



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

Annual implementation report

United Kingdom - Rural Development Programme (Regional) - Scotland

Annual implementation report	
Period	01/01/2018 - 31/12/2018
Version	2018.1
Status - Current Node	Accepted by EC - European Commission
National reference	SRDP 2014-2020 - AIR 4
Monitoring committee approval date	26/06/2019

Programme Version in force	
CCI	2014UK06RDRP003
Programme type	Rural Development Programme
Country	United Kingdom
Region	Scotland
Programming period	2014 - 2020
Version	6.0
Decision Number	C(2018)8463
Decision Date	05/12/2018
Managing authority	Scottish Government, Agriculture and Rural Development Division
Coordination body	UK Co-ordinating Body

Data and content of Tables F of the Annual Implementation Report on the achievement of milestones is linked with the last Rural Development Programme adopted by the Commission.

Table of contents

1. KEY INFORMATION ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME AND ITS PRIORITIES	6
1.a) Financial Data	6
1.b) Common and programme-specific indicators and quantified target values	6
1.b1) Overview table.....	6
1.c) Key information on RDP implementation based on data from a) and b) by Focus Area.....	14
1.d) Key information on achievements towards the milestones set in the performance Framework based on Table F	25
1.e) Other RDP specific element [optional].....	31
1.f) Where appropriate, the contribution to macro-regional and sea basin strategies.....	31
1.f1) ATLSBS	32
1.g) Currency rate used for conversion AIR (non EUR countries).....	36
2. THE PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE EVALUATION PLAN.....	37
2.a) Description of any modifications made to the evaluation plan in the RDP during the year, with their justification	37
2.b) A description of the evaluation activities undertaken during the year (in relation to section 3 of the evaluation plan).....	37
2.c) A description of activities undertaken in relation to the provision and management of data (in relation to section 4 of the evaluation plan).....	38
2.d) A list of completed evaluations, including references to where they have been published on-line.....	39
2.e) A summary of completed evaluations, focussing on evaluation findings	40
2.f) A description of communication activities undertaken in relation to publicising evaluation findings (in relation to section 6 of the evaluation plan)	42
2.g) Description of the follow-up given to evaluation results (in relation to section 6 of the evaluation plan).....	43
3. ISSUES WHICH AFFECT THE PERFORMANCE OF THE PROGRAMME AND THE MEASURES TAKEN.....	44
3.a) Description of steps taken to ensure quality and effectiveness of programme implementation.....	44
3.b) Quality and efficient delivery mechanisms	44
4. STEPS TAKEN TO IMPLEMENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND PROGRAMME PUBLICITY REQUIREMENTS.....	46
4.a) Action taken and state of play as regards the establishment of the NRN and the implementation of its action plan.....	46
4.a1) Actions taken and state of play as regards establishment of the NRN (governance structure and network support unit).....	46
4.a2) Actions taken and state of play as regards the implementation of the action plan.....	46
4.b) Steps taken to ensure that the programme is publicised (Article 13 of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 808/2014)	47
5. ACTIONS TAKEN TO FULFIL EX ANTE CONDITIONALITIES.....	49

6. DESCRIPTION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF SUB-PROGRAMMES	50
7. ASSESSMENT OF THE INFORMATION AND PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING THE OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAMME	51
7.a) Evaluation questions	51
7.a1) CEQ01-1A - To what extent have RDP interventions supported innovation, cooperation and the development of the knowledge base in rural areas?.....	51
7.a2) CEQ02-1B - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the strengthening of links between agriculture, food production and forestry and research and innovation, including for the purpose of improved environmental management and performance?	57
7.a3) CEQ03-1C - To what extent have RDP interventions supported lifelong learning and vocational training in the agriculture and forestry sectors?	59
7.a4) CEQ04-2A - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to improving the economic performance, restructuring and modernization of supported farms in particular through increasing their market participation and agricultural diversification?	60
7.a5) CEQ05-2B - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the entry of adequately skilled farmers into the agricultural sector and in particular, generational renewal?	66
7.a6) CEQ06-3A - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to improving the competitiveness of supported primary producers by better integrating them into the agri-food chain through quality schemes, adding value to the agricultural products, promoting local markets and short supply circuits, producer groups and inter-branch organization?.....	71
7.a7) CEQ07-3B - To what extent have RDP interventions supported farm risk prevention and management?	73
7.a8) CEQ08-4A - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the restoration, preservation and enhancement of biodiversity including in Natura 2000 areas, areas facing natural or other specific constraints and HNV farming, and the state of European landscape?	75
7.a9) CEQ09-4B - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the improvement of water management, including fertilizer and pesticide management?	81
7.a10) CEQ10-4C - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the prevention of soil erosion and improvement of soil management?	86
7.a11) CEQ11-5A - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to increasing efficiency in water use by agriculture?	90
7.a12) CEQ12-5B - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to increasing efficiency in energy use in agriculture and food processing?.....	90
7.a13) CEQ13-5C - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to the supply and use of renewable sources of energy, of by-products, wastes, residues and other non-food raw material for purposes of the bio-economy?.....	91
7.a14) CEQ14-5D - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to reducing GHG and ammonia emissions from agriculture?	92
7.a15) CEQ15-5E - To what extent have RDP interventions supported carbon conservation and sequestration in agriculture and forestry?	94
7.a16) CEQ16-6A - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the diversification, creation and development of small enterprises and job creation?	96
7.a17) CEQ17-6B - To what extent have RDP interventions supported local development in rural areas?.....	98

