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Guidelines for ex-post evaluation of measures under Regulation (EC) n° 951/97

1 Introduction

Working Document VI/3887/97 established initial guidelines on the mid term and ex post evaluation of measures on improving processing and marketing of agricultural structures. The experiences gained through the mid-term evaluations and the necessities for the exante evaluation foreseen for the Rural development plans demonstrate the need for an coherent approach for evaluation of measures under Regulation (EC) 951/97.

The present document establishes a common framework for evaluation of measures under Regulation (EC) 951/97. Common guidelines to the Member States should enhance evaluation in order to

– Clarify the impacts of the individual programmes and provide an overall assessment of the effect of Regulation (EC) n° 951/97 at Community level

– Facilitate a better integration of various evaluation results

– Increase the transparency, accountability of the individual programmes and of the regulation

– Enable an appropriate follow up, including a better implementation of the Rural Development Programmes in the period 2000-2006

2 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation should cover the duration of the programmes, which in principle runs from 1994 to 1999. It should cover the totality of respectively OP’s/CSF’s and SPD’s related to processing and marketing in a particular Member State, even if programming documents are of a regional nature and irrespective of administrative divisions. Evaluation results of Objective 1 and 6 regions should be integrated in the overall evaluation. For Member States completely within Objective 1, no additional evaluation is necessary. However, it would be helpful if a short synopsis could be produced in the format suggested here in order to enable the Commission services to draft the information from all Member States into a common format.

The evaluation should look at the impact of the interventions at all levels from the basic producer, the processing and marketing sector to the national and community level? It should, in principle, cover all measures related to improving processing and marketing of agricultural products. In cases where the programming strongly concentrates on certain sectors, it might be more appropriate and efficient to focus the evaluation on the main sectors of CSF/SPD. However, for the sectors of minor importance at least the
presentation of financial and physical results and a qualitative assessment of the impact of the measures has to be undertaken.

3 General approach of the evaluation

The *expost* evaluation should focus on the results and impacts of the aid scheme. Therefore it must go beyond the monitoring, reporting and auditing which deal with inputs, outputs and sometimes with results.

The relation between the inputs (financial or administrative resources) of an aid scheme and the impacts of a scheme, are described in the example of Figure 1.

**Figure 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial and administrative resources</td>
<td>Investments in processing equipment</td>
<td>Rationalised processing procedures</td>
<td>Improved competitiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction of costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with hygiene standards</td>
<td></td>
<td>Better quality of products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through an aid scheme the inputs produce outputs and achieve the intended operational objectives. The subsequent results are the most immediate impact of the assistance, in other words the contribution of the operational objectives to the specific objectives. Global impacts correspond to the overall objectives of the aid scheme. There may be also unexpected, possible negative impacts. It should be borne in mind that a measure may help to achieve more than one impact and that several measures may contribute to the same impact. The evaluation analyses systematically how the scheme achieves its general objectives.

The evaluation procedure proposed by the Commission is designed to ensure that the evaluations of Regulation (EC) n° 951/97 carried out in the Member States provide answers to key issues of the Regulation and that these answers serve both national/regional needs and can be synthesised at Community level.
Therefore the national/regional evaluations shall answer

– common evaluations questions to allow the aggregation of information on Community level.

The common evaluation questions are presented in Chapter 4 of this document.

– additional questions, which respond to the specific situation of the programme (e.g. natural conditions, eligibility conditions)

Member States should add such additional question to the above mentioned common evaluation question. Annex I provides examples of additional question, which could be a basis for the specific additional questions to be developed by Member States, in addition to the common evaluation questions.

To assess the success of the aid scheme appropriate criteria, indicators and target levels should in general be established. Indicators may relate to an output, a result or an impact. The success criteria help to formulate a judgement on the success of the assistance under examination by linking the indicator to the expected result or impact. As an example, for the question: “To what extent has the scheme reduced the cost of processing and marketing of agricultural products?” the criterion could be a reduction in the costs of 0.5 € per unit or alternatively by 2%. The precise target level can be defined in relation to a baseline or a benchmark. The example of 2% cost reduction relates to the baseline, which normally would mean the situation for the beneficiaries at the start of the programme. Alternatively, the target could have been “below a cost of 16 €/ton”, where the benchmark of 16 €/ton would be derived from knowledge of the best practice in the sector. A combination of these approaches would be “a downward trend in the costs” in the indicator compared to the evolution for non-assisted but otherwise similar firms. This document does not suggest any particular indicators for the impact of the schemes at Community level. However, it is strongly recommend that the Member States provide for most cases quantitative answers to the evaluation questions by using, *inter alia*, appropriate indicators to be defined at the level of the programme. In cases where quantitative answers are not possible well justified qualitative answers should be provided.

