of the indicators. However, no responses were received for this CEQ.

7.f4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources

Indicator type	Indicator code and name (unit)	Ratio	Indicator value	Calculated gross value	Calculated net value	Data and information sources
Output	PST13A - Percentage of total agri-food businesses supported under Article 17 of the Regulation (EU)	Yes	6.29%			

	No 1305/2013 (Focus Area 3A)					
Common result indicator	R4 / T6: percentage of agricultural holdings receiving support for participating in quality schemes, local markets and short supply circuits, and producer groups/organisations (focus area 3A)	Yes	14.69%			
Result	Margin of primary producers in the final price of agricultural products	No				Data are not available for this Additional Result Indicator.
Result	Agricultural output on supported farms	No				Data are not available for this Additional Result Indicator.

7.f5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings

At first glance it may appear that the lack of data to populate the Additional Results Indicators is a problem. However, this may not be the case, as there is a mismatch between the judgement criteria and the common results indicators set within the CMEF; the first two listed criteria are concerned with increases whereas the indicators relate to static percentages. Further, the indicator chosen for competitiveness is partial and potentially misleading (high output farms are not necessarily more competitive), and an increased percentage of price retained by primary producers is not necessarily something that is beneficial (and again the proposed indicator is a static observation, which is inappropriate). While an increase in added value of primary producers is more acceptable in the context of assessing a contribution to greater competitiveness, no additional indicator is proposed. Because of these fundamental problems, it is perhaps not a drawback that currently no data are available for these indicators.

7.f5.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this Focus Area:

- M04: Food Processing, Marketing and Co-operation Scheme (FPMC);
- M16: Food Processing, Marketing and Co-operation Scheme (FPMC);
- Rural Priorities (RP) (2007-1013); and
- Land Managers Options (LMO) (2007-2013).

Financial inputs and output data

A total of €17,413,174 of public money has been spent under Measure 4 (4.2 - support for investments in processing/marketing and/or development of agricultural products) under this Focus Area with a further €878,548 spent under Measure 16 (O1). Almost all of Measure 4 expenditure has been under the Food Processing, Marketing and Co-operation Scheme (€17,359,294, 99.7%) with the remainder committed under legacy schemes (RP). All expenditure under Measure 16 has been under the Food Processing, Marketing and Co-operation Scheme.

Total investment under Measure 4 has been €56,938,290 to the end of 2016 (O2), implying a leverage rate

of 1:2.3.

Fifty-five actions/operations have been supported under Measure 4 to the end of 2016 (O3) while 1 holding (O9) has completed 1 co-operation operation (O17) under sub-Measure 16.4 - support for co-operation among supply chain actors for the establishment and development of short supply chains and local markets, and for promotion activities.

Support has been provided to 6.3% of Scottish agri-food businesses (PST13A) while 14.7% of agricultural holdings have received support for participating in quality schemes, local markets and short supply circuits, and producer groups/organisations (R4/T6).

Qualitative assessment

Measure 4 and Measure 16: Food Processing, Marketing and Co-operation Scheme

Up to the end of 2016, support under this Focus Area was almost entirely directed at assisting capital investments (Measure 4). The primary purpose of the FPMC scheme (Measures 4 and 16) is to support more sustainable economic growth of the food industry through greater cooperation and collaboration, from primary production to final market, ensuring the long-term viability of primary producers and increasing export markets for Scottish produce (taken from 'Explanatory notes and additional information for the assessment, scoring and decision making/recommendations of FPMC applications', Scottish Government, August 2016). Thus, the impact on primary producers is indirect (unless they are also food processors). According to Scottish Government staff, the investments, which are primarily in the food processing sector, should have a positive impact on primary producers and their competitiveness and enhance their value added; this also follows the intervention logic. However, the impact on prices received by primary producers is less certain.

At the end of 2016 there is no evidence for an impact on the participation of primary producers in short-circuit schemes, quality-orientated producer groups and inter-branch organisations, though it is possible that this may emerge subsequently as recent projects mature. Similarly, there should be an impact on short supply chains, which are examined closely in the assessment process. There may be more use of local markets by supported projects, though this is not something that is specifically targeted.

7.f6) Conclusions and recommendations

7.f6.a) Conclusion / Recommendation 1

Conclusion:

According to the intervention logic, primary producers are likely to benefit indirectly from support from the FPMC scheme that operates under Measures 4 and 16, but to an extent that is currently uncertain. While information on participation rates in, for example, quality schemes or short supply chains may be useful intermediary process indicators, they may not necessarily give a reliable guide to the competitive or uncompetitive nature of the primary producers.

Recommendation:

Recommendation: If the fundamental aim of the Measures covered by this CEQ is to improve the competitiveness of supported primary producers, then information on the extent of the benefits delivered should be gathered.

7.g) CEQ07-3B - To what extent have RDP interventions supported farm risk prevention and management?

7.g1) List of measures contributing to the FA

Measures programmed under this Focus Area are:

- M01 - Knowledge transfer and information actions (art 14);
- M02 - Advisory services, farm management and farm relief services (art 15); and
- M16 - Co-operation (art 35).

7.g2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ

Judgment criteria	Common result indicator	Additional result indicator
Participation of farms in risk prevention and management schemes has increased	R5 / T7: percentage of farms participating in risk management schemes (focus area 3B)	

7.g3) Methods applied

This CEQ has been answered using a combination of monitoring data provided to the evaluators by the Scottish Government and qualitative input from interviews carried out with relevant Scottish Government officials and written responses from them. Stakeholders were requested to provide written feedback based on a set of questions developed from the judgement criteria and qualitative adaptations of the indicators. However, no information relevant to this CEQ was provided.

7.g4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources

Indicator type	Indicator code and name (unit)	Ratio	Indicator value	Calculated gross value	Calculated net value	Data and information sources
Output	PSTI3B - Number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013	No	0.00			No expenditure has been made under Focus Area 3B by the Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund, which delivers Measure 1, since the start of the SRDP 2014-2020. Therefore no participants had been trained under this Focus Area by the end of 2016.
Common result indicator	R5 / T7: percentage of farms participating in risk management schemes (focus area 3B)	Yes				Measures 5 and 17 are not programmed as part of the SRDP 2014-2020, therefore there is no programmed value for this Target or corresponding Result Indicator. Therefore there is no Indicator Value to report.

7.g5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings

No participants had been trained under this Focus Area by the end of 2016 and therefore there are no quantitative data to inform the CEQ.

7.g5.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this Focus Area:

- M01: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (programmed under Focus Area 2A, but contributing to Focus Area 3B); and
- M02: Farm Advisory Service.

Financial inputs and output data

A total of €14,539 had been spent under Measure 2 (Farm Advisory Service) to the end of 2016 under Focus Area 3B.

No participants had been trained under Measure 2 under this Focus Area by the end of 2016. However, 6 actions/operations had been undertaken under sub-measure 2.3 - support for training of advisors (O3). A total of 167 advisors had received training (O14) which suggests that training is likely to be provided by suitably qualified trainers during the remainder of the programming period.

Qualitative assessment

Measure 1: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (programmed under Focus Area 2A, but contributing to Focus Area 3B)

There are no projects so far linking explicitly to risk management, but this is within the scope of KTIF. We were told by Scottish Government officials that explicit risk management measures were not taken up because the expectation is that this should be dealt with by the sector itself.

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service

The FAS seeks to address risk and risk management through a number of activities, mainly by providing examples of good practice and performance thereby minimising risk. The objective is to improve resilience and minimise risk in several areas, but particularly in crop health, animal health and climate change, as well as cross-compliance. These themes are addressed through a range of techniques including on-farm events, technical notes, guidance notes, and advice through the telephone advice-line and the website.

There is a requirement for advice and knowledge transfer in this area (not necessarily recognised by farmers) because of the high volatility of Scottish agriculture. The most common area is in market risk movement in terms of commodity prices, and the structuring of their business based on benchmarks to indicate areas of excessive costs or poor technical performance.

Intervention actions are varied, but many are focused on technical issues including grassland management to ensure adequate forage supplies, enterprise mix changes to improve profitability, also management practices changed to ensure efficient use of fertilisers, and integrated pest management measures undertaken to improve crop health and technical performance of the crop gross margins by reducing variable costs to acceptable levels.

We have been told that there are multiple drivers, of which the most fundamental is the financial one; increased financial and economic performance as a result of minimising risk will motivate farmers most. By demonstrating a financial benefit to minimising risk, the likelihood of the adoption of such practices is

markedly increased. This, therefore, becomes a major factor in encouraging uptake by proving or demonstrating improved financial performance and benefit.

The one-to-many aspect of FAS will deal with risk management, as will some of the one-to-one management plans under which a holistic assessment of a business is made.

7.g6) Conclusions and recommendations

7.g6.a) *Conclusion / Recommendation 1*

Conclusion:

The Scottish Government decided not to implement Measures under the risk management tool kit (Articles 36 to 39). However, SRDP interventions have supported farm risk prevention and management through training and advice. The extent of the impact of what has been done is not at present quantifiable.

Recommendation:

That data are collected to populate the indicators, and that further information is obtained at farm level that can be used in the evaluation of the interventions. At the very least a breakdown of the proportion of training and advice activities which relate to risk management should be made available to subsequent evaluations.

7.h) CEQ08-4A - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the restoration, preservation and enhancement of biodiversity including in Natura 2000 areas, areas facing natural or other specific constraints and HNV farming, and the state of European landscape?

7.h1) List of measures contributing to the FA

Measures programmed under this Focus Area for agricultural land are:

- M01 - Knowledge transfer and information actions (art 14);
- M02 - Advisory services, farm management and farm relief services (art 15);
- M04 - Investments in physical assets (art 17);
- M08 - Investments in forest area development and improvement of the viability of forests (art 21-26);
- M10 - Agri-environment-climate (art 28);
- M11 - Organic farming (art 29);
- M13 - Payments to areas facing natural or other specific constraints (art 31); and
- M16 - Co-operation (art 35).

Measures programmed under this Focus Area for forestry land are:

- M08 - Investments in forest area development and improvement of the viability of forests (art 21-26); and
- M15 - Forest environmental and climate services and forest conservation (art 34).

7.h2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ

Judgment criteria	Common result indicator	Additional result indicator
Biodiversity on contracted land has been restored, preserved and enhanced	R6 / T8: percentage of forest/other wooded area under management contracts supporting biodiversity (focus area 4A)	
Biodiversity on contracted land has been restored, preserved and enhanced	R7 / T9: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts supporting biodiversity and/or landscapes (focus area 4A)	

7.h3) Methods applied

This CEQ has been answered using a combination of monitoring data provided to the evaluators by the Scottish Government and qualitative input from interviews carried out with relevant Scottish Government officials and their written responses to questions. Stakeholders were requested to provide written feedback based on a set of questions developed from the judgement criteria and qualitative adaptations of the indicators. This information has been used to provide additional context.

7.h4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources

Indicator type	Indicator code and name (unit)	Ratio	Indicator value	Calculated gross value	Calculated net value	Data and information sources

Common result indicator	R6 / T8: percentage of forest/other wooded area under management contracts supporting biodiversity (focus area 4A)	Yes	1.74%			
Common result indicator	R7 / T9: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts supporting biodiversity and/or landscapes (focus area 4A)	Yes	12.63%			

7.h5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings

Monitoring data are collected for Focus Area 4 in total and are not split into 4A, 4B and 4C. This makes assigning impacts to biodiversity problematic. More generally, there is an absence of quantitative evidence on the impact on biodiversity of participation in SRDP schemes which makes linking more general trends to interventions.

7.h5.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this Focus Area:

- M01: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF);
- M02: Farm Advisory Service (FAS);
- M04: Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme (AECS);
- M08: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS);
- M10: Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme (AECS);
- M13: Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS);
- M15: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS);
- M16: Environmental Co-operation Action Fund (ECAAF), Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS) (no expenditure to date);
- Rural Priorities (RP) (2007-2013); and
- Land Managers Options (LMO) (2007-2013).

Financial inputs and output data

Monitoring data are recorded for Focus Area 4 in total and are not split into 4A, 4B and 4C. The European Commission reporting requirements do not require a split of data for Measure 10.

Some €1,282,563 was spent to the end of 2016 under Measure 1 (KTIF, programmed under Focus Area 2A, but indirectly relevant to Focus Area 4) (O1).

Public expenditure under Measure 2 under Focus Area 4 was €116,309 by the end of 2016 (O1).

Total public expenditure under Measure 4 under Focus Area 4 had reached €5,773,807 by the end of 2016 (O1). Some €4,468,013 of this (77%) related to commitments entered into in the 2007-2013 programming period (RP) with €1,305,794 (23%) spent under AECS. Total investment amounted to €10,184,027 as a result of leverage under the RP scheme.

Some €54,185,296 of public expenditure took place under Measure 8 to the end of 2016 (O1). The vast majority of this related to on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 programming period under RP (€51,574,947, 95%); the FGS contributed €2,610,650 (5%).

Total public expenditure under Measure 10 relevant to Focus Area 4 to the end of 2016 amounted to €78,513,850, all disbursed under commitments made in the 2007-2013 period (80% of the total was disbursed under RP with the remainder under LMO).

Total public expenditure under activities which can be expected to have an impact on Focus Area 4A amounted to €74,652,728 by the end of 2016 (95% of the total). Total expenditure under Measure 13 relevant to Focus Area 4 (LFASS) amounted to €67,520,239 by the end of 2016.

Total public expenditure under Measure 15 relevant to Focus Area 4 (RP and LMO) amounted to €7,604,892 to the end of 2016.

By the end of 2016, 12.63% of agricultural land was under management contracts supporting biodiversity and/or landscapes (R7/T9), as was 3.02% of forest/other wooded area (R6/T8). Both these figures relate specifically to Focus Area 4A.

There was no expenditure under Measure 1 under Focus Area 4 to the end of 2016.

Two actions/operations on the training of advisors relevant to Focus Area 4 had taken place by the end of 2016 under Measure 2 (O3) with 55 advisors trained by the end of 2016 (O14).

Support for 455 non-productive investments linked to the achievement of agri-environment-climate objectives had been delivered under Measure 4 (sub-measure 4.4) by the end of 2016 (O3); 82% of these were delivered under legacy schemes (RP) with the remainder being supported under the AECS.

By the end of 2016, 8,576 hectares had been provided with support for afforestation/creation of woodland under Measure 8, sub-measure 8.1 with a further 17,919 hectares supported for maintenance only under RP in 2014 and 17,739 hectares in 2016 (O5). A further 63 hectares had received support under sub-measure 8.4 for the restoration of damage to forests from forest fires and natural disasters and catastrophic events (O5); this support was spread across 7 holdings/beneficiaries (O4). Measure 8, sub-measure 8.5, also supported 87 actions/operations to improve the resilience and environmental value of forest ecosystems which covered 897 hectares (O5). These data cannot be sub-divided.

The monitoring data held on outputs under Measure 10 is complicated because under some schemes area supported can address multiple issues and there is therefore the potential for double counting. This applies to the area under the LMO scheme whereas the RP scheme is unique. Data cannot be summed across years without double counting areas. It should also be noted that only legacy schemes (RP and LMO) had outputs to the end of 2016. The Measure 10 aspects of the new AECS have been implemented post-2016.

A total of 1,152,951 hectares of land was under agreement under Measure 13 (LFASS) under Focus Area 4 by the end of 2016 (O5). This area related to 5,744 holdings/beneficiaries. No further breakdown is possible.

Some 6,690 hectares were under legacy agreements under Measure 15 (RP and LMO) in 2014, 793 hectares in 2015 and 14,681 in 2016.

Qualitative assessment

Measure 1: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

A number of KTIF-funded projects are relevant to supporting the restoration, preservation and enhancement of biodiversity. The evaluators were told of two projects run by the Soil Association: “Farming with nature” and “Farming for the future”. The first of these projects focuses on improving biodiversity and the second on enhancing environmental resilience. The evaluators were supplied with a list of projects relevant to this Focus Area.

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

The evaluators were told that within the one-to-many element of the FAS, the programme has sought to integrate improvements in biodiversity and environmental performance with all other aspects of improvement, both financial and economic. In so doing, the objective is to increase the performance of businesses in an environmental sense at the same time as improving financial sustainability. The SRDP integrates environmental and biodiversity performance across all delivery aspects, from new entrants to business viability, the objective being to prove that a “win-win” situation exists and improvements in financial performance can also achieve environmental improvements and increased business resilience. As a result, all of the FAS programme is designed to achieve some aspects of enhanced environmental and biodiversity performance.

No specific species have been especially targeted, but corncrakes, corn bunting, waders, pollinators and invasive species have all been addressed at various meetings. Biodiversity in terms of the microflora and fauna of the soil has also been addressed.

