

Appendix III – Definition of key words within the evaluation questions to allow answering each question, as well as of target level

Criteria and Indicators for each evaluation answer

Questions	Criteria	Indicators (source SAPARD Evaluation Guidelines)	Result Indicators (source PNADR)	Target Level (source PNADR)	Impact Indicators (source PNADR)	Target Level (source PNADR)
Specific questions related to SAPARD measures						
A. Measure 1.1 “Improvement of processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products”						
A1. To what extent have the supported investments helped to increase the added value of the agricultural and fishing products through improved and rationalized processing and marketing of products?	Rational procedures and a better use of the production factors in the assisted processing and marketing of the products	Capacity of use in relation to the assisted processing and marketing of the products (ratio) Added value in relation to the assisted processing and marketing of the products Processing and marketing costs per basic product unit thanks to the assistance	Degree of use of the beneficiary processing and marketing lines Reduced processing and marketing costs / basic product unit	> 80% 20%	Added value of products obtained via the beneficiary processing and marketing lines	To increase by 10%
	Outlets created or improved for products in the beneficiary plants	Share of gross sales of processed products that are sold to outlets created or improved thanks to the assistance (%), of which: (a) to national markets (%) (b) to the European Union (%) (c) to other Central and Eastern European states (%)	Share of the offer of raw materials for beneficiaries, for the processing or marketing lines, that depends on multiannual agreements	>30%		

A2. To what extent have the supported investments helped to increase the added value and competitiveness of the agricultural products by improving their quality?	Intrinsic quality of the processed / marketed agricultural products is improved	Share of basic agricultural products contained in the processed / marketed products with improved intrinsic quality from assisted processing / marketing of the products (%), of which: (a) subject to automated quality monitoring thanks to the assistance (%) (b) with improved homogeneity within and / or between batches (%) (c) complying with EU quality standards (%) (d) with a quality label (% and description of label) (e) derived from organic farming (%)	Percentage of marketed products came from those obtained via the beneficiary processing and marketing lines which have a quality label (number of products and %)	>20%		
A3. To what extent have the supported investments improved health and welfare conditions in	Health and welfare concerns are appropriately integrated into the programme	Share of assisted investments in processing and marketing related to health and welfare (%), of which: (a) aiming to improve the nutritive and hygiene quality of products for human consumption (%)	Share of beneficiary investments related to health and welfare, of which: (a) aiming to improve the quality of products for human consumption, from the hygiene and nutrition viewpoints	>20% >30%		

compliance with EU standards?		(b) aiming to improve the nutritive and hygiene quality of the animal feed (%) (c) aiming to improve workplace safety and hygiene conditions (%) (d) aiming to improve animal welfare (%)	(b) aimed to improve the workplace security	>20%		
	Animal health and welfare conditions comply with EU standards	Share of assisted plants complying with EU standards (%)				
	Human safety and hygiene conditions at the workplace have improved	Trend in safety and hygiene conditions related to assistance (description, e.g. frequency of reported incidents) Share of assisted plants complying with EU standards (%)	Trend in frequency of reported labor accidents to decrease	Decrease		
A4. To what extent have the supported investments contributed to protect the environment?	Waste management has improved	Waste collected / treated thanks to assisted actions (% of waste in assisted processing plants)	Share of all the beneficiary investments aimed at environmental protection (emissions, resource use, etc.) in relation to the beneficiary processing and marketing lines	>20%		