7.a18) CEQ18-6C - To what extent have RDP interventions enhanced the accessibility, use and quality of information and communication technologies (ICT) in rural areas?.....	103
7.a19) CEQ19-PE - To what extent have the synergies among priorities and focus areas enhanced the effectiveness of the RDP?	104
7.a20) CEQ20-TA - To what extent has technical assistance contributed to achieving the objectives laid down in Art. 59(1) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 and Art. 51(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013?	106
7.a21) CEQ21-RN - To what extent has the national rural network contributed to achieving the objectives laid down in Art. 54(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013?	107
7.a22) CEQ22-EM - To what extent has the RDP contributed to achieving the EU 2020 headline target of raising the employment rate of the population aged 20 to 64 to at least 75 %?	113
7.a23) CEQ23-RE - To what extent has the RDP contributed to achieving the EU2020 headline target of investing 3 % of EU's GDP in research and development and innovation?	114
7.a24) CEQ24-CL - To what extent has the RDP contributed to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to achieving the EU 2020 headline target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by at least 20 % compared to 1990 levels, or by 30 % if the conditions are right, to increasing the share of renewable energy in final energy consumption to 20 %, and achieving 20 % increase in energy efficiency?	114
7.a25) CEQ25-PO - To what extent has the RDP contributed to achieving the EU 2020 headline target of reducing the number of Europeans living below the national poverty line?	116
7.a26) CEQ26-BI - To what extent has the RDP contributed to improving the environment and to achieving the EU biodiversity strategy target of halting the loss of biodiversity and the degradation of ecosystem services, and to restore them?	116
7.a27) CEQ27-CO - To what extent has the RDP contributed to the CAP objective of fostering the competitiveness of agriculture?	117
7.a28) CEQ28-SU - To what extent has the RDP contributed to the CAP objective of ensuring sustainable management of natural resources and climate action?	118
7.a29) CEQ29-DE - To what extent has the RDP contributed to the CAP objective of achieving a balanced territorial development of rural economies and communities including the creation and maintenance of employment?	118
7.a30) CEQ30-IN - To what extent has the RDP contributed to fostering innovation?	119
7.a31) PSEQ01-FA - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas	120
7.a32) PSEQ02-FA - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas	120
7.a33) PSEQ03-FA - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas	120
7.a34) PSEQ04-FA - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas	120
7.a35) PSEQ05-FA - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas	120
7.a36) PSEQ01-TOPIC - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic	120
7.a37) PSEQ02-TOPIC - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic	120

7.a38) PSEQ03-TOPIC - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic	121
7.a39) PSEQ04-TOPIC - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic	121
7.a40) PSEQ05-TOPIC - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic	121
7.b) Table of result indicators	122
7.c) Table of additional and programme specific indicators used to support evaluation findings.....	124
7.d) Table of CAP impact indicators	125
8. IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIONS TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE PRINCIPLES SET OUT IN ARTICLES 5, 7 AND 8 OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013.....	127
8.a) Promotion of equality between men and women and non-discrimination (Article 7 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013)	127
8.b) Sustainable development (Article 8 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013).....	128
8.c) The role of the partners referred to in Article 5 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 in the implementation of the programme	129
9. PROGRESS MADE IN ENSURING INTEGRATED APPROACH TO USE EAFRD AND OTHER UNION FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS.....	130
10. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS (ARTICLE 46 OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013).....	131
11. ENCODING TABLES FOR COMMON AND PROGRAMME-SPECIFIC INDICATORS AND QUANTIFIED TARGET VALUES	132
Annex II	133
Documents	143

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

1.a) Financial Data

See annexed documents

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

1.b1) Overview table

Focus Area 1A						
Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T1: percentage of expenditure under Articles 14, 15 and 35 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 in relation to the total expenditure for the RDP (focus area 1A)	2014-2018			0.93	32.59	2.85
	2014-2017			0.53	18.57	
	2014-2016			0.19	6.66	
	2014-2015			0.13	4.56	

Focus Area 1B						
Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T2: Total number of cooperation operations supported under the cooperation measure (Article 35 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013) (groups, networks/clusters, pilot projects...) (focus area 1B)	2014-2018			20.00	8.73	229.00
	2014-2017			13.00	5.68	
	2014-2016			4.00	1.75	
	2014-2015			1.00	0.44	

Focus Area 1C						
Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T3: Total number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (focus area 1C)	2014-2018			14,683.00	138.30	10,617.00
	2014-2017			13,065.00	123.06	
	2014-2016			12,118.00	114.14	
	2014-2015			9,227.00	86.91	

Focus Area 2A							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T4: percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP support for investments in restructuring or modernisation (focus area 2A)		2014-2018	5.55	33.95	5.55	33.95	16.35
		2014-2017	4.21	25.75	4.21	25.75	
		2014-2016	3.09	18.90	3.09	18.90	
		2014-2015	2.39	14.62	2.39	14.62	
Number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (Number of participants trained)		2014-2018			14,431.00	71.73	20,118.00
		2014-2017			13,065.00	64.94	
		2014-2016					
		2014-2015					
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	2,656,545.70	64.37	2,407,124.33	58.33	4,127,034.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	4,519,188.22	48.28	3,191,196.82	34.09	9,360,000.00
M04	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	39,829,196.12	81.03	34,002,001.12	69.18	49,151,926.00
M06	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	1,032,074.00	86.01	593,717.66	49.48	1,200,000.00
M13	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	156,044,241.34	62.07	151,555,627.81	60.28	251,400,000.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	1,992,737.38	53.93	1,909,931.95	51.69	3,694,929.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	206,073,982.76	64.61	193,659,599.69	60.72	318,933,889.00