Measures 4 and 10 Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme (AECS)

Scotland has had an AEC scheme since the early 1990s and has developed a suite of interventions that benefit Scotland’s biodiversity. The evaluators were told that evidence from previous programmes has demonstrated the benefits of AEC measures in supporting biodiversity. Of the “original” AEC schemes, the creation of Wild Bird Seed is considered to be one of the most beneficial actions, as it creates a food source for vulnerable bird species during winter in mixed agricultural systems throughout Scotland.

There is a total of 1,866 protected areas in Scotland, which host 5,368 natural features (habitats, species populations and earth science interests) which are routinely monitored through SNH’s Site Condition Monitoring programme. Where management is required to improve the special features, land managers are encouraged to seek SRDP support. Management Agreements and SRDP agri-environment contracts are legal contracts over land with the purpose of supporting natural heritage management. Payments are offered in return for an agreed work programme, and relate to income forgone and costs incurred for the alternative management. Scotland’s Biodiversity: A Route Map to 2020

(<http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2015/06/8630/>), which was developed to help direct priorities for action to achieve the Scottish Biodiversity Strategy, sets out the favourable condition target of at least 80% of designated ‘features’ in favourable condition by 2016. In May 2017, SNH released the latest figures tracking the proportion of Scottish protected natural features in favourable or recovering status. The main findings show that of the over 5,000 natural features on protected nature sites in Scotland, 80.3% are either in favourable condition, or unfavourable but recovering towards a favourable condition.

It has been found that one-to-one advice to land managers to explain the schemes and what is possible on their holding works best to achieve results. It is also hoped to establish co-ordinated beneficial management through AECS; with co-operating land managers bringing co-ordinated actions to deliver advantages for the environment, shared knowledge and best practices.

There is species targeting of farmland waders (with a list of types) and other species with significant Scottish population declines.

Based on the performance of Axis 2 actions in the previous programming period, the Scottish Government's expectation is that interventions in the current programming period will deliver the required impacts. The previous programming period placed a strong emphasis on Axis 2, focusing on enhancing the biodiversity and maintaining the traditional landscape, improving water quality and tackling climate change. The spend on Axis 2 in 2007-2013 was €1.030 billion, this is 72% of the overall Programme spend of €1.425 billion. According to the Scottish Government the objectives and Measures in Axis 2 were an appropriate response to widely recognised environmental problems in relation to rural land in Scotland. The objectives relating to Axis 2 were partially achieved. There were some areas where clear environmental benefits arose from interventions.

The evaluators have been told that, according to the *ex-post* evaluation, to a considerable extent, many of Scotland's environment-related problems associated with land use were addressed by the SRDP 2007-2013. The principal changes for the 2014-2020 period relating to biodiversity have been with respect to successful engagement with recovery strategies for some bird species such as corncrake, chough and corn bunting.

According to a stakeholder, overall the AECS is delivering its core objectives of supporting the preservation and enhancement of biodiversity, including Natura 2000 areas and designated sites. The breakdown of expenditure for AECS options for 2015 shows that a significant part of the funds were allocated to interventions that will deliver core objectives supporting the recovery vulnerable species, the farmland bird index, HNV farming and Natura 2000.

The breakdown of expenditure by options for 2016 is not yet available, but overall levels of funding are maintained (although demand has not met the budget initially allocated).

Measure 13: Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS)

Some 85% of agricultural area in Scotland is classed as LFA. The LFASS supports 11,300 farmers and crofters. Though within Pillar 2, it acts similarly to a Pillar 1 scheme of income support and, we were told, is more important than the latter for many farmers; for these, viability depends on the LFASS payments and without these payments, land abandonment would likely follow, with negative socio-economic and environmental consequences. LFASS supports livestock systems in remote and fragile areas and there is an implied impact on biodiversity. Grazing helps to maintain habitats and reduce rank grassland and monoculture species. Sheep grazing in remote areas provides greater environmental enhancements than does cattle grazing. The evaluators were told that previous studies have suggested that there are environmental benefits as a result of the scheme.

Measure 15: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS)

There are specific habitat and species options within the FGS, both for capital and on-going management works. The Scottish Government said that roughly €3.6-4.8 million per year is targeted towards biodiversity enhancements under the FGS. The woodland creation programme is to establish native woodlands because it is recognised that Scotland has only 4% native woodland cover and this is fragmented. Priorities are focused on EU designated sites and protected species. There are biodiversity targets based on these habitats. Woodlands are a component of this.

7.h6) Conclusions and recommendations

7.h6.a) Conclusion / Recommendation 1

Conclusion:

RDP interventions have supported the restoration, preservation and enhancement of biodiversity, including in Natura 2000 areas, areas facing natural or other specific constraints and HNV farming. However, the extent of these impacts are not quantified at this stage and in many cases it is too early to expect impacts from this programming period to have emerged. That said, it is clear that the general direction of travel over successive programming periods has been positive and this is expected to continue.

Recommendation:

That steps are taken to quantify the impacts that the various schemes, individually and collectively, have on biodiversity. This will mean that adequate monitoring facilities are required, although the difficulties in establishing a baseline and assigning causality are recognised.

7.i) CEQ09-4B - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the improvement of water management, including fertilizer and pesticide management?

7.i1) List of measures contributing to the FA

Measures programmed under this Focus Area for agricultural land are:

- M01 - Knowledge transfer and information actions (art 14);
- M02 - Advisory services, farm management and farm relief services (art 15);
- M04 - Investments in physical assets (art 17);
- M08 - Investments in forest area development and improvement of the viability of forests (art 21-26);
- M10 - Agri-environment-climate (art 28);
- M11 - Organic farming (art 29);
- M13 - Payments to areas facing natural or other specific constraints (art 31); and
- M16 - Co-operation (art 35).

Measures programmed under this Focus Area for forestry land are:

- M08 - Investments in forest area development and improvement of the viability of forests (art 21-26); and
- M15 - Forest environmental and climate services and forest conservation (art 34).

7.i2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ

Judgment criteria	Common result indicator	Additional result indicator
Water quality has improved	R8 / T10: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts to improve water management (focus area 4B)	
Water quality has improved	R9 / T11: percentage of forestry land under management contracts to improve water management (focus area 4B)	

7.i3) Methods applied

This CEQ has been answered using a combination of monitoring data provided to the evaluators by the Scottish Government and qualitative input from interviews carried out with relevant Scottish Government officials and their written responses to questions. Stakeholders were requested to provide written feedback based on a set of questions developed from the judgement criteria and qualitative adaptations of the indicators. This information has been used to provide additional context.

7.i4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources

Indicator type	Indicator code and name (unit)	Ratio	Indicator value	Calculated gross value	Calculated net value	Data and information sources

Common result indicator	R8 / T10: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts to improve water management (focus area 4B)	Yes	10.88%			
Common result indicator	R9 / T11: percentage of forestry land under management contracts to improve water management (focus area 4B)	Yes	1.74%			

7.i5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings

Monitoring data are collected for Focus Area 4 in total and are not split into 4A, 4B and 4C. This makes assigning impacts to water management problematic. More generally, there is an absence of quantitative evidence on the impact on water management of participation in SRDP schemes which makes linking more general trends to interventions.

7.i5.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this Focus Area:

- M01: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF);
- M02: Farm Advisory Service (FAS);
- M04: Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme (AECS);
- M08: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS);
- M10: Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme (AECS);
- M13: Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS);
- M15: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS);
- M16: Environmental Co-operation Action Fund (ECAAF), Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS) (no expenditure to date);
- Rural Priorities (RP) (2007-2013); and
- Land Managers Options (LMO) (2007-2013).

Financial inputs and output data

Monitoring data are collected for Focus Area 4 in total and are not split into 4A, 4B and 4C. The European Commission reporting requirements do not require a split of data for Measure 10.

Some €1,282,563 was spent to the end of 2016 under Measure 1 (KTIF, programmed under Focus Area 2A, but indirectly relevant to Focus Area 4) (O1).

Public expenditure under Measure 2 under Focus Area 4 amounted to €116,309 by the end of 2016 (O1).

Total public expenditure under Measure 4 under Focus Area 4 had reached €5,773,807 by the end of 2016 (O1). Some €4,468,013 of this (77%) related to commitments entered into in the 2007-2013 programming period (RP) with €1,305,794 (23%) spent under AECS. Total investment amounted to €10,184,027 as a result of leverage under the RP scheme.

Some €54,185,296 of public expenditure took place under Measure 8 to the end of 2016 (O1). The vast majority of this related to on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 programming period under RP (€51,574,947, 95%); the FGS contributed €2,610,650 (5%).

Total public expenditure under Measure 10 relevant to Focus Area 4 to the end of 2016 amounted to €78,513,850, all disbursed under commitments made in the 2007-2013 programming period (80% of the total was disbursed under RP with the remainder under LMO).

Total public expenditure under activities which can be expected to have an impact on Focus Area 4B amounted to €34,816,184 by the end of 2016 (44% of the total). Total expenditure under Measure 13 relevant to Focus Area 4 (Less Favoured Area Support Scheme) amounted to €67,520,239 by the end of 2016.

Total public expenditure under Measure 15 relevant to Focus Area 4 (RP and LMO) amounted to €7,604,892 to the end of 2016.

By the end of 2016, 10.88% of agricultural land was under management contracts to improve water management (R8/T10), as was 3.02% of forest/other wooded area (T11). Both these figures relate specifically to Focus Area 4B.

There was no expenditure under Measure 1 under Focus Area 4 to the end of 2016.

Two actions/operations on the training of advisors relevant to Focus Area 4 had taken place by the end of 2016 under Measure 2 (O3) with 55 advisors trained by the end of 2016 (O14).

Support for 455 non-productive investments linked to the achievement of agri-environment-climate objectives had been delivered under Measure 4 (sub-measure 4.4) by the end of 2016 (O3); 82% of these were delivered under legacy schemes (RP) with the remainder being supported under AECS.

By the end of 2016, 8,576 hectares had been provided with support for afforestation/creation of woodland under Measure 8, sub-measure 8.1 with a further 17,919 hectares supported for maintenance only under RP in 2014 and 17,739 hectares in 2016 (O5). A further 63 hectares had received support under sub-measure 8.4 for the restoration of damage to forests from forest fires and natural disasters and catastrophic events (O5); this support was spread across 7 holdings/beneficiaries (O4). Measure 8, sub-measure 8.5, also supported 87 actions/operations to improve the resilience and environmental value of forest ecosystems which covered 897 hectares (O5). These data cannot be sub-divided.

The monitoring data held on outputs under Measure 10 is complicated because under some schemes area supported can address multiple issues and there is therefore the potential for double counting. This applies to the area under the LMO scheme whereas the RP scheme is unique. Data cannot be summed across years without double counting areas. It is also not always possible to be certain where the output recorded under some codes (for example, "other") will have an impact. It should also be noted that only legacy schemes (RP and LMO) had outputs to the end of 2016. The Measure 10 aspects of the new AECS have been implemented post-2016.

A total of 1,152,951 hectares of land was under agreement under Measure 13 (LFASS) under Focus Area 4 by the end of 2016 (O5). This area related to 5,744 holdings/beneficiaries. No further breakdown is possible.

Some 6,690 hectares were under legacy agreements under Measure 15 (RP and LMO) in 2014, 793 hectares

in 2015 and 14,681 in 2016.

Qualitative assessment

Measure 1: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

A number of KTIF-funded projects are relevant to this question. Whilst none appear to be focused specifically on water management, several are concerned with input use, primarily for biodiversity reasons, and these will also be relevant to water quality.

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

Water management and pesticide and fertiliser management is included as a significant component in the FAS one-to-many delivery activities, accounting for some 27% of the current budget. The soil nutrient network farms, the Farming for a Better Climate initiative and the Farming and Water Scotland deliveries under the FAS are SRDP interventions aimed at improving water management, as well as fertiliser and pesticide management. The inclusion of integrated pest management under the crop health initiatives creates further significant delivery. The Scottish Government believes that Farming for a Better Climate and the Soil Nutrient Network farms in particular have had significant impact on the interventions as far as water management and fertiliser and pesticide management are concerned. Many agreements are multi-annual and long-term in nature and so short-term impacts will not yet have emerged. However, it is believed that in particular the creation of catchment area discussion groups will encourage cooperation amongst beneficiaries to the benefit of the catchment area.

Measures 4 and 10: Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme

The design of the AECS is intended to deliver benefits in water management, including fertilizer and pesticides management. Diffuse pollution mitigation is a national priority within AECS. We were told that every AECS application has to consider the diffuse pollution pressures as part of the farm environmental assessment of the holding. This process requires that applicants carry out a diffuse pollution assessment to identify risks on farm and identify the options to reduce pollution risk.

The Scottish Government told the evaluators that AECS has a number of options available which, if appropriately located, will have a benefit for water quality. These options include: riparian and in-field buffers, ponds, wetlands, swales, sediment traps, bridges, alternative watering facilities, etc. Some new capital items have been developed to help address diffuse pollution pressure, for example, Rural Sustainable Drainage capital items. The availability of several capital items dealing with diffuse pollution has been restricted to areas of Scotland identified as priorities for addressing diffuse pollution in order to target support at the areas with the greatest need for intervention. Funding is also available for irrigation ponds within specific target areas; these are aimed at helping farmers store more water over the winter for summer use to reduce the amount of water abstracted from rivers during dry weather. Funding to take forward natural flood management, for example, embankment removal, is also possible. In terms of fertiliser management, the slurry storage option will help farmers to better apply slurry at times of the year when best use can be made of the nutrients. With regard to pesticide management, options are available to help improve handling and mixing areas, such as funding options for concrete pads, biobeds, etc.

According to a stakeholder, the AECS contributes to the following:

- Scotland's climate change targets by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture and securing carbon stores in peatlands and other organic soils.
- meeting obligations to improve water quality under the EU Water Framework Directive by reducing

diffuse pollution.

- control of flooding through natural flood risk management.
- support of organic farming.

It does this through supporting the improvement of water management, including fertilizer and pesticide management, through options such as Wetland management; water margins in grassland fields; and, management of floodplains. A majority of AECS options restrict fertilizer and pesticide management. The scheme also targets options so that funds are directed towards locations of greatest need or where they are likely to deliver the most effective outcomes.

Measure 15: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS)

There is a water management theme within the woodland creation element of the FGS. This is targeted in various ways including support for woodland in areas where there are water quality and/or flooding issues. There is a higher contribution of grant in these areas. Areas which are at flood risk, or which do not meet current standards, are targeted.

7.i6) Conclusions and recommendations

7.i6.a) Conclusion / Recommendation 1

Conclusion:

RDP interventions have supported the improvement of water management, including fertilizer and pesticide management. However, the extent of their impact cannot be adequately assessed at this stage and in many cases it is too early to expect impacts from this programming period to have emerged. That said, it is clear that the general direction of travel over successive programming periods has been positive and this is expected to continue.

Recommendation:

That steps are taken to quantify the impacts that the various schemes, individually and collectively, have on water management. This will mean that adequate monitoring facilities are required, although the difficulties in establishing a baseline and assigning causality are recognised.

7.j) CEQ10-4C - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the prevention of soil erosion and improvement of soil management?

7.j1) List of measures contributing to the FA

Measures programmed under this Focus Area for agricultural land are:

- M01 - Knowledge transfer and information actions (art 14);
- M02 - Advisory services, farm management and farm relief services (art 15);
- M04 - Investments in physical assets (art 17);
- M08 - Investments in forest area development and improvement of the viability of forests (art 21-26);
- M10 - Agri-environment-climate (art 28);
- M11 - Organic farming (art 29);
- M13 - Payments to areas facing natural or other specific constraints (art 31); and
- M16 - Co-operation (art 35).

Measures programmed under this Focus Area for forestry land are:

- M08 - Investments in forest area development and improvement of the viability of forests (art 21-26); and
- M15 - Forest environmental and climate services and forest conservation (art 34).

7.j2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ

Judgment criteria	Common result indicator	Additional result indicator
Soil management has improved	R10 / T12: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion (focus area 4C)	
Soil management has improved	R11 / T13: percentage of forestry land under management contracts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion (focus area 4C)	
Soil erosion has been prevented		Additional information on soil erosion of the land under management contracts.

7.j3) Methods applied

This CEQ has been answered using a combination of monitoring data provided to the evaluators by the Scottish Government and qualitative input from interviews carried out with relevant Scottish Government officials and their written responses to questions. Stakeholders were requested to provide written feedback based on a set of questions developed from the judgement criteria and qualitative adaptations of the indicators. This information has been used to provide additional context.

7.j4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources

Indicator type	Indicator code and name (unit)	Ratio	Indicator value	Calculated gross value	Calculated net value	Data and information sources
Common result indicator	R10 / T12: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion (focus area 4C)	Yes	11.78%			
Common result indicator	R11 / T13: percentage of forestry land under management contracts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion (focus area 4C)	Yes	1.74%			
Result	Additional information on soil erosion of the land under management contracts.	No				Data are not available for this Additional Result Indicator.