A5. To what extent have the supported investments contributed to the restructure the processing food industry in the sectors involved in order to be able to compete in the single market?	A substantial part of the processing plants in the sectors involved is able to compete in the single market	Number of EU-approved processing plants as a result of the assistance, as a share from the overall sector (%), (a) of which assisted plants (%)				
					Number of full-time equivalent jobs (FTE) (a) maintained in better conditions, (b) created	19,000 13,300 - 70% 5,700 - 30%
B. Measure 1.2 "Improving the structures for quality, veterinary and plant-health control, for the quality of food stuffs and for consumer protection"						
B1. To what extent have the investments supported contributed to	Structures for quality, veterinary and plant-health control set up or improved thanks to the assistance	Share of new or improved structures thanks to the assistance, as compared to total quality, veterinary and plant-health control structures (%), of				

improve the quality of foodstuffs and the consumer protection measures in compliance with EU standards?		which: (a) in the sanitary veterinary sector (%) (b) in the plant-health sector (%) (c) in the field of food quality control (%)				
	Increase in the application of quality, veterinary and plant-health standards in the sectors involved	Ratio of average annual number of analysis performed thanks to the assistance to average annual number of analysis performed prior to assistance, of which: (a) in the sanitary veterinary sector (%) (b) in the plant-health sector (%) (c) in the field of food quality control (%)	Ratio of number performed analysis complying with EU requirements to the total number analysis performed Improved quality of foodstuffs of animal and vegetal origin	>90%		
	EU standards systematically used as a reference for the quality, veterinary and plant-health control	Share of laboratories using EU standards as a reference (%), of which: (a) assisted laboratories (%)	Increased number of achieved analysis types complying with EU requirements thanks to the assistance, as compared to the number of the types of analysis performed prior to the assistance granted, in relation to modernized laboratories	To increase by 20%	Percentage of laboratories using the Community harmonized standards or reference analysis methods: (a) in relation to modernized labs	100%

C. Measure 2.1 "Development and improvement of rural infrastructure"						
C1. To what extent have the type and extension of rural infrastructure activities been in accordance with the priority needs of the rural areas concerned?	The investments made responds to the priority needs identified during the ex-ante evaluation / programming period	Identified priority needs addressed by the intervention (description)				
C2. To what extent have the supported investments contributed to improve the competitiveness of the rural areas?	The investments supported have improved the access of holdings / enterprises to potential markets	Average reduction of transportation time to / from beneficiary areas from / to nearest capital regional cities (%) (emphasis should be on areas where SAPARD is the main assistance fund for rural development (> 50% of public assistance received for improvement of rural infrastructure))	Percentage of holdings/ households/ businesses having access to infrastructure as assistance beneficiaries Increased tourist frequency in rural areas (number of tourists and stays)	Increase by 50%	Number of created jobs: (a) During the project performance: (b) Permanent jobs:	14,000 1,400
	Better supply of energy for economic activities	Share of the rural holdings / enterprises having improved access to energy supplies				

		thanks to the assistance (%)				
C3. To what extent have the supported investments contributed to improve the quality of life of the beneficiary rural population?	Remoteness alleviated	Transport / journeys facilitated or avoided due assisted actions (description and kilometers and / or hours avoided per year)				
	Housing and sanitary conditions improved due to assistance	Share of rural population having access to improved electricity / sewage / drinking water / waste disposal services thanks to the assistance (%)			Evolution of the number of inhabitants	
	Waste treatment improved thanks to the assistance	Share of solid waste / wastewater treated thanks to the assistance (%)	Residual products / wastewater drainage / wastewater treatment in treatment plants due to the assisted actions	Increased percentage of treated water volume and increased number of served holdings/ho useholds		
D. Measure 3.1 "Investments in agricultural holdings"						
D1. To what extent have the supported investments contributed to improve the	The income of beneficiary farmers has improved	"Gross farm income" of assisted holdings (€)	Ratio of expenditure to turnover of the farms having benefited from assistance is estimated to be lower	Lower by 10%	Increased "Gross farm income" of the farms having benefitted from assistance (EURO)	Estimated to be higher by 20%.