Focus Area 2B							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T5: percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP supported business development plan/investments for young farmers (focus area 2B)		2014-2018	0.50	182.92	0.50	182.92	0.27
		2014-2017	0.39	142.67	0.39	142.67	
		2014-2016	0.31	113.41	0.31	113.41	
		2014-2015	0.11	40.24	0.11	40.24	
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	1,129,798.05	48.28	797,016.69	34.06	2,340,000.00
M06	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	14,015,738.35	83.40	13,767,637.54	81.93	16,805,101.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	15,145,536.40	79.11	14,564,654.23	76.08	19,145,101.00

Focus Area 3A							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T6: percentage of agricultural holdings receiving support for participating in quality schemes, local markets and short supply circuits, and producer groups/organisations (focus area 3A)		2014-2018	14.69	94.56			15.54
		2014-2017	14.69	94.56			
		2014-2016	14.69	94.56			
		2014-2015	14.69	94.56			
Percentage of total agri-food businesses supported under Article 17 of the Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (Percentage of total number of agri-food businesses)		2014-2018			12.57	96.69	13.00
		2014-2017			9.83	75.62	
		2014-2016			6.29	48.38	
		2014-2015					
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M03	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	960,652.73	92.95	959,364.70	92.83	1,033,518.00
M04	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	62,061,189.95	82.38	35,739,252.01	47.44	75,337,355.00
M14	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	5,514,031.74	95.52	5,501,385.17	95.30	5,772,606.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	2,882,914.76	72.80	1,022,693.67	25.83	3,960,000.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	71,418,789.18	82.95	43,222,695.55	50.20	86,103,479.00

Focus Area 3B							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
Number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (Number of participants trained)		2014-2018					530.00
		2014-2017					
		2014-2016					
		2014-2015					
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	564,898.53	48.28	400,073.36	34.19	1,170,000.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	564,898.53	48.28	400,073.36	34.19	1,170,000.00

Priority P4							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T13: percentage of forestry land under management contracts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion (focus area 4C)		2014-2018			4.68	12.32	37.99
		2014-2017			2.72	7.16	
		2014-2016			1.74	4.58	
		2014-2015			1.03	2.71	
T11: percentage of forestry land under management contracts to improve water management (focus area 4B)		2014-2018			4.68	12.32	37.99
		2014-2017			2.72	7.16	
		2014-2016			1.74	4.58	
		2014-2015			1.03	2.71	
T8: percentage of forest/other wooded area under management contracts supporting biodiversity (focus area 4A)		2014-2018			4.68	12.32	37.99
		2014-2017			2.72	7.16	
		2014-2016			1.74	4.58	
		2014-2015			1.03	2.71	
T12: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion (focus area 4C)		2014-2018			17.91	93.61	19.13
		2014-2017			13.70	71.60	
		2014-2016			11.78	61.57	
		2014-2015			11.78	61.57	
T10: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts to improve water management (focus area 4B)		2014-2018			16.30	82.33	19.80
		2014-2017			12.58	63.54	
		2014-2016			10.88	54.95	
		2014-2015			10.88	54.95	
T9: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts supporting biodiversity and/or landscapes (focus area 4A)		2014-2018			19.66	86.48	22.73
		2014-2017			14.76	64.93	
		2014-2016			12.63	55.56	
		2014-2015			12.63	55.56	
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023

M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	114,494.00	31.80	56,389.17	15.66	360,000.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	3,389,392.16	48.28	2,406,700.14	34.28	7,020,000.00
M04	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	42,022,864.26	129.35	20,003,667.78	61.57	32,487,995.00
M08	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	109,595,249.04	102.71	78,383,182.54	73.46	106,701,263.00
M10	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	134,764,888.46	50.50	113,305,427.05	42.46	266,870,570.00
M11	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	14,969,756.49	136.28	10,838,826.09	98.67	10,984,635.00
M13	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	156,044,241.34	62.07	151,555,627.80	60.28	251,400,000.00
M15	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	13,904,897.58	57.96	13,122,048.03	54.70	23,989,537.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			0.00	0.00	5,160,000.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	474,805,783.33	67.35	389,671,868.60	55.27	704,974,000.00

Focus Area 5B							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
Number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (Number of participants trained)		2014-2018					1,000.00
		2014-2017					
		2014-2016					
		2014-2015					
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			0.00	0.00	360,000.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	1,694,695.58	48.28	1,206,480.20	34.37	3,510,000.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	114,494.00	31.80	20,780.84	5.77	360,000.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	1,809,189.58	42.77	1,227,261.04	29.01	4,230,000.00

Focus Area 5D							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T18: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts targeting reduction of GHG and/or ammonia emissions (focus area 5D)		2014-2018			18.27	78.81	23.18
		2014-2017			13.76	59.35	
		2014-2016			10.88	46.93	
		2014-2015			10.88	46.93	
T17: percentage of LU concerned by investments in live-stock management in view of reducing GHG and/or ammonia emissions (focus area 5D)		2014-2018			0.01	0.76	1.32
		2014-2017					
		2014-2016					
		2014-2015					
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	561,746.00	40.49	730,913.79	52.69	1,387,200.00
M04	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	139,261.00	2.46	73,486.91	1.30	5,670,943.00
M10	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	11,781,111.00	40.49	10,353,564.57	35.59	29,092,800.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	12,482,118.00	34.53	11,157,965.27	30.86	36,150,943.00