Chapter 4 provides the common evaluation questions to be answered by Member States. Also optional questions are presented which could contribute to clarify other aspects of the programmes at national, sectoral and regional level.

Member States must substantiate if a common evaluation question is inappropriate in relation to the implementation of Regulation (EC) nº 951/97 in the region/Member State. A priori, all common evaluation questions are considered applicable and should be answered.

### 4 Evaluation questions

The following common evaluation questions have been identified at Community level:

A To what extent have the investments helped to achieve more competitiveness of agricultural products?

A 1 To what extent have the investments helped to increase the added value of agricultural products (e.g. better anticipation of market trends)?
A 1.1 To what extent have the investments helped to improve the quality of products?

A 2 To what extent have the investments contributed to improved marketing channels?

A 2.1 To what extent was the supply of intermediate and final products (e.g. timing, homogeneity, quantity) optimised by the investments?

A 3 To what extent has the scheme contributed to reduce the cost of processing and marketing of agricultural products?

A 3.1 To what extent have the investments helped to rationalise collection and treatment processing of products?

B To what extent have the producers of the basic products benefited from the investments?

B 1 To what extent have the investments helped to improve the situation of the basic agricultural production (prices, quantities)?

B 2 To what extent have the investments contributed to encourage the co-operation between producers of the basic products and the processing and marketing level (contracts, guarantee of outlets)?

C What are the impacts (positive and negative) of the scheme in terms of polluting emissions, waste production and the use of natural resources?

D To what extent have administrative arrangements influenced the impact of the scheme?

E To what extent has the scheme been adequately targeted towards the eligible beneficiaries?

E 1 To what extent and why have some eligible enterprises undertaken similar action without applying for aid?

E 2 How significant was the leverage effect within the beneficiary enterprises?

Member States must answer the common evaluation questions at the appropriate level. The reply to certain questions should be specified to the appropriate levels (sectoral, regional, local). The appropriate level of analysis may depend on the specific question. The competitiveness of a firm or sector may in some cases relate to a much larger geographical area than the area in which agricultural raw materials are purchased. The right level is crucial for the analysis for example concerning the particular evaluation question about the impacts on the basic agricultural production (N° B.1).

Annex II provides a number of additional optional evaluation questions that may help to establish programme specific questions related to, e.g. national and regional aims and socio-economic conditions or to specific eligibility criteria. Such questions should complete the picture provided by the answers to the common questions.
5 Evaluation methodology

Mid-term evaluations often displayed a lack of judgements based on analyses of the effects of the programmes. Evaluation should seek to provide information on precise data allowing unbiased conclusions to be drawn. The MEANS documents on evaluating socio-economic programmes, in particular volume 3 on principal evaluation techniques and tools provide additional information on evaluation methods. Evaluation reports must explain the methods used.

Answers on evaluation questions should be based on adequate data. The following data sources might be useful:

Use of secondary data:
- Data provided in programming documents, aid applications (including not retained applications), use of previous evaluation results (mid-term evaluation)
- Monitoring data, in particular to provide information on expenditures, uptake and on outputs
- Statistics, to describe the baseline and context

Collection of primary data

Questionnaires, interviews which must be based on representative sampling, in compliance with statistical rules among the direct and indirect beneficiaries
- Interviews with experts, beneficiaries, programme managers where monitoring and sampling data are insufficient
- Case studies, to produce comprehensive information about key parts of the scheme.

The analysis of the collected data should cover the following aspects:
- What are the estimated net effects of the scheme and its individual measures?
- What would have happened without the intervention (counterfactual situation)?
- To what extent would the projects have been implemented without assistance (deadweight effects)?
- Are there substitution or displacement effects?
- What are the unintended effects, including negative effects and the influence from significant exogenous factors?
- Was the impact of the measures reinforced by complementary of synergy effects of other programmes/policies?
6 Recommended common structure of the evaluation report

The report should follow the recommended structure of the evaluation reports to provide comparable evaluation results and enable Commission services to elaborate a synthesis report on Community level. The report must describe the aid scheme being evaluated, including its context and purpose, together with the procedure and findings of the evaluation and the conclusions and recommendations it leads to. The recommended structure is further described in Annex II.