income of beneficiary farmers?						
D2. To what extent have the supported investments contributed to a better use of the production factors on holdings?	Increase in factor productivity	Output per hectare on assisted holdings (€/ha) Output per hour of labor on assisted holdings (€/ha) Cost per unit of basic products sold (e.g., €/ton, €/m ³ , etc.) on assisted holdings	Ratio of “output” and “total input” on assisted farms Reduced cost per unit of product sold (EURO/ measurement unit) on the farms having benefitted from assistance	Increase by 20% Reduction by at least 10%		
D3. To what extent have the supported investments improved the quality of farm products in compliance with EU standards?	The quality of farm products has improved in compliance with EU standards	Share of products in assisted holdings sold with quality label (%), of which: (a) complying with EU food quality standards (%) (b) labels related to organic farming (%)	Ratio of price of basic products with improved quality thanks to the assistance to average price of the respective products should be increasing	>1 and increasing		
D4. To what extent have the supported investments improved	Working conditions have improved	Share of assisted holdings applying improvements akin to EU standards for working al safety and health conditions (%)	Reduced exposures to the following should be recorded: toxic substances, malodorous substances, dust, extreme weather			

production conditions in terms of better work conditions in compliance with EU standards?			conditions, lifting of heavy loads, exaggerated working time			
D5. To what extent have the supported investments improved production in terms of animal welfare in compliance with EU standards?	Animal welfare has improved	Share of assisted holdings meeting EU animal welfare standards (whether or not the co-financing concerns animal welfare) (%) Share of animals housed in accommodation that meets EU standards on assisted holdings (whether or not the co-financing concerns animal welfare) (%)	Percentage of farms having benefitted from assistance aligned to the new animal welfare standards is estimated to increase Percentage of animals housed in conditions complying with Community standards in the farms having benefitted from assistance	>90% >90%		
D6. To what extent have the supported investments facilitated environmentally friendly farming?	Integration of environmental concerns into farm investments	Share of beneficiary holdings introducing improvements thanks to the co-financing (%), of which: (a) with the environmental improvement as the direct aim of the investment (%) (b) as a collateral effect (e.g.,	Percentage of beneficiary farms out of the total assisted farms where more than 10% of the total investment co-financing is allocated to environmental improvement, of which: -relating to waste and	>30%, compared to total assisted farms		

		<p>due to new equipment acquired mainly for economic purposes) (%)</p> <p>(c) relating to stable waste and farm manure (%)</p> <p>(d) relating to on-farm water management (%)</p> <p>(e) relating to (other) benign farming practices / systems (%)</p>	<p>excess manure (%)</p> <p>- relating to on-farm water management (%)</p> <p>-other environmentally friendly farming practices / systems (%)</p>			
	Improved storage and landspreading of farm manure	<p>Share of assisted holdings improving storage /landspreading of farm manure (%), of which:</p> <p>(a) co-financed from the assistance (%)</p> <p>(b) storage (%)</p> <p>(c) landspreading (%)</p> <p>Share of assisted holdings meeting EU standards concerning farm manure (%)</p>	<p>Ratio of stable refuse storage capacity of the farms having benefitted from assistance to total refuse quantity obtained in the assisted farms</p> <p>Percentage of farms having benefitted from assistance aligned to standards as regards the farm refuse</p>	<p>>0,8</p> <p>>30%</p>		
					<p>Creation of jobs and social impact:</p> <p>Number of maintained full-time equivalent jobs</p> <p>Number of newly created full-time equivalent jobs</p> <p>Increased number of</p>	<p>16,800</p> <p>3,200</p>

					young people settled in the rural area: - of which, farm owners	2,400 600
E. Measure 3.2 "Setting-up producers' groups"						
E1. To what extent has the setting up of producer groups helped to improve the income of their members?	The income of the members of the producer groups have increased	Ratio of variation in income of group members during programming period to variation in income of all farmers during the same period			Increased income of producers as compared o the previous situation	10%
E2. To what extent has the setting up of producer groups contributed to improve the processing and/or marketing of agricultural products (including fishing	Lower costs in assisted production / processing lines	Average change in production / processing costs per unit of basic per member of the group				
	Marketing channels improved or created	Average change in marketing costs per unit of basic product per member of the group Number and description of stable links / contracts created between basic producers and processing plants through producer groups	Ratio of primary agricultural products marketed by producer groups to total marketed primary agricultural products	Minimum 70%		
	The producer groups have encouraged and facilitated the adoption	Share of producer groups applying / promoting EU quality standards amongst their				