Focus Area 5E							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T19: percentage of agricultural and forest land under management contracts contributing to carbon sequestration and conservation (focus area 5E)		2014-2018			13.23	81.99	16.14
		2014-2017			10.12	62.72	
		2014-2016			8.71	53.98	
		2014-2015			8.70	53.92	
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M08	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	117,295,007.36	54.39	73,941,645.13	34.29	215,640,000.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	685,246.00	76.14	82,114.48	9.12	900,000.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	117,980,253.36	54.48	74,023,759.61	34.18	216,540,000.00

Focus Area 6A							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T20: Jobs created in supported projects (focus area 6A)		2014-2018			17.00	100.00	17.00
		2014-2017			17.00	100.00	
		2014-2016			17.00	100.00	
		2014-2015			17.00	100.00	
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M04	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			0.00	0.00	480,000.00
M06	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	1,277,950.78	68.77	1,546,768.36	83.24	1,858,230.00
M08	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	949,391.92	131.86	912,586.67	126.75	720,000.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	2,227,342.70	72.83	2,459,355.03	80.42	3,058,230.00

Focus Area 6B							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T23: Jobs created in supported projects (Leader) (focus area 6B)		2014-2018			18.00	3.27	551.00
		2014-2017					
		2014-2016					
		2014-2015					
T22: percentage of rural population benefiting from improved services/infrastructures (focus area 6B)		2014-2018			2.61	25.75	10.14
		2014-2017			1.33	13.12	
		2014-2016					
		2014-2015					
T21: percentage of rural population covered by local development strategies (focus area 6B)		2014-2018			86.76	100.01	86.76
		2014-2017			86.76	100.01	
		2014-2016			86.76	100.01	
		2014-2015			86.76	100.01	
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M07	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	13,093,623.00	93.16	7,392,930.29	52.60	14,054,358.00
M19	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	81,718,845.43	83.05	31,062,416.24	31.57	98,400,000.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	94,812,468.43	84.31	38,455,346.53	34.20	112,454,358.00

Focus Area 6C

Focus Area 6C							
Target indicator name		Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
T24: percentage of rural population benefiting from new or improved services/infrastructures (ICT) (focus area 6C)		2014-2018					0.88
		2014-2017					
		2014-2016					
		2014-2015					
Measure	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
M07	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			0.00	0.00	10,800,000.00
Total	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			0.00	0.00	10,800,000.00

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

This is the fourth Annual Implementation Report (AIR) on the Scotland Rural Development Programme (SRDP) 2014-2020 and it covers the calendar year 2018.

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

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

The Scottish Government's Agriculture and Rural Economy Directorate is responsible for the SRDP; the Agriculture Policy Division is the Managing Authority and the Agricultural Delivery Division (SGRPID) is the paying agency.

The SRDP 2014-2020 will be delivered by 15 schemes:

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

During 2018, all schemes, with the exception of the Broadband Scheme, approved and supported new projects under the 2014-2020 Programme. During 2018, the Broadband Scheme worked with one project, although this project was not formally approved. This remaining project subsequently withdrew from the process after failing to secure a fully sustainable bid. The reduced interest in the Broadband Scheme was as a result of the launch of the Scottish Government's R100 Broadband programme (€720 million national investment) which significantly reduced the need for community led broadband solutions funded by the SRDP 2014-2020.

During the 2014-2020 Programme period to date just under half of the realised expenditure has been for commitments made under the 2007-2013 Programme, when there were different reporting requirements. It has not therefore been possible to populate some of the monitoring tables with the required data. For example, for Measure 14 the number of livestock units supported is a reporting requirement for the 2014-2020 Programme. The expenditure under Measure 14 is an on-going commitment relating to Measure 215 from the 2007-2013 Programme. For Measure 215 there was no requirement to record the number of

livestock units supported. In addition, for some indicators the Scottish Government was not able to report the required requirements under the 2007-2013 Programme and this will continue to be the case for these on-going commitments.

Also, for the 2014-2020 Programme each LEADER project has to be allocated a predominant Focus Area. There is a different reporting requirement attached to each of the Focus Areas. All the LEADER projects that were funded as a result of on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme did not have a predominant Focus Area allocated to them. Therefore, for these 263 LEADER projects the data that should be used to monitor contributions to all of the predominant Focus Areas are not available.

Committed Expenditure

Table A shows that 13 of the 15 measures that are programmed as part of the SRDP 2014-2020 had expenditure committed against them during 2018. Measures 3 and 14 did not have any committed expenditure during 2018. Both of these measures are purely on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme and are not used by any of the schemes programmed as part of the SRDP 2014-2020. As a result, these commitments will reduce and start to end as the 2014-2020 Programme period progresses. Therefore it is to be expected that there was no expenditure committed for these two measures during 2018.

In 2018, there was a committed expenditure of €252.0 million. Of this expenditure 29% was committed to Measure 13, 28% to Measure 8 (over 90% of which has been committed to Sub-Measure 8.1), 15% to Measure 4, a further 11% to Measure 19, and 9% to Measure 10.

