

**SYNTHESIS OF THE INTERIM
EVALUATIONS OF
THE OBJECTIVE 5B REGIONS IN
SPAIN (1994-1996)**

**Mar Isla
Antoni Soy**

Barcelona, February 1998

**COMMISSION EUROPEENNE
DIRECTION GÉNÉRALE VI. AGRICULTURE**

**COMMISSION DECISION of 11-08-1997 concerning a contract for
the interim evaluation of the single programming documents
(1994-1999) for the Objective 5(b) regions- Synthesis of Interim
Evaluations for Spain. ARINCO N° 97.ES.06.001**

INDEX

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1.- INTRODUCTION | 2 |
| 2.- DIMENSION OF ELEGIBLE ZONES OF THE DIFFERENT DOCUPS | 3 |
| 3.- EVALUATION METHODS FOR THE INTERMEDIATE EVALUATION | 5 |
| 4.- FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF THE PROGRAMS | 9 |
| 4.1.- Financial effectiveness | 9 |
| 4.2.- Proposals of modification | 11 |
| 5.- THE COHERENCE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAMS | 16 |
| 5.1.- Overview | 16 |
| 5.2.- Degree of realisations and achievements by type of measures | 19 |
| 5.3.- Quantitative data on overall results | 39 |
| 6.- IMPACTS OF THE PROGRAMS. AN APPROACH THROUGH THE QUANTITATIVE ESTIMATES | 48 |
| 6.1.- Socio-economic indicators | 48 |
| 6.1.1.- Impacts on employment | 49 |
| 6.1.2.- Other impact indicators | 51 |
| 6.1.3.- Operational context | 52 |
| 6.2.- Territorial effects | 55 |
| 6.3.- Environmental issues in the program implementation | 57 |
| 7.- SOME THOUGHTS ON EFFICIENCY | 59 |
| 8.- THE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT | 63 |
| 8.1.- Public management and efficiency | 63 |
| 8.2.- Promotion and communication of the program | 67 |
| 8.3.- The managers and evaluators view | 68 |
| 9.- OVERALL CONCLUSSIONS | 70 |
| 9.1.- Final remarks | 70 |
| 9.2.- A review of the results from the Principles of the Reform | 74 |
| 9.3.- The evaluation now and for the future | 75 |
| 9.3.1.- The review of monitoring and evaluation system | 75 |
| 9.3.2.- Institutional arrangements | 79 |
| ANNEX 1.- FINANCIAL TABLES | 81 |
| ANNEX 2.- QUESTIONNAIRE MODELS | 84 |

1. INTRODUCTION

The GAP, which is led by María del Mar Isla and Antoni Soy has been commissioned by the DG VI of the European Commission to carry out the Synthesis Report for the Intermediate Evaluation of the Objective 5b DOCUPS in Spain for the period 1994-1999, that is to say the Objective 5b DOCUPS in the regions of Aragón, Baleares, Catalonia, Navarra, País Vasco, La Rioja and Sierra de Madrid.

This work jointly with the evaluations of France, Germany, Italy and United Kingdom will constitute the Intermediate Evaluation of the 5b Objective at the European level.

The **main aims** of this synthesis report are to provide the Commission services with the elements to judge the progress and the impacts of the Objective 5b DOCUPS and to make easier the preparation of the report for all the Structural Funds.

More concretely the Synthesis reports of mid-term evaluations should cover **the assessment of the following issues**:

- The degree of realisation of the objectives of the different programmes and of their coherence with the measures foreseen.
- The level of advancement on the basis of financial and physical indicators analysing, when possible, the effectiveness of measures, subprogrammes and strategic axes.
- The aspects concerning the main elements regarding the efficiency of measures and programmes.
- An examination of the impacts of programmes.
- The questions regarding the implementation and management of the programmes.
- The application of the principles contained in the reform of the Structural Funds.
- An executive summary and operational recommendations for improvements from the evaluators.

2. DIMENSION OF ELEGIBLE ZONES OF THE DIFFERENT DOCUPS

A first aspect to be considered is the relative size and dimension of the different zones and the corresponding DOCUPS that exist in Spain. We can have a first approximation from the consideration of some data and variables as presented in the following figure.

Figure 1 . Basic Data from the Intermediate Evaluation Reports

| VARIABLES | Aragón | Baleares | Cataluña | La Rioja | Navarra | Pais Vasco | Sierra de Madrid |
|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Population 1991 | 562.855 | 251.769 | 461.474 | 78.357 | 122.462 (2) | 41.021 | 221.563 |
| Population 1995 | 563.618 | | 482.081 | | 119.586 (3) | 44.740(1) | 262.853(1) |
| Surface (sq q) | 45.653 | 3.114 | 16.978 | 4.262 | 6.751 | 2.657 | 5.156 |
| Number municipalities | 711 | 44 | 372 | 144 | 181 | 58 | 124 |
| Forecast expenditure 1994-1999 (million pesetas) | 97.686,9 | 6.774,3 (4) | 57.922,3 | 12.692,2 | 18.424,6 | 12.822,1 | 15.715,4 |
| Forecast expenditure/population 1995(thousand pesetas) | 173.320 | | 120.150 | | 154.065 | 286.591 | 59.786 |
| Forecast expenditure/ Surface (thousand pesetas) | 213.977 | | 341.161 | 297.799 | 272.917 | 482.578 | 304.798 |

(1) 1996

(2) 1989

(3) 1994

(4) 1994-1996

As one can see the data and information provided by the different Mid-term Reports are very diverse and many times difficult to compare. Anyway, Aragón and Catalonia seem to be the programmes with a bigger size both financially and demographically.

In relation to the forecast expenditure per inhabitant, for those regions where data are available, Pais Vasco is the first one followed by Aragón, Navarra and Catalonia and much more distanced Sierra de Madrid.

The increase of the dimension surface of the eligible areas under each program in the period 1994-1999 have a counterbalanced effect. On one hand, it has allowed a higher spreading of the European sources. On the other hand, it may have diluted the final impact. Thus, in Madrid the 5b area represents the 5% of the regional population while the 63,4% of the surface.

3.- EVALUATION METHODS FOR THE INTERMEDIATE EVALUATION

The Commission and the Ministry of Agriculture set up broad guidelines on the content of the intermediate evaluations to be carried out by each region. Nevertheless, the development of this content as well as the scope and priority assigned to each headline and the methodological approach was left out to the regions initiative.

As expected, **the evaluations have come to be fairly diverse**, indeed. Somehow, they show the concerns of the regional authorities at the time of analysing their own programs and setting the evaluation priorities.

Sometimes the global impact on main macro-variables, and more specially on employment, seems to be one of the main issue and the one which gathers their attention (Aragón). Thus, it uses three approaches, data from the monitoring, ad-hoc estimates by measure and I-O methodology, despite the reserves from the evaluator towards this methodology.

In the other opposite side, financial disbursements play the main role while physical realisations are not developed further from the information already provided at the Monitoring Committee (Balears, or País Vasco). In the middle, the rest of the evaluations mainly differ in their extent, work field and organisation.

The evaluations discuss the program organisation regarding the hierarchy of objectives and the indicators adequacy and criticisms to the measures organisation within the subprograms is widely spread all the evaluations. Even there are two evaluations, Aragón and Balears, that attempt to propose main organisational changes. Thus, the Aragón program proposes a reclassification of the measures to better fit with the intermediate and final objectives. The Balears evaluation, on the other side, proposes linking the measures according to their sectorial target (agriculture, Natural environment, Tourism...) and presents a taxonomy of indicators (physical, sectorial, global, ...) which does not apply later. Eventually, the Balears evaluation develops methodologies to analyse synergy, complementarity and impact with an extent

bibliography. The exercise prepares the steps to follow in the future and claims there was no time to collect information, other than the financial.

The Synthesis Report must consider **the different methodological approaches** because they will determine the mid-term evaluations and the possibilities and the level of their comparison.

Figure 2. Method Approaches

| | Aragón | Baleares | Catalonia | Rioja | Navarra | Pais Vasco | Madrid |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------|----------|-----------|-------|---------|------------|--------|
| Data Analysis | X | X | X | X | X | X(a) | X |
| Project dossiers and interviews with managers | X | | X | X | X | X | X |
| Surveys | X | | X | | X | | |
| Interviews and Panel Meetings with Beneficiaries and Experts | | | X | X | X | X | X |
| Case Studies | | | X | | X | | |
| Input-Output Analysis | X | | | | | | |
| Territorial consideration | X | | X | X | X | | X |

(a) Annual reports for the Monitoring Committee.

Another question about the evaluations is the relative to the **indicators**. Most of the evaluations do not get involved in the discussion regarding their adequacy. Then, evaluations hold the list of indicators as provided by the managers and physical, intermediate and final impacts are mixed with no distinction.

It is a common trend for many of the evaluations their complaint towards the physical and impact indicators provided by the programs, although the extent of the review proposed and its implementation are also varied. Thus, some programs have dealt with the system of information as it is provided by the managers and delivered to the monitoring committees, in a mixed list of physical, intermediate and physical indicators. Thus, for instance, “new firms or employment” might be together in continuum with “grants or studies”, “thematic guide”, “diversification projects”.

Some other cases, the evaluators just attempt to recommend new indicators for the future although they are not applied at this stage of the evaluation. Proposals in some cases show some misunderstanding about the role and the feasibility of the indicators. This is the case for instance of Balears where there is within the proposal an indicator on “Has reconverted/ has holding” without indication on the aggregation system or “increment of the production”, with no reference about the evaluation method to follow. Besides, all of them are included under physical indicators.

Some others, have combined this proposal with the enlargement of the current indicators until it was feasible. The issue deserves some attention and this report will come back to it later on. The diversity of proposals and, mainly, the lack of hierarchy in the indicators in this intermediate evaluations reflects, somehow, the unawareness of the Commission previous works in the issue and announces the pitfalls to find out in the final evaluation unless some remedies are put in place.

Another different approach among the evaluation grounds on the field work carried out at these stage of the program. The guidelines from the Commission do not point out any specific recommendation regarding this feature. All the evaluations have relied on the manager views, official documentation and statistics available, but their contrast with outsider viewers is not always proved, like in the Balears evaluation. It is true that most of the evaluations indicate some kind of contact with final beneficiaries in terms of interviews but surveys were carried out in less cases and only in Navarra and Catalonia a more intensive field work was pointed out.

One has the feeling that the top-down character associated to the 5b programs has been also transferred to the evaluation process and this exercise has had very much of a desk exercise with scarce search into the final beneficiaries perception.

A special attention should be considered in relation to the territorial approach set up in many Mid-term evaluations, as in Aragón, Catalonia, Navarra, La Rioja and Madrid. The evaluators recognise the diversity of the regional 5b areas and most of them try to evaluate the funds allocations. The desegregation of the actions and measures at the local level is of a major interest for the analysis of

the programs impacts. In fact, as can be exposed in the mid-term evaluations, the consideration of the overall impacts exclusively could disguise important and significant disparities both in the expenditure and in the ex-post effects.

More pessimism raises from the attention devoted to the environmental impacts in the different evaluations. Most of them deal with the issue but in such a formal and empty way that there are no conclusions at all. That may be explained because of the lack of work field. Through the dossiers and interviews with the managers, there is no real way of approaching conflicts and achievements in the real world.

Eventually, it has to be pointed out that **there is a big diversity of actions under similar names**. Therefore comparisons among regions cannot be easily done without risk. In order to get general conclusions regarding performance features by measures we attempted to group measures according to wide typologies although we aware of the inconveniences of doing it some recommendations to make results more comparable are provided for the future.

The synthesis report has benefited from the responses of managers and evaluators of the regions to a common questionnaire designed for this evaluation. Both managers and evaluators were required to reply a quite but not identical questionnaire. It tried to be as simple as possible and included mainly qualitative responses. The questionnaire (in **Annex 1**) was used as a complementary tool to help us to understand the writing of the very diverse reports. Summaries of the average responses appear spread along the report.

4.- FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF THE PROGRAMS

4.1.- Financial effectiveness

It is not easy to get a comparative analysis of the financial achievements and of the financial effectiveness (% actual expenditure/ forecast expenditure) of the programs due to the **differences of information which are gathered in the different evaluations of the 5b zones in Spain.**

We can see a summary of these differences in the following table.

Obviously, taking into account the information gathered in this table, it is necessary to say that **it is absolutely imperative to set up some common guidelines to gather information at least at the financial level.** More concretely **all the evaluations** of the DOCUPs, especially final evaluations, and consequently in the continuous process of monitoring and evaluation of the DOCUPs, **at least the following information should be included:**

- Forecast expenditure for the overall period (1994-1999): initial and reprogrammed for measures, subprograms, strategic axes and the overall program.
- Actual expenditure (Incurred Obligations) for the passed period for measures, subprograms, strategic axes and the overall program.
- Financial effectiveness (% Actual expenditure (Incurred Obligations)/ Forecast expenditure for the overall period)

Nevertheless, in spite of all these constraints, we can gather sufficient information **from the evaluation reports** to point out some interesting **conclusions from the financial achievements** of the DOCUPs in the period 1994-1996.

In the following table we summarise the financial effectiveness of the different measures, subprograms and priority axes of all the DOCUPs. **(In the case of Balears and País Vasco the data of financial effectiveness are the relation between committed expenditure in 1994-1996 regarding forecast expenditure in 1994-1996).** We present the data in four levels of financial effectiveness:

1. The financial effectiveness was lower than 40%: **LOW EFFECTIVENESS**.
2. The financial effectiveness was between the 40% and the 80%: **LOW-MEDIUM EFFECTIVENESS**.
3. The financial effectiveness was between the 80% and the 100%: **MEDIUM-HIGH EFFECTIVENESS**.
4. The financial effectiveness was higher than 100%: **HIGH EFFECTIVENESS**.

Then, the analysis of the **financial effectiveness by regions** allows to conclude that there is one region, Navarra, with a level 3 of global financial effectiveness, with one priority axes in the level 4, two Priority axes in the level 3, one in the level 2 and one in the level 1; Navarra also has three measures at the level 4 of financial effectiveness, five measures at the level 3, five measures at the level 2 and only two measures at the level 1.

There are two regions with a level 2 of global financial effectiveness, Aragón and País Vasco. Aragón has one priority axes at the level 3, one at the level 2 and three at the level 1; it has one measure at the level 4, two at the level 2, four at the level 2 and nine at the level 1. País Vasco has too one priority axes at the level 3, one at the level 2 and three at the level 1; it has one measure at the level 4, four at the level 3, two at the level 2 and four at the level 1.

Finally, there are four regions with a level 1 of global financial effectiveness: Baleares, Catalonia, Madrid and La Rioja. Baleares has one priority axes at the level 3, one at the level 2 and three at the level 1; it has three measures at the level 3, five at the level 2 and nine at the level 1. Catalonia has one priority axes at the level 2 and four at the level 1; it has two measures at the level 3, three at the level 2 and ten at the level 1. Madrid has two priority axes at the level 2 and three at the level 1; it has three measures at the level 3, three at the level 2 and four at the level 1 (we don't have information of the four measures of the FSE but the global financial effectiveness is very low). La Rioja has one priority axes at the level 2 and four at the level 1; it has one measure at the level 4, three at the level 2 and ten at the level 1.

At the **Priority axes level**, although there are logically some differences among regions, the best financial effectiveness is for The Improvement of Rural Settlement, followed by Basic Infrastructures for Rural Development, Economic

Diversification and Creation of Employment, Natural Resources and Environment. It is necessary to point out the very low financial effectiveness of the Priority Axes referred to Human resources in all the regions.

At the **level of measures** we can point out that the highest financial effectiveness was in the measures related to infrastructures: Renovation and Development of Rural Settlements, Basic Infrastructures, Infrastructures for Fostering Rural Development. The financial effectiveness was also relatively high in the measures related to Rural Tourism, Location of Productive Investments (SMEs) and to the Natural Resources (Fight against the Erosion, Natural Sites and Wild Life). Financial effectiveness was lower, with some exceptions, in the cases of Rural Infrastructure, Agrarian Diversification, R+D and especially in the case of Human Resources.

It is necessary to say that this data are not exactly the same that those presented in the last meeting of the Spanish Monitoring Committee at the level of subprograms and Priority Axes. Nevertheless, the main trends seem to be exactly the same.

4.2.- Proposals of modification

Despite some programmes have maintained rhythms of execution lower than forecast at mid term only in the case of Balears a reduction in the budget is proposed. This reduction is due basically to the changes in the ESF which proposes a diminution on the budget of 15%.

In fact the stabilisation on the budget of ESF is common to all the programmes. On the contrary, the ERDF is the fund that concentrates the increases of budget in all the programmes. Finally in the case of the EAGGF the programmes have different behaviours.

These trends are an important characteristic in the 5b dynamics in Spain especially taking into account the forecast changes in the Agenda 2000 regarding the Structural Funds.