products), increase their quality, and prepare the implementation of the Common Market Organization in the beneficiary sectors?	of EU quality standards by their members	members (%)				
			Volume of minimum primary production marketed by producer groups per year: Cereals and technical plants Medicinal and aromatic plants Specialized crops Vegetables and potatoes Fruits including table grapes Wine grapes Mushrooms Ornamental flowers and plants Milk	330,000 tons (t) 750 t 40 t 102,000 t 20,000 t 17,400 t 600 t 1,590 thousand pcs. 55,125 t (535,500 hl)		

			Meet Eggs Honey Fishing products Forestry products	3,200 t 7,050 thousand pcs. 1,258 t 3,000 t 73,000 cm		
					Minimum number of full-time equivalent jobs (FTEJ) (a) maintained in better conditions (b) newly created	20,850 2,100
F. Measure 3.3 "Agricultural production methods designed to protect the environment and maintain the countryside"						
F1. To what extent have the supported actions contributed to protect natural resources beneficiary areas?	Natural resources have been protected	Number and description of actions carried out, of which: (a) linked to the development of organic farming (%) (b) linked to soil quality and protection (%) (c) linked to protection of wildlife and biodiversity (%) Area covered by supported measures (ha), of which: (a) linked to the development of organic farming (%)	Share of land benefitting from the agri-environmental submeasure, as % of the total land in the pilot areas which is vulnerable to erosion. Share of provisionally flooded land benefitting from the agri-environmental submeasure, as % from the total area of the pilot areas optimal for rice growing.			

		(b) linked to soil quality and protection (%) (c) linked to protection	Share of land for meadow management benefitting from the agri-environmental submeasure, as % of the total area of alpine meadows in the pilot area.			
F2. To what extent have the supported actions contributed to develop practical experience of this agri-environmental measure implementation at farm level?	Awareness of environmental issues increased amongst farmers	Share of farmers participating in assisted activities related to agri-environmental measures (%)	Increased total number of farmers with certified ecological crops (%) Number of farmers achieving the conversion towards the production methods of the organic farming.		Number of participants to the measure, as percentage from the total number of farmers in the pilot area. Dissemination of participants' experience to other farmers, positive effect pursuant to the participation to the National Agri-Environment Programme.	
	Beneficiary farmers acquainted with the objectives and techniques of this agri-environmental measure	Share of assisted farmers implementing the agri-environmental measures after assistance (%)				
F3. To what extent have the supported	Environmental issues integrated into rural development policy at	Description of new agri-environmental services set up by the administration for the	Increased land area tilled according to organic farming model, out of the total area			

actions contributed to develop practical experience of implementation of this agri-environmental measure at administration level?	national level	assistance of farmers Description of new environmental requirements for rural development activities at national / regional level, adopted in accordance with EU standards	(%)			
G. Measure 3.4 "Development and diversification of economic activities generating multiple activities and alternative income"						
G1. To what extent have the development and diversification of on-farm or off-farm activities contribute to increase the income (and the standard of living) of the beneficiary rural	Alternative sources of income have been developed thanks to the assistance	Share of income of beneficiaries coming from non-agricultural activities (%) (a) of which coming from tourist activities (%) (b) of which coming from craftsmanship activities (%) (c) of which coming from the sale of local and traditional products (%) (d) of which coming from other non-agricultural activities (%) (e.g. provision of services, folklore activities, etc.)			Share of beneficiary's gross income earned (generated) off-farm thanks to the assistance (euro / beneficiary), of which: (a) from tourism (b) from craftsmanship and local products	20%, 12% 8%