The Financial Annex of this report shows the total public expenditure (EAFRD and national funding) paid during 2018, as opposed to the expenditure that has been committed. In total there has been a realised expenditure of €197.1 million. Of the total realised expenditure, 37% (€72.5 million) was on Measure 13. With a further 21% (€41.7 million) of expenditure on Measure 8, 13% (€26.0 million) on Measure 4 and 12% (€23.9 million) on Measure 10.

Common and Programme-Specific Indicators

Focus Area 1A

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

From the start of the 2014-2020 Programme period until the end of 2018, there has been a total expenditure of approaching €2.5 million under Measure 1, just over €8.7 million under Measure 2 and a further €3.0 million under Measure 16.

During the five year period that the 2014-2020 Programme has been running there has been a total expenditure of almost €14.2 million under Measures 1, 2 and 16. This is 0.93% of the total planned expenditure of the Programme. This compares to a target value of 2.85%. Of the total expenditure for these three measures 20% has been due to commitments made under the 2007-2013 Programme.

As part of the third modification, the Programme co-financing rate was altered and the finance plan was updated. As a result the overall Programme budget decreased and the planned expenditure for Measures 1, 2 and 16 were revised. Therefore, the target for the percentage of expenditure under Measures 1, 2 and 16 in relation to the total planned expenditure of the Programme was changed from 3.78% to 2.85%.

Focus Area 1B

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

A number of schemes utilise Measure 16: the Crofting Agricultural Grant Scheme (CAGS), the Food Processing, Marketing and Co-operation (FPMC) Scheme, the Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS) and the Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF).

In 2018, four new EIP operational groups were supported by the KTIF and in total three new co-operation projects were supported. One by the FMPC Scheme and the other two by the FGS. During the five years of the Programme to date 20 co-operation operations have been supported under Measure 16. This is 8.73% of the target of supporting 229 co-operations.

As part of the third and fourth modifications of the Programme the planned output for the of co-operation operations to be supported were revised to 154, with 52 EIP operational groups to be supported and 102 co-operation projects to be supported. Along with budgetary changes, one of the reason for the revision was the removal of the Environmental Co-operation Action Fund from the Programme. At the end of 2018, 12.99% of the new planned output for the number of co-operation operations to be supported had been achieved.

Focus Area 1C

Under Focus Area 1C there is a target indicator to train 10,617 participants under Measure 1. It should be noted that individuals can be counted more than once if they participate in more than one training event. The target was exceeded in the first three years of the 2014-2020 Programme and at the end of 2018 14,683 participants have been trained, this is 138.30% of the target.

The majority of the training delivered has been as a result of commitments made under the previous Programme. The vast majority of which has been delivered by the KTIF through commitments made under the Skills Development Scheme (SDS), which is the predecessor to the KTIF. From 2017 onwards, all the training delivered by KTIF has been as a result of projects approved during the 2014-2020 Programme period. As a result of the different delivery mechanisms of the KTIF (through both Measures 1 and 16) compared to the SDS there has been a reduction in the number of participants trained between 2016 and 2018 compared to the first two years of the Programme period.

Due to the higher than anticipated level of training due to the on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme and that the same individual can be counted multiple times, the planned output indicator of the number of participants to be trained was increased to 22,118 from 10,617 as part of the third modification of the Programme. By the end of 2018, 66.38% of the new planned output for the number of participants to be trained had been met.

Focus Area 2A

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

Programme period.

In total, 2,905 agriculture holdings have been given support for investment in restructuring or modernisation so far, with 703 holdings being supported in 2018. This is 5.55% of the total number of agricultural holdings, with the target being to support 16.35% during the Programme. Almost two third thirds of the total number of holdings that have been supported so far have been supported though the CAGS (1,914 holdings supported).

As part of the third modification of the Programme the assumptions behind the planned output indicator for the number of agriculture holdings that will be supported for investment in restructuring or modernisation were re-examined based on what had happened during the first three years of the Programme. It was found that the estimated spend per holding, based on data from the 2007-2013 Programme, was lower than it actually was. As a result of this and a reduced budget available to support investment in restructuring or modernisation the planned output indicator was reduced from 8,553 to 4,888. This would be equivalent to supporting 9.34% of the total number of agriculture holdings. As a consequence it is unlikely that this target will come close to being achieved.

The Programme specific target is the number of participants trained under Measure 1. Under Focus Area 2A, Measure 1 will be primarily delivered by the KTIF but there will also be some on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme relating to RP and LMO. This Programme specific target was introduced as part of the third modification of the 2014-2020 Programme. Progress towards the target was first reported against in the 2017 Annual Implementation Report. As this Programme specific target was introduced as part of the third modification of the Programme, it takes into consideration in the increase in the planned output indicator for the number of participants that will trained under Focus Area 2A unlike the target for Focus Area 1C.

During the Programme period to date, 14,431 participants have been trained under Focus Area 2A. This compares to the target value of 20,118 participants being trained. This means that 71.73% of the target has been achieved by the end of 2018. Of the 14,431 participants trained almost 98% have been trained as a result of the KTIF. The remaining 299 participants that have been trained as a result of on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme. Again it should be noted that individuals can be counted more than once if they participate in more than one training event.

All of the six measures programmed under Focus Area 2A have had expenditure recorded against them. In total there has been a committed expenditure of €206.1 million and a realised expenditure of €193.7 million. Just over three quarters of both the committed and realised expenditure has been on Measure 13. The majority of the remaining committed and realised expenditure has been on Measures 4 (19% of the committed expenditure and 18% of the realised expenditure).