7.j5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings

Monitoring data are collected for Focus Area 4 in total and are not split into 4A, 4B and 4C. This makes assigning impacts on soil erosion and improving soil management problematic. More generally, there is an absence of quantitative evidence on the impact on soil erosion and improving soil management of participation in SRDP schemes which makes linking more general trends to interventions.

7.j5.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this Focus Area:

- M01: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF);
- M02: Farm Advisory Service (FAS);
- M04: Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme (AECS);
- M08: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS);
- M10: Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme (AECS);
- M13: Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS);
- M15: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS);
- M16: Environmental Co-operation Action Fund (ECAAF), Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS) (no expenditure to date);
- Rural Priorities (RP) (2007-2013); and
- Land Managers Options (LMO) (2007-2013).

Financial inputs and output data

Monitoring data are recorded for Focus Area 4 in total and are not split into 4A, 4B and 4C. The European Commission reporting requirements do not require a split of data for Measure 10.

Some €1,282,563 was spent to the end of 2016 under Measure 1 (KTIF, programmed under Focus Area 2A,

but is indirectly relevant to Focus Area 4) (O1)..

Public expenditure under Measure 2 under Focus Area 4 amounted to €116,309 by the end of 2016 (O1).

Total public expenditure under Measure 4 under Focus Area 4 had reached €5,773,807 by the end of 2016 (O1). Some €4,468,013 of this (77%) related to commitments entered into in the 2007-2013 programming period (RP scheme) with €1,305,794 (23%) spent under AECS. Total investment amounted to €10,184,027 as a result of leverage under the RP scheme.

Some €54,185,296 of public expenditure took place under Measure 8 to the end of 2016 (O1). The vast majority of this related to on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 programming period under RP (€51,574,947, 95%); the FGS contributed €2,610,650 (5%).

Total public expenditure under Measure 10 relevant to Focus Area 4 to the end of 2016 amounted to €78,513,850, all disbursed under commitments made in the 2007-2013 programming period (80% of the total was disbursed under RP with the remainder under LMO).

Total public expenditure under activities which can be expected to have an impact on Focus Area 4C amounted to €33,763,877 by the end of 2016 (43% of the total). Total expenditure under Measure 13 relevant to Focus Area 4 (LFASS) amounted to €67,520,239 by the end of 2016.

Total public expenditure under Measure 15 relevant to Focus Area 4 (RP and LMO) amounted to €7,604,892 to the end of 2016.

By the end of 2016, 11.78% of agricultural land was under management contracts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion (T12), as was 3.02% of forest/other wooded area (R11/T13). Both these figures relate specifically to Focus Area 4C.

There was no expenditure under Measure 1 under Focus Area 4 to the end of 2016.

Two actions/operations on the training of advisors relevant to Focus Area 4 had taken place by the end of 2016 under Measure 2 (O3) with 55 advisors trained by the end of 2016 (O14).

Support for 455 non-productive investments linked to the achievement of agri-environment-climate objectives had been delivered under Measure 4 (sub-measure 4.4) by the end of 2016 (O3); 82% of these were delivered under legacy schemes (RP) with the remainder being supported under AECS.

By the end of 2016, 8,576 hectares had been provided with support for afforestation/creation of woodland under Measure 8, sub-measure 8.1 with a further 17,919 hectares supported for maintenance only under RP in 2014 and 17,739 hectares in 2016 (O5). A further 63 hectares had received support under sub-measure 8.4 for the restoration of damage to forests from forest fires and natural disasters and catastrophic events (O5); this support was spread across 7 holdings/beneficiaries (O4). Measure 8, sub-measure 8.5, also supported 87 actions/operations to improve the resilience and environmental value of forest ecosystems which covered 897 hectares (O5). These data cannot be sub-divided.

The monitoring data held on outputs under Measure 10 is complicated because under some schemes area supported can address multiple issues and there is therefore the potential for double counting. This applies to the area under the LMO scheme whereas the RP scheme is unique. Data cannot be summed across years without double counting areas. It is also not always possible to be certain where the output recorded under some codes (for example, "other") will have an impact. It should also be noted that only legacy schemes (RP and LMO) had outputs to the end of 2016. The Measure 10 aspects of the new AECS have been

implemented post-2016.

A total of 1,152,951 hectares of land was under agreement under Measure 13 (LFASS) under Focus Area 4 by the end of 2016 (O5). This area related to 5,744 holdings/beneficiaries. No further breakdown is possible.

Some 6,690 hectares were under legacy agreements under Measure 15 (RP and LMO) in 2014, 793 hectares in 2015 and 14,681 in 2016.

Qualitative assessment

Measure 1: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

A number of KTIF-funded projects are relevant to this question. Whilst none appear to be focused specifically on soil management, several are concerned with input use, primarily for biodiversity reasons, and these will also have some relevance for soil erosion and soil management.

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

The FAS one-to-many component has a significant input into soil erosion and more particularly soil improvement. The creation of 12 soil nutrient network farms as demonstration sites across Scotland covering a wide range of agricultural systems as well as soil types, including some of the most fragile soils in the country, is evidence of the focus and determination of the programme to address this particular aspect. The soil nutrient network farm initiative is set to run throughout the FAS one-to-many delivery period, through to December 2020, and is expected to use around 9% of the annual funding. The soil nutrient network farms, as well as attendance at prominent agricultural shows throughout the country by FAS, are both believed to be highly effective. The impact of the soil nutrient network farms will be more evident from 2018 onwards once results of management practices can be demonstrated. The focus on soil biodiversity is relatively novel and is considered to be of great importance in encouraging good practice. Attendance at agricultural shows under the farming and water Scotland banner is also focused on soil improvements.

Measures 4 and 10: Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme

The design of EACS interventions are expected to deliver good soil management in addition to their effects in terms of better management of water management, fertilizers and pesticides. Soil erosion has been addressed through management options such as converting arable land at risk of erosion or flooding to low-input grassland and from use of a range of other options such as water margins, grass strips in arable fields and retention of winter stubbles for wildlife and water quality. Some measures, such as tramline interruption, were not taken forward in the SRDP because of the difficulty in verifying that work had been undertaken and lack of clarity over contributions to equipment costs.

7.j6) Conclusions and recommendations

7.j6.a) Conclusion / Recommendation 1

Conclusion:

It is likely, based on the intervention logic, that SRDP interventions have contributed to supporting the

prevention of soil erosion and improvement of soil management. However, the extent cannot be quantified at this stage. Also, some impacts may not have yet had time to develop.

Recommendation:

That a monitoring system is set up to be adequate to enable this question to be answered at the 2019 Enhanced AIR and at the proposed subsequent ex-post evaluation. This should include the quantification of impacts on soil erosion and soil management.

7.k) CEQ11-5A - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to increasing efficiency in water use by agriculture?

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

No Measures are programmed under Focus Area 5A in the SRDP 2014-2020.

7.l) CEQ12-5B - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to increasing efficiency in energy use in agriculture and food processing?

7.11) List of measures contributing to the FA

Measures programmed under this Focus Area are:

- M01 - Knowledge transfer and information actions (art 14);
- M02 - Advisory services, farm management and farm relief services (art 15); and
- M16 - Co-operation (art 35).

7.12) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ

Judgment criteria	Common result indicator	Additional result indicator
Efficiency of energy use in agriculture and food processing has increased	R14: Increase in efficiency of energy use in agriculture and food-processing in RDP supported projects (focus area 5B)*	
Efficiency of energy use in agriculture and food processing has increased	T15: Total investment for energy efficiency (focus area 5B)	

7.13) Methods applied

This CEQ has been answered using a combination of monitoring data provided to the evaluators by the Scottish Government and qualitative input from interviews carried out with relevant Scottish Government officials and their written responses to questions. Stakeholders were requested to provide written feedback based on a set of questions developed from the judgement criteria and qualitative adaptations of the indicators. This information has been used to provide additional context.

7.14) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources

Indicator type	Indicator code and name (unit)	Ratio	Indicator value	Calculated gross value	Calculated gross value out of which Primary contribution	Calculated gross value out of which Secondary contribution, including LEADER/CLLD contribution	Calculated net value	Data and information sources
Output	PST15B - Number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013	No	0.00					No expenditure has been made under Focus Area 5B by the Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund, which delivers Measure 1, since the start of the SRDP 2014-2020. Therefore no participants had been trained under this Focus Area by the end of 2016.
Common result indicator	R14: Increase in efficiency of energy use in agriculture and food-processing in RDP	No						No actions will be delivered against this Common Result Indicator under the SRDP 2014-2020.

	supported projects (focus area 5B)*							
Common result indicator	T15: Total investment for energy efficiency (focus area 5B)	No						Measures 4 and 7 are not programmed under Focus Area 5D as part of the SRDP 2014-2020, therefore there is no programmed value for this Target. Therefore there is no Indicator Value to report.

7.15) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings

The absence of indicator data at this stage means that the answer to this question relies on the intervention logic, specifically that beneficiaries will make suitable changes to farm management practices and that these will deliver the benefits expected.

7.15.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this Focus Area:

- M01: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF);
- M02: Farm Advisory Service (FAS); and
- M16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF) (no expenditure to end of 2016).

Financial inputs and output data

A total of €1,409,139 has been spent to the end of 2016 under Measure 1 (allocated to Focus Area 2A) which is potentially relevant to increasing efficiency in energy use in agriculture and food processing (O1). As noted under CEQ 1, 91% of relevant expenditure has been under the KTIF scheme.

Some €29,077 has been spent to the end of 2016 under Measure 2 under Focus Area 5B.

None of the outputs related to Measure 1 can be assigned to this Focus Area. However, 2 actions/operations relating to the training of advisors took place under Measure 2 (O3), under which 103 advisors were trained (O14).

No participants had been trained under this Focus Area by the end of 2016 (PSTI5B). The Managing Authority advised the evaluators that no actions have been delivered against Common Result Indicator 14 (increase in efficiency of energy use in agriculture and food-processing in RDP supported projects); there is also no programmed target for Common Result Indicator 15 (total investment for energy efficiency).

Qualitative assessment

Measures 1 and 16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

So far, no supported projects have contributed to energy efficiency, but it is within scope of the projects which can be supported.

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

The FAS one-to-many delivery activities have a focus through the Farming for a Better Climate initiative on energy efficiency and its use in agriculture. The use of climate change focus farms to demonstrate management practices including energy efficiency is an effective way of showing to a large audience (open days are well attended) the benefits that can be achieved. The objective is to demonstrate the financial and economic benefits of the actions taken on the focus farms and encourage adoption of techniques on a wide basis. This initiative promotes five key action areas that are designed to reduce greenhouse gases, one of which is related to the increased use of renewable resources. As part of the delivery under Farming for a Better Climate, renewable energy is a key topic area, along with utilising new technologies to improve energy efficiency. However, at this stage there is no evidence on impacts resulting from these activities.

According to a stakeholder, under the new Scottish FAS, carbon audits are being delivered and are likely to impact positively on energy efficiencies.

7.16) Conclusions and recommendations

7.16.a) *Conclusion / Recommendation 1*

Conclusion:

RDP interventions have the potential to contribute to increasing efficiency in energy use in agriculture and food processing, and may have done so through the FAS. However, the extent of the impact cannot be assessed at this time.

Recommendation:

That progress is made in developing data to populate the indicators. It will also be necessary to investigate impacts.

7.m) CEQ13-5C - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to the supply and use of renewable sources of energy, of by-products, wastes, residues and other non-food raw material for purposes of the bio-economy?

7.m1) List of measures contributing to the FA

Measures programmed under this Focus Area are:

- M01 - Knowledge transfer and information actions (art 14);
- M02 - Advisory services, farm management and farm relief services (art 15); and
- M16 - Co-operation (art 35).

7.m2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ

Judgment criteria	Common result indicator	Additional result indicator
The supply of renewable energy has increased	R15: Renewable energy produced from supported projects (focus area 5C)*	
The supply of renewable energy has increased	T16: Total investment in renewable energy production (focus area 5C)	
The use of renewable energy has increased		Renewable energy used in supported holdings
The use of renewable energy has increased		Total investments for the use of renewable energy supported by the RDP;

7.m3) Methods applied

This CEQ has been answered using a combination of monitoring data provided to the evaluators by the Scottish Government and qualitative input from interviews carried out with relevant Scottish Government officials and their written responses to questions. Stakeholders were requested to provide written feedback based on a set of questions developed from the judgement criteria and qualitative adaptations of the indicators. However, no responses relevant to this CEQ were provided.

7.m4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources

Indicator type	Indicator code and name (unit)	Ratio	Indicator value	Calculated gross value	Calculated gross value out of which Primary contribution	Calculated gross value out of which Secondary contribution, including LEADER/CLLD contribution	Calculated net value	Data and information sources
Output	PST15C - Number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013	No	0.00					No expenditure has been made under Focus Area 5C by the Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund, which delivers Measure 1, since the start of the SRDP 2014-2020. Therefore no participants had been trained under this Focus Area by the end of 2016.

Common result indicator	R15: Renewable energy produced from supported projects (focus area 5C)*	No					No actions will be delivered against this Common Result Indicator under the SRDP 2014-2020.
Common result indicator	T16: Total investment in renewable energy production (focus area 5C)	No					Measures 4, 6, 7 and 8 are not programmed under Focus Area 5C as part of the SRDP 2014-2020, therefore there is no programmed value for this Target. Therefore there is no Indicator Value to report.
Result	Renewable energy used in supported holdings	No					Data are not available for this Additional Result Indicator.
Result	Total investments for the use of renewable energy supported by the RDP;	No					Data are not available for this Additional Result Indicator.

7.m5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings

The absence of any delivery by the end of 2016 means that this question cannot be answered meaningfully at this stage.

7.m5.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this Focus Area:

- M01: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF);
- M02: Farm Advisory Service (FAS); and
- M16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF) (no expenditure to end of 2016).

Financial inputs and output data

A total of €1,409,139 has been spent to the end of 2016 under Measure 1 (allocated to Focus Area 2A) which is potentially relevant to the supply and use of renewable sources of energy, of by-products, wastes, residues and other non-food raw material for purposes of the bio-economy (O1). As noted under CEQ 1, 91% of relevant expenditure has been under the KTIF scheme.

Some €14,539 had been spent to the end of 2016 under Measure 2 under Focus Area 5C.

None of the outputs related to Measure 1 can be assigned to this Focus Area. Despite expenditure having been incurred, the monitoring system does not record any outputs under Measure 2 under this Focus Area.

No participants had been trained under this Focus Area by the end of 2016 (PSTI5C). The Managing Authority advised the evaluators that no actions have been delivered against Common Result Indicator 15 (renewable energy produced from supported projects); there is also no programmed target for Common Result Indicator 16 (total investment in renewable energy production) and data are not available on renewable energy used in supported holdings (additional result indicator).

Qualitative assessment

Measures 1 and 16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (no expenditure under M16 to end of 2016)

So far, no supported projects have contributed to the supply and use of renewable energy, but it is within scope of the projects which can be supported.

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

Increasing efficiency of energy use is being addressed through the FAS programme in the same manner and at the same time as the adoption and promotion of renewable energy sources. The FAS one-to-many delivery activities have a focus through the Farming for a Better Climate initiative on energy efficiency and its use in agriculture. The use of climate change focus farms to demonstrate management practices including energy efficiency is an effective way of showing to a large audience (open days are well attended) the benefits that can be gained. The objective is to demonstrate the financial and economic benefits of the actions taken on the focus farms and encourage adoption of techniques on a wide basis. This initiative promotes five key action areas that are designed to reduce greenhouse gases, one of which is related to the increased use of renewable resources. As part of the delivery under Farming for a Better Climate, renewable energy is a key topic area, along with utilising new technologies to improve energy efficiency. As noted, elsewhere, demonstration does not necessarily translate to implementation and impacts and there is an absence of evidence in these regards at this stage in the process.

7.m6) Conclusions and recommendations

7.m6.a) *Conclusion / Recommendation 1*

Conclusion:

SRDP interventions have potentially contributed to the supply and use of renewable sources of energy, of by-products, wastes, residues and other non-food raw material for purposes of the bio-economy. However, evidence on changes made on-farm and the impacts of these changes is not available at this point in the process and results indicators are not available.

Recommendation:

That steps are taken to populate indicators for the Enhanced AIR of 2019 and the proposed ex-post evaluation of the SRDP. It would also be advisable to consider how the impacts on-farm should be evaluated.

7.n) CEQ14-5D - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to reducing GHG and ammonia emissions from agriculture?

7.n1) List of measures contributing to the FA

Measures programmed under this Focus Area are:

- M01 - Knowledge transfer and information actions (art 14);
- M02 - Advisory services, farm management and farm relief services (art 15);
- M04 - Investments in physical assets (art 17);
- M10 - Agri-environment-climate (art 28); and
- M16 - Co-operation (art 35).