The following parts are essential:

- **Context of the aid schemes**

  The evaluation should be accompanied by a comprehensive description of the context of the scheme: social and economic need justifying the intervention, definition of target groups, characteristics of the implementation (institutions, timeframe, budget) and indicators describing the overall situation of the region over the programming period.

- **Financial information**

  The financial information should include the actual expenditure until the end of 1999 as well as the initial and any updated forecasts for the expenditure for 1994-1999. The financial effectiveness (actual spending in relation to the planned expenditure for the whole period) should also be provided.

- **Answers to common evaluation questions**

  For each of the common evaluation question (see chapter 4) well argued responses where possible based on quantitative criteria and indicators have to be submitted. Some of the questions are specified in more detail by sub-questions to elucidate the head question. In general, the answers should be based on a thorough analysis of appropriate indicators, but such quantitative indications will only be one essential element of the answer. A qualitative assessment based on all relevant information should be used in order to provide complete and reliable evaluation findings. The focus of many questions is on the effectiveness of the measure, but the evaluation should also include further analysis and qualitative assessment of other evaluation aspects as the above mentioned efficiency, relevance, utility, sustainability. In the situation of an ex post evaluation, the two latter aspects are of particular importance. Furthermore, replies should include a consideration of the impact of competing factors, possible deadweight and displacement and substitution effects.

  Member States are invited to complement the common evaluation questions by adding further questions. The evaluation report should provide a methodological part explaining the techniques used and contain statements on the validity of data and their sources.

- **Conclusions and recommendations**

  In order to be useful, the evaluation must go beyond merely describing what has been observed, through analysis of causal links between the elements of the aid scheme and their impact. The evaluation findings should help draw conclusions on the contribution of the measures to the objectives of Regulation (CE) n° 951/97 and subsequently to the wider objective N° 5a, i.e., to what extent has the regulation promoted rural development
by speeding up the adjustment of agricultural structures in the framework of the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy?

The report should also contain judgements and recommendations in order to facilitate the use of evaluation.

7. Administrative matters

7.1 National terms of reference for evaluation

In principle the national terms of reference have to take into account the general framework outlined in the present document. Furthermore, to prepare suitable terms of reference, there is a need to address the following points: the legal basis for evaluation - the evaluation scope - the objectives and users of the evaluation - the evaluation questions posed - methodological guidelines - an outline of the organisation of the evaluation - a draft work plan and calendar, including budgetary indications - criteria for the selection of the evaluating body (i.e. the required skills in terms of methodology and in terms of experiences in the field of rural development)

The terms of reference have to address the deliverables that the evaluator must provide: preliminary reports, final report, type of support (paper and electronic versions).

Problems that might, at a later stage, hinder the publications of the results should also be eliminated at this stage.

7.2 The independent evaluator

The evaluation should be carried out by an “independent” evaluator in the sense of no direct involvement in the implementation, management and financing of the aid scheme. It should show proof of sufficient independence and skill.

Public institutions are not excluded from the task if they fulfil the criteria of independence and competence. The terms of reference should define further criteria for the selection of the evaluator.

7.3 Follow-up to the evaluation report

The draft evaluation reports have to be transmitted to the Commission for information and possible amendments before their publication. After the reception of all evaluations a synthesis report will be prepared based on the national evaluations for presentation and discussion in the STAR Committee.

To get value added from their evaluation Member States should take into consideration the recommendations of the evaluation reports, inter alia, in the future implementation of this type of measures. Member States are asked to communicate their reactions to the evaluation recommendations to the Commission.
7.4 **Budget/Cofinancing**

The modification of the indicative 5a allocations\(^1\) opens the possibility of support for technical assistance for the mid term review and the *ex post* evaluation of the period 1994-1999 for the measures under Regulations (EC) n° 951/97 and (EEC) n° 867/90 from commitment appropriations available for the agricultural part of Objective 5a outside Objective 1. An amount of 4 MECU has been earmarked to this end.