Figure 3.-FINANCIAL INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE DIFFERENT DOCUPs

| | Aragón(a) | Baleares(b) | Catalonia(c) | Madrid(d) | Navarra(e) | Pais Vasco | Rioja(f) |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|-----------|------------|------------|----------|
| Forecast Expenditure 1994-1999 by measures and subprograms (1) | X | | X | (X) | X | | (X) |
| Actual expenditure 1994-1996 by measures and subprograms (2) | X | | X | (X) | X | | X |
| Financial Effectiveness by measures and subprograms = (2)/(1) % | X | | X | (X) | X | | (X) |
| Forecast Expenditure 1994-1999 by measures and Priority axes(3) | X | | X | (X) | (X) | | (X) |
| Actual expenditure 1994-1996 by measures and Priority axes (4) | X | X | (X) | X | (X) | | X |
| Financial Effectiveness by measures and Priority axes = (4)/(3) % | X | | (X) | X | X | | (X) |
| Forecast Expenditure 1994-1996 by measures and subprograms (5) | | (X) | X | | | | X |
| Forecast Expenditure 1994-1996 by measures and Priority axes (6) | | X | | | | | X |
| Financial Effectiveness by measures and subprograms = (2)/(5) | | (X) | X | | | X | X |
| Financial Effectiveness by measures and Priority axes = (4)/(6) % | | X | | | | X | X |

(a) The information is available too by level of administration.

(b) It is possible to calculate the forecast and actual expenditure 1994-1996 by subprograms and the corresponding financial effectiveness.

© There are too data in relation to the reprogrammed forecast expenditure at the end of 1996, the actual expenditure 1994-1996 for the different actions included in every measure and consequently the correspondent financial effectiveness, the actual investment 1994-1996, the investment by km2 and the investment by inhabitatn by counties and zones at the subprograms and measures level. It is possible to calculate the actual expenditure 1994-1996 and the financial effectiveness by priority axes.

(d) There is not the forecast expenditure 1994-1999 by measures. It is possible to calculate the actual expenditure 1994-1996 and the financial effectiveness by subprograms. There is the actual expenditure 1994-1996 by the different actions included in every measure. The information is available too by administration levels and by counties. Most available information include the actual expenditure (incurred obligations) and the real payments.

(e)There are data too in relation to the reprogrammed forecast expenditure at the end of 1996, the actual expenditure 1994-1996 by the different actions included in every measure and consequently the correspondent financial effectiveness, the actual investment 1994-1996, the investment by km2 and the investment by inhabitant by municipalities and counties, at the level of subprograms, measures and actions in the case of the counties. It is possible to calculate the forecast expenditure 1994-1999 and the actual expenditure 1994-1996 by priority axes.

(f) It is possible to calculate the forecast expenditure 1994-99 by subprograms and priority axes and the financial effectiveness by measures.

Figure 4.

FINANCIAL EFFECTIVENESS: ACTUAL EXPENDITURE (INCURRED OBLIGATIONS) 1994-1996/ FORECAST EXPENDITURE 1994-1999 (%)

| MEASURES | ARAGÓN | BALEARES (1) | CATALONIA | MADRID | NAVARRA | PAIS VASCO (1) | RIOJA |
|------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|------------|----------------|------------|
| Rural Infrastructure | 33 | 45 | 51 | 30 | 73 | 65 | 31 |
| Agrarian Diversification | 22 | 80 | 23 | 43 | 37 | 63 | 34 |
| Fight against Erosion | | 156 | 23 | 12 | 100 | | 15 |
| Biodiversity Conservation. Natural Sites and Wild Life | 52 | 71 | 35 | 54 | 43 | 77 | 31 |
| Orderly Use of Natural Resources | 83 | | | | | | |
| Protection and Restoration of the Environment | 31 | | | | | | |
| Protección and Improvement of Vegetation | | 71 | 31 | | 60 | | |
| Protection of Natural Resources | | | | | | 135 | |
| Renovation and Development of Rural Settlements | 81 | 101 | 51 | 94 | 100 | 301 | 29 |
| Technical assistance | | 38 | | | | | |
| Subprogram I: FEOGA-O | 40 | 74 | 38 | 31 | 68 | 91 | 28 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Basic Infrastructures | 53 | 158 | 90 | 90 | 46 | | 103 |
| Advanced Services of Telecommunications | | | | | 42 | | |
| Actions in Favour of the Location of Productive Activities | 56 | 85 | 48 | 38 | 55 | 142 | 49 |
| Rural Tourism | 133 | 97 | 36 | 67 | 60 | 161 | 27 |
| R+D | 0 | 12 | | | 63 | 0 | |
| Protection and Improvement of the Environment | | | 18 | | | | |
| Environmental Actions in Rural Settlements | 30 | 61 | | 49 | 95 | | 18 |

Mid-Term Evaluation of 5b DOCUPs. Synthesis Report, Spain

| MEASURES | ARAGÓN | BALEARES (1) | CATALONIA | MADRID | NAVARRA | PAIS VASCO (1) | RIOJA |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|------------|----------------|-------|
| Infrastructures for Fostering Rural Development | 80 | <u>167</u> | 31 | 20 | <u>103</u> | 91 | |
| Subprogram II: FEDER | 63 | 91 | 43 | 51 | <u>67</u> | <u>122</u> | 59 |
| Occupational Professional Training | | 93 | 27 | | 53 | | 12 |
| Training and New Qualifications | 19 | | | | | | |
| Initial and Continous Training | | | | No consta | | | |
| Training of Employees and Actives | | 5 | | | 34 | 29 | |
| Employment Aids | 28 | 0 | 34 | No consta | | <u>163</u> | 45 |
| Creation of Organizations to Foster Employment and Training | | | <u>70</u> | | | | |
| Professional Orientation and Advice | 4 | 3 | | No consta | | | |
| Training Monitoring | | | | No consta | | | |
| Researchers Training/ R+D | 6 | 7 | 13 | | | | |
| Technical Assistance | | 30 | | | | | 52 |
| Subprogram III: FSE | 16 | 13 | 29 | 15 | 48 | 31 | 21 |
| Axe I: Basic Infrastructures for Economic Development | 38 | 78 | 53 | 49 | <u>71</u> | 65 | 56 |
| Axe II: Economic Diversification and Creation of Employment | 44 | 74 | 23 | 27 | 51 | 88 | 38 |
| Axe III: Natural Resources and Environment | 37 | 89 | 25 | 28 | <u>62</u> | 79 | 18 |
| Axe IV: Improvement of Rural Settlement | <u>81</u> | <u>138</u> | 21 | 51 | <u>100</u> | <u>190</u> | 29 |
| Axe V: Human Resources | 16 | 13 | 29 | 15 | 34 | 31 | 19 |
| TOTAL | 43 | 60 | 38 | 32 | <u>65</u> | 90 | 35 |

(1) In this case financial effectiveness rates are estimated as the relationship between committed expenditure in 1994-1996 regarding forecast expenditure in 1994-1996.

Figure 5
PROPOSALS OF MODIFICATION

| PRIORITY AXES | ARAGÓN | | BALEARES | | CATALONIA | | MADRID | | LA RIOJA | |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------|---------|----------|--------|-----------|----------|---------|--------|----------|----------|
| | % init. | %Variat | % init. | %Varia | % init.I | %Variati | % init. | %Varia | % init. | %Variati |
| I. Basic Infrastructures | 38,33 | 3,42 | 15,56 | 12,37 | 28,35 | 15,58 | 25,34 | -8,55 | 24,92 | 12,95 |
| II. Economic Diversification | 23,00 | -30,17 | 33,71 | -2,65 | 27,83 | 0,00 | 18,59 | 5,43 | 28,33 | -0,28 |
| III. Natural Resources and Environment | 14,65 | -16,90 | 18,35 | 4,66 | 23,21 | -19,03 | 22,64 | 4,86 | 25,00 | -10,70 |
| IV. Improvement of Rural Settlement | 14,35 | 59,64 | 3,27 | -1,72 | 4,58 | 0,00 | 9,27 | 23,38 | 14,25 | 0,00 |
| V. Human Resources | 9,40 | 0,00 | 28,39 | -15,36 | 15,78 | 0,00 | 23,65 | 0,00 | 6,57 | 0,00 |
| VI. Technical Assistance | 0,26 | 0,00 | 0,71 | 0,00 | 0,25 | 0,00 | 0,5 | 0,00 | 0,93 | 0,00 |
| FUNDS | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL EAGGF | 66,31 | 0,46 | 45,34 | 0,00 | 59,99 | 0,00 | 49,67 | -0,09 | 67,77 | -6,50 |
| TOTAL ERDF | 24,30 | 0,63 | 26,26 | 6,97 | 24,23 | 0,00 | 26,68 | 8,08 | 25,66 | 19,01 |
| TOTAL ESF | 9,40 | 0,00 | 28,39 | -15,36 | 15,78 | 0,00 | 23,65 | 0,00 | 6,57 | 0,00 |
| TOTAL DOCUP | 100,00 | 0,46 | 100 | -2,53 | 100 | 0,00 | 100 | 2,11 | 100 | 0,48 |

5. THE COHERENCE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAMS

5.1. Overview

The coherence of the programs as they are presented in the DOCUP is not always clearly displayed. Similar actions appeared involved under different measures and are being financed by different funds. This is, somehow, the outcome of the institutional arrangements the integrative program cannot forget. Nevertheless, despite these inconveniences and some criticisms no evaluation questions its coherence as an overall and its relevance to tackle the problems in the area.

After the review of the current evaluations and the previous ones, one has some doubts on the feasibility of reaching a different answer to this question. Even when the program is recognised as partial, the limited resources involved and its complementarity with other existing policies would justify the approach. Thus, some measures are split among many small and disperse actions covering the whole territory. Then, the claimed effects would come from the demonstration effect and the support to local policies. The diagnosis does not provide the required information to be effectively checked for this issue.

The information system has evolved since the first programs to provide a wider range of indicators. However, as it was already pointed out in the methodology **there is not yet a consistent and uniform system of indicators all over the measures nor, even less, along the different regional programs.** That makes **very difficult a comparative approach and clearly unfeasible any attempt to assess effectiveness and efficiency.**

As it has been already stated, the degree of criticism towards the existing indicators has been different among the regions. Some evaluations have expressed their criticisms to the quantity and quality of the available indicators. While in some cases the scarcity of indicators is a problem, the truth is that the efforts to enlarge may just take to a very large set of information with little analytical value. It is also true that some other evaluators seem more comfortable with the existing ones. This is the case of

La Rioja that states the “already existing physical indicators are basic to make the follow-up of the measures; nevertheless we believe that the monitoring could be enriched if a larger number of physical indicators, measurable from the dossiers were included”.

Despite the weaknesses of the used indicators, **the main shortcoming for the evaluation purposes lies on the lack of targets** evenly distributed to all the indicators. Thus, the analysis faces the problems not just when there is no reference to the foreseen target but also when targets are very different in size and scope and the rates of effectiveness cannot be compared across as if they were homogenous.

Some other times, the targets set at the start have proved to be inaccurate and contribute little to the final analysis. This is particularly important for the ESF, where low rates of financial effectiveness combine with overdone physical targets. That proves two facts: that indicators were set with no care and that real content of the actions was not enough defined at that time to estimate the financial resources scope.

The evaluators seem very well aware of the problem and it is easy to see that comments on effectiveness disregard the effectiveness rate which are, even when provided, left aside. Unfortunately, qualitative comments on measures performance is not well developed for all the evaluations and comparison will mainly focuses on those which provide more information.

Managers themselves also recognise these shortcomings as the answer to the survey reveals.

Figure 6. Qualitative assessment on the existing indicators. Average rate by managers and evaluators (from 0=minimum to 5=maximum)

| Issues | Managers | Evaluators |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Accuracy on the SWOT definition | 3.4 | 3.0 |
| Diagnosis relevance on the strategy design | 3.4 | 3.0 |
| Program adequacy to the area needs | 3.3 | 3.5 |
| Availability of indicators for the objective results | 2.8 | 1.8 |
| Availability of indicators for the objective impacts | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| Availability of indicators for the action results | 3.6 | 3.1 |
| Availability of indicators for the action impact | 2.4 | 1.6 |
| Availability of targets for results | 3.6 | 3.1 |
| Availability of targets for impact | 2.2 | 1.4 |

Nevertheless, for a more qualitative of quantitative perspective, the fact is that a significant effort on this side will have to be made if evaluation of the effectiveness is envisaged.

As a first attempt to analyse the effectiveness of the programs we tried to group the indicators with available targets according to their achievement rates. It provides a first view on the program realisations although the procedure could be applied only to those evaluations with this information. The chart itself shows the difficulties to achieve a common and comparable view for all the programs.

Figure 7. Groups of indicators according to the degree of achievements (achievements/targets %)

| EFFECTIVENESS (Achievements/targets %) | ARAGÓN | CATALUNYA | LA RIOJA | NAVARRA | MADRID | PAIS VASCO |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| < 25% | 9 (39%) | 11 (34%) | 34 (57%) | 7 (10%) | 4 (15%) | 7(21%) |
| 25-50% | 1 (4%) | 9 (28%) | | 14 (19%) | 5 (19%) | 9(26%) |
| 50-75% | 4 (17%) | 2 (6%) | 17(28%) | 14 (19%) | 5 (19%) | 8(24%) |
| 75-100% | 1 (4%) | 1 (3%) | | 10 (14%) | 2 (8%) | 3 (8%) |
| > 100% | 8 (35%) | 9 (28%) | 9 (15%) | 27 (38%) | 10 (39%) | 7(21%) |
| TOTAL | 23 (100%) | 32 (100%) | 60 (100%) | 72 (100%) | 26 (100%) | 34(100%) |

It should be taken into account that many measures correspond to infrastructures and therefore that would justify lower rates of physical achievements at this stage of implementation. On the other hand, there is a high number of indicators which shows an effectiveness of over 100% (achieved over foreseen), what seriously questions the quality of the target itself.

5.2. Degree of realisations and achievements by type of measures

To go deeper into the analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the different measures, we attempted to group the actions into main homogenous types. Sometimes that implied to split the program organisation and search for the real content of the measures included under broad headings. Therefore, we gave more priority to the cohesiveness of the group than to the heading under which these actions were financed.

Next chart describes the available indicators and the degree of effectiveness for each of the eleven types of measures considered and underlies some features that could not be perceived through the general previous one. Although we tried to be strictly faithful to each report organisation and philosophy, some arrangement had to be applied to make the results comparable. Then, the synthesis involves also some work on our side, to understand the meaning, made calculations some times and allocate to each

group. Each group results include the qualitative comments provided by the evaluators and are commented in the next pages.