population?	Local enterprises created or revitalized are maintained after assistance	Number of enterprises established or revitalized thanks to the assistance still functioning two years after the end of the assistance (a) of which in the tourist sector (%) (b) of which in the crafts sector (%) (c) of which related local and traditional products(%) (d) of which linked to other non-agricultural activities (%)	Production of fish (tons/ year)	250		
			Production of frogs (tons/ year)	10		
			Production of crabs (tons/ year)	3		
			Production of oysters (tons/ year)	2		
			Production of scallops (tons/ year)	3		
			Production of snails (tons/ year)	5		
			Production of honey and other beekeeping products (tons/ year)	150		
			Production of silkworms (tons/ year)	0,5		
			Production of mushrooms (tons/ year)	30		
			Number of new facilities for wildberries and fruit trees processed at farm level.	20		
			Number of modernized facilities for wildberries and fruit trees processed at farm level.	25		

			Number of new facilities for aromatic plants processed at farm level. Number of modernized capacities for aromatic plants processed at farm level.	20 10		
G2. To what extent has the development and diversification of on-farm or off-farm activities helped to create new employment opportunities?	Jobs created or maintained in non-farming activities thanks to the assistance	Number of jobs created or maintained jobs in assisted enterprises two years after the end of the assistance (FTE) (a) of which in the tourist sector (%) (b) of which in the crafts sector (%) (c) of which related to local and traditional products(%) (d) of which linked to other non-agricultural activities (%) (%) (e) of which women (%)			Number of full-time equivalent jobs (a) maintained in better conditions (b) created	35,000 14,000 21,000
					Share of non-agricultural rural population earning an income from transactions/jobs generated by the	

					assistance off-farm (agricultural mechanics and suppliers of agricultural services) (%) Increased number of tourist guesthouses Increased fish production Increased honey production Increased silkworm production Increased mushroom production Increased processed wildberries and fruit trees production Increased processed aromatic plants production	by 5% by 7% by 7% by 5% by 5% by 7% by 7%
H. Measure 3.5 "Forestry"						
H1. To what extent have the forestry measure contributed to maintain and enhance forest	Increase of wooded area on previous agricultural and non-agricultural land	Area of assisted plantings (ha.)	Increase of wooded area on previous agricultural land area. Increased length of forest roads	40,000 ha 5%	Increased wooded area, via the SAPARD projects, as compared to the existing area (of private and public forests of the local councils). Increased number of	2% Increase by

resources, by influencing land use and the structure and quality of the growing stock?					localities served by forest roads.	200.
	Abandoned land reduced thanks to afforestation	Share of abandoned land afforested thanks to the assistance (%)				
	Anticipated increase of volume of growing stock thanks to planting of new woodland and improvement of existing forests	Anticipated additional average annual increment thanks to the assistance (m ³ / ha / year) (a) of which in new plantings (% hectares concerned) (b) of which due to improvement of existing woodlands (% and hectares concerned)	Increased number of seedling plants obtained in own nurseries.	8,000,000 pieces		
	Anticipated improvement in quality rest due to planting and forest improvement	Trend in quality/structure parameters (description; e.g. including hardwood / softwood, diameter evolution, straightness, knots...)				
H2. To what extent have the forestry measures contributed to maintain and enhance forest resources by influencing the	There is an additional build-up of carbon in the new and existing woodlands	Trend in average annual net carbon storage thanks to the assistance (million tons / year)				

total carbon storage in forest stands?						
H3. To what extent have the assisted actions enabled forestry measure to contribute to the social and economic aspects of rural development?	More rational production of forest products (or services)	Short / medium term change in annual costs for forestry, harvesting and transportation, storage operations thanks to the assistance (euro / m ³) Share of holdings being connected to associations of forest owners or similar (%)	Increased capacity of primary wood processing compliant with the technical conditions for the environmental protection Increased number of associated forest owners	20% 20%	Increased productivity in the forest exploitation sector	Increase by 3%
	Land and socio-economic interests are protected	Additional assisted outlets, in particular for small dimension / low quality products (m ³) Additional activities set up in forests (e.g., tourist activities, etc.)				
	More activities in rural community, due to the primary or secondary production or due to initial processing and marketing stages	Volume in short/medium term supply of basic forestry products, of small scale, processed locally (m ³ / year) Employment in the short / medium term outside holdings (logging, initial processing and marketing, and further local, small scale processing and marketing), directly or indirectly,			Increased number of jobs.	Increase by 3%