7.n2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ

Judgment criteria	Common result indicator	Additional result indicator
GHG and ammonia emissions from agriculture has been reduced	R18: Reduced emissions of methane and nitrous oxide (focus area 5D)*	
GHG and ammonia emissions from agriculture has been reduced	R19: Reduced ammonia emissions (focus area 5D)*	
GHG and ammonia emissions from agriculture has been reduced	R16 / T17: percentage of LU concerned by investments in live-stock management in view of reducing GHG and/or ammonia emissions (focus area 5D)	
GHG and ammonia emissions from agriculture has been reduced	R17 / T18: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts targeting reduction of GHG and/or ammonia emissions (focus area 5D)	

7.n3) Methods applied

This CEQ has been answered using a combination of monitoring data provided to the evaluators by the Scottish Government and qualitative input from interviews carried out with relevant Scottish Government officials and their written responses to questions. Stakeholders were requested to provide written feedback based on a set of questions developed from the judgement criteria and qualitative adaptations of the indicators. However, no responses relevant to this CEQ were received.

7.n4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources

Indicator type	Indicator code and name (unit)	Ratio	Indicator value	Calculated gross value	Calculated gross value out of which Primary contribution	Calculated gross value out of which Secondary contribution, including LEADER/CLLD contribution	Calculated net value	Data and information sources
Common result	R18: Reduced emissions of methane and nitrous	No						Data are not available for this Common Result

indicator	oxide (focus area 5D)*							Indicator.
Common result indicator	R19: Reduced ammonia emissions (focus area 5D)*	No						Data are not available for this Common Result Indicator.
Common result indicator	R16 / T17: percentage of LU concerned by investments in live-stock management in view of reducing GHG and/or ammonia emissions (focus area 5D)	Yes	0%					No expenditure on Measure 4, which supports livestock management, has been made under Focus Area 5D by the Agri-Environment Climate Scheme since the start of the SRDP 2014-2020. Therefore, the Indicator Value is zero.
Common result indicator	R17 / T18: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts targeting reduction of GHG and/or ammonia emissions (focus area 5D)	Yes	10.88%					

7.n5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings

Although there are some data to populate the common result indicators, most of the evidence available to the evaluators relies on outputs and the intervention logic under which these should be translated into outcomes. Some of the activities relevant to this Focus Area have only recently been instigated and outcomes are not yet apparent.

7.n5.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this Focus Area:

- M01: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF);
- M02: Farm Advisory Service (FAS);
- M04: Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme (AECS) (no expenditure to the end of 2016);
- M10: Beef Efficiency Scheme (BES) (no expenditure to the end of 2016); and
- M16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF) (no expenditure to end of 2016).

Financial inputs and output data

A total of €1,409,139 has been spent to the end of 2016 under Measure 1 (allocated to Focus Area 2A) which is potentially relevant to reducing GHG and ammonia emissions from agriculture (O1). As noted under CEQ 1, 91% of relevant expenditure has been under the KTIF scheme.

Some €14,539 has been spent to the end of 2016 under Measure 2 under Focus Area 5D.

None of the outputs related to Measure 1 can be assigned to this Focus Area because they are recorded elsewhere (this does not though mean that there are no impacts in practice). Despite expenditure having been incurred, the monitoring system does not record any outputs under Measure 2 under this Focus Area; again this does not preclude relevant impacts.

Qualitative assessment

Measures 1 and 16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (no expenditure under Measure 16 to end of 2016)

So far, no supported projects have contributed to reducing GHG and ammonia emissions from agriculture, but it is within scope of the projects which can be supported.

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

Written submissions from scheme administrators reported that significant contributions from the FAS have been made towards climate change, and in particular reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The Farming for a Better Climate initiative is particularly focused on this area. The five key action areas include carbon sequestration; improve nutrient use; optimising livestock performance; along with energy and fuel use; and, renewable technologies. We have been told that the first three are very much about reducing greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture. By optimising livestock performance and improving nutrient use and adopting carbon sequestration whenever possible, reductions in greenhouse gas emissions are achievable. These are promoted using a whole range of techniques, including the use of Marginal Abatement Cost Curves (MACC) that show where the biggest returns come to the business in financial terms as well as carbon terms. The production of carbon footprinting tools in the one-to-one programme is also a significant component in delivering reduced greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture. The FAS uses a range of techniques to get the message across about reducing GHG gases, including the climate change focus farms, a series of practical guides to highlight the key adaptation and mitigation options, the production of farmer case studies, and guidance notes, as well as social media and video footage. In common with most of the evidence we have gathered relating to FAS, it is necessary to make the point that this focuses on outputs rather than outcomes and it will be necessary in the future to consider implementation and the impact that this has.

Measure 4: Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme (no expenditure to the end of 2016)

The design of the AECS is intended to contribute to reducing GHG and ammonia emissions from agriculture. AECS has a 'slurry store option' which allows farm businesses to apply for a contribution to modern facilities which will reduce GHG and ammonia emissions, and contribute to the Scottish Government's Climate Change Plan. A Scottish Government official told the evaluators that the first full round of slurry storage applications closes at the end of June 2017; therefore, benefits have not yet materialised. Any future GHG benefit will accrue from better timing of application of slurry, but reduced ammonia emissions will only be realised if improved application methods are also implemented. This is something that will need to be followed up in future evaluations.

AECS also includes measures to secure carbon stores in peatland; further information on this was not made available to the evaluators.

Measure 10: Beef Efficiency Scheme (BES)

The BES has only been running for one year and, as a result, there has been no direct impact in terms of GHG improvements or ammonia emissions to the end of 2016. However, applicants have to complete a carbon audit which will guide the management changes that they make; we have been told that any genetic improvement is unlikely to make any difference in the early years of the scheme. Ammonia emissions will only be reduced as the planned management of the way in which organic manures are stored or applied to land (for example, by injecting slurry rather than broadcast spreading) come into effect.

7.n6) Conclusions and recommendations

7.n6.a) *Conclusion / Recommendation 1*

Conclusion:

SRDP interventions have contributed to reducing GHG and ammonia emissions from agriculture, but the extent of this cannot be quantified at the present time.

Recommendation:

That steps are taken to populate gaps in indicators by the time of the Enhanced AIR 2019 and in preparation for the proposed ex-post evaluation. Attention will need to be given to assessing impacts on-farm.

7.o) CEQ15-5E - To what extent have RDP interventions supported carbon conservation and sequestration in agriculture and forestry?

7.01) List of measures contributing to the FA

Measures programmed under this Focus Area are:

- M01 - Knowledge transfer and information actions (art 14);
- M02 - Advisory services, farm management and farm relief services (art 15);
- M08 - Investments in forest area development and improvement of the viability of forests (art 21-26); and
- M16 - Co-operation (art 35).

7.02) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ

Judgment criteria	Common result indicator	Additional result indicator
Carbon conservation and sequestration in agriculture and forestry has increased	R20 / T19: percentage of agricultural and forest land under management contracts contributing to carbon sequestration and conservation (focus area 5E)	
Agricultural and forestry land under enhanced management contract contributing to carbon sequestration has been enlarged	R20 / T19: percentage of agricultural and forest land under management contracts contributing to carbon sequestration and conservation (focus area 5E)	

7.03) Methods applied

This CEQ has been answered using a combination of monitoring data provided to the evaluators by the Scottish Government and qualitative input from interviews carried out with relevant Scottish Government officials. Stakeholders were requested to provide written feedback based on a set of questions developed from the judgement criteria and qualitative adaptations of the indicators. This information has been used to provide additional context.

7.04) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources

Indicator type	Indicator code and name (unit)	Ratio	Indicator value	Calculated gross value	Calculated net value	Data and information sources
Common result indicator	R20 / T19: percentage of agricultural and forest land under management contracts contributing to carbon sequestration and conservation (focus area 5E)	Yes	8.71%			

7.05) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings

The Common Results Indicator does not reflect the increase in area under enhanced management contracts

contributing to carbon sequestration, and the direct effect on sequestration is not measured or estimated by a model.

7.o5.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this Focus Area:

- M01: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF);
- M02: Farm Advisory Service (FAS);
- M08: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS);
- M16: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS) (no expenditure to the end of 2016);
- M16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF) (no expenditure to end of 2016);
- Rural Priorities (RP) (2007-2013); and
- Land Managers Options (LMO) (2007-2013).

Financial inputs and output data

A total of €1,409,139 has been spent to the end of 2016 under Measure 1 (allocated to Focus Area 2A) which is potentially relevant to supporting carbon conservation and sequestration in agriculture and forestry (O1). As noted under CEQ 1, 91% of relevant expenditure has been under the KTIF scheme.

Some €14,539 has been spent to the end of 2016 under Measure 2 under Focus Area 5E.

A total of €22,593,044 has been spent under Measure 8 to the end of 2016 (O1). Of this, just under a quarter (€5,199,882, 23%) was spent under the Forestry Grant Scheme with the majority spent under the legacy schemes (almost all under Rural Priorities, spend under Land Managers Options was marginal).

None of the outputs related to Measure 1 can be assigned to this Focus Area. Despite expenditure having been incurred, the monitoring system does not record any outputs under Measure 2 under this Focus Area.

A total of 3,568 hectares had been supported under sub-measure 8.1: support for afforestation/creation of woodland (establishment only) (O5) across 275 holdings (O4) by the end of 2016. The majority of holdings and areas supported was under the Rural Priorities scheme, as would be expected given that this accounted for the majority of expenditure.

A total of 755 actions/operations had been supported under sub-measure 8.5: support for investments improving the resilience and environmental value of forest ecosystems by the end of 2016 (O3). Of this total, 15% were supported under the Forestry Grant Scheme with the majority supported under the Rural Priorities scheme. These supported actions covered 128,834 hectares (O5), 96% of which were supported under the Rural Priorities scheme, again implying that the cost per hectare increased under the Forestry Grant Scheme.

By the end of 2016, 8.78% of agricultural and forest land was under management contracts contributing to carbon sequestration and conservation (R20/T19).

Qualitative assessment

Measure 8: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS)

The main anticipated impact on carbon conservation can be expected to come from projects under Measure 8 in the form of the FGS (only expenditure under Measure 8 has been made up to the end of 2016, though Measure 16 may subsequently contribute). The main sequestration contribution is planting new woodland, which accounts for about 80% of spend under the Scheme, the remainder being accounted for by forestry management (which has an impact on carbon conservation, though this is not the main focus of the support).

We have been told that woodland creation is a significant component of delivering Scotland's climate change target; there is what amounts to a legal commitment to which the FGS contributes. The target is to plant 7,000 hectares annually. This has not been achieved in the first two years of the SRDP due to a lag caused by the transition from the 2007-2013 programming period to the current one, though the evaluators have been told that planting will start catching up from 2017 and there is confidence within the Scottish Government that the targets will be delivered. Plantation forests are dominated by Sitka Spruce, but beneficiaries are being encouraged to use a wider range of species which are more climate resilient. In terms of the conservation of carbon, the focus is on existing woodland through increasing species diversity and adaptation to climate change and removing threats such as browsing mammals and non-native species such as rhododendron. If land owners can overcome these threats it will secure the future of these woodlands and the carbon that they lock up.

Estimates of the amount of carbon sequestered come from a model that brings together two elements. First, a typology (nine categories) of woodland plantation/commercial forestry that have different specifications and carbon sequestration potentials; and, second, the numbers of hectares planted of each type. Account is taken of the lower growth rate in specific geographical regions such as the highlands and islands.

Measure 1: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

So far, no supported projects have contributed to carbon conservation and sequestration, but it is within scope of the projects which can be supported.

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

Measure 2 (FAS) also contributes to carbon conservation and sequestration through advice delivered to farmers. Woodlands are a topic under the one-to-many FAS activities, with all aspects of woodland establishment, management and harvesting addressed. The FAS contributes in this area by encouraging good soil management practices on high carbon soils and by encouraging good farm woodland practices. FAS also signposts clients towards the other delivery components in the SRDP that deal directly with this issue (such as the FGS). Again, the translation of advice into impacts is important and the extent to which this takes place is unknown at this point in time.

According to a stakeholder, the new Scottish FAS specifically supports farm carbon audits by reviewing enterprises and use of fuels in considerable detail.

7.06) Conclusions and recommendations

7.06.a) Conclusion / Recommendation 1

Conclusion:

The SRDP, through Measure 8 (FGS), is supporting carbon conservation and sequestration and is doing this principally through the planting of new woodland, with better management of existing woodland providing some additional impact. A contribution is also made under Measure 2 (FAS).

Recommendation:

That information is made available on net changes in woodland area, and that for the 2019 Enhanced AIR, modelled estimates of carbon sequestration and conservation are made available to the evaluators to allow this question to be addressed more directly.

7.p) CEQ16-6A - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the diversification, creation and development of small enterprises and job creation?

7.p1) List of measures contributing to the FA

Measures programmed under this Focus Area are:

- M06 - Farm and business development (art 19); and
- M08 - Investments in forest area development and improvement of the viability of forests (art 21-26).

7.p2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ

Judgment criteria	Common result indicator	Additional result indicator
Jobs have been created	R21 / T20: Jobs created in supported projects (focus area 6A)	
Small enterprises have been created		Percentage of new small enterprises created with RDP support
Small enterprises have diversified their economic activity		Percentage of small enterprises in the nonagricultural sector created with the RDP support

7.p3) Methods applied

This CEQ has been answered using a combination of monitoring data provided to the evaluators by the Scottish Government and qualitative input from interviews carried out with relevant Scottish Government officials. Stakeholders were requested to provide written feedback based on a set of questions developed from the judgement criteria and qualitative adaptations of the indicators. However, no stakeholder provided relevant information on this CEQ.

7.p4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources

Indicator type	Indicator code and name (unit)	Ratio	Indicator value	Calculated gross value	Calculated net value	Data and information sources
Common result indicator	R21 / T20: Jobs created in supported projects (focus area 6A)	No	17.00			15 male and 2 female.
Result	Percentage of new small enterprises created with RDP support	No				Under Focus Areas 6A the projects that support farm and business development are on-going commitment from the 2007-2013 Programme. The number of small enterprises created with RDP support is not available.
Result	Percentage of small enterprises in the nonagricultural sector created with the RDP support	No				Under Focus Areas 6A the projects that support farm and business development are on-going commitment from the 2007-2013 Programme. The number of small enterprises created in the non-agricultural sector with RDP support is not available.

7.p5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings

The Measure 8 Forestry Grant Scheme is the only action listed as being relevant to this evaluation question from the 2014-2020 suite of measures (Rural Priorities, a legacy scheme from the 2007-2013 programming period is funded under Measure 6, sub-measure 6.4). However, it is likely that other parts of the current SRDP, such as Measure 6 (the NESUG and YFSUG schemes, sub-measures 6.3 and 6.1 respectively), will have an indirect influence and, though the FAS (Measure 2) explicitly does not deal with diversification, some impact of it on the development of small enterprises and job creation might be anticipated. The evaluators were also told that LEADER was the main support mechanism for diversification under the SRDP, but no data were available to investigate this.

7.p5.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this Focus Area:

- M08: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS); and
- Rural Priorities (RP) (2007-2013).

Financial inputs and output data

Total public expenditure under Rural Priorities (programmed under Measure 6) amounted to €1,186,101 by the end of 2016.

Total public expenditure under Measure 8 (FGS) to the end of 2016 amounted to €194,103. Total investment was €485,258, suggesting leverage of 1:1.5.

Eight actions/operations were supported under sub-measure 8.6: support for investments in forestry technologies and in processing, mobilising and marketing of forest products (O3). Under Measure 6, the target total of 17 jobs had been created under legacy schemes (Rural Priorities) by the end of 2016, of which 15 were male and 2 female (R21/T20) (O4).

Qualitative assessment

Measure 8: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS)

With respect to Measure 8 (FGS), forestry on farms is clearly one form of diversification, both of farm businesses and of the rural economy. Interviews with Scottish Government staff found that most of the woodland created has been on farms. Factors that inhibit this form of diversification include the relatively high price of land and the long period of waiting between planting and the flow of income, a gap that necessitates public intervention and without which planting would not take place. The cost of public intervention varies with *inter alia* the price of land. Related investments in machinery and access similarly would not be viable without support that is designed to enable projects to become viable.

There are undoubtedly positive impacts on rural business and jobs created that extend beyond the farms that undertake this form of diversification. There are significant positive effects on contractors, agents and managers, nurseries producing trees and other businesses concerned with providing capital items such as machinery and access infrastructure so the timber which would not otherwise be viable can be brought to market. In total some €36-48 million is being injected into the Scottish economy, and this will inevitably

have an impact.

In terms of quantifying the economic impacts, including job creation, data have so far been collected from some 100 cases and will be available for evaluation, though data have yet to be collated ready for use. The numbers of jobs created can also be assessed from knowing the labour requirements of activities such as tree planting, though this is more difficult in the timber processing stages.