Figure 8. Effectiveness rates by measures

| | Madrid | Aragón | La Rioja | Pais Vasco | Cataluña | Navarra |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------|----------|------------|----------|---------|
| Plot Concentration | | | | | | |
| Number of has. concentrated | 0,88 | 0,55 | 0,3071 | 0,43 | | 0,61 |
| Number of has. affected | | | | | 1,30 | 452,16 |
| Number of plots improved | 0,73 | | | | | |
| Number of works | | | 0,6 | | | |
| Number of municipalities | | | 0,4 | | | |
| Changes in degree of fragmentation | 0,647- 0,861 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Improvements in Irrigation | | | | | | |
| Number of Ha improved | 0,17 | 0,42 | 0,74 | 0,72 | 0,6 | 0,72 |
| Number of Ha irrigated | | 2,67 | | | 5,842 | |
| Number of actions | | | 0,8 | | | |
| kms of irrigation networks | | | | 0,10 | | |
| irrigation ditch improved (meters) | | | | | | 0,94 |
| m3 of water capacity | | | | 0,29 | | 2,00 |
| Has. irrigated with reused wastewater | 3,17 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Agriculture diversification | | | | | | |
| Surface | | 0,6914 | 0,16 | | | |
| Num agrarian associations improved. | | | 0,79 | | | |
| Number of houses rehabilitated | | | 1,02 | | | |
| Number of demonstrative projects | | | 0,56 | | | |
| Number of diversification projects | | | | 0,69 | | |
| Number of quality actions | | | | | | 0,417 |
| number of firms | | | | 0,33 | | |

| | Madrid | Aragón | La Rioja | Pais Vasco | Cataluña | Navarra |
|----------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|----------|------------|----------|---------|
| number of firms improved | | | | 2,10 | | |
| new jobs | | | | 0,28 | | |
| Number of holdings benefited | | | | | 0,267 | |
| Projects of R+D in agriculture | | | | 2,17 | 0,13 | 1,68 |
| Number of development centres | | | | | 2 | 1,33 |
| Promotional actions | | | | 6,08 | 0,656 | |
| | | | | | | |
| Rural roads | | | | | | |
| Núm. Kms. constructed | 1,95 | | | 0,59 | 0,359 | 0,9607 |
| Num kms. improved | | 0,61 | 1,18 | | | |
| Núm. Kms. constructed forest roads | | | | | | 4,047 |
| Núm. Kms.improved forest roads | | | 0,365 | | | 0,43 |
| Num. of actions | | | 0,54 | | 0,147 | |
| Núm. kms. pathways | 0,39 | | 0,4 | | | |
| Núm. kms. horse routes | 0,57 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Animal health and Livestock Infrastructures | | | | | | |
| Number of holdings improved | | | 0,718 | | | |
| Number of shelters | 0,4 | | | | | |
| Number of facilities | 1,75 | | 0,11 | | | |
| Number of actions in grazing | 0,3 | | 0 | | | |
| Number of Ha pastures affected | | | 0,2956 | | | 0,6796 |
| Number of watering places | | | 0,8 | | | 0,2212 |
| Kms of fences | 7 | | 0,275 | | | 0,3659 |
| road access (length in meters) | | | | | | 0,1863 |
| | | | | | | |
| Tourism and cultural heritage | | | | | | |

| | Madrid | Aragón | La Rioja | Pais Vasco | Cataluña | Navarra |
|----------------------------------------------|--------|--------|----------|------------|----------|---------|
| Number of projects on tourism | | | 1,1 | | 0,156 | |
| Number of other kind projects | | | 0,4615 | | 0,08 | |
| Number of public investments | | | | | | 0,2916 |
| Number of actions from Foral Administr. | | | | | | 0,6666 |
| Number of houses in tourism | | | | | | 0,221 |
| SMEs benefited | 0,59 | | | 1,40 | | 1,166 |
| Number of rooms in rural houses | | | | | | 0,285 |
| Restores buildings | | | | | | 0,6666 |
| Number museums and other equipment | | | | | 0,04 | |
| Number of monuments | | | | | 0,2 | |
| Number of jobs | | | 0,3614 | | | |
| Number of new jobs | | | | 0,48 | | 1,9 |
| | | | | | | |
| SMEs development and new settlements | | | | | | |
| Number of aids to SMEs | | | | | 4,2 | 0,88 |
| New SMEs | 0,58 | | | 0,85 | | |
| Num of actions on premises | | | | | 0,5 | |
| Industrial premises -modified | 0,5 | | | | | |
| Private investment | | | 1,21 | | | |
| Area of industrial land | | | | 1,89 | | |
| Number of projects | | | 1,62 | | | |
| Number of advises | | | | 0,30 | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Reforestation and Natural environment | | | | | | |
| Has reforested | 0,71 | | 0,1359 | | | 0,87 |
| Has reforested for erosion | | 2,95 | | | | |

Mid-Term Evaluation of 5b DOCUPs. Synthesis Report, Spain

| | Madrid | Aragón | La Rioja | Pais Vasco | Cataluña | Navarra |
|--------------------------------------------|--------|--------|----------|------------|----------|---------|
| Has reforested for production | | 0,78 | | | | 0,47 |
| Has with by production plans | | | | | | 0,91 |
| Number of actions for erosion control | | | | | 0,123 | |
| Has of reforestation control** | | | 0,5208 | | | |
| Ha for forest treatments | | | 0,05 | | 0,344 | 0,09 |
| Has of borders reforested | 0,776 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Number of produced plants | 0,72 | | | | | |
| Has fire prevention | | | 0,19 | | | 0,58 |
| Kms. of pathways | 0,73 | | 0 | | | |
| Kms. of new pathways | | | 0,37 | | | |
| Kms. of improved pathways | | | 0,54 | | | |
| Length riverbasin | | | | | 1,5 | |
| Number of resource plans | | | 0,6 | | | |
| Has improved for habitat protection | | 0,06 | 0,3 | | | |
| Number of has protected | | 1 | | 1,00 | | |
| Number of has protected (by buying) | | | 8,22 | | | |
| Number of studies(cattle paths) | | | 0,4 | | | |
| Employment created | | | | 1,00 | | |
| Kms. of electricity network corrected | | | | | | 0,46 |
| | | | | | | |
| Awareness and environmental | | | | | | |
| Publications | | | 0,17 | | | |
| Understanding Centres created | 0,5 | | | | | 1,00 |
| Understanding Centres improved | | | | | | 1,00 |
| Centres with compensation for flow control | | | | | | 0,75 |
| Has. improved for recreation sites | | | 0,22 | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| | Madrid | Aragón | La Rioja | Pais Vasco | Cataluña | Navarra |
|-------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|----------|------------|----------|---------|
| Environmental actions in rural nucli | | | | | | |
| Kms.Sewage systems | 0,22 | | | | | 1,17 |
| Length of water networks | | | | | | 1,10 |
| kms water systems | | | | | | 3,33 |
| Number of water services projects | | | | | 0,16 | |
| Kms. of electricity | | | | | | 0,75 |
| Number Treatment plants | 0 | | 1,00 | | | |
| Number of farms with controlled wastes | | | | | | 1,10 |
| Wastes treated | | | | | | 1,97 |
| Landfills closure | | | 0,40 | | | |
| Treated wastewater | | | | | | 1,32 |
| Number of wastewater treatm. plants | | | 0,14 | | | |
| Number of wastewater treatm. projects | | | | | 0,5 | |
| Capacity of water tanks | | | | | | 8,946 |
| Number of urban renewal projects | | | | | 0,4 | |
| Number of restored houses | | | | | | 0,508 |
| Number of rehabilitation urban areas (projects). | | | | | 0,32 | |
| | | | | | | |
| Rural nuclei renewal and basic infrastructures | | | | | | |
| Number of actions | 1,68 | | | | 0,10 | 0,44 |
| Number of nucli affected | 1,45,8 | | | 4,33 | | |
| Inhabitants (number) | 1,8 | | | 0,53 | | |
| Inhabitants affected local develop. (number) | | | | 0,34 | | |
| N.municipalities with water improvements | | | 0,82 | | | |

| | Madrid | Aragón | La Rioja | Pais Vasco | Cataluña | Navarra |
|----------------------------------------|--------|--------|----------|------------|----------|---------|
| N.municipalities with electric lights | | | 0,58 | | | |
| N.nuclis with paving | | | 0,59 | | | |
| m2 paved | | | | | | 0,93 |
| Local infrastructures (number of) | | | | 0,00 | 1,33 | |
| Kms of high tension | | | 0,36 | | | |
| Electric lines | | | 3,30 | | | |
| Kms of low tension | | | 0,07 | | | 1,12 |
| Num lighting points | | | | | | 1,20 |
| kms of roads | | | 3,00 | | 1,24 | |
| kms of roads reformed | | | 0,33 | | | |
| km. roads improved | | | 2,40 | | | 0,96 |
| Number of phone lines | | | 0,70 | | | 2,13 |
| Retransmitter centres | | | 1,16 | | | |
| Reception equipment | | | 0,25 | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Aid to employment | | | | | | |
| Number of actions | | | 0,62 | | | |
| Number jobs supported | 0,03 | 0,05 | 0,76 | 0,63 | 0,34 | |
| | | | | | | |
| Training | | | | | | |
| Number of students Researchers | | | | | 0,21 | |
| Number of students | | 0,12 | | | | |
| Number of students for women | | | | | | 0,914 |
| Number of students in tourism | | | | | | 0,548 |
| Number of students SME | | | | 0,73 | 0,85 | 0,298 |
| Number of students in labour market | | | 0,28 | | 1,85 | 0,298 |
| students for employed en food industry | | | | | | 0,134 |

| | Madrid | Aragón | La Rioja | Pais Vasco | Cataluña | Navarra |
|----------------------------------------|--------|--------|----------|------------|----------|---------|
| number of students in agrarian courses | | | | | | 0,562 |
| number of agrarian students | | | | | | 1,06 |
| Number of hours | | | | 0,56 | | |
| Number of courses | | | 0,23 | 1,20 | | |
| | | | | | | |
| R+D | | | | | | |
| Number of projects | | | | | | 1,07 |
| Number of centres benefited | | | | 0,00 | | |
| Number of grants | | | | 0,00 | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Anticipated retirements | | | | | | |
| Number of farmers | | | | | | 0,69 |
| Number of workers | | | | | | 0,73 |
| | | | | | | |

1. Plot concentration

This action is a traditional one all over the regions and it maintains within the program the features it had in the past. Most of the programs had their targets and therefore to some extent they evaluate the effectiveness. The achievement rates range between the 30.7% of La Rioja and the 88% of Madrid.

In fact, everywhere the measure seems to have been applied without significant problems and these differences in the rates have to be analysed carefully to avoid misunderstandings. Plot concentration is a long process, usually much longer than the whole program span. That means that most of the plot concentrations started at the beginning of the program cannot be finished by now yet. On the other side, any action may have been financed under different programs, national or European. Thus, to really compare the effectiveness among regions the rate should specify the stages it included and the starting point for each one. Moreover, the concentrations are of varied difficulty according to the number of ownership, the diversity of the lands included and their size. Therefore, comparison have to be carefully approach, otherwise the figures may be misleading.

In general, though, the evaluations do not point out any specific problem in the measure implementation. For Madrid the evaluators state that the measure worked well and was devoted to finalise those concentrations already started, achieving a plot reduction from the 64% to the 86% . That would explain why they achieved that higher rate. On the other extreme, in La Rioja, with lower rate of achievement, the evaluators state as a positive aspect the trend towards a wider participation of the areas in the process that was in the past much targeted to strict zones. Also in Catalonia and Navarra the rates of realisation seem fairly high. In this last evaluation, there are specific proposals to split the indicator into two to distinguish the stage of completeness of the whole process. Moreover, other questions of interest raised in the Navarra evaluation relate to the quality of the land involved and its agriculture uses. The case studies undertaken in Navarra as well as the previous ex post evaluations showed the direct impacts in terms of time devoted to the agriculture tasks and to travelling as well as the cost

reduction due to new techniques in use. In the short term, there are also indirect economic effect because of the construction and public works involved in any project. However, in turn, the evaluation raises the concern about the threshold or the criteria to guarantee net benefits from such an action and this may apply to other regions. The concentration as a traditional rural intervention has been widely applied everywhere. The question, in terms of agriculture impact, is to define the criteria to ensure the efficiency of such a measure. Should it be supported everywhere?. There is a minimum size, land quality, owners agreement and so to qualify the holdings involved for a public support?. We believe this is a real key and the programs are encouraged to provide some guidelines in this sense.

Finally, it has to be taken into account that environmental implications are in many of the evaluations disregarded, arguing sometimes that the regional commission for the environmental affairs had not pointed out any conflict. We will come back to this issue.

2. Improvements in irrigation

The irrigation improvements show also high degree of effectiveness for La Rioja, Pais Vasco, Navarra -with indicators showing around 70% of achievement out of the targets- and being Catalonia, at the top. This last region has among this measure one of the most emblematic projects of the whole program, the irrigation for Las Garrigues. The project has been selected as a case study and the region is carrying out a tide follow-up of its evolution and impact in the whole area. In Navarra the case studies analysed the impacts to conclude that in the first 2-3 years no yield increase is expected and in fact the effect may be the other way around since the soil movements and the refills with lower quality soils may reduce productions at the start. Moreover, the main benefits from this action lye on the water use and crops rationalisation and a close monitoring of the situation is advice. No other evaluation goes into similar details, besides the Catalonia document. The evaluation of La Rioja assumes there are positive socio-economic impacts although it recommends to go later into its evaluation. Madrid, here, would occupy the last position because of the delays in the

irrigation plan which has to guide all the envisaged projects for the 5b program.

Concerning the environmental impacts, the project of La Rioja highlights the need to study them but no other evaluation has pointed this as an issue, not even in the case studies.

3.Agricultural diversification

Under this general heading the programs included a wide range of actions and projects, very heterogeneous indeed and with weak common trends. In fact, this statement applies also within regional programs. At least, for Madrid, the evaluators point out the disparity of measures involved more when regional and state government are acting together. The failure of the Agriculture Ministry on going ahead with the commitments was pointed out some times as a source of ineffectiveness. Moreover, the measure had not been fully planned at the start. In la Rioja the scope of projects goes from plague treatments to housing rehabilitation while other actions like (new seeds, improvement of agriculture uses or animal breeding) that had been planned in advance were not seen as priorities later on and were not executed.

In Navarra, the actions focused on the promotion activities for the Quality Label of the Navarra Veal. The undertaken survey revealed that further from the consumer acknowledge and their confidence on the health guarantee, final retailers have seen increase overall sales up to 5% even when the meat market has shrunken. That gives a thrust to the sector since there is a shift from other meats although the real improvement in the quality and the increase in meat consumption are not perceived yet.

In Pais Vasco, as another example, the actions were also clearly biased towards promotion and quality improvement, while real diversification actions were misrepresented, according to the evaluator viewpoint. They propose to reduce the budget for these measures and transfer funds to another ones.

In sum, the review reveals as a general trend the lack of content under this heading. Although everywhere recognised as an issue to incorporate, the

truth is that at the time of approving the programs the different regions did not have the strategy nor its content. Later on, on the implementation process, some projects have been shifted to this fund box in such a way that financial achievements is being reached. However, in the on-going process the regions do not seem to have been able to shape its content nor to promote real diversification actions. As a fairly common pattern, and further from changes and shifts in the budget taken from each region perspective, the situation claims for a in-depth rethinking of the situation from the EU agriculture perspective.

4. Animal health and livestock infrastructures

The heading deals together with a lot of different kind of actions which appear disseminated in different measures all along the programs. They go from animal health services to infrastructures and pastures. Because of the difficulty to treat each group separately, we decided to approach the issue from a broader perspective on livestock actions.

Actions involving animal health, subsidies to the Health Defence Associations, veterinarian services and treatments seem to have worked effectively, even when the indicators selected are not able to show this performance, like in La Rioja. The program tends to be a priority in many regions and therefore other sources contribute jointly with the 5b program to the co-financing, to the extreme of making unfeasible the separation.

In Madrid the action concentrates mainly on livestock infrastructures, including premises and the results have surpassed the forecast.

In Navarra the actions on common property pastures got the improvement of the farmers' work conditions and a time saving which may reached until 60% of the previous dedication. Some projects put in use bald lands and approached pastures to the farm holding. However, the field studies allow seeing that some projects could not pass a cost-effectiveness study since their current use and most of all, the guarantee of sustainability of the current investments are low. Consequently, the evaluators advice of the

need to include specific requirements on the use and future maintenance of the pastures in order to get access to the subsidies.

5.Tourism

Actions involved in this measure include private and public initiatives. The evaluations that provide information agree on the good response from the private initiative, although the diversity of project within each program and among them do not allow to describe this general feeling so clearly through the indicators which are available. Among the diversity one could tell that those actions that depend upon public initiative, that means local actions, restoration of monuments or other facilities have performed better in terms of targets achievement.

As a common trend, the evaluations reveal certain concentration of the actions among those areas with higher tradition in this activity. This is the case for Madrid, Navarra o Catalonia. This trend which deserves some attention for future evolution is specially analysed in Madrid where the evaluators raise some concern on the environmental impact of the tourism concentration in the Sierra Norte. Again, the environmental issue is envisaged as a potential source of conflict while it has been disregarded.

Another feature raised in some evaluations relates to the scattering of the actions impeding a common approach to the intervention and most of all the synergy. Thus, that is discussed for Catalonia and in a similar way, the evaluation from Madrid points out the fact that no commercialisation measures were involved in the intervention planning. In Navarra, though, the evaluation highlights the complementarity between tourism and nature preservation that has overcome some conflict of the start and has helped to modify attitudes and raised environmental awareness among residents and visitors.

6.SME development and new settlements

The promotion of new activities towards the economic diversification has focused in most of the areas in the aid to SMEs and in the reform of new creation of industrial premises.

The evaluations reflect the effectiveness of the measure and the private response, which overpass the targets, to the extent that at this time the measure has already committed all the foreseen resources. This is the case for Catalonia, Navarra o la Rioja and Pais Vasco. It is necessary to note that the indicators for Pais Vasco do not show the full achievement of the targets. The high rates of achievement should not make forget that the measure had, in general, a minor weight within the programs and in fact, sometimes, the resources and the attention from the program responsible was clearly residual. Also, the manager responses to this high private application vary among programs. For the Pais Vasco, it is envisaged to enlarge the budget, while for Catalonia they kept the total budget and reduce the individual aid to cover a larger range of applicants. The Navarra evaluation pointed out that according to the interviews with social agents, industrial application could have been even higher if the rules had taken into account the rural specificities, while now the 5b zone does not have an unlike treatment.

Linkage of this measure with the training and employment aid ones is not well developed in all the evaluations and therefore it cannot fully approached here. Just the Pais Vasco states those changes in the budget with go together with a bigger relationship with the ESF measures.

In terms of geographical distribution, in Madrid the projects concentrate around two areas, the most industrialised ones, Lozoya-Somosierra and Las Vegas. In Navarra the measure maintains the same patterns it had in the past and applies evenly for the whole region, and the work field and interviews reflected some criticism to policy application, drawn under urban pattern without the consideration of the rural singularities. Also in the Aragón evaluation the concentration of the activities in the metropolitan ring deserved some attention. Therefore, it is believed that the distribution of the initiatives in the whole 5b territory should be analysed in depth.