Focus Area 2B

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

By the end of 2018 support had been given to 263 young farmers. This is the 0.50% of the total number of agriculture holdings, compared to the target of 0.27%. The fact that the target has already been exceeded is a result of a much higher than anticipated uptake of the YFSUGS. This is illustrated by the fact that the uptake in the first three years of the Programme was greater than the anticipated uptake for the whole Programme

period. A higher than expected number of on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme has also contributed to the meeting the target this early in the Programme period. As a result of the higher than anticipated uptake, the third modification of the Programme increased the planned output indicator for the number of young farmers receiving start up aid from 143 to 283. This would be the equivalent of supporting 0.54% of the total number of agriculture holdings.

There are two measures, Measures 2 and 6, programmed under Focus Area 2B and both have had recorded expenditure during the 2014-2020 Programme period. Over 90% of both the committed and realised expenditure under Focus Area 2B has been on Measure 6. For Measure 6, there has been a committed expenditure of €14.0 million and a realised expenditure of €13.8 million. While, there has been a committed expenditure of €1.1 million and a realised expenditure of around €0.8 million for Measure 2.

Focus Area 3A

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

The vast majority of agricultural holdings that will receive support for participating in quality schemes, local markets and short supply chains, and producer groups/organisations will be funded through commitments that were made under the 2007-2013 Programme by the LMO Scheme. These commitments are decreasing and are starting to come to an end as the 2014-2020 Programme period progresses. The remaining few holdings will be supported by the FPMC Scheme, which has only supported two holdings so far.

The percentage of agricultural holdings that have received support for participating in quality schemes, local markets and short supply chains, and producer groups/organisations during the 2014-2020 Programme period is 14.69%. This compares to the target value of 15.54%. The percentage has not changed since 2016, as only one additional holding was supported during 2017 and no new holdings were supported during 2018.

Most of the holdings have been supported through commitments made during the 2007-2013 Programme via Measure 3. Measure 3 is not being supported by any of the new or continuing schemes that make up the SRDP 2014-2020. As a result it was expected that the target value would be close to being achieved in the first few years of the 2014-2020 Programme period.

The Programme specific target is based on the percentage of total agri-food businesses supported under Measure 4. By the end of 2018, 110 operations have been given support for investments in processing/marketing and/or development of agricultural products. All but two of these operations have been supported by the FPMC Scheme. The remaining two are commitments made under the 2007-2013 Programme made under the RP Scheme. This equates to 12.57% of the total number of agri-food business being supported, with the target being to support 13.00% during the lifetime of the Programme.

All four of the measures programmed under Focus Area 3A have had recorded expenditure during the 2014-2020 Programme period. In total there has been a committed expenditure of €71.4 million and a realised expenditure of €43.2 million. Of the committed expenditure 87% has been against Measure 4. The percentage of realised expenditure for Measure 4 is slightly higher at 83%.

Measures 3 and 14 are both not being supported by any of the new or continuing schemes that make up the SRDP 2014-2020. The on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme relating to these two measures will be coming to an end as will the associated expenditure. As a result it is to be expected that

both the committed and realised expenditures for both these measures are over 90% at this stage of the Programme.

Focus Area 3B

There are no target indicators or Programme specific target indicator for Focus Area 3B. There is one Programme specific output indicator relating to the number of beneficiaries advised by the FAS under Measure 2. The FAS was launched in 2016 but advice was first delivered to beneficiaries in 2017. In 2017 and 2018, a total of 4,087 beneficiaries have been advised under Measure 2. This compares to the planned output of advising 8,445 beneficiaries being during the lifetime of the Programme. Please note that the same beneficiary can be advised multiple times, with each contributing towards achieving the overall planned output.

There is only one measure programmed under Focus Area 3B, the measure being Measure 2. Measure 2 has had both committed and realised expenditure. The level of this expenditure has been low, with €0.6 million being committed and €0.4 being realised.

Priority 4

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

Agriculture:

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

The Agri-Environment Climate Scheme (AECS) will fund all the agricultural land under management contracts that will contribute to these three targets. All of agricultural land that was under management during the first three years of the Programme was due to on-going commitments made under the 2007-2013 Programme. However, in 2017, agricultural land started to be under management as the result of the AECS. In addition to the agricultural land under management via Measure 10, the agricultural land under management via Measure 11 will also contribute to the targets supporting biodiversity and soil management.

By the end of 2018, 1,092,060 ha of agricultural land had been under management contracts that support biodiversity. This means that 19.66% of agricultural land is under management compared to the target of 22.73%. Over 85% of the target has been achieved to date.

The target for the agricultural land under management contracts to improve water management has been more than 80% achieved. With 16.30% (905,605 ha) of agricultural land under managements compared to the target of 19.80%.

The area of agricultural land under management contacts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion is 994,961 ha. This is 17.91% of the total agricultural land, compared to a target of 19.13%. Of the three agricultural land indicators the target to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion is the closet to being achieved, with 94% of the target agricultural land being under management by the end of

2018.

Forest:

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

The same forest/other wooded area under management contracts contribute to the three forestry related target indicators under Priority 4. In relation to these three indicators the forest/other wooded area under management contracts is the:

- Area of forest to be established under Sub-Measure 8.1;
- Area of forest to be established in agro-forestry systems under Sub-Measure 8.2;
- Area concerned by investments improving resilience and environmental value of forest ecosystems under Measure 8.5; and
- Area under forest environment contract under Sub-Measure 15.1.