		depending on assisted actions (FTE / year)				
	Income maintained or increased in rural areas	Income in the short / medium term due to assisted activities (number of beneficiaries) (a) of which additional income (% and ha) (b) of which due to assisted on-farm and off-farm activities (%)				
H4. To what extent have the supported actions enabled forestry measure to contribute to the social and economic aspects of rural development by maintenance and appropriate enhancement of protective	Appropriate protection actions undertaken	Area planted/managed with a view to protective functions (ha.) (a) of which agricultural land (%) (b) of which water bodies (%) (c) of which villages, tourist facilities (% plus type and magnitude of interest, e.g., expressed approximately as number of inhabitants, night beds, etc.)	Increased woodlands administered by the forest owner associations	10%	Increased area of private forests administered on the basis of land management plans.	Increase by 10%

functions in forest management?						
I. Measure 4.1 "Improvement of vocational training"						
I1. To what extent are the training courses in accordance with existing training needs and coherent with other measures of the programme measures?	The training responds to the needs and potential for adaptation (conversion, reorientation, improvement)	Share of assisted training actions addressing issues identified as gaps/weaknesses or potential / opportunities during ex-ante evaluation (%) (a) of which because of the type / mix of participants (e.g., young people, women ...) (b) of which because of the topic / contents of the courses (%) (c) of which related to other co-finance actions of the programme (%) (d) of which complementary to the training actions co-financed by other pre accession programmes (%) Share of assisted training actions relating to the adaptation to the Community acquis (%)	Share of trainees having projects financed under SAPARD out of the total number of trainees. Share of your farmers out of the total number of trainees. Share of women out of the total number of trainees.	≥ 70% ≥ 30% ≥ 30%		
I2. To what extent have the	The skills / competencies acquired	Share of assisted trainees (both holders and employees)			Share of graduates of training courses	

acquired skills/ competencies helped improve the situation of the trainees and of the agricultural/ forestry/ fishing sectors?	by the trainees help improve their employment conditions	<p>experiencing job improvement related to training (%)</p> <p>(a) of which farm/ forest/ shipowners (%)</p> <p>(b) of which employees (%)</p> <p>(c) of which thanks to better remuneration (%)</p> <p>(d) of which thanks to non-pecuniary job quality (e.g., seasonal / contractual work security, exposure to risk and adverse conditions) (%)</p> <p>(e) of which women (%)</p>			submitting SAPARD projects within the first year after graduation (%)	
	The skills / competencies acquired by the trainees facilitate the adaptation of agriculture, forestry and fishing	<p>Share of holdings with an assisted trainee, initiating conversion/ reorientation / improvement related to the assisted training (%)</p> <p>(a) of which new / additional activities (%)</p> <p>(b) of which improved quality / hygiene / added value concerning existing activities (%)</p> <p>(c) of which management related (%)</p> <p>(d) of which environmentally benign methods/ practices (%)</p>				

		(e) of which farming (%) (f) of which forestry (%) (g) of which fishing (%)				
J. Measure 4.2 "Technical assistance"						
J1. To what extent have the technical assistance activities facilitated the implementation of the programme actions?	Beneficiaries assisted in the preparation / implementation of projects	Share of beneficiaries from other measures having received technical assistance (%) (a) of which for each of the measures (%) (b) of which women (%)				
	National / regional / local authorities assisted in the setting up and management of the programme	Number of officials / authorities having participated in assisted actions (training, technical support, information activities...) (a) of which at local level (%) (b) of which at regional level (where relevant) (%) (c) of which at national level (%)				
J2. To what extent have the technical assistance actions increased the acquaintance of the rural population and	Rural population acquainted with EU policy for rural development, notably SAPARD	Ratio of number of farmers participating in assisted information / awareness raising activities to overall population of farmers Trend in the distribution of information instruments (e.g. brochures, conferences, training courses, etc.)				