Measure 19: LEADER

The evaluators were told that, although not programmed under this Focus Area, LEADER provides the main support for diversification under the SRDP.

7.p6) Conclusions and recommendations

7.p6.a) *Conclusion / Recommendation 1*

Conclusion:

The SRDP has supported the diversification, creation and development of small enterprises and job creation. The extent of the impact up to the end of 2016 has not been fully quantified, though data exist by which this may be done, at least for a sample of projects. Indirect calculation is also possible. We would expect other parts of the SRDP to also contribute to these aims.

Recommendation:

That, first, steps are taken to confirm that the monitoring system is capable of providing the data required to evaluate the impact of diversification on the creation and development of the small enterprises with which it is engaged and the jobs they create. Second, that consideration is given to how other parts of the SRDP also contribute to these aims.

7.q) CEQ17-6B - To what extent have RDP interventions supported local development in rural areas?

7.q1) List of measures contributing to the FA

Measures programmed under this Focus Area are:

- M07 - Basic services and village renewal in rural areas (art 20); and
- M19 - Support for LEADER local development (CLLD – community-led local development) (art 35 Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013).

7.q2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ

Judgment criteria	Common result indicator	Additional result indicator
		Percentage of RDP expenditure in Leader measures with respect to total RDP expenditure
		Number of projects/initiatives supported by the Local Development Strategy
Employment opportunities have been created via local development strategies	R24 / T23: Jobs created in supported projects (Leader) (focus area 6B)	
Rural territory and population covered by LAGs has increased	R22 / T21: percentage of rural population covered by local development strategies (focus area 6B)	
Access to services and local infrastructure has increased in rural areas	R23 / T22: percentage of rural population benefiting from improved services/infrastructures (focus area 6B)	
Services and local infrastructure in rural areas has improved	R23 / T22: percentage of rural population benefiting from improved services/infrastructures (focus area 6B)	
Rural people have participated in local actions		
Rural people have benefited from local actions		

7.q3) Methods applied

This CEQ has been answered using a combination of monitoring data provided to the evaluators by the Scottish Government and qualitative input from interviews carried out with relevant Scottish Government officials. Stakeholders were requested to provide written feedback based on a set of questions developed from the judgement criteria and qualitative adaptations of the indicators. This information has been used to provide additional context.

7.q4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources

Indicator type	Indicator code and name (unit)	Ratio	Indicator value	Calculated gross value	Calculated net value	Data and information sources
----------------	--------------------------------	-------	-----------------	------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------

Common result indicator	R22 / T21: percentage of rural population covered by local development strategies (focus area 6B)	Yes	86.76%			
Common result indicator	R23 / T22: percentage of rural population benefiting from improved services/infrastructures (focus area 6B)	Yes	0%			The projects that had been funded are on-going commitment from the 2007-2013 Programme. For these projects the population benefiting from improved services/infrastructures is not available.
Common result indicator	R24 / T23: Jobs created in supported projects (Leader) (focus area 6B)	No	0.00			There were no new LEADER projects funded by the end of 2016. The only projects that were funded were on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme. As a result there have been no new jobs created in LEADER supported projects.
Result	Percentage of RDP expenditure in Leader measures with respect to total RDP expenditure	Yes	3.24%			
Result	Number of projects/initiatives supported by the Local Development Strategy	No	263.00			

7.q5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings

Results indicators are not yet available. Expenditure to date relates almost entirely to projects approved originally under the SRDP 2007-2013.

7.q5.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this Focus Area:

1. M07: Improving Public Access (IPA);
2. M19: LEADER;
3. Rural Priorities (RP) (2007-2013); and
4. Land Managers Options (LMO) (2007-2013).

Financial inputs and output data

A total of €5,805,014 of public money has been spent under Measure 7 under Focus Area 6B to the end of 2016, all of which comes from commitments entered into in the 2007-2013 programming period (RP and LMO, O1). Total investment under Focus Area 6B totals €10,075,184 (O2). This money has been spent under sub-measures 7.4 - support for investments in the setting-up, improvement or expansion of local basic services for the rural population; 7.5 - support for investments for public use in recreational infrastructure, tourist information and small-scale tourism infrastructure; and, 7.6 - support for studies/investments associated with the maintenance, restoration and upgrading of the cultural and natural heritage of villages, landscapes and HNV sites. There is no breakdown of spend by sub-measure.

A total of €12,849,619 of public money has been spent to the end of 2016 under Measure 19 (O1). Of this, €7,641,855 (59%) has been spent under sub-measure 19.2 - Support for implementation of operations under the community-led local development strategy; €4,526,954 (35%) has been spent under sub-measure 19.4 - Support for running costs and animation; €544,648 (4%) has been spent under sub-measure 19.3 -

Preparation and implementation of cooperation activities of the local action; and, €136,162 (1%) has been spent under sub-measure 19.3 - Preparation and implementation of cooperation activities of the local action.

Four actions have been supported (one completed) under sub-measure 7.4 - support for investments in the setting-up, improvement or expansion of local basic services for the rural population; 120 have been supported (103 completed) under sub-measure 7.5 - support for investments for public use in recreational infrastructure, tourist information and small scale tourism infrastructure; and, 978 (all completed) under sub-measure 7.6 - support for studies/investments associated with the maintenance, restoration and upgrading of the cultural and natural heritage of villages, landscapes and HNV sites (O3).

The population covered by 21 LAGs (O19) is 2,100,000 (O18). Of these 21 LAGs, 14 are multi-funded (O19). Some 263 LEADER projects have been completed under sub-measure 19.2 - Support for implementation of operations under the community-led local development strategy (O20), as have been 23 inter-territorial co-operations and 6 transnational co-operations (O21). These have involved 17 and 3 unique LAGs respectively (O23).

Qualitative assessment

Measure 7: Improving Public Access (IPA)

Under the 2014-2020 SRDP, the IPA scheme sits within the Agri-Environment Climate Scheme, but draws on a different Measure (M07: Art. 20: “Basic services and village renewal in rural areas”). Contracts awarded after the first (2015) application round are resulting in claims in early 2017, after the period to which this Enhanced AIR relates.

The basic rationale of the IPA scheme is to support local development in rural areas by improving infrastructure, in the form of increasing the connectivity of existing path networks and removing barriers to allow walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders to use the network. IPA responds to locally produced proposals to create and enhance path networks. Applicants from a broad spectrum are eligible, including local authorities, public bodies, community groups and private landowners. The IPA comprises entirely of grants to support capital investment in assets relating to public access; there is no support to current activities or management. Consequently, local development comes from the way that these assets impact on improved public access and on the economic agents involved in the provision of these supported assets.

The design of the IPA scheme drew on lessons learned from capital grant schemes for infrastructure in the previous programming period (Rural Priorities and Land Management Options). This has resulted in a much simplified process of application and assessment, a set menu of 22 capital items and standard costs based on national averages (rather than multiple quotations for capital work) and a broader range of eligible applicants.

The initiatives for improving access are developed locally and provide for public goods that are not supported by other schemes. The system for scoring applications for acceptance favours local involvement such as partnerships and whether the path ties into longer distance routes. Applications are notified to the relevant local authority to raise their awareness (an improvement in information sharing beyond what was done under the previous grant system) and scoring takes into account their comments.

Currently data are only available on the number of schemes approved and money allocated (none being claimed before the end of 2016) (essentially input indicators). No data currently exist on output (such as the length of new paths created or upgraded) or the extent to which they have raised the usage of the existing networks to which they connect. The economic benefits (incomes, jobs, etc.) of this increased public access has not been assessed, though local accommodation facilities are expected to gain; new and improved routes

are publicised through opening events and then by local stakeholders as they promote tourism.

Measure 19: LEADER

The design of LEADER is directly aimed at supporting local development in rural areas. It has a bottom-up approach that develops priorities which are relevant to the local areas, covering economic, social and environmental impacts (to the extent that these can be supported under LEADER and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF)). The current LEADER has seen an increase in coverage by Local Development Strategies to effectively 100% of the territory of rural Scotland, up from about 90% of coverage in the 2007-2013 period; this covers 86% of the population of rural Scotland. Improvements have also been made to communications and governance, with careful consideration of the optimum share of costs that is spent on administration. Some other Managing Authorities have reduced the percentage of spend on administration and animation, but the Scottish Government considers that it is necessary to invest in animation to improve the quality and breadth of projects and for this reason, the allocation to animation remains at 25% of total spend. There are 21 signed Service Level Agreements (LAGs) each with 3-4 staff, an accountable body and a LAG Committee with some 10 people in each, some 500 people are involved in delivering LEADER across Scotland. Many LAGs were launched only in 2016 so there is generally a lack of output from their activities at this point in the programming period; the wider political context of the UK exit from the European Union has also caused delay. LEADER has a Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy against which LAGs will report, covering, *inter alia*, improved infrastructure, services, access to them, and other local benefits. Although there is no evidence yet, in time relevant data will be available.

The evaluators have also been told that LEADER provides the main support for diversification under the SRDP; some €12 million is allocated to diversification projects which are determined at the local level through the LAGs.

LEADER is designed to draw on supportive and synergistic relationships with other parts of the SRDP, in particular with the Scottish Rural Network and its encouragement of cooperation, but also extending to many other areas. The evaluators have been told that the SRN is also good at promoting LEADER. LEADER also supports trans-national cooperation by LAGs, such as with Northern Ireland.

A stakeholder explained that the SRDP contributes to supporting local developments in rural areas by providing support to individual agricultural businesses and through the LEADER programme. Local people are able to participate in, and benefit from, local actions through representation on LEADER LAGs (this is evidenced by meeting minutes). Stakeholders work together through the LEADER LAGs and through Community Planning partnerships and other localised structures.

7.q6) Conclusions and recommendations

7.q6.a) Conclusion / Recommendation 1

Conclusion:

The IPA scheme can be expected to support local development, though at present there is no information by which this can be assessed. Similarly, the design of LEADER is such that local development in rural areas can be expected, and local strategies and delivery groups now extend to virtually 100% of rural Scotland. There is a monitoring system in place which will provide evidence for the economic, environmental and social impacts, though it is too early for this to be available for use in evaluations.

--

Recommendation:

<p>While a full economic impact analysis of IPA would be disproportionate at this stage, a simple extension of monitoring to cover output (length of new paths, number of connections to existing networks, etc.) should be started. For LEADER, a watch should be kept on the accumulating data as it flows in and steps taken to fill gaps in the evidence necessary to answer this CEQ in 2019 and in the ex-post evaluation; this may include a separate evaluation of this part of the SRDP.</p>

7.r) CEQ18-6C - To what extent have RDP interventions enhanced the accessibility, use and quality of information and communication technologies (ICT) in rural areas?

7.r1) List of measures contributing to the FA

Measures programmed under this Focus Area are:

- M07 - Basic services and village renewal in rural areas (art 20).

7.r2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ

Judgment criteria	Common result indicator	Additional result indicator
Access of rural households to ICT has increased	R25 / T24: percentage of rural population benefiting from new or improved services/infrastructures (ICT) (focus area 6C)	

7.r3) Methods applied

This CEQ has been answered using a combination of monitoring data provided to the evaluators by the Scottish Government and qualitative input from interviews carried out with relevant Scottish Government officials. Stakeholders were requested to provide written feedback based on a set of questions developed from the judgement criteria and qualitative adaptations of the indicators. This information has been used to provide additional context.

7.r4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources

Indicator type	Indicator code and name (unit)	Ratio	Indicator value	Calculated gross value	Calculated net value	Data and information sources
Common result indicator	R25 / T24: percentage of rural population benefiting from new or improved services/infrastructures (ICT) (focus area 6C)	Yes	0%			No Broadband projects that will benefit the population in terms of new or improved services/infrastructures had been approved by the end of 2016.

7.r5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings

No projects that will benefit the population in terms of new or improved services/infrastructures had been approved by the end of 2016, no data are therefore available on the result indicator. There had been no spend up to the end of 2016.

7.r5.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this Focus Area:

M07: Broadband (no expenditure to the end of 2016).

Qualitative assessment

No projects that will benefit the population in terms of new or improved services/infrastructures had been approved by the end of 2016. However, qualitative information gathered from the Scottish Government enables a partial answer to be provided to this Evaluation Question. According to what a stakeholder told us, they were not aware of the role of the SRDP in enhancing the accessibility, use and quality of ICT in rural areas: this is probably due to the lack of project approvals to date.

Lack of Broadband is high on the list of priorities for rural areas, many of which have levels of service that are the cause of well-documented dissatisfaction among rural residents. The lack of Broadband facilities means that rural businesses cannot operate in the global market. People cannot work from home, business leaks out of the area, new businesses cannot start-up, tourism is affected because businesses cannot promote themselves and holiday makers demand access to the internet. The evaluators have been provided with research reports evidencing this importance of Broadband services to rural areas (see for example, Analysys Mason (2009) "Telecoms connectivity in the Highlands and Islands" –

<http://www.hie.co.uk/common/handlers/download-document.ashx?id=ae811a4f-196a-4806-8bcb-01a89f009bc8>). The importance of ICT to the attractiveness of rural areas was also stressed by a stakeholder who provided comments relevant to this question.

It must be understood that action under this Measure (M07, sub-measure 7.5) within the SRDP (Focus Area 6C) with the scheme title 'Broadband' does not itself provide new or enhanced broadband services; in the UK this is done under the Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK) scheme which is run by the UK Department of Media and Sport and supported by State Aid (<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/broadband-delivery-uk>).

Funding under the SRDP is to facilitate the provision of broadband; under the SRDP 'Broadband scheme' funds are made available to community groups to allow them to procure a private sector provider to design, build and operate a broadband network in their area. The BDUK will not recognise a project as valid until the community group has completed the procurement phase. Support can be provided when a preferred bidder has been identified. At this point the groups can apply for the funding and can draw down the money. Local community groups are also now being funded to help them get legal advice, etc. to help them make applications.

The scheme will deliver high quality broadband to the areas in which it operates (30 Mbps, which is Next Generation Access (NGA) access speed). This will meet the UK standard and will make rural areas comparable to urban areas. This compares to less than 0.5 Mbps currently available in eligible rural areas.

Scottish Government staff have indicated that there are 16 projects in the pipeline where assistance has been provided to scope demand and to meet the State Aid requirements. This includes a consultation process which requires the publication of postcodes to be served, so that it can be clear that there is no overlap with commercial operators. Some 7,000 to 9,000 households will benefit from these 16 projects if/when they are complete. These households are located in the most rural areas of Scotland and as such are unlikely to benefit from commercial or public funded provision, including the Digital Scotland Superfast Broadband (DSSB) Programme which aims to achieve close to 100% coverage. The Broadband scheme will help fill the gap in this provision.

Five groups are about to complete their procurement phase, at which point information on project costs will become apparent. There is greater demand than can be serviced with the current budget and the scheme is likely to be able to absorb additional funds should any become available.

Though no projects are yet completed, it is evident from the scheme design that it represents a high degree

of additionality, no or minimal displacement, but also high complementarity with other schemes associated with broadband services in rural areas. There is no evidence as yet on satisfaction of rural residents because no projects have yet been completed, though it is likely that their requirements will be met.

7.r6) Conclusions and recommendations

7.r6.a) *Conclusion / Recommendation 1*

Conclusion:

There is an expectation that spending under this Measure will enhance the accessibility, use and quality of ICT in the rural areas to which it applies.

Recommendation:

In view of the strong demand, consideration should be given to increasing the quantity of resources available. The monitoring system should be checked to ensure that it is capable of generating the required Common Results Indicator. As an additional indicator, it would be desirable to collect data on the additional GVA of businesses benefitting from the improved ICT services.

7.s) CEQ19-PE - To what extent have the synergies among priorities and focus areas enhanced the effectiveness of the RDP?

7.s1) Programme synergies and transverse effect

The SRDP programme document sets out the combination and justification of rural development Measures selected under each Focus Area. In each case the needs identified in the SWOT appear with an explanation of the way in which the relevant Measures will come together to address these needs. Measures are brigaded together to offer a comprehensive and coherent intervention. Scottish Government officials confirmed to the evaluators working on this Enhanced AIR that this intervention logic remains valid.

The main area of synergy within the SRDP relates to Priority 1. No spend is programmed under this Priority, but aspects of Measures under Priorities 2-5 have an indirect impact under Priority 1. This synergy is to be expected given that the architecture of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013.

The *ex-ante* evaluation concluded that there was consistency and complementarity within the SRDP and between the SRDP and other actions under the Structural Funds and Scottish domestic policy. Specific examples of synergy were pointed out such as that between Measure 13 (LFASS) under which support is provided to maintain sustainable farming systems through preventing land abandonment and conserving biodiversity, and Measure 19 (LEADER) which supports the development of rural communities by contributing to social cohesion and poverty reduction.