It does not include the area of forest that is maintained under Sub-Measures 8.1 and 8.2 on an annual basis.

The majority of the forestry land under management will be funded by the FGS, along with on-going forestry commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme. There will also be some additional forest land under management as a result of the AECS. Forestry land was under management as a result of the FGS for the first time in 2016. In the first two years of the Programme, the land under forestry management was all as a result of the on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme.

In total, 65,947 ha of forestry land has been under management contracts during the 2014-2020 Programme period. This is 4.68% of the total forest and other wooded land. The target percentage for all three of the forestry target indicators is 37.99%. Only limited progress has been made towards these targets. As the FGS funds more projects and these new projects, as well as existing projects, start to be fully implemented it is anticipated that more progress will be made toward achieving these three targets.

There are nine measures programmed under Priority 4, of which eight have had expenditure so far. By the end of 2018 there had been no committed or realised expenditure for Measure 16 under Priority 4. There has been a committed expenditure of €474.8 million and a realised expenditure of €389.7 million. Just under half of the committed expenditure and half of the realised expenditure has been for Priority 4, with high levels of committed and realised expenditure for Measures 8, 10 and 13.

It should be noted that the committed expenditures for Measures 4 and 8 are higher than the current planned expenditure for the whole Programme period. Committed expenditure does not necessarily become realised expenditure, with the realised expenditure for Measure 4 currently at 62% and 73% for Measure 8. The levels of commitment and realised expenditure for these two measures will be monitored going forward. Whether to change the planned expenditure for them will be considered when the programme undergoes future review.

The realised expenditure for Measure 11 is also greater than the current planned expenditure for the Programme period but the realised expenditures is also 99% of the planned expenditure. Measure 11 is the conversions to and maintenance of organic farming practices and methods. The popularity of this measure

and organic farming has been higher than anticipated at the start of the Programme. This will be taken into consideration when the programme undergoes future review.

Focus Area 5A

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

Focus Area 5B

There is one Programme specific target indicator for Focus Area 5B, which is the number of participants trained under Measure 1. Measure 1 will be delivered by the KTIF.

In the initial years of the 2014-2020 Programme period, the KTIF expenditure was predominately on on-going commitments made by the SDS under the 2007-2013 Programme, and this expenditure was solely under Focus Area 2A. By the end of 2018, the KTIF expenditure under Measure 1 was almost exclusively under Focus Area 2A, apart from a small amount under Priority 4 relating to one project. As a result there had been no participants trained under Measure 1 for Focus Area 5B by the end of 2018.

At the start of the 2014-2020 Programme the KTIF Project Assessment Committee (PAC) was established. The remit of the KTIF PAC was to consider and determine applications for assistance under KTIF, including the level of grant and any conditions to be imposed. As well as to monitor the operation of the Scheme and consider any adjustments needed to achieve its objectives more effectively.

In late 2017, the KTIF Project Assessment Committee (PAC) undertook a review of KTIF, with particular focus on the use of the remaining scheme budget. The PAC agreed on a number of guidelines for future projects:

- Restricted to a maximum grant award of €120,000;
- Up to one year duration; and
- Innovation projects (Measure 16) only should be considered, There would be no further skills and knowledge transfer projects (Measure 1) approved.

As a result, progress towards achieving the target of training 1,000 participants under Focus Area 5B will not be made. The findings of the PAC review and the guidelines agreed upon will be taken into consideration when the programme undergoes future review.

There are currently three measures programmed under Focus Area 5B, but only Measures 2 and 16 has had any committed or realised expenditure to date. There has been no expenditure associated with Measure 1. The level of this expenditure has been low, with €1.7 million being committed and €1.2 being realised for Measure 2. While for Measure 16 there has been a committed expenditure of just over €0.1 million and a realised expenditure of just over €20,000.

Focus Area 5C

Following the third modification of the Programme, no measures and therefore expenditure are programmed under Focus Area 5C in the 2014-2020 SRDP.

Focus Area 5D

For Focus Area 5D there are two target indicators one relating to livestock units (LU) and the other to

agricultural land under management contracts.

The LU target indicator is the percentage of LU concerned by investments in livestock management in view of reducing Greenhouse Gas (GHG) and/or ammonia emissions. This is being delivered by the AECS under Measure 4. While over 80 operations have been approved for support only two operations had been financially supported by the end of 2018. By the end of 2018, 149 LU were under management with a view of reducing GHG and/or ammonia emissions. This is 0.01% of the total LUs and this compares to the target value of 1.32%.

As part of the third modification of the Programme, the planned number of operations that will support investment in livestock management with the aim of reducing GHG and/or ammonia emissions was reduced. As a consequence the expected number of LU that will be concerned by investments in livestock management with a view to reducing emissions has been reduced from 28,800 to 6,912. If the revised planned output was met this would equate to 0.32% of LU being concerned by investments in livestock management in view of reducing GHG and/or ammonia emissions. Therefore, it is unlikely that the original target value of 1.32% will be achieved. In future years of the Programme progress should be made towards having 0.32% of LU under management with a view of reducing GHG and/or ammonia emissions as more of the approved projects are implemented.