authorities involved with EU procedures, rules and principles, notably those regarding SAPARD?		Share of technical assistance activities dealing specifically with acquis-related issues (%. e.g. EU standards on sanitary requirements, food quality, hygiene conditions at the workplace, etc.)				
	National / regional / local authorities acquainted with EU rules and mechanisms in rural development policy, notably SAPARD	Share of officials at all levels dealing with rural development issues having participated in technical assistance activities (%) (a) of which activities dealing specifically with acquis related issues (%)				
			Number of promotional materials for the general information of all the parties (flyers, brochures, etc.) Number of publicity campaigns Number of supported expert meetings Number of workshops, conferences, seminars Number of Monitoring Committee sessions			

			Number of studies on the preparation and implementation of the programme measures			
			Number of programme evaluation reports			
Common evaluation questions						
Common questions regarding the objective: contribution to the Community acquis implementation in relation to common agricultural policy						
K1. To what extent has the programme been conducive to adjust the agricultural sector and the rural economy to Community standards and to prepare them for the implementation of the Community acquis?	Beneficiary sectors are more adapted to the EU standards - as regards the environment protection - as regards food quality and consumer protection - as regards animal health and welfare - as regards safety and hygiene conditions at the workplace - as regards fishing standards and regulations	Share of processing plants / enterprises in the agricultural / fishing sector or rural areas applying the EU environmental standards on a regular basis (%) (a) of which processing plants / enterprises (%)			Share of laboratories using harmonized standards or Community reference analysis methods (Measure 1.2)	100%
		Share of agricultural / fishing production complying with EU standards for food quality and consumer protection (%) (a) of which processing plants / enterprises (%)				
		Share of processing plants / enterprises in the fishing / agricultural sector or rural areas complying with EU standards for animal health and welfare (%) (a) of which processing plants /				

		enterprises (%)				
		Share of processing facilities / enterprises complying with EU standards in the field of safety and hygiene conditions at the workplace (a) of which processing plants / enterprises (%)				
		Change in the share of fishing enterprises complying with EU fishing standards and regulations (%) (a) of which processing plants / enterprises (%)				
	Increased awareness of private actors about EU rules and procedures for agricultural / fishing production	Share of rural population (households, holdings, farmers, etc.), directly or indirectly reached by information or awareness raising campaigns funded by the programme (%) (a) of which on issues linked to accession (%)				
K2. To what extent has the programme contributed to establish and	New legislation in the fields of action of the programme integrates CAP objectives and principles	New legislation developed during the implementation in the field of rural development integrating CAP objectives and principles (description and links				

improve the implementation of CAP objectives and procedures at the administrations' level?		to RDP)				
	Administrations acquainted with EU standards, rules and procedures	Share of officials working in the field of rural development acquainted with EU standards, rules and procedures (%)				
Common questions concerning the objective: contribution to solving of priority and specific problems for the sustainable adaptation of the agricultural sector and rural areas in the applicant countries						
L1. To what extent has the programme helped stabilizing the rural population?	Age profile of the population benefitting from assistance contributes towards maintaining / promoting a balanced population structure	Share of persons working on beneficiary farms / forests holdings and aged: (a) < 30 years (%) (b) 30-39 years (%) (c) 40-60 years (%) (d) > 60 years (%)				
	Gender profile of population benefitting from assistance contributes towards maintaining / promoting a balanced population structure	Ratio of female to male for persons benefitting from assistance Share of assisted projects developed by women (%)				
L2. To what	Employment is created	Employment maintained /				