There is also synergy between aspects of Priority 4 where schemes relevant to one Focus Area are also relevant to others. The *ex-ante* evaluation noted the strong synergy between sustainable land management and the protection, enhancement and restoration of Scotland's iconic landscapes including hills, moorlands and farmland. Many land management actions that support landscape objectives can be designed to also deliver wider multiple benefits, including carbon sequestration and natural flood management (e.g. peatland restoration). This synergy between outputs is evidenced in the monitoring data where a substantial proportion of land under agreements contributes to all three Focus Areas under this Priority.

A review of schemes shows that there are multiple areas where synergy can be expected. Examples include the Broadband scheme (Measure 7) where improved connectivity will enhance the ability of beneficiaries to take part in other schemes; the suite of grants for young farmers/new entrants (Measures 4 and 6) where support for business planning can be used alongside support for investments; actions taken at the local level under LEADER (Measure 19) can be used with support for greater connectivity under the IPA scheme (Measure 7); the suite of cooperation sub-measures under Measure 16 where the Scottish Government told the evaluators of this Enhanced AIR that these were designed to ensure coherence from the customer point of view; and, the link between innovation and the provision of advice provided under Measures 1, 2 and 10 and through the SRN.

In terms of synergy between the SRDP and other policy initiatives, the *ex-ante* evaluation notes the strong synergy between green belt policy, vacant and derelict land policy/support and the vision and objectives of the Central Scotland Green Network. This is a key area where there is potential for targeted SRDP investment to deliver multiple benefits. Another example of synergy between the SRDP and wider policy initiatives relates to Measure 7 (Broadband) where the SRDP provides support to fill gaps in provision for remote areas that cannot be reached through the Digital Scotland Superfast Broadband (DSSB) Programme.

7.s2) Methods applied

This CEQ has been answered using a review of the SRDP programme document and the *ex-ante* evaluation supplemented by interviews with Scottish Government officials involved in the drafting of the SRDP and in

its on-going operation as well as officials responsible for operating individual schemes.

7.s3) Quantitative findings based on the calculation of secondary contributions of operations to focus areas

Scottish Government officials explained that there are no data at this stage in the programming period to allow the calculation of secondary contributions of operations to Focus Areas. However, evidence in this area might be available later in the programming period. That said, it should be noted that no Measures are programmed under Priority Area 1, yet several Measures are relevant to fostering knowledge transfer and innovation in agriculture, forestry and rural areas and therefore will have impacts in this area. It is not though possible to disaggregate the outputs and outcomes (when these become evident) and split these by Focus Area. In the case of Measure 1, which is programmed under Focus Area 2, many individual activities under specific interventions will have impacts on, say, fostering innovation (Focus Area 1A), but will also have impacts in terms of improving the economic performance of farms (Focus Area 2A). It is clearly not meaningful to try to apportion the impact between these two areas. Neither is it appropriate to count the impact under both Focus Areas because this would involve double counting; not every activity will have an impact in both areas.

The guidance available to evaluators under this question suggests that positive, negative or neutral interactions might be found. We can conclude that there are likely to be both positive and neutral interactions, but Scottish Government officials told the evaluators that, based on the careful planning of the SRDP and the choice of Measure combinations, it is considered unlikely that there are any negative interactions. In one area where negative interactions could be theoretically conceived (the environmental impact of supported physical investments highlighted in the Strategic Environmental Assessment which accompanied the ex-ante evaluation), it was explained to the evaluators that investments have to meet national planning regulations and these include provisions to protect the environment thereby ensuring that negative consequences are avoided.

7.s4) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings

It is possible to comment relatively extensively on the way in which the SRDP was designed and to conclude that it is highly likely that the programme will deliver synergies. However, there are currently no data with which to demonstrate quantitatively the ways in which synergies have enhanced the effectiveness of the SRDP. This is the result of the inability to split the outputs and, ultimately, outcomes between different Focus Area in a meaningful manner and also the lack of data which are available at this point in the programming period. As a result, the answer to this CEQ must rely on the relationship between Measures programmed into the SRDP and the intervention logic behind their inclusion.

7.s4.a) Answer to evaluation question

The SRDP was designed following a SWOT analysis and needs assessment and the Measures chosen were brigaded together to offer a comprehensive and coherent intervention. The evaluators are clear that the SRDP was designed to operate as a programme delivering synergies, rather than as a disparate group of Measures. Of particular note is the way in which Priority 1: “fostering knowledge transfer and innovation in

agriculture, forestry and rural areas” is programmed as a horizontal priority. There are other specific examples of synergies both within the SRDP and between the SRDP and other policy initiatives in Scotland (see above).

However, it is not possible at this stage in the programming period to come to a definitive conclusion on the extent to which synergies among Priorities and Focus Areas have enhanced the effectiveness of the RDP. Whilst it may be possible to present evidence to quantify synergies in 2019 and/or in the anticipated *ex-post* evaluation, the inherent challenges in apportioning impacts/outcomes between Focus Areas is likely to remain.

7.s5) Conclusions and recommendations

7.s5.a) Conclusion / Recommendation 1

Conclusion:

It is clear that the SRDP was designed with synergies between Measures in mind and the intervention logic for the programme strongly suggests that synergies will be delivered. However, this cannot be demonstrated in quantitative terms at this point in time.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Scottish Government considers how best to provide evidence of synergy in quantitative terms for the 2019 and ex-post evaluations.

7.t) CEQ20-TA - To what extent has technical assistance contributed to achieving the objectives laid down in Art. 59(1) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 and Art. 51(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013?

7.t1) Support for technical assistance (other than NRN)

The broad aims of technical assistance are to increase the effectiveness of other parts of the SRDP, enhance administrative performance and reduce burden on beneficiaries. The ex-ante evaluation notes that the proposed use of Technical Assistance included funding the Scottish Rural Network, IT systems to implement the SRDP and monitoring and evaluation. Approximately €4.8 million was set aside to operate an expanded SRN run within the Scottish Government (based on an identified need – see CEQ19); a further €1.2 million was allocated to operating monitoring and evaluation activities. Most of the Technical Assistance funds (€12 million) were set aside for the IT requirements of implementing the SRDP (the IT system also covers CAP Pillar 1 and this allocation is only the SRDP’s contribution). Total allocation to Technical Assistance is equivalent to 1% of the total SRDP budget and is therefore well within the permitted 4%.

7.t2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ

Judgment criteria	Common result indicator	Additional result indicator
Institutional and administrative capacities for the effective management of the RDP have been strengthened		Number of staff involved in RDP management
Institutional and administrative capacities for the effective management of the RDP have been strengthened		Skills of staff involved in RDP management
Institutional and administrative capacities for the effective management of the RDP have been strengthened		Functionality of the IT system for programme management
Capacities of relevant partners as defined by the Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013, Art. 5(1) have been reinforced		Types and number of capacity building activities
RDP has been communicated with the public and information has been disseminated		Number of RDP communication and dissemination activities
RDP has been communicated with the public and information has been disseminated		Number of people receiving information about the RDP
RDP has been communicated with the public and information has been disseminated		Information on the use of evaluation results
Monitoring has been improved		
Evaluation methods have been improved and have provided robust evaluation results		
The RDP implementation has been improved		The length of the application and payment process
Administrative burden on beneficiaries has been reduced		

7.t3) Methods applied

This CEQ has been answered using a review of the *ex-ante* evaluation of the SRDP 2014-2020, supplemented by interviews with Scottish Government officials involved in the drafting of this SRDP and in its on-going operation, as well as officials responsible for operating individual schemes in the current Programme.

7.t4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources

Indicator type	Indicator code and name (unit)	Ratio	Indicator value	Calculated gross value	Calculated net value	Data and information sources
Result	Skills of staff involved in RDP management	No				Not funded by Technical Assistance, however Scottish Government and delivery partners staff are experienced with a wide range of relevant technical and management skills.
Result	Functionality of the IT system for programme management	No				Technical Assistance has been used towards funding Pillar 2 elements of a new IT system to provide a new service for all CAP schemes.
Result	Number of RDP communication and dissemination activities	No				Not Technical Assistance funded, Rural Issues monthly newsletter to 12,000 recipients, weekly SRN newsletter to 1,100 recipients, 79 agent updates, 10 formal stakeholder meetings, social media activity.
Result	The length of the application and payment process	No				Varies, dependent on scheme rules and delivery mechanism.
Result	Types and number of capacity building activities	No				711 people have attended 14 SRN events.
Result	Information on the use of evaluation results	No				Ex-Post Evaluation of the Scotland Rural Development Programme 2007-2013 recommendations available from December 2016 to be used by the Rural Development Operational Committee.
Result	Number of staff involved in RDP management	No				No RDP management staff funded by Technical Assistance, management and delivery of the SRDP are a core function of the Scottish Government and delivery partners, for example the Rural Payments and Inspections Directorate have around 600 staff members.
Result	Number of people receiving information about the RDP	No				Technical Assistance funded - SRN weekly newsletter to 1,100 recipients. However, this is extensive beyond Technical Assistance funding, for example website hits – 248,000.

7.t5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings

The main problem with assessing the validity and reliability of the evaluation findings is the inability in the timescale to assess stakeholder views on the use of Technical Assistance. Given the nature of the Technical Assistance, this point is of greatest relevance to the operation of the SRN. It would be advisable to assess stakeholder perception of the use of Technical Assistance, and especially the operation of the SRN, in the 2019 and *ex-post* evaluations.

It is also worth adding a comment on the additional result indicators. Many of these appear impossible to capture in a single value (for example, “functionality of the IT system”. Others are not possible to derive, for example “number of people receiving information on the RDP” because it is not known how many people will read an article in the press. As a result of these difficulties, none of these indicators have been populated.

7.t5.a) Answer to evaluation question

The Scottish Government has built up considerable institutional experience of implementing the SRDP over successive programming periods. It is clear from previous evaluations that lessons learned have been used to continually improve the implementation of the SRDP over time. The *ex-ante* evaluation of the 2014-2020 SRDP makes clear that there has been careful consideration of possible improvements to implementation. Examples provided include a considerable simplification of implementation minimising bureaucracy for Scottish Government staff, delivering improvements to customer services. Specifically with reference to Technical Assistance the IT systems and processes for rural payments and inspections were updated, and the budget for the SRN was increased substantially to allow it to play a more significant role in improving implementation (see also CEQ21).

Promotion of the SRDP is an activity undertaken by the Managing Authority, a communication team with the Rural Payments and Inspections Directorate (RPID), the Scottish Government’s central communications team and the SRN. These units work together with the Technical Assistance funds relating to communication routed through the SRN.

As noted under CEQ 21, communication and dissemination activities under the SRN have been greatly enhanced since the 2007-2013 programming period. There is now greater awareness of the SRN among beneficiaries and within the Scottish Government, and this has helped with the quality of communication and the dissemination reach. It is not possible to determine how many people have received information about the SRDP due to the nature of the communication activities undertaken. However, it is possible to comment on the dissemination of specific forms of communication via the SRN, and this is presented under CEQ 21.

The budget for monitoring and evaluation has also been increased compared to the 2007-2013 programming period. However, a planned €360,000 contract to assess the impact of the RDP on biodiversity has not yet been let. Whilst this remains scheduled expenditure, there is a degree of uncertainty as to whether it will actually go ahead. This is because assessing the impact on biodiversity is complicated and it is difficult to establish a robust system. The importance attached to this issue is demonstrated by the fact that, according to Scottish Government officials, a large part of the discussion in the Monitoring and Evaluation Steering Group is focused on environmental monitoring. The importance attached to environmental monitoring is also demonstrated by the creation of an Agri-Environment sub-group.

The Scottish Government recognises the fact that the timing of the *ex-post* evaluation in the policy cycle precludes its use in formulating the successor SRDP. Despite this, efforts are being made to try to use the recommendations arising from the most recent *ex-post* evaluation more than has been the case in the past.

Whilst there has not been any change in the overall approach taken to evaluation, there have been improvements in terms of the availability of data (this has not been paid for under Technical Assistance). There is now an increased emphasis on evaluation and the evaluations undertaken are considered by the

Scottish Government to be robust.

The increased emphasis on evaluation has included engagement within the wider UK and the EU in activities designed to improve monitoring and evaluation performance using Technical Assistance funds through the activities of the SRN. In the opinion of Scottish Government officials, the same level of engagement across the EU would not have been possible without the Technical Assistance funds.

The increase in budget for key Technical Assistance activities demonstrates that the institutional and administrative capacities for the effective management of the RDP have been strengthened.

7.t6) Conclusions and recommendations

7.t6.a) *Conclusion / Recommendation 1*

Conclusion:

Technical Assistance has clearly contributed to achieving the objectives laid down in Art. 59(1) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 and Art. 51(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013, with a focus on monitoring, evaluation, information and communication and networking. The spend on Technical Assistance is, at 1%, well within the maximum of 4% of total RDP spending envisaged.

Recommendation:

Although the performance of the SRN appears to be much improved compared to the 2007-2013 programming period, a scheduled evaluation has not taken place and this should be undertaken to capture the improvements more thoroughly than is possible in this Enhanced AIR.

7.u) CEQ21-RN - To what extent has the national rural network contributed to achieving the objectives laid down in Art. 54(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013?

7.u1) Intervention logic of the NRN

The Action Plan for the Scottish Rural Network (SRN) sets out the four objectives required by Art. 54(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013:

1. Increase the involvement of stakeholders in the implementation of rural development;
2. Improve the quality of implementation of the rural development programme;
3. Inform the broader public and potential beneficiaries on rural development policy and funding opportunities; and
4. Foster innovation in agriculture, food production, forestry and rural areas.

The specific SRN objectives are listed as:

1. Support the effective delivery of LEADER Local Development Strategies;
2. Communicate the impacts and benefits of SRDP funding;
3. Engage stakeholders to help improve implementation of the SRDP and rural policy;
4. Promote innovative approaches to achieving rural development priorities;
5. Promote cooperation as an effective tool for Rural Development;
6. Promote the SRN as the ‘network of networks’; and
7. Collaborate at UK and European level to enhance learning and share best practice amongst NRNs.

The Action Plan links the seven specific objectives to types of activity, outputs and expected results and cross-references the specific objectives to the four objectives required by the Regulation.

7.u2) Link between judgment criteria, common and additional result indicators used to answer the CEQ

Judgment criteria	Common result indicator	Additional result indicator
Number and types of stakeholders involved in RDP implementation has increased		Number of stakeholders (by type) participating in the implementation of the RDP due to activities of the NRN (including those through LAGs)
The quality of implementation of the RDP has been improved through the activities of the NRN, e.g. - Improved capacity of RDP beneficiaries - Improved evaluation awareness - Lessons from evaluations are taken into account in programme implementation		Number of RDP modifications based on evaluation findings and recommendations from thematic working groups organized by the NRN)
Broader public and potential beneficiaries are aware of the rural development policy and funding opportunities through activities of the NRN		Percentage of RDP implemented projects encouraged by NRN(P) activities)
Broader public and potential beneficiaries are aware of the rural development policy and funding opportunities through activities of the NRN		Number persons that have been informed about the rural development policy and funding opportunities through the NRN communication tools)
Innovation in agriculture, food production forestry and rural areas has been fostered by the NRN opportunities		Percentage of innovative projects encouraged by NRN out of the total number of innovative projects supported by the RDP(s)

7.u3) Methods applied

No monitoring data from the operations database could be provided by the Managing Authority against the specified additional results indicators, though other quantitative information was available that covered similar metrics. No additional data obtained via surveys of stakeholders were available to the evaluators. Interviews with the Managing Authority provided qualitative information which was used further to develop the answer and provide context for the quantitative data.

7.u4) Quantitative values of indicators and data sources

Indicator type	Indicator code and name (unit)	Ratio	Indicator value	Calculated gross value	Calculated net value	Data and information sources
Result	Number of stakeholders (by type) participating in the implementation of the RDP due to activities of the NRN (including those through LAGs)	No				A set of key performance indicators specific to the SRN have been developed to monitor performance. These indicators are discussed in Section 7.v6) – Answer to evaluation question.
Result	Number of RDP modifications based on evaluation findings and recommendations from thematic working groups organized by the NRN)	No	0.00			
Result	Percentage of RDP implemented projects encouraged by NRN(P activities)	No				A set of key performance indicators specific to the SRN have been developed to monitor performance. These indicators are discussed in Section 7.v6) – Answer to evaluation question.
Result	Number persons that have been informed about the rural development policy and funding opportunities through the NRN communication tools)	No				A set of key performance indicators specific to the SRN have been developed to monitor performance. These indicators are discussed in Section 7.v6) – Answer to evaluation question.
Result	Percentage of innovative projects encouraged by NRN out of the total number of innovative projects supported by the RDP(s)	No				A set of key performance indicators specific to the SRN have been developed to monitor performance. These indicators are discussed in Section 7.v6) – Answer to evaluation question.