Once more, the lack of a prevention pollution control for the new settlements is considered a pitfall in some evaluations and all the evaluations in the future should checked that a proper environmental evaluation is always carried out.

7.Reforestation and natural environment improvement

Under this heading there are mainly included those actions related to forest maintenance -reforestation, treatments, forest roads, fire controls,...). The edge between those works for erosion control and those for production does not seem perfectly defined everywhere. In fact, some evaluators complain about the lack on information regarding the species used for the reforestation.

The programs include also under this measure a wide range of actions, sometimes less important in budget and hardly measurable nor comparable. Among those there are awareness measures, recreational sites conditioning and so on or, for instance, the buy of 1025 ha. of forest in the program of La Rioja that represents alone 97% of the whole budget of measure 4.2.

Implementation of this measure does not follow similar patterns everywhere. While the Madrid or Navarra programs show good rates of execution, La Rioja had poor levels of implementation all over the projects (reforestation, fire control and pest treatments) despite the clear cut of the zones in and out the 5b area. For Catalonia, most of the physical indicators lack of targets so it is not feasible to analyse them. Among all the available indicators, only the one for fire prevention seems to have been much higher, (8,8 times) than planned.

Concentration in specific areas is subject to some criticism in the program of Madrid, although the overall effectiveness of the undertaken actions to recover derelict zones is applauded. The environmental quality of the actions is pointed out also by La Rioja at the time of roads works which were always performed out of the bird-breeding season. In Catalonia, actions

against erosion and desertification concentrate in the Mountain area, although physical characteristics would seem to justify it.

8. Infrastructures and conditioning in rural nuclei

This heading includes jointly two independent measures: environmental actions and infrastructures in rural nuclei. Although they are separated their content is not fully separable and therefore we would rather to understand globally those actions undertaken in rural nuclei to improve infrastructures, urban renewal and cultural endowment rehabilitation and therefore all different actions attempting to improved quality of life in those nuclei.

The actions on infrastructure included under this measure do generally fit into broader regional plans and therefore the 5b dynamics cannot be independently analysed. That would explain, for instance, like in La Rioja those measures concerning solid wastes performed well and those on wastewater treatment did badly.

Some programs state this kind of subsidies was already set up before the program and the achievements reflect the awareness of it among the administration as well as the push from it. That would apply to Pais Vasco, Catalonia or Navarra. Navarra has a well development of indicators all showing big effectiveness and Catalonia has already covered the target for the whole program. This good appraisal in Pais Vasco would not match, according to the evaluators, with the effectiveness in terms of population since actions gave priority to low populated municipalities. In turn, Madrid, provides few indicators and with low rates and added the uneven distribution among counties. This is justified by the less priority of this kind of intervention in the 5b area (low density...). Both outcomes, the concentration in low density zones and the low execution because of minor problems in the 5b area would deserve further clarification. One wonders whether priority areas were really targeted or the demand-drive leaded the process with inefficiencies in the fund allocation.

9. Rural nuclei renewal and basic infrastructures

Actions oriented to rural nuclei renewal have common features with the previous ones. On a overview, the most of the indicators show figures higher than the 50%. Two exceptions to this general rule affect la Rioja for electrical project, although other actions in basic infrastructures (measure 2.5) like the housing reform worked well (102%) in the region.

Here also the demand-drive could explain the disparities between zones or the effectiveness of Catalonia where the Diputació (supramunicipal administration) played the leaded role for some of the actions. The side effect of this demand-drive procedure is the isolation of the projects that may respond to local and independent objectives although synergy and multiplier effects may be precluded.

Financial contribution raised problems from different perspectives. Thus, in Madrid actions under the state responsibility had been envisaged with private financing but it did not take place. Also in Catalonia, actions under local administration responsibilities are suffering significant delays because of the difficulties of these entities to advance the funds and fulfil their commitments. It does not seem that actions under this heading had well defined priorities

-neither territorial nor sectorial- from the program perspective. Instead, it is the meeting point of individually conceived plans made by the Diputació, municipalities, building owners or other administrative bodies. Thus, outcomes respond also to different dynamics and cannot easily summarised.

10. Aid to employment

The measure has not been in place in all the regions. Physical indicators for this measure, although disperse, do not seem to reflect the conflicts and queries around it. Pais Vasco and to a larger extend Madrid show low rates of achievements as they are also stated in the text. In Pais Vasco the evaluations says the administration plans to support the measure from now on and get the take-off. Even for La Rioja with higher rates, some aids to

research that had been planned were not eventually implemented. The physical results show the limited size of the actions involved.

The aids to employment are of different kinds, affecting subsidies to public entities to hire employees for a period of time and other aids to co-operative societies to maintain jobs. The evaluation of Catalonia devotes some attention to discuss the real impact of this kind of aids that do not ensure the sustainability of the job once its ceases.

The truth is that in general evaluation is not explicit regarding the difficulties in meeting the targets or the undergoing discussions around the current ESF application. This synthesis had to go back to the managers to complement the shortages in the evaluation documents.

11. Training programs

The most striking feature in the training evaluation is the contrast between the physical and the financial effectiveness. In general, physical realisations show a fairly well developed program while financial executions are very low.

Shortcomings in the indicators quality has been discussed somewhere else as a widely spread feature. However, there is no other measure where the gaps between physical and financial indicators were so large. It is not easily explained why -besides the previous experience of these administrations in running training programs- they failed at setting up the targets. Of course there are some administrative reasons, like that the programs came to be much shorter that they had been foreseen, but the questions regarding why this happened remains unanswered.

Under this situation two extreme hypotheses can be formulated. First, one recognises that the targets were badly set at that time. Under this hypothesis the financial results would be the dominant and therefore that would mean that a much higher effort to enlarge the scope of the training has to be enforced. This effort would entail a larger number of people involved in the training programs but also a higher cost programs for each one.

The second hypothesis would rely on the quality of the physical target, as the indicator of the market size. Then, the financial resources would be oversized and it won't be feasible to spend them all under efficiency standards.

Any other combination of the two hypothesis drives also to the conclusion that although situations may vary along the programs, some amendments have to be put on place everywhere. Thus the program from Madrid brings together information for the many managers involved apparently with no aggregation neither common guidelines. Evaluation on the adequacy of this training is approached through surveys in some of the evaluations with a range of response between 30 and 80% for the degree of satisfaction and between 72 and 100% for the applicability of the training.

Another issue raised mainly in Madrid and to some extent in Catalonia relates to the eligibility of the students. Thus, the evaluation discusses whether the residency of the people and the celebration place should be the criteria or maybe other features should be considered to give the training a larger scope and feasibility.

In Navarra, the case studies were training for women and firms plans to complete training. Women assessed more positively the content and quality of the training but pointed out the lack of marketable application of the training as well as some deficiencies in the organisation. Main outcome so far has been the creation of 23 associations with 1250 for women all over rural areas in Navarra.

In the other courses for firms, two plans were selected and the beneficiaries interviewed. They stated their satisfaction with the final results although the evaluators discussed the efficiency of some of the courses financed with the ESF.

From an internal perspective, the Pais Vasco recognises the need to improve the linkage and complementarity between the training actions and others.

5.3. Quantitative data on overall results

Although many actions could not be evaluated in terms of their effectiveness because of the lack of targets, in fact the evaluations were able to prove more easily some quantitative achievements. Thus, many indicators are provided, especially in some regions although most of the problems stated before came out also at the time of aggregating data.

To achieve common results much of the individual information had to be left out since there is no agreement on the minimum indicators to be followed everywhere. Even sometimes, although aggregation is feasible, the sum of different actions involved under a common name has no sense out of its own program and does not contribute to the understanding of the program implementation. This is the case for the indicators that count the number of projects, the number of actions and so on. Only sometimes information regarding the number of nuclei or the municipalities involved were kept and aggregate. This indicator contains the same pitfalls of the former ones but could provide some insights regarding the territorial spread and therefore they were shown. Moreover it is also true that some measures involved complex interventions and therefore some kind of indicators appear in many of them.

This is the case for the communications projects (road, paths, access routes, and so on). The option taken was in this case to carry all those indicators to a single group on road infrastructures. Although from each individual program perspective this would empty the content of the measures, this may have some sense from the overall since the individual indicators for each measure have already no full sense. In turn, it may help to show the scope of the full intervention in this kind of infrastructures, no mind its justification (forest production, fire control, rural connection or recreational activities).

The **following chart** shows the information obtained for each region and the aggregated data at the last column. There are still some blanks, which value is uncertain since we do not know whether there is no information or there is not any result of this kind. Moreover, **the regional results did not always**

come out easily from the first reading and some fishing within the writing was made. For these reasons, results are not complete and have to be understood as a minimum.

Still, the outcome deserves some attention. First of all, because it provides information on the size and scope of the whole 5b intervention in Spain, despite the difficulties to get homogeneous indicators everywhere. Secondly because it highlights the limitations of the overall evaluation when there are no minimum guidelines for everybody. No doubt, these shortcomings call for a further co-ordination in the next future, what does not impede a further development for each area according to each one needs.

Figure 9. Summary on realisations by groups of measures

| MEASURES | Madrid | Aragón | La Rioja | Pais Vasco | Catalunya | Navarra | TOTAL |
|--------------------------------------------|--------|--------|----------|------------|-----------|----------|------------|
| <i>Plot Concentration</i> | | | | | | | |
| Number of has. concentrated | 3658 | 50199 | 2150 | 850,00 | | 14633 | 71490 |
| Number of has. affected | | | | | 1952 | 72345 | 74297 |
| Number of holding improved | 366 | | | | | 2345 | 2711 |
| Number of works | | | 3 | | | | 3 |
| Number of municipalities | | | 4 | | 2 | | 6 |
| Number of owners | | | | | 559 | 9642 | 10201 |
| <i>Improvements in Irrigation</i> | | | | | | | |
| Number of Ha improved | 432 | 40000 | 3700 | 2454,00 | 900 | | 47486 |
| Number of Ha new irrigated | | 8906 | | | 2921 | 2150,00 | 13977 |
| Number of actions | | | 56 | | | | 56 |
| kms of irrigation networks | | | | 10,00 | | | 10 |
| m.l. irrigation ditch improved | | | | | | 37532,00 | 37532 |
| m3 of water capacity | | | | 700000,00 | | 2,00 | 700001,9 |
| Has. Irrigated with reused wastewater | 190 | | | | | | 190 |
| <i>Agriculture diversification</i> | | | | | | | |
| Ha. treated against plagues | | | 80 | | | | 80 |
| Ha. affected by improvement in agriculture | | 242000 | | | | | 242000 |
| Num agrarian associations improved. | | | 79 | | | | 79 |
| number of ADV with subsidies | | | | | 33 | | 33 |
| Aids to associations and ADV | | | | | | | 112 |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Number of demonstrative projects | | | 14 | | | | 14 |
| MEASURES | Madrid | Aragón | La Rioja | Pais Vasco | Catalunya | Navarra | TOTAL |
| Number of diversification projects | | | | 11 | | 600 | 611 |
| Number of quality actions | | | | | | 5 | 5 |
| Projects of R+D in agriculture | | | | 13 | | 27 | 40 |
| Quality, demonstrative and diversification projects | | | 14 | 24 | | 632 | 670 |
| number of firms | | | | 5 | | | 5 |
| number of firms improved | | | | 42 | | 16 | 58 |
| number of sectors benefited | | | | | 12 | | 12 |
| Number of holdings benefited | | | | | 40 | | 40 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Number of development centres | | | | | 2 | 8 | 10 |
| Promotional actions | | | | 73 | 42 | | 115 |
| Fairs | | | | | 88 | | 88 |
| Promotional actions (fairs and others) | | | | 73 | 132 | | 213 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Rural roads | | | | | | | |
| Núm. Kms. constructed | 101 | | | | | | 101 |
| Num kms. improved | | | 118 | | | 16 | 134 |
| Num. kms. affected | | 635 | | | | | 635 |
| Núm. Kms. constructed forest roads | | | 7,3 | | | 97,13 | 104,434 |
| Núm. Kms .improved forest roads | | | 134,7 | | | 297,43 | 432,131 |
| Núm. Kms., forest roads | | 37 | | | 196 | | 233 |
| Núm. kms. pathways | 58 | | | | | | 58 |
| Núm. kms. horse routes | 57 | | | | | | 57 |
| m.l. access roads | | | | | | 37257 | 37257 |
| kms of roads | | | 1,5 | | 30,90 | 3,5 | 35,94 |
| kms. of roads reformed | | | 10,2 | | | | 10,2 |
| km. roads improved | | | 19,2 | | | | 19,2 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Kms affected (new and improved) | 216 | 672 | 290,94 | | 226,9 | 37671,065 | 39076,90 |
| MEASURES | Madrid | Aragón | La Rioja | Pais Vasco | Catalunya | Navarra | TOTAL |
| <i>Animal health and Livestock Infrastructures</i> | | | | | | | |
| Number of holdings improved | 3590 | | 359 | | | | 3949 |
| Number of shelters | 20 | | | | | | 20 |
| Número de facilities | 14 | | 11 | | | | 25 |
| Number of Ha pastures affected | 4099 | | 369,5 | | | 16990 | 21458,5 |
| Number of watering places | 18 | | 4 | | | 146 | 168 |
| Kms of fences | 15,596 | | 27,5 | | | 439,074 | 482,17 |
| m.l. access roads | | | | | | 37257 | 37257 |
| number of owners participating in genetic control | 86 | | | | 216 | | 302 |
| UGM affected | 281962 | 40000 | | | | | 321962 |
| <i>Tourism and cultural heritage</i> | | | | | | | |
| Number of rooms in rural houses | | | | | | 407 | 407 |
| Camping places | 35 | | | | | 4238 | 4273 |
| New capacity | | | | | 120 | 367 | 487 |
| Total capacity (new or improved) | 35 | | | | 120 | 5012 | 5167 |
| Restored churches | 190 | | | | 6 | | 196 |
| Restores buildings | | | | | 12 | 8 | 20 |
| Number museums and other equipment | | | | | | | 0 |
| Number of monuments | | | | | | | 0 |
| Number of local public reformed | | | | | 16 | | 16 |
| Restored and reformed buildings and monuments | 190 | | | | 34 | 8 | 232 |
| Number of jobs | 39 | | 73 | | | | 112 |
| Number of new jobs | | | | 11,00 | 2 | | 13 |
| Maintained jobs | | | | 4,00 | | | 4 |