In the case of co-financing, Member State should be aware that the Commission will obviously more closely follow the evaluation activities; this means in particular that national terms of reference have to be submitted for approval and that the draft evaluation reports are subject to Commission consultation and requests for amendments. In the case of evaluating bodies subordinated to the national administration only additional costs arising from the 951/97 evaluation are eligible for cofinancing. The co-financing rate will be up to 50%.

7.5 **Assessing the quality of reports**

The quality of evaluation reports must be assessed by the Member states. When submitted to the Commission, evaluation reports must be accompanied by a quality assessment. Recognised methods must be used for assessing the quality. This would normally entail the use of the following criteria:

- **Meeting needs:** Does the evaluation adequately address the information needs and fit the terms of reference?
- **Relevant scope:** Is the rationale of the programme and its outputs, results and impacts examined fully, including both intended and unexpected policy interactions and consequences?
- **Defensible design:** Is the evaluation design appropriate and adequate to ensure that the full set of findings, along with methodological limitations, is made accessible for answering the evaluation questions?
- **Reliable data:** To what extent are primary and secondary data collected/selected appropriate, offering an adequate degree of reliability for the intended use?
- **Sound analysis:** Is quantitative and qualitative information appropriately and systematically analysed according to the state of the art so that evaluation questions are answered in a valid way?
- **Credible findings:** Do findings follow logically from, and are they justified by, the data analysis and interpretations based on carefully described assumptions and rationale?
- **Impartial conclusions:** Are recommendations fair, unbiased by personnel or stakeholders’ views, and sufficiently detailed to be operationally applicable?
- **Clear report:** Does the report clearly describe the programme being evaluated, including its context and purpose, together with the procedures and findings of the evaluation, so that information provided can easily be understood?

---

These criteria are explained in the Volume 1 of the MEANS collection. “Evaluating socio-economic programmes: evaluating design and management”.

7.6 Timetable-draft work schedule

- Discussion of the draft working document on evaluation in STAR Committee of September
- Distribution of the final version of the document based on the discussions and written contributions in October 1999
- Elaboration of national terms of reference and submission to the Commission two months after the distribution of the final working document at latest to enable the necessary resources to be released by 31 December 1999
- Transmission of the draft reports to the Commission for information and possible comments in spring 2001

---------------------------------------------------------------
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Annex I

Evaluation questions concerning Regulation (EC) N° 951/97

< common questions are underlined >

1. To what extent have the investments helped to achieve more competitiveness of agricultural products?
   1.1 To what extent have the investments helped to increase the added value of agricultural products (e.g. by better anticipation of market trends)?
   1.1.1 To what extent have the investments helped to improve the quality (e.g. incl. new receipts) of products?
   1.1.2 To what extent was the processing and marketing of PDO, PDI and organic products encouraged by the investments?
   1.1.3 To what extent have the investments helped to improve the preparation, processing and presentation of products (new products and existing products)?
   1.1.4 To what extent have the investments led to added value of by-products?

1.2 To what extent have the investments contributed to improved marketing channels?
   1.2.1 To what extent was the supply of intermediate and final products (e.g. timing, homogeneity, quantity) optimised by the investments?
   1.2.2 To what extent have the investments contributed to the creation of new outlets?
   1.2.3 To what extent have the investments contributed to improved transparency of price formation (i.e. information exchange between the actors in the branch)?

1.3 To what extent has the scheme helped to reduce the cost of processing and marketing of agricultural products?
   1.3.1 To what extent have the investments helped to rationalise collection, treatment processing and marketing of products?
   1.3.2 To what extent have the investments led to less seasonal and less uncertain production of processed goods?
   1.3.3 To what extent have the investments led to reduced loss (e.g., reduced waste) and other cost reducing elements?

2. To what extent have the producers of the basic products benefited from the investments?
   2.1 To what extent have the investments contributed to improve the situation of the basic agricultural production (prices, quantities)?
   2.2 To what extent have the investments encouraged the co-operation between producers of the basic products and the processing and marketing level (contracts, guarantee of outlets)?

3. To what extent have the investments improved health conditions by improving hygiene conditions of processing and marketing?
4. What are the impacts (positive and negative) of the scheme notably in terms of polluting emissions, waste production and the use of natural resources?

4.1 To what extent have the investments influenced pollution such as emissions to air and water or waste disposal?
4.2 To what extent have the investments influenced the consumption of water and energy?