7.u5) Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings

Required data to feed the specified additional results indicators are not generally available. This gap results for a number of reasons which are set out above. In this context, it should be noted that there is no requirement to record additional results indicators. Suitable alternatives are thought to be available and these are described in the following section. It might prove useful in any survey of beneficiaries either in 2019 or at the *ex-post* evaluation stage to ask whether beneficiaries received any support from the SRN.

7.u5.a) Answer to evaluation question

The objectives for the SRN (Art. 54(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013) are:

- (1) increase the involvement of stakeholders in the implementation of rural development;
- (2) improve the quality of implementation of rural development programmes;
- (3) inform the broader public and potential beneficiaries on rural development policy and funding opportunities;
- (4) foster innovation in agriculture, food production, forestry and rural areas.

The budget for the SRN in the 2007-2013 programming period was €1.32 million (not including the cost of the Scottish Government staff involved in delivering what was then an outsourced operation). This was increased to €4.8 million for the 2014-2020 period as the SRN was overhauled and brought within the Scottish Government.

The ex-ante evaluation of the 2014-2020 SRDP noted that the Scottish Rural Network (SRN) was manifestly set up to assist in the achievement of rural policy objectives. There was evidence that consideration had been given to how the SRN could add the greatest value to the SRDP through co-ordination and facilitation, communication and the development of thematic working groups. The potential role of the SRN had been under-appreciated in the 2007-2013 programming period and lessons had been learned for the current period, principally the need to focus on achieving outcomes rather than on the details of implementation. In designing the current SRN, the Scottish Government was able to draw on both the mid-term evaluation of the 2007-2013 period and a specific evaluation, carried out in 2013, which identified a number of areas for improvement, which have been incorporated into the current SRN.

Though the required additional results indicators are not available, there is alternative quantitative evidence relating to each objective in addition to qualitative information.

In terms of objective (1), ***increasing the involvement of stakeholders in the implementation of rural development***, stakeholders have been widely involved in the 13 SRN events held in Scotland to the end of 2016. These have targeted at a range of actors including the general public, specific stakeholder groups, LAGs, Managing Authority policy and delivery leads and potential beneficiaries, including; farmers, groups of farmers, land managers, foresters, rural businesses. In total, these events were attended by 761 people/organisations, with many people/organisations attending more than one event.

The SRN has a communications plan that includes a list of stakeholders that can be compared with a list from the previous planning period. The SRN has surveyed stakeholders on what should be priorities in its workplan, thereby involving them in SRN implementation.

In terms of objective (2), ***improving the quality of RDP implementation***, the SRN has worked particularly with LEADER helping to deliver in areas where new approaches are being taken (for example, tsiMORAY where the third sector is implementing LEADER, but also elsewhere). The SRN has been working on a monitoring and evaluation toolkit for LEADER, intended to reduce the burden of such activities on local areas and focus on what indicators need to be captured; this work has only become possible in the current programming period. The SRN provided help with launching the EACF scheme and advice, based on information gathered on implementation of sub-Measure 16.5 elsewhere was given (Support for joint action undertaken to mitigate or adapt to climate change, and for joint approaches to environmental projects and practices). Help has also been offered for the implementation of other schemes (though not always taken

up).

A number of lessons learned by the SRN (principally from operating in the previous programming period) have been incorporated into current implementation. Examples are: (a) that it is necessary for the SRN to have sufficient capacity effectively to support the SRDP, and this is reflected in the larger SRN budget in the current period (which also allows better management) and greater provision of resources for social media, which is now of increased importance and is more sharply focused on Facebook, Twitter, Vimeo and Flickr; (b) benefits from partnership working, reflected in more partnership working in this programming period. This helps to bring new customers to the SRDP and helps influence how rural development can be delivered; (c) there is a more robust communications element in this programming period; (d) there is a greater focus on outcomes achieved; (e) following an evaluation in the previous programming period, the SRN, which was formerly outsourced, is now operated internally, bringing advantages that include the key benefit of providing business continuity between programming periods, a characteristic which was otherwise lost.

Relating to this objective, several addition judgement criteria are specified to be used when forming an answer to CEQ 21. One concerns what the SRN has done to increase the capacity of SRDP beneficiaries. Qualitative information collected by interview with administrators indicated that this was best illustrated by changes in LEADER; the SRN has funded various stakeholders to attend events run by EIP, ENRD, etc. Related to capacity, following SRN involvement, a simpler LEADER application process has been devised that makes it easier for beneficiaries to take the first step through using a common Expression of Interest form. Another judgement criterion concerns improved awareness of evaluations. To this end, the SRN produced a short summary of the ex-post evaluation of the 2007-13 SRDP and highlighted its main conclusions. This summary was disseminated by social media and eNewsletter and thus reached more beneficiaries than would have access to the evaluation itself.

In terms of objective (3), ***informing the broader public and potential beneficiaries on rural development policy and funding opportunities***, several communications tools have been used by the SRN. The SRN has maintained a presence at the Royal Highland Show, which has been helpful in reaching a broader public, and at crofting events where it has highlighted the role of the RDP and how beneficiaries can apply for various schemes. The SRN has also responded to invitations to speak at events organised by other organisations (some on other funding streams and some more general) and also acts as a facilitator for events. The SRN has developed an RDP animation which explains the RDP to people and there is a developing library of outcomes to help publicise the RDP.

Much informing is done electronically. The SRN's Rural Network News eNewsletter had a registration list which numbered 700 at the end of 2015 and which grew to 1,142 by December 2016 (not all of those registered might receive the publication due to firewalls, email preferences, etc.). Some 94 eNewsletters had been distributed by the end of 2016. The eNewsletter was opened (the closest proxy to the eNewsletter having been read) an average of 363 times by recipients, with an average of 167 recipients clicking through to its contents, which suggests a deeper interest. The monitoring data provides a snapshot and does not allow for the fact that recipients might open the email and click on links after the data have been collected. These numbers should therefore be seen as minimum figures.

A monthly LEADER eNewsletter has been published since November 2015. This had 224 subscribers by December 2016, up from 129 initially. The email was opened by an average of 103 recipients with 45 clicking through to access content.

A specific eNewsletter on finding rural funding via the SRN was distributed to 1,139 recipients in December 2016. This was opened by 477 and 155 recipients subsequently clicked through to content.

Twelve case studies have been published by the SRN in the current programming period, although ten of these refer to projects supported under the 2007-2013 period.

Downloads from the SRN website increased from 3,000 in 2015 to 5,407 in 2016. Video views fluctuated from month to month in 2016 (there are no data from 2015) with 3,763 viewed in total.

Visits (unique visits) to the SRN website increased from 51,000 (33,500) in 2015 to 56,632 (36,832) in 2016, while visits to the funding section of the website increased from 17,000 to 45,035 over the same period. There were increases in web traffic to other elements of the SRN website as well.

An increase in referrals from other websites (4,679 to 10,352) suggests an increase in the links made to the SRN site; the increase in direct traffic was much lower (8,900 to 10,976). Whilst there was a modest increase in referrals from Facebook (1,255 to 1,939), the increase in referrals from Twitter was more substantial (881 to 2,109). Email referrals declined from 2,334 in 2015 to 1,787 in 2016. In keeping with this apparent move towards social media, the number of Twitter followers increased steadily from July 2016, when data were first collected, to reach a total of 4,847 by the end of that year.

The communication efforts being made represent a substantial improvement compared to the 2007-2013 programming period in which, according to the *ex-ante* evaluation, effectiveness was judged to have been compromised by design and delivery flaws. The recommendations made by the evaluators of the communication plan (2013) appear to have been taken seriously.

In terms of objective (4), *fostering innovation in agriculture, food production, forestry and rural areas*, there have been activities by the SRN, but the timing means that impacts were not seen by the end of 2016. The SRN has spent the last year developing the Innovation Support Service. This will support collaborations in agriculture, forestry and the food and drink supply chain. There will be a budget to help organisations access funds under KTIF, FPMC and LEADER. There has been a lot of work under LEADER on cooperation project ideas, cooperation often being seen as interchangeable with innovation; this is at a relatively early stage, but should develop over the course of the programming period. There are more efforts now to engage with the EIP agenda. Several events have been attended by SRN staff to understand the innovation agenda and to investigate how innovation might work in the Scottish context; for example, changes to KTIF scheme guidance were suggested by the SRN to improve the inclusion of innovation.

7.u6) Conclusions and recommendations

7.u6.a) Conclusion / Recommendation 1

Conclusion:

The evaluators of this Enhanced AIR conclude that the national rural network (the SRN) has contributed substantially to achieving the objectives laid down in Art. 54(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013. At present the specified additional results indicators cannot be used to support this conclusion. However, other quantitative data and the qualitative information that relate to specified judgement criteria suggest that the SRN has made a significant contribution to achieving the objectives laid down in Art. 54(2), as detailed in CEQ 21, and has addressed each of the judgement criteria.

Recommendation:

Although the performance of the SRN appears to be much improved compared to the 2007-2013 programming period, a scheduled evaluation has not taken place and this should be undertaken to capture the improvements more thoroughly than is possible in this Enhanced AIR.

7.v) PSEQ01-FA - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

No Programme specific Focus Areas in the SRDP 2014-2020.

7.w) PSEQ02-FA - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

No Programme specific Focus Areas in the SRDP 2014-2020.

7.x) PSEQ03-FA - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

No Programme specific Focus Areas in the SRDP 2014-2020.

7.y) PSEQ04-FA - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

No Programme specific Focus Areas in the SRDP 2014-2020.

7.z) PSEQ05-FA - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

No Programme specific Focus Areas in the SRDP 2014-2020.

7.aa) PSEQ01-TOPIC - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

No Programme specific Evaluation topics in the SRDP 2014-2020.

7.bb) PSEQ02-TOPIC - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

No Programme specific Evaluation topics in the SRDP 2014-2020.

7.cc) PSEQ03-TOPIC - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

No Programme specific Evaluation topics in the SRDP 2014-2020.

7.dd) PSEQ04-TOPIC - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

No Programme specific Evaluation topics in the SRDP 2014-2020.

7.ee) PSEQ05-TOPIC - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

No Programme specific Evaluation topics in the SRDP 2014-2020.

8. IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIONS TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE PRINCIPLES SET OUT IN ARTICLES 5, 7 AND 8 OF REGULATION (EU) No 1303/2013

8.a) Promotion of equality between men and women and non-discrimination (Article 7 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013)

It is the view of the Scottish Government that everyone deserves to be treated fairly, regardless of their age, disability, gender, gender identity/reassignment, race, religion or sexual orientation.

There is no place in Scotland for prejudice or discrimination and, among other actions, the Scottish Government is working to make sure women and men receive equal treatment and are not discriminated against because of their gender.

The schemes offered through the SRDP are assessed on the basis of each application meeting the scheme requirements and then, where required, achieving the appropriate threshold under the scoring and selection criteria, thus ensuring that gender discrimination is avoided. However, it was recognised that there was no factual baseline information available regarding the number of women involved in farming or the agricultural sector in Scotland. A ministerial commitment was made to commission research which could be used to properly inform decisions going forward. Early in the process it was found that this research would be of use to a number of other policy areas within the Scottish Government rather than just related to informing the SRDP. The Women In Agriculture report is due to be published in June 2017 and the outcomes and recommendations will be considered by the Managing Authority.

It is estimated that one in 10 people has a form of dyslexia and there is a belief that this might be higher in rural farming communities. The Scottish Government Agriculture and Rural Economy Directorate has worked towards improving accessibility standards by producing material for the CAP support that is an example of best practice. This has included :

- a redesign of the website to use colours that are easier for dyslexic users to view;
- a new style of hyperlinks that allow for colour and underlining;
- the addition of subtitles to guidance videos; and
- more descriptive 'alt-tags' (the little box of text that pops up when you hover over a hyperlink).

The SG are also working with the National Farmers Union Scotland to support their Farming with Dyslexia campaign and, as part of this, have designed a range of accessible graphics and backdrops to use on our digital channels.

8.b) Sustainable development (Article 8 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013)

The SRDP has a number of objectives that contribute to sustainable development.

Under Measures 4, 10 and 11 the Agri-Environment Climate Scheme contributes to:

- the delivery of the 2020 Challenge for Scotland's Biodiversity by supporting appropriate management for vulnerable and iconic species and habitats, strengthening ecological networks, controlling invasive non-native species and enhancing the condition of protected nature sites;
- Scotland's world-leading climate change targets by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from

- agriculture and securing carbon stores in peatlands and other organic soils;
- meeting obligations to improve water quality under the EU Water Framework Directive by reducing diffuse pollution;
 - the control of flooding through natural flood risk management; and
 - supporting organic farming.

Under Measures 4, 8, 15 and 16 the **Forestry Grant Scheme** will support the sustainable management of existing woodlands

Under Measures 1 and 16 the **Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Scheme** will:

- be aligned with the European Innovation Partnership for agricultural productivity and sustainability;
- help form partnerships between farmers, advisers and businesses working on the ground; and
- Form of operational groups who its expected will generate new insights and innovative ideas, as well as mobilising existing knowledge into practical solutions.

Under Measure 2 the **Farm Advisory Service** provides information and resources aimed at increasing the profitability and sustainability of farms and crofts which is designed to provide integrated advice for farmers and crofters across Scotland.

Under Measure 13 the **Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS)** is vital for Scotland's rural economy and remote communities throughout Scotland, providing support to around 11,300 farmers and crofters. Whilst no specific data are held on in case benefits to biodiversity, LFASS provides support that maintains livestock systems in remote and fragile areas where, without this support, it would be likely be uneconomical to operate these agriculture enterprises. Having a grazing pressure in sensitive and remote areas of Scotland can assist with maintaining habitat mosaics and reduce establishment of rank grasslands / monoculture species habitats.

Under Measure 19 **LEADER** supports multi-sectoral community-based development. It helps individuals, communities and businesses to come together to design and implement Local Development Strategies.

The LEADER approach is about developing links between local people and, in doing so, building social and economic capital.

Twenty-one Local Action Groups (LAGs) will be implementing Local Development Strategies across rural Scotland during the Programme period, with each LAG adopting their own approaches to supporting local development and social inclusion.

Under Measures 4 and 16, the **Food Processing Marketing and Co-operation Grant Scheme** supports the food and drink sector helping to make Scotland healthier, wealthier and smarter, with stronger communities and production that is socially and environmentally sustainable.

The scheme provide support to suppliers and producers to contribute to the Scottish Government's overall vision for food and drink in Scotland, which is to be a Good Food Nation, where it is second nature to produce, buy, serve and eat fresh, healthy food.

8.c) The role of the partners referred to in Article 5 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 in the implementation of the programme

Stakeholder engagement is a fundamental part of implementing the SRDP. During the development of the Programme a number of Stakeholder Working Groups were established to draw out key principles. This was followed by two public consultations. Subsequently a number of stakeholder organisations have involved in the Rural Development Operational Committee (the technical committee which informs the Joint Programme Monitoring Committee) to consider the progress of the Programme. Along with this a number of committees have been convened by the SG to consider wider policy issues are also free to consider and feedback views regarding the Programme. In addition the SRDP is also considered at an Agriculture and Rural Development Committee which involves stakeholders with interests across both CAP pillars. Key messages are relayed to stakeholders who have disseminated information to their members and the Scottish Government makes information publically available on the SRDP pages where appropriate.

Further to this, the Scottish Rural Network support partnership engagement and dissemination of information.