| MEASURES | Madrid | Aragón | La Rioja | Pais Vasco | Catalunya | Navarra | TOTAL |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| <i>SMEs development and new settlements</i> | | | | | | | |
| Number of aids to SMEs | | | | | 42 | 44 | 86 |
| New SMEs | 58 | | | 11 | | | 69 |
| Aids to SME (new and existing) | 58 | | | 11 | 42 | 44 | 155 |
| Number of projects and advises | | | 157 | 3 | | | 160 |
| Num of actions on industrial premises | 1 | | | | 2 | | 3 |
| m2 total surface | | | | 161018 | 167360 | 12495 | 340873 |
| Number of municipalities with commercial or industrial premises | | 57 | | | 2 | | 59 |
| New stockholders | | | | | | | 0 |
| Number of municipalities | | | | | | | 0 |
| jobs | 158 | | 321 | | | | 479 |
| New jobs | | | | 41,00 | | | 41 |
| Jobs maintained | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | | | | | | |
| <i>Reforestation and Natural environment</i> | | | | | | | |
| Has reforested | 465,1 | | 183,5 | 8,00 | 176 | 5753,50 | 6586,1 |
| Has reforested for erosion and other | | 235996 | | | | | 235996 |
| Has reforested or improved for production | | 31079 | | | | 4685 | 35764 |
| Has of borders reforested | 43,3 | | | | | | 43,3 |
| Total has reforested for all purposes | 508,4 | 267075 | 183,5 | 8 | 176 | 10438,5 | 278389,4 |
| Has affected by production plans | | 2843 | | | 23322 | 21887 | 48052 |
| number of owners benefited | | | | | 154 | 52 | 206 |
| Has of reforestation control** | | | 625 | | | | 625 |
| Ha for forest and harvest treatments | 35160 | | 148,90 | 300,00 | 1110 | | 36718,9 |
| Ha for forest treatments | | | | | 41236 | 4287 | 45523 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Ha with plague treatments | | | 2062 | | | | 2062 |
| MEASURES | Madrid | Aragón | La Rioja | Pais Vasco | Catalunya | Navarra | TOTAL |
| Has fire prevention | 84 | | 304,50 | | | 1011 | 1399,5 |
| Ha under treatment and fire control | 35244 | 0 | 3140,4 | 300 | 42346 | 5298 | 86328,4 |
| Has improved for habitat protection | | | 6 | | | 460 | 466 |
| Has protected for hunting and fishing | | 110000 | | | | | 110000 |
| Number of has protected | 130205 | 128513 | | 235,00 | | 140 | 259093 |
| Number of has protected (by buying) | | | 1028 | | | | 1028 |
| Has. Protected | 130205 | 238513 | 1034 | 235 | | 600 | 370587 |
| River sections(fishing) | | | | | | | 0 |
| Number of studies(cattle paths) | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Employment created | | | | 8,00 | 610 | | 618 |
| Kms. of electricity network corrected | | | | | | 205 | 205 |
| Plant nurseries | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| | | | | | | | 0 |
| Number of visitors to the centres | | | | | | 68371 | 68371 |
| number of birds saved | | | | | | 212 | 212 |
| | | | | | | | |
| <i>Infrastructures and reform of rural nucli</i> | | | | | | | |
| Municipalities preserved of flooding | | 27 | | | | | 27 |
| N.municipalities with water improvements | | | 37 | | | | 37 |
| Number of nucli affected | 35 | | | 97 | | 509 | 641 |
| N.municipalities with electric lights | | | 7 | | | | 7 |
| N.nuclis with paving | | | 88 | | | | 88 |
| Number of nucli and municipalities with actions | 35 | 27 | 132 | 97 | | 509 | 800 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Kms. Sewage systems | 1,3316 | | | | | | 1,3316 |
| Length of water networks | | | | | | 48,068 | 48,068 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|
| kms water systems | | | | 16,91 | | 68,09 | 84,995 |
| Kms. of water systems affected | 1,3316 | | | 16,905 | | 116,158 | 134,394 |
| | | | | | | | 6 |
| MEASURES | Madrid | Aragón | La Rioja | Pais Vasco | Catalunya | Navarra | TOTAL |
| Treated wastewater(m3/year) | | | | | | 912500 | 912500 |
| Capacity of water tanks | | | | | 1700 | 8946 | 10646 |
| Kms of high tension | | | 2,2 | | | | 2,152 |
| Kms of low tension | | | 1,3 | | | 18 | 19,287 |
| Kms. of electricity network | | | 3,439 | | | 18 | 21,439 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Wastes collected | | | | | | 44747 | 44747 |
| Wastes treated | 1179,24 | | | | | 21475 | 22654,2 |
| | | | | | | | 4 |
| Landfills closure | | | 86 | | | 108 | 194 |
| Surface of closed landfills | 91,189 | | | | | 24918 | 25009,1 |
| | | | | | | | 8 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Number of restored houses | | | 303 | | | 122 | 425 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Inhabitants (number) | 54187 | | | 9110 | | 197694 | 260991 |
| Inhabitants affected local develop. (number) | | | | 6037 | | | 6037 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| <i>Aid to employment</i> | | | | | | | |
| Local Development Agents Number | | | | | 22 | | 22 |
| Number jobs supported | 62 | 748 | 188 | 19,00 | 253 | | 1270 |
| Number jobs supported (ADL included) | 62 | 748 | 188 | 19 | 275 | | 1292 |

| MEASURES | Madrid | Aragón | La Rioja | Pais Vasco | Catalunya | Navarra | TOTAL |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| <i>Training</i> | | | | | | | |
| Number of students Researchers | | | | | | | |
| Number of training students | | | | | | | |
| Number of students for women | | | | | | 2660 | 2660 |
| Number of students in tourism | | | | | | | |
| Number of students SME | | | | 474,00 | | | 474 |
| Number of students in the labour market | | | | | | 7246 | 7246 |
| Number of students | | 7367 | 1931 | | 11704 | 3726 | 24728 |
| students for employed en food industry | | | | | | 290 | 290 |
| number of students in agrarian courses | | | | | | 1533 | 1533 |
| number of agrarian students | 3440 | | | | | | 3440 |
| Students | 3440 | 7367 | 1931 | 474 | 11704 | 15455 | 40371 |
| Number of hours | | | | 6202,00 | | 197662 | 203864 |
| Number of courses | | | 109 | 30,00 | 762 | 1846 | 2747 |
| | | | | | | | |

6.- IMPACTS OF THE PROGRAMS. AN APPROACH THROUGH THE QUANTITATIVE ESTIMATES

6.1. Socio-economic indicators

The intermediate evaluation does not allow the fully approach to the evaluation of the final impacts in the zones. Most of the evaluations attempt to provide some indications **on the employment** created by the program although these evaluations **lack of a common methodology** and cannot be considered as the single parameter to appraise the dynamics of the program in the 5b areas.

The chapter includes three parts. The first gathers the information on employment as provided, if this is the case, by the evaluators. Besides Aragón, which devotes most of the evaluation to this macro estimates, the rest of the evaluations provide this information disseminated within each measure comments, together with the analysis of the effectiveness, the territorial distribution and so on. Therefore, these aggregate figures are the result of picking up partial estimate spread all over the report and adding them up. Therefore, the results have to be understood as a broad estimate and as a minimum estimate since some measures may have been left out of the calculation.

The second part of the chapter includes the results of the survey to managers and evaluators regarding different kinds of impacts. This is just a qualitative estimate will intends to order different impacts from the managers and evaluators perspective. Partial attempts to quantify some of them are mixed up between the results (SMEs, and others) in those evaluations that made the effort of including results, even when target did not exist. However, although the lack of common indicators for all the regions unable us to summarise them and a lot of this individual information has been lost for the overall purposes.

Eventually, data on the operational context of the regions during the period of the program implementation is included. Again, the disparities in the variables included along the regions makes difficult the overall approach.

We believe that the chapter, providing that it is early to determine full impacts, helps to understand the constraints to approach it and to draw some guidelines towards the final evaluation.

6.1.1. Impacts on Employment

The evaluations include some figures on the employment estimates although at this stage of the evaluation sustainability of the jobs in the medium and long run is not envisaged yet. In fact, as can be seen, some of the reported jobs correspond to the employment created throughout the process of investment, that means to the jobs directly paid by the program works (public works and construction jobs, aid to new contracting,...).

Figure 10. Data on the supported and new employment due to the 5b program

| ARAGÓN | CATALUÑA | LA RIOJA | NAVARRA | SIERRA MADRID | Pais Vasco |
|--------------|-------------------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 6.658 | 350 (new) 167(supported) | 321 | 267 (new) 914(supported) | 867 607 construction ESF: 41 aid to employment 219 got employed | 114 |

The estimate for Aragón ranges far away from the rest of figures, both in volume and methodology. The evaluation uses the input-output methodology taking advantage of the existing table for a so-called area alike. The approach allows to do also some estimates on the income impact. The evaluators seem aware of the shortcoming of such approach and highlight the fact that the multiplier is applied to the whole investment -paid by the 5b- as if all of it was effectively additional to the public investment that already took place in the 5b area. Thus, to avoid misunderstandings they propose a more prudent interpretation of the impact results by considering this would be the potential losses of jobs if the interventions would cease.

In terms of income, the evaluation estimate an immediate effect of 9,591 millions ptas, 1,4% of the 5b PIB, in the area, and a total effect of 14.238 million ptas.

In Madrid, 867 jobs have been registered as created, through subsidies to the employment, new jobs after any training or employment in the construction sector. This figure has to be considered as partial since only 9 out of 14 measures had been considered for this evaluation. Moreover, the information relates to the jobs paid through the program and cannot be given the same value as the former estimates for Aragón. Still, under this narrow perspective, the estimates for Madrid belong to Axe 2 and 3 (24,6% each) and Axe 5 (25,2%).

The estimates on employment for Navarra and Catalonia are also the result of partial estimates for each measure and initially project. Differently from the Madrid evaluation, these two have tried to avoid accounting the employment which is just the counterpart of the program expenditure, that is the contracted jobs for public works investments, for instance. Nevertheless, to the extent that the overall figure results from the sum of the figures provided by the applicants and for each project, one cannot ensure the criteria has been enforced evenly all along the program. The results on employment, jobs creation after the training, and so on can only guarantee its reliability for the case studies where the evaluators have gone into the details of the projects and its effects.

The intermediate study for the Pais Vasco states that it is still too early to evaluate final impacts of the program, although those areas which benefited from the first program (1989-1993) has shown in the 1991-96 period later higher levels of demographic growth. Moreover, most of the beneficiaries point out that the aid had a positive or very positive influence in their projects. The program became a factor of attractiveness to get promoters from outside the area. Dates on employment would add 114 jobs but they are partial for this and do not allow at this time for a full evaluation.

For the program of Baleares, the evaluators propose an approach through a qualitative matrix. It is built by integrating in each Action/Measure or Action/Unbalance a qualitative value (High-Medium-Low) which expresses

the degree of coherence/impact. The matrix revealed actions affect positively to overcome the demographic, economic and environmental shortcuts in the 5b area. Support to SMEs seems to have been the measure of higher employment impact. In terms of employment, the evaluation does not provide any figure.

6.1.2. Other impact indicators

The survey to managers and evaluators attempted to get some qualitative assessment on different impacts. The chart below provides their respective rate to different issues that are considered as signs of impacts.

With no differences between the two groups, the best rates go to the improvement on infrastructure and the maintenance to existing jobs. Compatibility with the CAP and complementarity with other regional and national policies get also high rates. Additionality of funds is quite highly rated and differences in the two averages are due to the no full identity of regions involved in one group or another.

At the bottom positions in the rank, managers and evaluators set the impacts on pluri-activity developments, fostering of entrepreneurship, women improvements in the rural world or decentralisation of the actions. In fact, all the manager surveys but the Madrid one rated this last issue between 0 and 2. That fact arises some insights regarding the decentralisation issue to be faced on section 6.2.

Taking into account the ranking on the rates one tells that managers and evaluators have the perception that the program has contributed to improve the infrastructures and facilities in the real word, making current activities more profitable and contributing to the stabilisation on the population. However, all these issues reflecting a deeper shift in the social and economic dynamics (pluri-activity, human capital enhancement, women situation, entrepreneurship...) are not well developed at least at this stage of implementation. Maybe the shortcomings on program integration -as stated on rates given to synergy- as well as the limited weight of the 5b programs in

relationship to the rural public intervention can explain why the scope of the impact of the 5b programs in the rural perspectives is also limited.

Figure 11. Qualitative impact assessment by managers and evaluators.
Average rate (from 0=minimum to 5=maximum)

| Issues | Managers | Evaluators |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| New jobs | 3.2 | 3.0 |
| Maintenance of the existing ones | 4.2 | 4.0 |
| Development of puri-activity for rural population | 2.8 | 2.2 |
| Increase on holdings yields | 3.0 | 3.6 |
| Maintenance or improvement of rural income | 3.4 | 3.4 |
| Increase in SME and handicraft settlements | 3.2 | 3.0 |
| Improvement on infrastructures and rural facilities | 4.4 | 4.2 |
| Improvement on environmental management | 3.6 | 3.0 |
| Improvement on human capital by training | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| Fostering of entrepreneurship | 2.2 | 2.4 |
| Stabilisation of rural population | 3.6 | 3.8 |
| Social involvement in the economic development | 2.6 | 2.6 |
| Improvement of women situation in the rural world | 2.4 | 1.8 |
| Decentralisation of actions in the territory | 1.8 | 2.4 |

6.1.3. Operational context

The evaluations included information on the evolution of the macro-variables in the 5b areas, according to the information available in each region.

The single common variable to compare everywhere is the population increase, and here the evolution is unlike. The 5b area in Madrid showed a higher demographic growth than the regional one as an overall, although it cannot be attributed to the DOCUP but to the dynamics of the second rang cities, differences in land prices and the improvement of communications. Catalonia and Pais Vasco show a similar trend although differing within the

5b area. The counties already existing under the 5b program in 1989-1991 in the Pais Vasco have increased their population higher up than the regional level, although it cannot be fully attributed to the program itself. In these two cases, though, the explanation for Madrid does not seem to apply here. For the rest of the regions the rate of growth is slower than the regional average although only in Baleares the evaluators hold the 5b area is still losing population.

Data in employment trends are not available everywhere. For the Pais Vasco it seems like unemployment has decreased more in the 5b area between 1994 and 1996 than in the rest of the region, although again the evaluators do not feel like asserting the stability of the ratio and the 5b contribution to it. That would also apply to the unemployment rate of Catalonia and to the income increase and to other indicators on income tax for the region of Madrid.

In La Rioja, the evaluators state the DOCUP seems to have had positive impacts in terms of quality of life, employment and stabilisation of population although no data is provided. It assumes that those economic impacts are associated to the actions and therefore the achievement would be at this stage proportional to the expenditure. In Baleares, the operational context is qualitative described although the authors refer to the previous ex-ante evaluation for further development about the 5b area.

In sum, as the chart shows, **the information on macro-indicators for the rural areas is limited and trends cannot be fully compared.** However and just referring to the fragmented information that appears on next chart, the overall view is **that the depopulation trends of the past have at least slowed down** although one has to be cautious before formulating stronger hypothesis.

Figure 12 . Indicators on the evolution of the 5b areas

| EVOLUTION | Madrid | | La Rioja | | Pais Vasco (since 1995) | | Balears | | Aragón | | Catalonia | | Navarra | |
|------------------------------------------|--------|---------|----------|---------|----------------------------|------------|---------|---------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| | R | 5b area | R | 5b area | R | 5b area | R | 5b area | R | 5b area | R | 5b area | R | 5b area |
| Increase in Population 91-96 | 1.13 % | 15,7 % | 2% | 0.2% | 0,1% | 10% varied | | (-) | 1.42 % | 0.14 % | 1991-95 2.90% | 1991-95 4.47% | 1989-94 1.05% | 1989-94 -2.35% |
| Changes in Unemployees (1994-96) | | | | | -13,2 % | -23% | | | +7.68 | -2.34 | | | | |
| Jobs/ 10.000 inhab. | | 33,1 | | | | 170 | 25 | | (jobs-93/96) 4.54 | (jobs 93/96) 4.6 | | | | |
| Unemployment rate | | | | | | | | | | | 14.19% | 9.02% | | 1994 8.24% |
| 1993-95 Taxable base on Income Tax | 10% | 20.4% | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1993- 95 N° people subject to Income tax | 8.2% | 17% | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Increase on average yield | 1.6% | 2.9% | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| GDP 1990-1996 | | | | | | | | | | | 1.66% | 1.05% | | |

6.2. Territorial effects.

Territorial diversity was hardly approached in the DOCUPs although the most of the evaluations recognised its interest and devoted attention to it (Aragón, Catalonia, Madrid, Navarra and to some extent La Rioja and País Vasco). In fact since there were no targets at the start, the ex-post evaluation tried to deal with the distribution of the sources and with its adequacy to each area specificities, according to the evaluators' criteria.

Although with different emphasis, the evaluations showed the uneven territorial distribution of the measures and funds. Partly, this distribution is the result of the physical and economic differences within the 5b area. Thus, spaces with more forest or more industrial development can show up higher share in the allocation of resources for these issues.

Other explanatory aspects relate to the social dynamics and awareness. Thus, those areas that were already 5b regions in the first program seem more aware of the program opportunities and seem to generate higher rates of participation. Also, the limited size of the municipality was also pointed out as a constraint to participate in ESF actions.

Most of the evaluations underlie measure by measure what had been the main characteristics of the fund allocation. However, most of the times they could not go much further than describing the situation and at the most, pointing out those cases where allocation was not apparently justified. In the end, the evaluations seem fairly comfortable with the distribution. Thus, for instance, the Aragón evaluation states that there has been a kind of territorial specialisation of the investments. While the EAGGF has gone to dynamic rural areas, the ERDF has concentrated in urban areas and structuring municipalities and, eventually, the ESF devoted little attention to small municipalities.

In Catalonia, though, the evaluators highlight the differences in the program allocation between the less favoured and the mountain areas. In fact, they approve the higher efforts towards the industrial land creation for the mountain areas although this comparison with structural indicators could not

be applied for all the measures. Finally, the program for Madrid concludes that the allocation has been adequate although no quantitative information is provided.

Among the evaluations, the program of La Rioja gets more criticisms because of the higher share of La Rioja Baja and Santo Domingo, which in turn are the counties best positioned within the area. Instead, the most depressed areas have received less attention, mainly for agricultural actions. Six municipalities concentrate the most of the actions while 12 municipalities did not get any of them. The final conclusion is that “within the 5b area, the program is contributing to the socio-economic disparities”. That would reveal the nature of the actions and the role of the local agents in getting involved in the program and, at the same time, would prove the incapacity of the regional government to overcome the situation. Despite these sentences, the report at the beginning holds that the territorial assignation had been justified (iii).

In sum, once more, the lack of a detailed diagnosis in geographical terms and the lack of targets assigned to the areas limit the scope of the diagnosis and conclusions driven from the analysis of just the data allocation cannot allow the evaluator to fully conclude about the issue. The evaluations, for sure, have already put on the table the main questions for a further internal debate. All the evaluation reports can be read and understood from the internal perspective, and then, there is already quite a lot of information to assess the regional situation in each area. However, this exercise cannot be formalised yet as far as there is no reference on the original DOCUPs about the priorities and targets from the land viewpoint. The same situation impedes the overall analysis and the interregional comparison.