<p>extent has the programme been conducive to creating/ maintaining employment opportunities in the rural areas?</p>	<p>or maintained, directly and indirectly by the programme, in enterprises in rural areas or in branches connected with agriculture and fishing sectors</p>	<p>created in directly / indirectly benefitting enterprises (FTE) (a) of which women (%) (b) of which young people (under the age of 30) (%) (c) of which concerning the pluriactivity of part-time farmers (%) (d) of which indirectly, as a result of supplier and income multiplier effects (%)</p>				
<p>L3. To what extent has the programme been conducive to improving the standard of living of the beneficiary population?</p>	<p>Income of the assisted rural population maintained or improved directly or indirectly by the programme</p>	<p>Ratio of average variation of income of directly or indirectly assisted population to average variation of income of overall population</p>			<p>“Gross farm income” on the farms having benefitted from assistance (EURO) (Measure 3.1) Increased producers’ income as compared to the previous situation (Measure 3.2) Share of the gross income of the beneficiaries earned (generated) off-farm thanks to the assistance (euro / beneficiary), of which:</p>	<p>Estimated to be higher by 20%. 10% 20%, 12% 8%</p>

					(a) from tourism (b) from crafts and local products (Measure 3.4)	
	Access of rural population to services improved directly or indirectly by the programme program	Share of rural population having access to the programme services (%) (a) of which assisted directly or indirectly by the programme (%) (b) of which basic services (water supply, sewage, electricity) (c) of which telephone and telecommunications services (%) (d) of which cultural / social services (%)				
L4. To what extent have the assisted actions contributed to diversify the rural economy and improve the market situation of the rural areas?	More dynamic economy in rural area	Number of directly or indirectly assisted new economic activities in beneficiary areas Evidence of improved dynamics in beneficiary areas (description)				
	Productivity has been improved and / or production costs reduced in key production chains thanks to the	Added value in key production chains before and after assistance			Added value of the products obtained via the beneficiary processing and marketing lines (Measure 1.1)	To increase by 10%

	programme					
L5. To what extent have the assisted actions contributed to protect the environment of the rural areas?	Protection of environment in rural areas has improved	Share of rural territory directly or indirectly protected thanks to the assistance (%)				
	Waste management has improved	Volume of waste collected / treated thanks to the assistance (m ³) (a) of which water treatment (%) (b) of which solid waste treatment (%)		>20%		
			Residual products / wastewater drainage / wastewater treatment in treatment plants pursuant to the assisted actions (Measure 2.1)		Increased percentage of treated water volume and increased number of served holdings/ho useholds	
	Awareness of environmental issues has increased amongst the rural population	Share of rural population involved in assisted actions related to environmental protection of any kind (%; e.g. environmental training, pilot activities, information campaigns, etc.)				

Common questions concerning the conception and implementation of the programme					
M1. To what extent have the implementing arrangements contributed to maximizing the the intended/ concerned effects of the programme?	The assisted actions are concerted and complementary, so as to produce synergy through their interaction on different aspects of rural development problems / opportunities	Frequency of groups/ combinations of actions / projects: (a) within measures (%) (b) and / or between measures (%) (c) and / or between SAPARD and other pre-accession funds (notably PHARE) (%)			
	The uptake within the programme (by holdings, enterprises, associations) involves those having the biggest need and / or potential for the adaptation of rural economies to the single market and the implementation of the acquis (adaptation to EU standards and procedures) in the area concerned by the programme, thanks to	Main types of direct beneficiaries and operators (e.g., holdings, enterprises, associations, networks; processors / marketers; arable / pastoral; small / large; etc., including administrations and officials at all levels) involved in the programme (rank) Description of premium differentiation arrangements, according to the needs and characteristics of beneficiaries Evidence of discouraging, unnecessary delays or costs for the direct beneficiaries /			

	a combination of implementing arrangement such as eligibility criteria, premium differentiation and / or project / criteria for selection of projects, as well as the absence of unnecessary delays and bureaucratic costs for these beneficiaries	operators (description)				
	Beneficial effects have been maximized through a combination of eligibility criteria, premium differentiation or procedures / criteria for the selection of projects	Leverage rate = {total spending by direct beneficiaries on assisted actions} to {public co-financing}				
		Evidence of dead-weight (description and approximate quantification)				
		Evidence of actions / projects resulting in beneficial indirect effects (description)				