5. To what extent have administrative arrangements influenced the impact of the scheme?

5.1 How far have the selection procedures of projects by Member States or regions (tender procedure, ...) been conducive to the objectives?
5.2 How did the programming and selection procedure take into account special regional needs in addition to sectoral needs where necessary and to what extent did this reinforce or reduce the impact of the investments?
5.3 To what extent have the administrative arrangements accommodated environmental requirements (involvement of environmental authorities, environmental impact assessment, ..)?
5.4 To what extent has the communication undertaken towards potential beneficiaries raised the awareness of the scheme and assisted its uptake?

6. To what extent has the scheme been adequately targeted towards the eligible beneficiaries?

6.1 To what extent and why have some eligible enterprises undertaken similar action without applying for aid?
6.2 How relevant was the scheme given the magnitude of the potential needs?
6.2.1 To what extent were the investments targeted to key sectors or processes?
6.2.2 How significant was the leverage effect within the beneficiary enterprises?

7. How adequate are the eligible measures of the scheme compared to its objectives?

7.1 To what extent has the implementation of the scheme produced significant impacts (positive or negative) in addition to its declared objectives (e.g. working conditions, employment, transport), (quantify if possible)?
7.2 To what extent has the implementation of the scheme produced significant impacts (positive or negative) outside the beneficiary enterprises (quantify if possible)?
7.3 To what extent could alternative approaches have achieved the objectives of the scheme and what would be the likely outcome of such approaches (in terms of effectiveness, efficiency, side-effects)?

---

2 Regulatory approaches, aid for advice, research, patents, promotion,....
Annex II

Proposed structure of the evaluation report

• Executive summary

The evaluation report starts with an executive summary with the main findings and conclusions of the evaluation. This summary should not exceed 5 pages.

• Introduction

It provides general information about the programme

– a description of the context of the scheme: national policy, social and economic needs justifying the assistance, definition of beneficiaries or target groups;

– Characteristics of the implementation: actors involved, institutional context, time frame, general budgetary information;

– Purpose of the evaluation, evaluation scope, evaluation questions (common evaluation questions at EU level and additional sectoral, regional or national questions).

• Methodological approach

Clear description of the method used in the evaluation process, the techniques applied to reply to the evaluation questions and to assess the quality of the data provided. The limits to the methodological approach should also be clearly stated.

– Techniques used for data collection: programming documents, applications, questionnaires, interviews; size of samples and selection criteria used, etc …;

– Sources of data, how indicators were calculated;

– Validity of data, possible biases.

• Presentation and analysis of the information collected

Secondary and primary data\(^3\) constitute the basis of the evaluation. They should provide an answer to the evaluative questions. The report must not be limited to providing descriptive information. It should include a main section with an analysis and interpretation of the data collected.

---

\(^3\) Primary data are specific data collected through questionnaires, interviews in the framework of this evaluation. Secondary data refer to existing data (statistics, previous surveys)
– Expenditure for the overall period 1994-1999, including comparisons to the initial forecast. This also includes information on financial effectiveness. The financial data must be set in relation to the actual output of the scheme;

– Uptake of the scheme (specified to the sectors, regions);

– Replies to the common evaluation questions must be provided: data must be provided and analysed. Quantitative answers include indicators where possible, completed with other quantitative and qualitative results from the surveys, enquiries and other sources;

– Answers to sectoral, regional and national level questions should also be provided in this section.

• **Conclusions and recommendations**

The conclusions reached by the evaluation team should logically derive from the preceding analysis. They should be clearly presented in an operational way and answer the questions asked in the terms of reference. The recommendations must also be included in this section.

– The results of the evaluation should allow to draw conclusions on the overall contribution of the schemes to the general aims of the regulation and to objective 5a;

– Contribution of the scheme to sectoral, national, regional or local objectives;

– Judgement of the evaluation team in terms of effectiveness, efficiency and other relevant evaluation aspects;

– Presentation of recommendations concerning follow up in priority order, issued from the findings of the evaluation.

• **Annexes**

The following elements should be annexed to the report: terms of reference, literature, sources of data, additional tables charts and data.
Annex III

Glossary of evaluation terms

**Coherence**
Assessment of whether a better complementarity or synergy could be found within a programme and in relation to other programmes. The internal coherence refers to the correspondence between the resources allocated to a programme and its objectives. The external coherence refers to the adequacy between the evaluated programme and other related programmes, e.g. Community aids for early retirement and related national state aids.