At this stage, the conclusion is that **the evaluation has allowed almost everywhere to raise the issue on distribution and has provoked a review on the way of providing the information, assessing the implementation that will have their influence in the next years of execution**. The low rate response to this question in the survey addressed to the managers provides some insights on their views regarding the issue. Despite the differences among measures the overall rate opens new perspectives for a more detailed approach to this.

6.3. Environmental issues in the program implementation

The evaluations made some comments on the environmental issues regarding the program, although **the issue still plays a minor role within the analysis**. According to the comments, as they are in the individual reports, the intervention has been fairly satisfactory. Madrid, for instance, qualifies the interventions on degraded lands, forest, waste and emission control as very effective. The evaluation of La Rioja gets around the appraisal by translating the conclusions elaborated by the Regional Environmental Commission. This one had denied any negative impact and pointed out the positive ones in terms of contribution to the water use, protection against water pollution, Erosion and soil loss control, fire prevention and so on. In Baleares, there are no environmental changes in the state of the environment Among 1994 and 1996, the 5b region experiments a relative decline in the number of surface burned, what could be considered as an impact of the program. Finally, the Pais Vasco on the other hand, did not even mention this aspect in the whole analysis.

The reports of Catalonia and Navarra introduced the environmental issue as a major one to check for. The surveys, interviews and case studies included the environmental consideration and at least one meeting was devoted to it. In general, the administration pointed its satisfaction with the program development and the general public seems to be aware of the changes towards greeter control. Regardless this, the evaluators in Navarra made some recommendations for plot concentration, forest infrastructures and species used on reforestation while no negative impacts could be detected so far for the tourism measures. Specially for plot concentration, the evaluation of Navarra suggest the elaboration of a guide on good practices to help the managers. Tourism measures have been implemented very closely to the environmental measures to the extent that the new actions seem to have the environmental awareness embedded. On the other side, the evaluation points out the positive effect of irrigation on water savings. In spite of the critical comments made by the evaluators.

Similarly, the evaluation of La Rioja, advises in summary tables (Pag. 39 and next) to monitor the environmental impact of, at least, irrigation, fight against harmful agents and transport and electric energy and also recognises that for plot concentration the dossiers do not even contain environmental reports.

The weight of the environmental measures in the 5b programs concedes to them and by itself a nice image. Nevertheless, **the approach towards the environmental issues, first in the DOCUPs and later on, in most of the evaluations is from our point of view still too much narrow.** Environmental effects are mostly linked to the environmental measures and from this perspective, the current programs have given more priority to these interventions. However, environmental effects concern also the rest of the measures and for many of them this is a real issue. Some of this effects are already needed of EIA, like the road infrastructures, but the EU orientations through the V program, as well as the recently approved modification of the Directive 85/337/CEE (Directive 87/11/CE of 3 march 1997) increase the projects subject to EIA and calls for a more intensive role of the prevention rules. Thus, new industrial settlements, agrarian or tourism facilities, due to their size and their location should deserve further attention from the environmental perspective. This concern does not seem to have reached by now most of the managers, beneficiaries and the environmental commissions focus on the application of the EIA procedures like anywhere else and without further extension to other actions.

In this sense, **this report strongly holds that in order to enforce the prevention principle, to accomplish the EU principles, and to force towards a greater awareness, the evaluations in the future should guarantee a full approach to the environmental impact evaluation.** To do it, specific protocols to check for the environmental effects of the undertaken measures could be of help.

7. SOME THOUGHTS ON EFFICIENCY

As it has been pointed out by different evaluators (Navarra, Catalonia, Madrid,...) **efficiency cannot be assessed, indeed, with the information already available**. Regarding the final outcome and the estimates of value for money, the information on final impacts is still limited and the first data cannot be considered very reliable. In terms of physical achievements, the indicators are scarce and not very well quoted to the extent that under one single indicators there are very different actions and stages. There is one clear example for the plot concentration, where the single indicator of hectare affected hides a large variety of situations and works. In this situation there is no place even for intra-regional comparison but also for inter-regional ones. Only one region, Navarra, and, still partially, remains out of this general situation.

With these inconveniences in mind, approaches to the issue are partial and sometimes not very accurate nor useful. Thus, Madrid points out the fact that the cost per employment is higher for the basic infrastructures while for the rest (axes 2 and 4) values are around 7 million pesetas.

La Rioja follows the EU guidelines and after the impossibility of applying them discusses their validity (page 14 in the synthesis). Measure by measure it assesses the unitary cost and compares its evolution over time. That, for instance, in terms of plot concentration the evaluation assesses the cost per hectare in two consecutive years (1994 and 1995) to assert the increasing trend. However, each stage in the plot concentration has its own financial requirements and comparison cannot disregard this fact. Finally, as a final conclusion the document says that “due to all these reasons, there is no conclusion regarding the efficiency of the DOCUP”. Still, it attempts to compare unitary costs among years although the calculations are misleading and do not contribute to a real analysis.

Aragón defines efficiency like the unitary cost of the action and recognises that comparative data are rarely available. Afterwards, the study provides calculations of efficiency for each program (new irrigation, access

infrastructure, hold concentration,...). Unfortunately data are presented in tables without further analysis.

In the evaluations of Catalonia and Navarra, a comparative study on the different costs between the sub-areas included in the 5b area is undertaken.

Moreover, for the Navarra program it is feasible to go further in the comparison between the foreseen costs and the actual ones. The results of this approach reveal some differences among areas and provides of information that seems of interest to the managers control and analysis. However, it does not allow the evaluator to go much further nor drawing general conclusions on the issue.

A wider approach towards the analysis of this issue is performed comparing physical and financial effectiveness. Comparison between the two ratios would help to understand whether efficiency has been achieved. Thus, physical rates higher than financial expenditure would prove lesser costs than the foreseen with the other way around would show inefficiencies within the system.

Unfortunately, the indicators came back as the conditioning features for the analysis. For those measures with some fitted targets the approach seems valuable but this cannot be applied to all the cases, as already stated. Big differences among the physical and financial effectiveness are much more than anything else a proof of the inaccuracy of the indicators and any other further comment has to be carefully assessed.

Again, the evaluation relies mostly on qualitative information, and there are no specific remarks to the issue. The case studies approach, for those regions that undertook them, allowed for a more detailed information on the issue in such a way that it was possible to define specific criteria to ensure efficiency in the future.

At this stage, we understand that the issue of efficiency has to be fully reformulated if we attempt to make the evaluations useful for the day to day tasks. A careful reading of all the evaluation reports shows at least two facts. First, that the concept is still misleading and there is no single understanding

of it. Second, that despite the theoretical appeal of the issue, the evaluators lack of the practical tools to make it applicable and extensive to all the measures right away.

We believe that the issue of efficiency has a twofold dimension, and that need to be independently addressed. On one side, the efficiency applies to the smaller single units in the programs, that is the projects and the actions. At this level, the control of unitary costs belongs to the controller task a financial manager should carry out. The set up of standards as references gives more transparency to the program itself, helps the managers in their planning tasks and makes easier the task of ex-ante evaluation, monitoring mid-term and final evaluation. That was the orientation for further monitoring in any of the evaluations. We understand, that probably, this cannot be provided for every of the actions, more when they are very fragmented and small. However, they may be elaborated for most of them and for all the most important ones. Thus, unitary costs per hour of training, per ha. Fully concentrated, per types of roads, and so on can be provided without big difficulty. The approach is interesting for the program management, more given the number of organisms involved but cannot be easily transferred from one region to another. Content and procedures of the measures would vary among regions and therefore cost would also do. By now, we believe that interregional comparison will have to be reduced to qualitative assessments.

The second perspective on the effectiveness applies to the higher level objectives in the hierarchy. That would include the value for money in terms of cost of the achievement of final objectives. This perspective entails much more difficulties that the former one. One could see that if the projects involved in one measure and the measures involved in one subprogram did well, the subprogram itself did well, too. However, this still leaves out of consideration the comparison between different approaches towards one single objective. Let's say as the objective the improvement in agriculture yields and let's understand that one can approach it through irrigation, plot concentration, individual aids to farmers and many others. The same exercise would apply for employment. That view on efficiency was at the heart of the concept at the time of inclusion in the methodologies. We believe, though, that the practical issues have made the topic non-affordable

with the skills and information we have right now. Therefore a cautious behaviour would advice the Commission first and the evaluators later to guarantee the fulfilment of the first perspective on the efficiency while remaining wise for new developments to approach this second more ambitious one.

8. THE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

8.1. Public management and efficiency

On administrative co-ordination

It is a common trend to all the programs the fragmentation of the measures into many different services and departments. Managers for the actions sometimes know the source of their financing, specially because the accountancy system imposed by the program although they are hardly aware of the program itself.

Figure 13. Qualitative assessment on additionality and co.ordination by managers and evaluators. Average rate (from 0=minimum to 5=maximum)

| Issues | Managers | Evaluators |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Additional financial resources | 3.4 | 4.2 |
| Complementarity with other regional and national policies | 2.8 | 3.6 |
| Synergy between funds | 2.4 | 2.6 |
| Synergy between measures | 2.8 | 2.6 |

For the managers, the change regarding previous situation is the origin of the funding. Other conditions, administration responsibilities, content, and links to other measures have remained as they were in the past. In this situation the managers do not perceive the difference and are not well aware of the 5b program. This overall view of the whole program seems to rely only on the final responsible of it, that is to say who is in charge of preparing the documents and justify the implementation. Nevertheless, the truth is that its competence over the rest of departments involved is limited and therefore, as the reports of Navarra, Catalonia and Aragón mainly highlighted, its tasks are mainly of collection of partial reports, organisation of meeting, data consolidation and little more in terms of planning and strategies.

The administrative reality in each region cannot be disregarded. The 5b program gets into the existing public mechanisms and actions financed under it are mixed up with the regional and national policies. As far as objectives, priorities and guidelines may differ among departments, the actions involved in the 5b program will also face problems. The truth is also that neither the national nor the European administrations work in an integrative manner and therefore one cannot expect to solve all the relative problems through the regional administration.

Besides this remaining limitation, the 5b program is forcing a co-ordination that although shyly provokes a raising awareness, and some attitudes on the way of working may be shifting. But, if we want consider attitudes towards evaluation as an indicator, the rating of the “willingness of the managers to collaborate in the evaluation procedures” is fairly low, 2,7 (out of 5 as the maximum) for the evaluators and 3,2 for the managers surveys on average but with considerable differences among regions.

The regional evaluations dealing with the issue, encourage a higher communication between the responsible unity and other services and managers. That would foster a climate of mutual understanding and co-operation among officials while getting over the unsurmountable pitfalls of the administration. Exchanges among departments have generally been scarce in the past probably because their role in the full process was disregarded.

On bureaucracy and delays

As stated in the previous section, for most of the officials, being a part of the 5b program is not regarded as much more as an increase in the monitoring and co-ordination tasks with no clear advantage from the previous situation. To the extent that no new resources were provided to mitigate their tasks, some officials state their complaints to the evaluators in Aragón, Navarra, Catalonia and others about the situation.

Also the beneficiaries have to learn new requirements. The evaluation of the Pais Vasco pointed out that the process was at the onset costly what made

that many applications were delivered after the deadlines, although these delays are becoming little by little less important.

Regarding the implementation dynamics, the evaluators state that the programs work with some inertia. The administrative bodies as well as the social agents favour the implementation of traditional measures while the more innovative ones -those attempting to modify economic trends- require a longer maturing term. That situation would be a common trend everywhere and noting it just calls for further monitoring and advising to guarantee effectiveness.

Finally, some evaluations referred to the rules for eligibility as an element conditioning the application. Most of the queries go to the ESF regarding the criteria on residency for being beneficiary of a training program, the allocation of aid between unemployed and autonomous workers or between public and private entities.

Other aspect of concern would apply to the aid to municipalities within the ERDF program and their difficulty to advance the payment before the EU reimbursement in Catalonia. There also some delays in payments and engagements were pointed out. The truth, though, is that in general complaints on the financial delays have deserved little attention within the evaluation and in Pais Vasco, for instance, the time span for the final payments to beneficiaries range between 15 days and 3 months.

On the criteria for selection

The criteria for the funds allocation varied among regions, funds and measures. For those measures directly implemented by the regional or national administration the priorities were set up according to their higher-level plans. In some other cases the initiative for application relied on private partners although final decision was up to the responsible administration. Evaluators believe these criteria are implicit (employment, support to private projects, kind of activity, feasibility, EIA,...). These would explain why some private projects were rejected, although they may represent a small part of the whole. However, the evaluations did not make special remarks on this as

a source of conflict. On the contrary, some evaluations, like the Pais Vasco, specifically state the satisfaction of the beneficiaries with the procedures involved.

Some other times, the transparency in the allocation did not leave too margin for complaining. This is the case of the ERDF allocation in Catalonia. There, funds were allocated to guarantee that all counties got their share. Later, there are two monitoring committees for the two areas (mountain and less favoured areas) which meet regularly to keep track of the implementation and which joins all partners involved. In this way everybody knows well the functioning of each other and their projects.

This procedure seems to show some good features although it also entails some risks. Partly, because it does not embrace all funds but the ERDF and therefore other measures remain out of mutual knowledge and integration. In fact, with this broader view, the evaluator for the Pais Vasco claimed that resources should be evenly distributed between counties and municipalities and be developed into several county programs to make it more understandable, integrated and able to join the commitment of all institutions and administrations involved in those areas. Still, the risk now would be dispersing the actions in many different programs with no global strategy, and with diluted impact, too.

On beneficiaries satisfaction

In the overall those surveys addressed to the final beneficiaries revealed that they are fairly satisfied with the functioning of the program and the collaboration from the administration. Besides the aid obtained directly from the services involved, other entities strictly linked to the program and the rural development objectives were of help. Thus, in the Pais Vasco, for instance, most of the projects or the bigger ones, got technical support both at the time of presentation and later on in the implementation thanks to the role played by the Asociaciones de Agricultura de Montaña, Asociaciones de Desarrollo Rural and public managers (Mendikoi). The financial contribution is decided on one by one bases, according to the importance of the project, the employment created and so on. Also in Navarra the local development

agents played the same role and in that way contributed to mitigate the pitfalls in the promotion and communication of the programs that had not been specifically planned by the administration.

8.2. Promotion and communication of the program

Indeed, there are not specific channels neither tools to inform, promote and disseminate the objectives of the 5b program. The publicity does usually include the EU symbols and makes explicit the financial contribution in each action as mandated by the Directive 94/342/CEE. Nevertheless each promotion depends upon each fund and there is no common pattern, or label that identifies the 5b as a single program.

The outcome of this procedure is that everybody may be able to associate no the measure to the financing fund, but they do not know other actions involved in the same program. Thus, for instance, in many 5b regions most entities which carries out training programs states its knowledge of the ESF, but even for the manager there is no difference between the functioning in and out of the 5b area.

Besides differences among funds and areas, the common trend is that evaluations note the knowledge of the objectives and the content of the program are scarce, more specially for those areas which are new in this second generation. Thus, for instance, meetings with social agents for the evaluation purposes needed a previous introduction to the program content to let them aware of the program scope while they recognise that there had not been a similar information in the past by the regional administration. Communication through brochures and talks existed in some areas and were appointed by the evaluators. Nevertheless, at least for Pais Vasco and Navarra, local and rural agents strongly relied on the rural associations and Local agents, respectively as their closest source of information.

The situation may only be somehow different for those very emblematic operations like it is the case for the irrigation project of Las Garrigues. The project involves a new and a very big action in the area what makes people

more aware of although at another level, the lack of connection with other projects in 5b remains.

8.3. The managers and evaluators view

Next chart shows the results to the survey to managers and evaluators regarding the management issues. Although the two columns do not include exactly the same regions, and that could introduce a bias. Bearing this in mind, the comparison shows that evaluators do usually rate lower than managers although the ranking does not get modified. In concordance with the individual reports, communication and publicity occupies the position in the bottom of the rank. Integration and co-ordination go down in the rank. Conversely, the clarity of the selection criteria is placed at the top.

Figure 14. Assessment of the management quality by managers and evaluators. Average rate (from 0=minimum to 5=maximum)

| Issues | Managers | Evaluators |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Policy integration among the administration involved | 2.8 | 2.4 |
| Co-ordination for the regional administration | 2.6 | 2.6 |
| Agility, simplicity and flexibility in administrative procedures | 2.6 | 2.6 |
| Achievement of the time schedule for implementation | 3.6 | 3.0 |
| Agility and efficiency on the financial procedures | 3.4 | 3.0 |
| Clear criteria for the project selection | 4.0 | 3.4 |
| Transparency and simplicity for the project selection | 4.0 | 3.2 |
| Objectivity on the criteria | 4.2 | 3.3 |
| Transparency and simplicity for the project selection | 3.8 | 3.2 |
| Publicity and communication | 2.5 | 2.0 |
| Managers and beneficiaries knowledge about the 5b program content | 3.0 | 2.4 |
| Managers Willingness to co-operate in the evaluation | 3.2 | 2.7 |

All the evaluations drove in a similar manner to a single conclusion on the need to introduce to support the co-ordination and monitoring tasks from now towards the end of the program. They recommend all programs should be provided with specific management structures to undertake the co-ordination and the monitoring and evaluation tasks and some evaluations have even defined the main functions of this unit.