9. PROGRESS MADE IN ENSURING INTEGRATED APPROACH TO USE EAFRD AND OTHER UNION FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS

This section applies to AIR(s) 2018 only

10. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS (ARTICLE 46 OF REGULATION (EU) No 1303/2013)

30A. Has the ex-ante assessment been started ?	No
30B. Has the ex-ante assessment been completed ?	No
30. Date of completion of ex-ante assessment	-
31.1. Has selection or designation process already been launched ?	No
13A. Has the funding agreement been signed ?	No
13. Date of signature of the funding agreement with the body implementing the financial instrument	-

11. ENCODING TABLES FOR COMMON AND PROGRAMME-SPECIFIC INDICATORS AND QUANTIFIED TARGET VALUES

See Monitoring Annex

Annex II

Detailed table showing implementation level by Focus areas including output indicators

Focus Area 1A							
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
1A	T1: percentage of expenditure under Articles 14, 15 and 35 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 in relation to the total expenditure for the RDP (focus area 1A)	2014-2016			0.19	5.03	3.78
		2014-2015			0.13	3.44	

Focus Area 1B							
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
1B	T2: Total number of cooperation operations supported under the cooperation measure (Article 35 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013) (groups, networks/clusters, pilot projects...) (focus area 1B)	2014-2016			4.00	1.75	229.00
		2014-2015			1.00	0.44	

Focus Area 1C							
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
1C	T3: Total number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (focus area 1C)	2014-2016			12,118.00	114.14	10,617.00
		2014-2015			9,227.00	86.91	

Focus Area 2A							
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
2A	T4: percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP support for investments in restructuring or modernisation (focus area 2A)	2014-2016	3.09	18.90	3.09	18.90	16.35
		2014-2015	2.39	14.62	2.39	14.62	
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
2A	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	109,385,460.76	31.99	91,326,517.43	26.71	341,937,032.00
M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	1,569,790.70	114.79	1,409,139.39	103.04	1,367,508.00
M01.1	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			1,409,139.00	120.03	1,173,986.00
M01.1	O12 - Number of participants in trainings	2014-2016			12,118.00	253.62	4,778.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	1,476,068.22	24.60	116,309.33	1.94	6,000,000.00
M02.1	O13 - Number of beneficiaries advised	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	2,625.00
M04	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	23,341,460.12	46.23	21,410,364.44	42.40	50,490,765.00
M04	O2 - Total investment	2014-2016			29,008,880.15	52.35	55,410,765.00
M04.1	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			21,109,913.60	48.63	43,410,765.00
M04.1	O4 - Number of holdings/beneficiaries supported	2014-2016			1,614.00	18.87	8,553.00
M04.3	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			300,450.84	4.24	7,080,000.00
M06	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			206,717.66	8.61	2,400,000.00
M06	O2 - Total investment	2014-2016					2,400,000.00
M06.3	O4 - Number of holdings/beneficiaries supported	2014-2016			17.00	10.63	160.00
M13	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	82,092,159.34	29.81	67,520,238.91	24.52	275,400,000.00
M13.2	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2016			831,125.11	59.37	1,400,000.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	905,982.38	14.43	663,747.70	10.57	6,278,759.00

Focus Area 2B							
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
2B	T5: percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP supported business development plan/investments for young farmers (focus area 2B)	2014-2016	0.31	113.41	0.31	113.41	0.27
		2014-2015	0.11	40.24	0.11	40.24	
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
2B	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	9,109,712.40	85.89	7,400,033.72	69.77	10,606,586.00
M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	240,000.00
M01.1	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	120,000.00
M01.1	O12 - Number of participants in trainings	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	1,062.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	369,017.05	30.75	29,077.33	2.42	1,200,000.00
M02.1	O13 - Number of beneficiaries advised	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	525.00
M06	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	8,740,695.35	106.51	7,370,956.39	89.82	8,206,586.00
M06	O2 - Total investment	2014-2016					8,206,586.00
M06.1	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			7,370,956.39	89.82	8,206,586.00
M06.1	O4 - Number of holdings/beneficiaries supported	2014-2016			164.00	114.69	143.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016					960,000.00

Focus Area 3A							
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
3A	T6: percentage of agricultural holdings receiving support for participating in quality schemes, local markets and short supply circuits, and producer groups/organisations (focus area 3A)	2014-2016	14.69	94.56			15.54
		2014-2015	14.69	94.56			
	Percentage of total agri-food businesses supported under Article 17 of the Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (Percentage of total number of agri-food businesses)	2014-2016			6.29	48.38	13.00
		2014-2015					
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
3A	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	29,555,989.18	32.40	24,536,754.53	26.90	91,221,408.00
M03	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	960,652.73	115.31	954,324.72	114.55	833,124.00
M03.1	O4 - Number of holdings/beneficiaries supported	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	8,098.00
M04	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	22,291,529.95	31.20	17,413,174.55	24.37	71,449,137.00
M04	O2 - Total investment	2014-2016			56,938,289.60	22.32	255,049,137.00
M04.1 M04.2	O3 - Number of actions/operations supported	2014-2016			55.00	47.83	115.00
M14	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	5,514,031.74	86.98	5,260,959.18	82.99	6,339,147.00
M14	O4 - Number of holdings/beneficiaries supported	2014-2016			353.00	18.00	1,961.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	789,774.76	6.27	908,296.08	7.21	12,600,000.00
M16.4	O9 - Number of holdings participating in supported schemes	2014-2016			1.00	3.45	29.00

Focus Area 3B							
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
3B	Number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (Number of participants trained)	2014-2016					530.00
		2014-2015					
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
3B	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	184,508.53	9.58	14,538.66	0.75	1,926,167.00
M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	366,167.00
M01.1	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	246,167.00
M01.1	O12 - Number of participants in trainings	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	531.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	184,508.53	15.38	14,538.66	1.21	1,200,000.00
M02.1	O13 - Number of beneficiaries advised	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	525.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016					360,000.00

Priority P4								
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023	
P4	T13: percentage of forestry land under management contracts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion (focus area 4C)	2014-2016			1.74	4.58	37.99	
		2014-2015			1.03	2.71		
	T11: percentage of forestry land under management contracts to improve water management (focus area 4B)	2014-2016			1.74	4.58	37.99	
		2014-2015			1.03	2.71		
	T8: percentage of forest/other wooded area under management contracts supporting biodiversity (focus area 4A)	2014-2016			1.74	4.58	37.99	
		2014-2015			1.03	2.71		
	T12: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion (focus area 4C)	2014-2016			11.78	61.57	19.13	
		2014-2015			11.78	61.57		
	T10: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts to improve water management (focus area 4B)	2014-2016			10.88	54.95	19.80	
		2014-2015			10.88	54.95		
	T9: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts supporting biodiversity and/or landscapes (focus area 4A)	2014-2016			12.63	55.56	22.73	
		2014-2015			12.63	55.56		
	FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
	P4	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	250,731,236.33	30.69	215,591,755.27	26.39	817,023,847.00
M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	720,000.00	
M01.1	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	360,000.00	
M01.1	O12 - Number of participants in trainings	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	2,123.00	
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	1,107,051.16	11.53	87,232.00	0.91	9,600,000.00	
M02.1	O13 - Number of beneficiaries advised	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	4,200.00	
M04	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	10,212,479.26	9.35	5,773,807.31	5.29	109,200,000.00	
M04	O2 - Total investment	2014-2016			10,184,026.38	9.33	109,200,000.00	
M04.4	O3 - Number of actions/operations supported	2014-2016			455.00	3.40	13,400.00	
M08	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	56,889,082.04	55.42	50,717,595.82	49.40	102,660,000.00	
M08.1	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			46,676,503.79	62.74	74,400,000.00	
M08.2	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	360,000.00	
M08.3	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	4,800,000.00	
M08.3	O4 - Number of holdings/beneficiaries supported	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	800.00	
M08.4	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			82,829.13	1.73	4,800,000.00	

M08.5	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			3,958,262.90	21.63	18,300,000.00
M08.5	O3 - Number of actions/operations supported	2014-2016			87.00	11.23	775.00
M08.5	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2016			896.76	0.28	320,000.00
M10	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	84,766,293.46	32.05	78,513,850.26	29.68	264,513,847.00
M10.1	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2016			578,099.38	48.17	1,200,000.00
M11	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	7,647,673.49	50.98	5,374,139.10	35.83	15,000,000.00
M11.1	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2016			2,989.55	23.00	13,000.00
M11.2	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2016			25,817.63	51.64	50,000.00
M13	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	82,092,159.34	29.81	67,520,238.90	24.52	275,400,000.00
M13.2	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2016			831,125.11	59.37	1,400,000.00
M15	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	8,016,497.58	31.07	7,604,891.88	29.48	25,800,000.00
M15.1	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2016			14,681.00	7.34	200,000.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	14,130,000.00

Focus Area 5B							
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
5B	Number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (Number of participants trained)	2014-2016					1,050.00
		2014-2015					
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
5B	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	553,525.58	14.63	43,616.00	1.15	3,783,884.00
M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	423,884.00
M01.1	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	303,884.00
M01.1	O12 - Number of participants in trainings	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	1,062.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	553,525.58	23.06	43,616.00	1.82	2,400,000.00
M02.1	O13 - Number of beneficiaries advised	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	1,050.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	960,000.00

Focus Area 5C

FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
5C	Number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (Number of participants trained)	2014-2016					265.00
		2014-2015					
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
5C	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	1,500,000.00
M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	180,000.00
M01.1	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	60,000.00
M01.1	O12 - Number of participants in trainings	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	265.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016					1,200,000.00
M02.1	O13 - Number of beneficiaries advised	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	525.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016					120,000.00

Focus Area 5D							
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
5D	T18: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts targeting reduction of GHG and/or ammonia emissions (focus area 5D)	2014-2016			10.88	46.93	23.18
		2014-2015			10.88	46.93	
	T17: percentage of LU concerned by investments in live-stock management in view of reducing GHG and/or ammonia emissions (focus area 5D)	2014-2016					1.32
		2014-2015					
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
5D	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	78,900,000.00
M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	180,000.00
M01.1	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	60,000.00
M01.1	O12 - Number of participants in trainings	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	265.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	1,200,000.00
M02.1	O13 - Number of beneficiaries advised	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	525.00
M04	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	23,400,000.00
M04	O2 - Total investment	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	35,400,000.00
M04.1 M04.3 M04.4	O3 - Number of actions/operations supported	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	330.00
M04.1 M04.3 M04.4	O8 - Number of Livestock Units supported (LU)	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	28,800.00
M10	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	54,000,000.00
M10.1	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	168,000.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016					120,000.00

Focus Area 5E							
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
5E	T19: percentage of agricultural and forest land under management contracts contributing to carbon sequestration and conservation (focus area 5E)	2014-2016			8.71	53.98	16.14
		2014-2015			8.70	53.92	
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
5E	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	39,804,326.36	19.42	26,083,737.82	12.72	204,980,754.00
M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	240,000.00
M01.1	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	120,000.00
M01.1	O12 - Number of participants in trainings	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	531.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016					1,200,000.00
M02.1	O13 - Number of beneficiaries advised	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	525.00
M08	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	39,804,326.36	19.63	26,083,737.82	12.87	202,730,754.00
M08.1	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			21,568,493.52	11.58	186,290,754.00
M08.1	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2016			3,568.29	10.37	34,400.00
M08.2	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	840,000.00
M08.2	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	200.00
M08.5	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			4,515,244.30	28.94	15,600,000.00
M08.5	O3 - Number of actions/operations supported	2014-2016			755.00	116.15	650.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	810,000.00

Focus Area 6A							
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
6A	T20: Jobs created in supported projects (focus area 6A)	2014-2016			17.00	100.00	17.00
		2014-2015			17.00	100.00	
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
6A	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	1,542,096.70	78.67	1,357,210.93	69.24	1,960,106.00
M06	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	1,277,950.78	168.13	1,186,101.40	156.04	760,106.00
M06	O2 - Total investment	2014-2016			2,894,770.02	380.84	760,106.00
M06.2 M06.4	O4 - Number of holdings/beneficiaries supported	2014-2016			17.00	56.67	30.00
M08	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	264,145.92	22.01	171,109.53	14.26	1,200,000.00
M08	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2016					57.00
M08.6	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			171,109.53	14.26	1,200,000.00
M08.6	O2 - Total investment	2014-2016			427,773.82	14.26	3,000,000.00

Focus Area 6B								
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023	
6B	T23: Jobs created in supported projects (Leader) (focus area 6B)	2014-2016					551.00	
		2014-2015						
	T22: percentage of rural population benefiting from improved services/infrastructures (focus area 6B)	2014-2016						10.14
		2014-2015						
	T21: percentage of rural population covered by local development strategies (focus area 6B)	2014-2016				86.76	100.01	86.76
		2014-2015				86.76	100.01	
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023	
6B	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	22,717,113.70	20.25	18,654,632.80	16.63	112,200,215.00	
M07	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	6,074,289.00	67.49	5,805,013.68	64.50	9,000,215.00	
M07.1 M07.2 M07.4 M07.5 M07.6 M07.7 M07.8	O15 - Population benefiting of improved services/infrastructures (IT or others)	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	245,376.00	
M07.4	O3 - Number of actions/operations supported	2014-2016			4.00	1.27	314.00	
M07.5	O3 - Number of actions/operations supported	2014-2016			120.00	67.80	177.00	
M07.6	O3 - Number of actions/operations supported	2014-2016			978.00	176.53	554.00	
M19	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016	16,642,824.70	16.13	12,849,619.12	12.45	103,200,000.00	
M19	O18 - Population covered by LAG	2014-2016			2,100,000.00	100.00	2,100,000.00	
M19	O19 - Number of LAGs selected	2014-2016			21.00	100.00	21.00	
M19.2	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			7,641,855.07	10.79	70,800,000.00	
M19.3	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			680,809.71	5.67	12,000,000.00	
M19.4	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			4,526,954.34	22.19	20,400,000.00	

Focus Area 6C

FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
6C	T24: percentage of rural population benefiting from new or improved services/infrastructures (ICT) (focus area 6C)	2014-2016					0.88
		2014-2015					
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
6C	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	10,800,000.00
M07	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	10,800,000.00
M07.3	O15 - Population benefiting of improved services/infrastructures (IT or others)	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	21,240.00
M07.3	O3 - Number of actions/operations supported	2014-2016			0.00	0.00	13.00

Annex III

Summary table of quantified results

Result indicator name and unit (1)	Target value (2)	Main value (3)	Secondary contribution (4)	LEADER/CLLD contribution (5)	Total RDP (6)=3+4+5
R1 / T4: percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP support for investments in restructuring or modernisation (focus area 2A)	16.35	3.09	N/A	0.00	3.09
R2: Change in Agricultural output on supported farms/AWU (Annual Work Unit) (focus area 2A)*	N/A				
R3 / T5: percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP supported business development plan/investments for young farmers (focus area 2B)	0.27	0.31	N/A	0.00	0.31
R4 / T6: percentage of agricultural holdings receiving support for participating in quality schemes, local markets and short supply circuits, and producer groups/organisations (focus area 3A)	15.54	0.00	N/A	0.00	0.00
R5 / T7: percentage of farms participating in risk management schemes (focus area 3B)			N/A	0.00	0.00
R6 / T8: percentage of forest/other wooded area under management contracts supporting biodiversity (focus area 4A)	37.99	1.74	N/A	0.00	1.74
R7 / T9: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts supporting biodiversity and/or landscapes (focus area 4A)	22.73	12.63	N/A	0.00	12.63
R8 / T10: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts to improve water management (focus area 4B)	19.80	10.88	N/A	0.00	10.88
R9 / T11: percentage of forestry land under management contracts to improve water management (focus area 4B)	37.99	1.74	N/A	0.00	1.74
R10 / T12: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion (focus area 4C)	19.13	11.78	N/A	0.00	11.78
R11 / T13: percentage of forestry land under management contracts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion (focus area 4C)	37.99	1.74	N/A	0.00	1.74
R12 / T14: percentage of irrigated land switching to more efficient irrigation system (focus area 5A)			N/A	0.00	0.00
R13: Increase in efficiency of water use in agriculture in RDP supported projects (focus area 5A)*	N/A				
R14: Increase in efficiency of energy use in agriculture and food-processing in RDP supported projects (focus area 5B)*	N/A				
R15: Renewable energy produced from supported projects (focus area 5C)*	N/A				
R16 / T17: percentage of LU concerned by investments in live-stock management in view of reducing GHG and/or ammonia emissions (focus area 5D)	1.32	0.00	N/A	0.00	0.00
R17 / T18: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts targeting reduction of GHG and/or ammonia emissions (focus area 5D)	23.18	10.88	N/A	0.00	10.88
R18: Reduced emissions of methane and nitrous oxide (focus area 5D)*	N/A				
R19: Reduced ammonia emissions (focus area 5D)*	N/A				
R20 / T19: percentage of agricultural and forest land under management contracts contributing to carbon sequestration and conservation (focus area 5E)	16.14	8.71	N/A	0.00	8.71

R21 / T20: Jobs created in supported projects (focus area 6A)	17.00	17.00	N/A	0.00	17.00
R22 / T21: percentage of rural population covered by local development strategies (focus area 6B)	86.76	86.76	N/A		86.76
R23 / T22: percentage of rural population benefiting from improved services/infrastructures (focus area 6B)	10.14	0.00	N/A	0.00	0.00
R24 / T23: Jobs created in supported projects (Leader) (focus area 6B)	551.00	0.00	N/A		0.00
R25 / T24: percentage of rural population benefiting from new or improved services/infrastructures (ICT) (focus area 6C)	0.88	0.00	N/A	0.00	0.00

Documents

Document title	Document type	Document date	Local reference	Commission reference	Checksum	Files	Sent date	Sent By
AIR Financial Annex 2014UK06RDRP003	Financial annex (System)	14-05-2019		Ares(2019)3193101	1026278384	AIRfinancialAnnex2014UK06RDRP003_en.pdf	15-05-2019	n002614s
SRDP 2014-2020 - AIR 2016 - Summary for Citizens	Citizens' summary	14-05-2019	SRDP 2014-2020 - AIR 2 - SforC	Ares(2019)3193101	2623607509	SRDP 2014-2020 - AIR 2016 - Summary for Citizens	15-05-2019	n002614s