**Counterfactual situation**
Situation which would have occurred without the public assistance. Also referred to "policy-off" situation.

**Criterion**
Characteristic on which a judgement can be based. The criterion must be explicitly defined. A measure would usually be judged on several criteria. Indicators are then defined for each criterion. "Reduction of costs" is an example of a criterion to examine the efficiency of agricultural holdings.

**Deadweight effect**
Change in the situation of the beneficiary that would have occurred even without the public funding. For instance, an agricultural holding might have invested even in the absence of co-finance.

**Displacement effect**
Effect obtained in a given geographical area to the detriment of another area. For example, when a job is created in an assisted area to the detriment of another job which is lost outside the area concerned.

**Effectiveness**
Assessment of the effects in relation to the objectives of the evaluated programme. An action will be effective when the objectives have been attained. For example, the ratio between the “number of kilometres” of water pipes that should have been constructed (quantified objective) and the “number of kilometres” that have actually been constructed could serve to assess the effectiveness of an agricultural measure concerning irrigation.

**Efficiency**
Assessment of the achieved effects in relation to the inputs (financial or administrative) mobilised; i.e., how economically have the inputs been converted into outputs, results or impacts. Could the same result have been achieved with less resources, or more results with the same resources?

**Exogenous factor**
External factors partly or entirely responsible for the changes observed. The evaluation must take into account such factors (e.g., market prices) in order to assess the net effect of the assisted action.
**Gross effect**
Change observed consequently to the implementation of the measure. The observation of gross effect is not sufficient to conclude properly on the effects imputable to the assisted action. Deadweight, displacement and substitution effects must also be assessed to conclude on the net effects.

**Impact**
Effects of the programme in the medium or long term. There can be expected, unexpected, positive or negative impacts, depending also on the influence of exogenous factors. Direct and indirect beneficiaries can be affected by the impacts of a programme.

**Indicator**
For the purpose of the present guidelines: information in a form suitable for assessing or ‘indicating’ the effects of an assistance. They help in quantifying and simplifying information about complex phenomena. They represent more than the raw data on which they are based. Measurement produces raw data, which may be aggregated and summarised to provide statistics; statistics can be analysed and re-expressed in the form of indicators, which fed into the evaluation or decision-making process.

There are programme indicators and context indicators. As an example, a programme indicator for the criterion “Reduction of costs” might be the “Ratio between costs and turnover on assisted holdings”. A context indicator relating to the income in the geographical area covered by the programme might be compared to a programme indicator such as “Gross farm income on assisted holdings”.

For the purpose of these evaluation guidelines, the programme indicators are linked to criteria.

**Input**
Resources mobilised to implement the programme: financial means, material, legal and organisational resources.

**Leverage effect**
Fact that the public funding induces private spending among the beneficiaries.

**Net effect**
Effect completely imputable to the programme. Deadweight, substitution and displacement effects have been subtracted from gross effect to estimate the net effect.

**Output**
What the programme finances. For example: buildings, storage equipment, tourist facilities, …

**Primary data**
Data collected ad hoc directly in the field at the time of the running evaluation.

**Relevance**
Appropriateness of the objectives of a programme in relation to the sectoral needs and socio-economic problems to which the programme should respond.

**Result**
The most immediate impact, directly identifiable once the action has been implemented. It occurs as soon as the public intervention has been completed. For instance, when tourist accommodation is created or upgraded, a result would be an increased accommodation capacity; when transport infrastructure has been created or upgraded the travelling time within or from the area would be reduced.

**Secondary data**
Existing information, e.g., statistics, monitoring data, data from previous evaluations, …

**Substitution effect**
Fact that an effect is obtained in favour of the target beneficiaries but at the detriment of non-eligible persons or organisations. Substitution effect appears, for example, when a person finds a job thanks to a programme but at the same time another person loses his/her job.

**Sustainability of results**
Effects are sustainable when they last in the long term, and after the end of the programme.

**Utility**
The fact that the impacts observed correspond to sectoral needs and to identified socio-economic problems. Unlike relevance, utility does not appreciate the intervention by referring to the objectives of the assisted actions.