To a large extent, the costs of this management were planned already by the programs at the time of approval and as such the budget appears in Subprogram VI. Nevertheless, out of the direct managers and officials who are aware of the tasks and the human and physical constraints to carry them out with the same endowments, the political responsible seem reluctant to value them and to assume the new cost.

The activities of this unit may differ between regions and while for some programs it may limit its functions to the more administrative activities for others it may go from the managerial field until the strategic one. No matter which is the scope of this unit, there is a unitary agreement on the need to review the existing indicators and the targets as they are set up now. This comes directly from the reports and it has already been checked out in the survey to managers and evaluators. Accuracy of the targets is the worst rated by managers and evaluators. The managers of La Rioja do not seem to question the quality and the indicators and the reliability of the targets they have now as much as the rest although recognise like everybody else that the number of them should be enlarged.

9. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

9.1. Final remarks

The analysis of the regional evaluations faced the problems derived of the **unlike approaches to the evaluation methodology**, to the extent that it has not been feasible to approach each issue for all the regions. The priorities on the aspects to analyse, the methodological estimates and the content differ and the synthesis report could not deal with some interesting issues unless they were treated by more than one region. Many times the same measures are located under different measure headings. A questionnaire was delivered to managers and evaluators to achieve a qualitative wisdom of the programs.

The **methods** are very diverse, and while financial disbursements are addressed in all of them, physical realisations and impacts are not evenly covered everywhere. Most of the intermediate evaluations propose organisational changes in the program presentation. In most regions the evaluation was mainly a work desk and no new information besides that already available by the officers has been generated. In fact, few evaluations undertook work field. Moreover, most of the intermediate evaluations disregarded the environmental issues that were hardly or not at all addressed. On the converse, almost all the evaluations provided a territorial analysis of the DOCUP, despite the fact that the original documents did not have developed it.

The **financial aspects** of the implementation are analysed for all the programs. The overall conclusion is that the most of the programs are running at the adequate speed for the EAGGF and the ERDF funds, although the ESF is facing significant delays. Even with that the regions experiment different rhythms in the execution with Navarra at the top in the execution and Baleares at the bottom. At the level of measures, Training and Agrarian Diversification had the worst financial effectiveness whereas Infrastructures, Rural Tourism and Location of SMEs had the best one.

The study of the **physical effectiveness** raises more problems. Targets are missing for many -most- of the actions and when provided they lack of accuracy. The result of this is that indicators as they are now cannot be of great help to understand the program dynamics. Very often comments from the evaluators go aside from the indicators' information. Managers and evaluators all recognise the need to review them. From the synthesis perspective, to the **lack of targets to check effectiveness**, we faced the **lack of common indicators**, able to be summarise and discussed all over the reports. Each program has its own singularities and the aim of applying a single pattern everywhere is not only unfeasible but also not advisable. The strength of the evaluation lies on its ability to recognise the program and the administration identities and therefore each evaluation has to be tailored to each program.

Nevertheless, from the State and European perspective there is also the need to get from the exercise some general conclusions on the overall results, the effectiveness of the different measures, effects from the program and so on. To do it **some guidelines on the content to be dealt with, the accountancy criteria to account for the results, minimum indicators to be provided by everybody and so on should be followed**. Otherwise, the overall results face unsurmountable problems.

Despite the problems for the general assessment, some common trends can be described. **The programs seem to have achieved a large display of actions involving many administrative services and applied in a fairly independent way.**

It is well known and has been extensively explained that traditional measures (mainly on infrastructures) are easier to apply and show greater rates of accomplishment. We understand this statement call to think about, from two related perspectives.

First, because, **it is time to check the cost-effectiveness of such traditional measures after certain level of implementation**. This question was discussed for the Navarra program when evaluating plot concentration action involved lands of small agronomic value. Also, the cost-effectiveness concern applies when actions do not guarantee the profitability and the

sustainability of the investment in the future. This is the case also for plot concentration without guarantee of the agrarian survival or the actions on grazing and pastures, without any enforcement of measures to ensure their use and maintenance.

Second, because, from the regional perspective measures on infrastructures are considered “a must” for rural reform. However, it seems pretty striking that while all these traditional measures are implemented without great difficulties, diversification and R+D activities are minor actions within the program and, as stated by the evaluators, not very well planned. One would expect that the adaptation of the rural world to the CAP principles would be achieved through a more harmonic progress on the infrastructure conditioning (irrigation, holdings size, roads,...) on one side and on the agriculture diversification on the other. Only the livestock sector seem to show clearer trends towards the search of quality production and promotional actions, but similar actions cannot easily be detected on the crops side.

Therefore, results from the evaluation call the attention to the EAGGF actions and advice for a closer review on their content.

The ERDF has been financing a wide range of actions. Some of them, again rural infrastructures on nuclei, could be receptive for most of the comments already made to the EAGGF. Many projects on urban renewal are spread in the territory and one wonders whether a more co-ordinated strategy would have been more profitable. On the private side, there is a fairly common agreement in the fact that the program has got a leverage on private activity, mainly on the tourism sector. From this perspective, it seems that, although quantitative results are still scarce, the reaction to SMEs actions have been welcome everywhere and that many applications may have no assistance if the budget is not modified. The result gives some optimism on the economic diversification feasibility in those areas while claims for a special attention to these programs to be adapted to the rural singularities, which is not always the case.

Main concern at this stage lies on the ESF actions. Programs with lower rates of financial disbursement show high rates of physical achievements as

a proof of the low quality of the targets. Training courses were planned longer than they were in the end, so with much less money they reached the same students. Linkages between this training and other actions have been weak in the past and evaluations point out a move towards closer interaction in the future. Aids to employment show also little results, and some regions complaint about the strictness on the eligibility criteria to achieve better results in terms of sustainable jobs.

The evaluations that undertook surveys for the beneficiaries seem to conclude they were satisfied with the training programs although the responses are not so unanimous when dealing with the marketable applicability of the training. Thus, managers and evaluators gave a low score to the impact on the program in terms of the improvements on human capital through the training.

The role devoted to the ESF in the new reform demands a full review of its application as a support to the rural development.

Final impacts cannot be fully approached at this stage. Figures at this stage are provisional although differences among estimates in the regional reports call already for the setting up of common criteria for impact accountancy. Otherwise, the apparently disparities among regions would damage the overall approach to the evaluation. On the qualitative assessments, there are some trends on the managers and evaluators. Both groups rated the highest, the improvements in infrastructure and the support to existing jobs. Conversely, those aspects reflecting most social and economic changes in the rural dynamics are rated the lowest. Finally, the macro-data on the operational context, although limited, seem to reveal that the situation in the rural areas is not clearly worst off. In fact, for some areas the evolution seems more favourable than it is for the whole region, although there are not enough information to drawn general conclusions.

Eventually, the evaluations draw more general conclusions on the **program management**. They mostly agree on the fact that co-ordination among the services involved is still limited to the most administrative aspects. However, many services involved do not know the full content of the 5b program, the objectives nor are aware of the evaluation implications.

A second big feature is the lack of promotion and communication towards beneficiaries. The Local Development Agents and Rural Associations fill the gap in some areas acting as intermediary bodies between final beneficiaries and administration, but there is still a lot of work to develop if the objectives of the 5b programs are to be disseminated.

Besides these shortcomings, the general view on the final beneficiaries seems to be fairly positive towards the actions and the administrative tasks. Complaints mainly affect to the complexity of the procedures, which deserve some training at the start, and to the delays in the payments, which is not a criticism applied everywhere.

9.2. A review of the results from the principles of the Reform

The evaluations did not reveal any specific conflict of the programs with the principles of the Reform. The survey to the managers and the evaluators seem to confirm this fact. Nevertheless, from our viewpoint the review of the evaluation raised **three issues** deserving some attention and which should be carefully monitored towards the future.

The first issue, stated in the former section, refers to the **agrarian evolution and its compatibility with the CAP principles**. There is no place here to express again the concern on the final effects of the agrarian measures in terms of the agriculture diversification. Moreover, the objective of rejuvenating the agrarian population which develops the Reform does not seem directly addressed in the evaluation and no analysis on the achievements can be undertaken.

The second issue relates to the **territorial distribution of the measures in terms of economic cohesiveness**. These intermediate evaluations showed differences in the resources allocation and provided quite a rich information for the regional analysis. However, without specific targets and full diagnosis by zones, one can only draw some hypothesis to be checked with the regional officers. However, further from the regional reports, the response of the managers to the same question in the survey undertaken for

this study, calls our attention and recommends keeping track of this issue in the monitoring process.

Eventually, the last aspect to take care of relates to the **environmental impacts**. It has been noted in this report that the issue is not fully addressed in the evaluation. At this stage, when most of the evaluations did hardly do any work field, one could justify this limitation. Information, when provided, gets constrained to the regional environmental committee dossiers and evaluators do not go further into the analysis. Thus, the approach to the environment is very administrative and limited to the legal assumptions for the EIA rules already in place in Spain. From our viewpoint, the approach does not even consider what are already the assumptions for the EIA introduced by the EC in 1997 and mainly does not seem aware of the environmental role in the rural development. Thus, landscape impacts, erosion problems, visitors pressure and so on are taken for granted without any further check.

9.3. The evaluation now and for the future

9.3.1. The review of monitoring and evaluation system

The 5b programs for the 1994-1999 period show **significant improvements** regarding the previous ones **but they are not fully integrated programs yet**. The former sections noted that the flaws in the diagnosis make difficult to check for the real relevance of the DOCUPs. The definition of the objectives and the development strategy is not the result of a previous diagnosis analysis and a SWOT matrix. It is normally a result of the know how of the officials and public managers or/and the inertia of the historical/traditional actions in the corresponding sector or area and the relevance issue will mostly rely on their own capabilities.

Sometimes actions are grouped without a well set up hierarchy and linkages, as they were developed in the past, although, afterwards a considerable **coherence** among the different objectives can usually be proved, as it was

agreed by managers and evaluators. However, coherence does not imply full complementarity or synergy.

In all the programs, there is somehow a display of **Indicators** also but they still refer mainly to physical actions while intermediate or final indicators are scarce, if existing, and their quality is doubtful. Moreover, **targets** are either not provided or unreliable and this is an important difficulty for the monitoring and evaluating tasks, as it has been proved.

Coherently with previous conditions, **management of the programs tends to follow the traditional patterns** within regional administrations. Sectoral measures rely on each department and the coordinator does not really have the competence to introduce big changes, neither in the content nor in the procedures. Managers are often reluctant to accept rules from outside and are hardly aware of the program as a whole, and then patterns keep the same as there were in the past. In fact, this comes to be the real constraint to effective changes in the programs, much more important than the deficiencies of the program content because it relates to attitudes instead of inexperience.

In this context, monitoring and evaluation face serious constraints and **a review of the state of the art is required** if any progress for the final evaluation is intended.

The review embraces:

- The **definition of accurate indicators and targets** at least for **financial, physical realisations, results and impacts**, as envisaged in the guidelines provided by the Commission.
- Moreover, we think that programs should also **provide indicators and targets on management quality**. These indicators would

collect, at the lower levels, a follow up on timings and delays, objective criteria for selection, EIA, or others, depending on the kind of measures. At the higher level it would mainly relate to financial effectiveness and delays on payments. The proposal for this inclusion grounds on the fact that final results in those areas rely heavily on the implementation procedure and it is coherent with former works developed from the Commission in this way.

- **The set up of targets**, which able the monitoring of the **effectiveness**.

There is a general agreement on the need to carry out this review as the evaluations and the survey revealed. However the approach to the content and scope of such review looks still unlike. Some evaluations are searching on the evaluation foundations while others seem more aware on the recent development built on the Structural fund programs and the European guidelines. **A common approach, as a set of minimum agreed**, would save isolate efforts and would allow ensuring overall results in the end. Otherwise there is no way to assess overall results at European level, niether get deeper into the effectiveness of the different approaches to rural development.

This common approach refers to **the agreement on a set of CORE INDICATORS, used everywhere and collected under common criteria**. The experience of past years on the methodological developments and applications teach us that the only feasible evaluation is that one which grounds on the pragmatism. Some of the items we all agree are important to be assessed and have proved to be easy to be checked under the evaluation limits. This is the case for impacts on income or the same evaluation of the efficiency.

Although **efficiency** remains as a real issue in public activity, the truth is that **we have not been able so far to develop a feasible technique to approach it globally**, and the mid-term evaluations are good proof of this statement. Navarra was the single region that had foreseen some unitary cost at the start and that allowed some comparisons between the real and the planned cost at the action level. Out of Navarra, no other regions display any reference cost to guide the evaluation. Thus, unitary costs showed a wide range of values, depending on many factors and results could not be fully understandable and much less taken out of the regional context.

A broader approach to the efficiency entailed the comparison between physical and financial effectiveness but again, the results may be misleading. Higher rates of physical achievements may be due not just to progress in the efficiency but also to the set of inaccurate targets. It is not envisaged we can overcome these shortcomings in the short term and therefore we have to realise that by now, the evaluation on effectiveness is partial and not very reliable. Only after some evaluations when reference values exist we can start to think about sound estimates.

Thus, **the core indicators would include impact indicators, results, physical, financial indicators and, if we agree, management ones**. The core indicators, as the minimum list, should guarantee the coverage of the most of the measures involved in the program and calculations on the effectiveness. Afterwards, **each region would develop its own additional specific indicators** to allow its program monitoring and evaluation from the internal perspective.

It seems that **a proposal on core indicators should be made by DG VI** from the basis of its knowledge, know-how and from the evaluations carried out in the former programs and the mid-term evaluations carried out in the current DOCUPs. It looks like that **to make this proposal operational it**

has to be agreed and consultation with the regions is required. From the former reports on evaluation of 5b programs it is feasible to elaborate a tentative list since some of them have already defined some proposals. This first proposal may circulate to get a maximum consensus. **The aim of limiting the size of the list should not dismiss the overall perspective, that it to agree on the most comparable as possible indicators.** Thus, for example, we believe that distinction between improved/maintained or new should be kept in mind. Also, indicators for actions that can be very different indeed should be split into few but more homogeneous categories. An example of this second case would be the distinction within the plot concentration between hardly initiated or very advanced or ended projects.

The **impact on employment** is the single indicator attempting to approach the results effectiveness -at least partially-. The appeal of the indicators is its ability to summarise under one common unit -jobs- the results of different measures.

Nobody would discuss the importance of knowing the creation or maintenance of jobs because of the 5b intervention, but the truth is that quite often the figures are either not well known or misleading. Evaluations tend to point out the employment involved in the intervention -public works, for instance- as an asset, although, in turn, they forget to include the cost -the subsidy- on the debit side. We believe ***the employment to be considered is that which has been created or maintained because of the intervention, as it is defined by the Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) rules, and specific guidelines about this accounting should be delivered to everybody.***

Besides employment, a small and selected number of specific indicators related to the main measures in the program and employment indicators could be added to the list of impacts, if they reveal feasible.

9.3.2. Institutional arrangements

The above reform cannot be approached without the review of the institutional arrangements at the regional level. It will require **the creation and maintenance of an information system** that for most of the areas is still precarious. So far, it has been stated that for many managers the evaluation is still perceived as an administrative task, where the monitoring becomes a routine and indicators are mixed up in a heterogeneous list without the definition of the targets nor the concepts when the measures shift.

There is a different perception on the cost that the management imposes, according to the amount involved. For small programs it has been pointed out it does not pay, while for big programs managers understand the monitoring as one more of their ordinary functions, although additional to the already existing ones. However, these ordinary functions rarely include systematic communication among responsible or promotional tasks in the rural areas.

Under these premises, **there is a general agreement that the potential for real changes in the traditional management system is limited**. To overcome this, **all the evaluations recommend the strength of the organisational structure in charge of the program**. This support may adopt different appearance, **going from the contract of external services for punctual tasks to the designation of a Unit within the administration devoted to these functions**. Otherwise, this had already been foreseen in the programs at the time of the approval under the technical assistance measure. Despite this financial reserve, the truth is that in most cases the monitoring and evaluation tasks have still been disregarded in this second generation of the programs and they have not received the attention they will need in the next years.

ANNEX 1: FINANCIAL TABLES

**Execution Financière par Fonds (montants effectivement payés aux bénéficiaires finaux)
Niveau d'exécution au 31/12/96 par rapport au total de la période. MECU**

| REGION | FEOGA | | | FEDER | | | FSE | | | Total | | |
|-------------------|---------|---------|------|---------|---------|------|--------|---------|------|---------|---------|------|
| | Plan | Realisé | % | Plan | Realisé | % | Plan | Realisé | % | Plan | Realisé | % |
| Aragón | 202,087 | 79,821 | 39,5 | 74,047 | 54,520 | 73,6 | 28,641 | 4,596 | 16,0 | 304,775 | 138,938 | 45,6 |
| Baleares | 21,062 | 8,821 | 41,9 | 12,200 | 6,700 | 54,9 | 13,190 | 1,350 | 10,2 | 46,452 | 16,671 | 36,3 |
| Catalunya | 90,650 | 32,543 | 35,9 | 36,610 | 15,015 | 41,0 | 23,850 | 6,765 | 28,4 | 151,111 | 54,323 | 35,9 |
| La Rioja | 26,928 | 7,556 | 28,1 | 10,198 | 5,927 | 58,1 | 2,610 | 0,586 | 22,5 | 39,736 | 14,069 | 35,4 |
| Madrid | 24,589 | 7,820 | 31,8 | 13,212 | 6,992 | 52,9 | 11,709 | 1,753 | 15,0 | 49,510 | 16,565 | 33,5 |
| Navarra | 38,808 | 25,352 | 65,3 | 12,210 | 8,650 | 70,8 | 6,767 | 3,296 | 48,7 | 57,785 | 37,299 | 64,5 |
| País Vasco | 19,528 | 7,226 | 37,0 | 4,605 | 2,670 | 58,0 | 2,967 | 0,417 | 14,0 | 27,100 | 10,313 | 38,1 |
| Total | 42,653 | 169,140 | 39,9 | 163,082 | 100,474 | 61,6 | 89,733 | 18,763 | 20,9 | 676,468 | 288,377 | 42,6 |

**Execution Financière par Axe Prioritaire (montants effectivement payés aux bénéficiaires finaux)
Niveau d'exécution au 31/12/96 par rapport au total de la période. MECU**

| REGION | Axe I Infrastructures | | | Axe II Diversification | | | Axe III Environnement | | | Axe IV Renovation villages | | | Axe V Ressources Humaines | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|---------|------|------------------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---------|------|----------------------------|---------|------|---------------------------|---------|------|
| | Plan | Realisé | % | Plan | Realisé | % | Plan | Realisé | % | Plan | Realisé | % | Plan | Realisé | % |
| Aragón | 120,8 | 56,3 | 46,6 | 49,1 | 29,1 | 59,2 | 37,1 | 16,5 | 44,5 | 69,8 | 32,4 | 46,6 | 28,6 | 4,6 | 16,0 |
| Baleares | 7,2 | 3,0 | 41,5 | 15,7 | 7,2 | 45,7 | 8,5 | 4,2 | 49,8 | 1,5 | 1,1 | 72,4 | 13,2 | 1,4 | 10,2 |
| Catalunya | 42,8 | 20,0 | 46,7 | 42,1 | 14,8 | 35,3 | 35,1 | 9,5 | 27,1 | 6,9 | 2,9 | 42,2 | 23,9 | 6,8 | 28,4 |
| La Rioja | 10,0 | 5,6 | 55,5 | 11,1 | 4,3 | 38,5 | 10,0 | 1,9 | 19,0 | 5,7 | 1,7 | 30,9 | 2,6 | 0,6 | 22,5 |
| Madrid | 12,5 | 6,4 | 51,1 | 9,2 | 2,4 | 26,4 | 11,2 | 3,6 | 32,2 | 4,6 | 2,3 | 51,2 | 11,7 | 1,8 | 15,0 |
| Navarra | 12,8 | 8,7 | 67,9 | 10,8 | 5,7 | 53,1 | 19,5 | 12,1 | 62,0 | 7,3 | 7,3 | 100 | 6,8 | 3,3 | 48,7 |
| País Vasco | 5,8 | 1,7 | 29,4 | 9,4 | 3,6 | 38,7 | 4,8 | 1,7 | 35,6 | 3,7 | 2,8 | 75,6 | 3,0 | 0,4 | 14,0 |
| Total | 212,0 | 101,7 | 48,0 | 147,3 | 67,1 | 45,6 | 126,2 | 49,6 | 39,3 | 99,5 | 50,6 | 50,9 | 89,7 | 18,8 | 20,9 |

ANNEX 2: QUESTIONNAIRE MODELS

SINTESIS DE LA EVALUACIÓN INTERMEDIA DE LOS DOCUP DEL OBJETIVO 5B EN ESPAÑA

CUESTIONARIO A LOS RESPONSABLES DEL DOCUP

1.- Características del DOCUP

1.1.- Puntúe de 0 a 5 (de menor a mayor grado) los siguientes aspectos:

| | Puntuación |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Precisión del diagnóstico en la definición de las debilidades, amenazas, fortalezas y oportunidades de la zona 5b | |
| Hasta que punto los objetivos y la estrategia de desarrollo se deducen de las conclusiones del diagnóstico del DOCUP. | |
| Hasta que punto los objetivos y la estrategia de desarrollo dan respuesta a las prioridades de desarrollo de la zona 5b. | |
| Existencia de indicadores de resultados para los objetivos establecidos | |
| Existencia de indicadores de impacto para los objetivos establecidos | |
| Existencia de indicadores de resultados para las intervenciones programadas | |
| Existencia de indicadores de impacto para las intervenciones programadas | |
| Existencia de metas cuantificadas para los indicadores de resultados | |
| Existencia de metas cuantificadas para los indicadores de impacto | |

2.- Resultados físicos

2.1.- Considere de forma aproximada:

| | % |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| % de actuaciones que tienen definidos indicadores de resultados | |
| % de actuaciones que tienen definidas metas cuantificadas para los indicadores de resultados | |

2.2.- Puntúe de 0 a 5 (de menor a mayor grado) los siguientes aspectos:

| | Puntuación |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Grado en el que los indicadores de resultados reflejan adecuadamente el contenido de las medidas y la estrategia de desarrollo | |
| Grado de realismo en la cuantificación de los indicadores de resultados | |
| Grado en el que es previsible que se consigan los resultados | |

2.3.- Indique con un X con qué frecuencia se elabora y analiza la información relativa a los indicadores de resultados físicos por parte de los coordinadores del DOCUP

| | Subprograma 1 | Subprograma 2 | Subprograma 3 |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Menos de una vez al año | | | |
| Una vez al año | | | |
| Dos veces al año | | | |
| Tres veces al año o más | | | |

2.4.- Puntúe de 0 a 5 el grado de disponibilidad de datos para poder hacer el seguimiento de los indicadores.

| | Puntuación |
|---------------|------------|
| Subprograma 1 | |
| Subprograma 2 | |
| Subprograma 3 | |

2.5.- De la evaluación se desprende la necesidad de que revisar:

| | Si/No | Señale los principales |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------------------|
| Número de indicadores de resultados | | |
| Definición de metas cuantificadas | | |
| La calidad de los indicadores y la fiabilidad de las metas | | |

3.- Impactos

3.1.- Desde un punto de vista cualitativo, y respecto a la situación existente al inicio de la ejecución del DOCUP, considere en que grado (de 0 a 5) la influencia de este último ha permitido:

| | Puntuación |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Crear nuevos puestos de trabajo | |
| Mantener puestos de trabajo ya existentes | |
| Desarrollar la pluriactividad de la población rural | |
| Aumentar la productividad de las explotaciones agrarias | |
| Mantener o aumentar la renta de la población | |
| Fomentar la implantación de pequeñas y medianas empresas y actividades artesanales | |
| Mejorar la dotación y calidad de las infraestructuras y equipamientos del hábitat rural | |
| Mejorar la gestión y conservación del medio natural y del medio ambiente | |
| Mejorar el nivel de formación de los recursos humanos | |
| Fomentar la capacidad y la iniciativa empresarial de la población rural | |
| Mantener la población rural en la zona | |
| Integrar la población rural en el proceso de desarrollo | |
| Mejorar la situación de los agricultores femeninos y de la mujer en el mundo rural | |
| Descentralizar las actuaciones en el territorio | |

3.2 . Considere en que grado (de 0 a 5) el DOCUP ha permitido:

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Recursos financieros adicionales para el desarrollo rural | |
| Complementariedad con otras políticas estatales o regionales | |
| Sinergia entre los fondos estructurales | |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Sinergia entre las medidas | |
| Compatibilidad del DOCUP con la PAC | |
| Compatibilidad del DOCUP con la política ambiental comunitaria | |

4. Eficacia y eficiencia

4.1.- ¿Teniendo en cuenta los impactos alcanzados a finales de 1996, puntúe de 0 a 5 hasta que punto prevé que las actuaciones previstas permitirán conseguir los objetivos inicialmente previstos para

| | Puntuación |
|--------------------|------------|
| Conjunto del DOCUP | |
| Subprograma 1 | |
| Subprograma 2 | |
| Subprograma 3 | |

4.2.- Indique cuales son las medidas que han contribuido más positivamente a la dinámica de desarrollo rural de la zona 5b y señale brevemente por qué razones:

4.3.- ¿Qué ajustes deberían realizarse para aumentar la eficacia y la eficiencia en la obtención de los objetivos previstos en el DOCUP?:

| En el ámbito estratégico | En el ámbito operacional |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | |

4.4.- Señale para los dos o tres proyectos principales de cada subprograma los siguientes aspectos

| | Gasto ejecutado (millones ptas.) | Coste efectivo/coste previsto o coste estándar (%) | Resultado físico obtenido/ coste efectivo |
|---------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Subprograma 1 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subprograma 2 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subprograma 3 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

5.- La ejecución y la gestión del DOCUP

5.1.- Adjunte por favor un organigrama completo de la estructura administrativa y de organización, con la consiguiente distribución y naturaleza de las competencias, de la ejecución y gestión del DOCUP en su CCAA.

5.2. Puntúe de 0 a 5 los siguientes aspectos:

| | Puntuación |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Integración de las políticas de las distintas administraciones involucradas | |
| Coordinación de los distintos departamentos de la administración regional | |
| Agilidad, simplificación y flexibilidad de los procedimientos administrativos para la ejecución de las actuaciones | |
| Cumplimiento del calendario previsto en la ejecución de las actuaciones | |
| Agilidad y eficiencia de los procedimientos financieros | |
| Cumplimiento del calendario previsto en la ejecución de los procedimientos financieros | |
| Existencia de criterios claros para la selección de los proyectos | |
| Grado de objetividad de los criterios de selección | |
| Transparencia y simplicidad de los criterios de selección | |
| Grado de publicidad y comunicación de las actuaciones | |
| Grado de conocimiento de las actuaciones que forman parte del 5b por parte de los gestores y de los beneficiarios | |
| Colaboración de los gestores de las distintas medidas en el proceso de seguimiento y de evaluación del DOCUP | |

5.3. Puntúe de 0 a 5 en qué medida la existencia del DOCUP ha permitido a la administración regional :

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| | |
| Comprensión de la política de desarrollo rural europea | |
| Acercamiento a la administración europea | |
| Conocimiento e intercambio de experiencias con otras regiones | |

6.- Propuestas y recomendaciones globales de mejoras y reformas

SINTESIS DE LA EVALUACIÓN INTERMEDIA DE LOS DOCUP DEL OBJETIVO 5B EN ESPAÑA

CUESTIONARIO A LOS EVALUADORES

1.- Características del DOCUP

1.1.- Puntúe de 0 a 5 (de menor a mayor grado) los siguientes aspectos:

| | Puntuación |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Precisión del diagnóstico en la definición de las debilidades, amenazas, fortalezas y oportunidades de la zona 5b | |
| Hasta que punto los objetivos y la estrategia de desarrollo se deducen de las conclusiones del diagnóstico del DOCUP. | |
| Hasta que punto los objetivos y la estrategia de desarrollo dan respuesta a las prioridades de desarrollo de la zona 5b. | |
| Existencia de indicadores de resultados para los objetivos establecidos | |
| Existencia de indicadores de impacto para los objetivos establecidos | |
| Existencia de indicadores de resultados para las intervenciones programadas | |
| Existencia de indicadores de impacto para las intervenciones programadas | |
| Existencia de metas cuantificadas para los indicadores de resultados | |
| Existencia de metas cuantificadas para los indicadores de impacto | |

2.- Resultados físicos

2.1.- Considere de forma aproximada:

| | % |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| % de actuaciones que tienen definidos indicadores de resultados | |
| % de actuaciones que tienen definidas metas cuantificadas para los indicadores de resultados | |

2.2.- Puntúe de 0 a 5 (de menor a mayor grado) los siguientes aspectos:

| | Puntuación |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Grado en el que los indicadores de resultados reflejan adecuadamente el contenido de las medidas y la estrategia de desarrollo | |
| Grado de realismo en la cuantificación de los indicadores de resultados | |
| Grado en el que es previsible que se consigan los resultados | |

2.3.- Puntúe de 0 a 5 el grado de disponibilidad de datos para poder hacer el seguimiento de los indicadores.

| | Puntuación |
|---------------|------------|
| Subprograma 1 | |
| Subprograma 2 | |
| Subprograma 3 | |

2.4.- De la evaluación se desprende la necesidad de que revisar:

| | Si/No | Señale los principales |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------------------|
| Número de indicadores de resultados | | |
| Definición de metas cuantificadas | | |
| La calidad de los indicadores y la fiabilidad de las metas | | |

3.- Impactos

3.1.- Desde un punto de vista cualitativo, y respecto a la situación existente al inicio de la ejecución del DOCUP, considere en que grado (de 0 a 5) la influencia de este último ha permitido:

| | Puntuación |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Crear nuevos puestos de trabajo | |
| Mantener puestos de trabajo ya existentes | |
| Desarrollar la pluriactividad de la población rural | |
| Aumentar la productividad de las explotaciones agrarias | |
| Mantener o aumentar la renta de la población | |
| Fomentar la implantación de pequeñas y medianas empresas y actividades artesanales | |
| Mejorar la dotación y calidad de las infraestructuras y equipamientos del hábitat rural | |
| Mejorar la gestión y conservación del medio natural y del medio ambiente | |
| Mejorar el nivel de formación de los recursos humanos | |
| Fomentar la capacidad y la iniciativa empresarial de la población rural | |
| Mantener la población rural en la zona | |
| Integrar la población rural en el proceso de desarrollo | |
| Mejorar la situación de los agricultores femeninos y de la mujer en el mundo rural | |
| Descentralizar las actuaciones en el territorio | |

3.2 . Considere en que grado (de 0 a 5) el DOCUP ha permitido:

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Recursos financieros adicionales para el desarrollo rural | |
| Complementariedad con otras políticas estatales o regionales | |
| Sinergia entre los fondos estructurales | |
| Sinergia entre las medidas | |
| Compatibilidad del DOCUP con la PAC | |
| Compatibilidad del DOCUP con la política ambiental comunitaria | |

4. Eficacia y eficiencia

4.1.- ¿Teniendo en cuenta los impactos alcanzados a finales de 1996, puntúe de 0 a 5 hasta que punto prevé que las actuaciones previstas permitirán conseguir los objetivos inicialmente previstos para

| | Puntuación |
|--------------------|------------|
| Conjunto del DOCUP | |
| Subprograma 1 | |

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Subprograma 2 | |
| Subprograma 3 | |

4.2.- Indique cuales son las medidas que han contribuido más positivamente a la dinámica de desarrollo rural de la zona 5b y señale brevemente por qué razones:

4.3.- ¿Qué ajustes deberían realizarse para aumentar la eficacia y la eficiencia en la obtención de los objetivos previstos en el DOCUP?:

| | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| En el ámbito estratégico | En el ámbito operacional |
| | |

4.4.- Señale para los dos o tres proyectos principales de cada subprograma los siguientes aspectos

| | Gasto ejecutado (millones ptas.) | Coste efectivo/coste previsto o coste estándar (%) | Resultado físico obtenido/ coste efectivo |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| Subprograma 1 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subprograma 2 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subprograma 3 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

5.- La ejecución y la gestión del DOCUP

5.1. Puntúe de 0 a 5 los siguientes aspectos:

| | Puntuación |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Integración de las políticas de las distintas administraciones involucradas | |
| Coordinación de los distintos departamentos de la administración regional | |
| Agilidad, simplificación y flexibilidad de los procedimientos administrativos para la ejecución de las actuaciones | |
| Cumplimiento del calendario previsto en la ejecución de las actuaciones | |
| Agilidad y eficiencia de los procedimientos financieros | |
| Cumplimiento del calendario previsto en la ejecución de los procedimientos financieros | |
| Existencia de criterios claros para la selección de los proyectos | |
| Grado de objetividad de los criterios de selección | |
| Transparencia y simplicidad de los criterios de selección | |
| Grado de publicidad y comunicación de las actuaciones | |
| Grado de conocimiento de las actuaciones que forman parte del 5b por parte de los gestores y de los beneficiarios | |
| Colaboración de los gestores de las distintas medidas en el proceso de seguimiento y de evaluación del DOCUP | |

6.- Propuestas y recomendaciones globales de mejoras y reformas