The other target indicator is for the percentage of agricultural land under management contracts which targets the reduction of GHG and/or ammonia emissions. The agricultural land under management contracts that contributes to this target is the land under management contracts as a result of the Beef Efficiency Scheme (BES) as well as relevant agricultural land under management funded under Priority 4. The BES was launched in 2016 and the first payments were made to beneficiaries in 2017. During 2018, 108,322 ha of agricultural land were under management contracts which targets the reduction of GHG and/or ammonia emissions as a result of the BES.

The vast majority of agricultural land under management contracts that contributes towards achieving this target is funded under Priority 4. This will be via AECS as well as on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme. By the end of 2018, 906,482 ha of agricultural land were management contracts which targets the reduction of GHG and/or ammonia emissions as a result of commitments made under Priority 4.

During the Programme period to date, 1,014,0804 ha of agricultural land has been under management contracts which targets the reduction of GHG and/or ammonia emissions, 18.27% of the total agricultural land. This is over three quarters of the target value of 23.18% of total agricultural land.

There are three measures programmed under Focus Area 5D, all of which have had expenditure recorded against them. For Measure 10 there has been a committed expenditure of €11.8 million and a realised expenditure of €10.4 million. This is over 90% of both of the committed and realised expenditure for Focus Area 5D. The levels of committed and realised expenditure for Measures 2 and 4 have been much lower, particularly for Measure 4.

Focus Area 5E

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

In the first three years of the 2014-2020 Programme, all the agricultural land that was under management contacts that contributed to carbon sequestration and conservation was due to on-going commitments made under the 2007-2013 Programme. There was agricultural land under management contacts contributing to carbon sequestration as a result of the AECS for the first time during 2017. By the end of 2018 there were 904,835 ha of agricultural land under management contacts contributing to carbon sequestration.

There were 17,037 ha of forestry land under management contacts that contribute to carbon sequestration and conservation by the end of 2018. Of this 17,037 ha, 56% were under management as a result of the FGS with the remaining 44% were due to on-going forestry commitments made under the 2007-2013 Programme.

In total, 921,872 ha of agricultural and forest land have been under management contacts and are contributing to carbon sequestration and conservation. This is 13.23% of the total agricultural and forest land. This compares to the target value of 16.14%. This means that over 80% of the target has been achieved so far during the Programme period.

The two measures programmed under Focus Area 5E are Measures 8 and 16. Under this Focus Area both measures relate to the FGS, or on-going forestry related commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme. For Measure 8 there has been a committed expenditure of €117.3 million and a realised expenditure of €73.9 million. This is over 99% of the committed and realised expenditure associated with this Focus Area. While for Measure 16 the level of expenditure have been much lower, there has been a committed expenditure of €0.7 million and a realised expenditure of just over €82,000.

Focus Area 6A

The target indicator for Focus Area 6A is the number of jobs created in supported projects. The target was to create 17 jobs during the 2014-2020 Programme and 17 jobs were created in supported projects by the end of 2015. This target solely relates to commitments made under the previous Programme which will lessen and then stop as the 2014-2020 Programme period progresses. That is why the target was reached within the first two years of the 2014-2020 Programme period.

There are three measures programmed under Focus Area 6A, but only two of which have had expenditure to date. For Measure 6, there has been a committed expenditure of €1.3 million and a realised expenditure of €1.5 million.

There has been a committed and realised expenditure of €0.9 million for Measure 8, with the level of commitment marginally higher. The committed and realised expenditure for Measure 8 are both greater than the planned expenditure for the whole Programme period. The level of interest in this measure has been greater than originally anticipated. By the end of 2018 more operations had been supported for investments in forestry technologies and in processing, mobilising and marketing of forest products than was anticipated during the whole Programme period, 37 operations compared to the forecasted 34 operations. This will be taken into consideration when the programme undergoes future review.

Measure 4 was programmed under Focus Area 6A as part of the third modification of the SRDP 2014-2020. There has yet to be any committed or realised expenditure associated with Measure 4 under Focus Area 6A.

Focus Area 6B

There are three target indicators under Focus Area 6B, two of which relate to LEADER. The LEADER focused target indicators are the percentage of the rural population covered by local development strategies

and the number of jobs created in projects supported by LEADER.

The 21 Local Actions Groups (LAGs) supported by the SRDP 2014-2020 cover a rural population of 2,100,000. This is equivalent to 86.76% of the total rural population and meets the target set for the percentage of the rural population to be covered by local development strategies.

LEADER supported projects created jobs for the first time during 2018. In total 233 jobs were created by supported projects. This compares to the target of creating 551 jobs during the 2014-2020 Programme period. At the end of 2018, 42.29% of the target had been achieved. Of the 233 people newly employed by LEADER supported projects 11 were female and seven were male. For the other 215 jobs created the gender of the employee was not available.

The third target indicator relates to the Improving Public Access (IPA) Scheme and is the percentage of the rural population benefiting from improved services/infrastructure. In this case the support for new and upgraded paths for public use. By the end of 2018, the projects that have been supported by the IPA Scheme had benefited 63,100 people. This is equivalent to 2.61% of the rural population benefiting from improved services/infrastructure, compared to the target 10.14% of the rural population.

As part of the third modification of the Programme the planned number of operations that will be supported by the IPA Scheme was reduced from 164 to 144. As a result the planned output for the rural population benefiting from improved services/infrastructure was also decreased from 245,376 to 215,452. If the planned 215,452 of the rural population do benefit from improved services/infrastructure as a result of the IPA Scheme this would be equivalent to 8.90% of the rural population.

There are two measures programmed under Focus Area 6B, both of which have expenditure recorded against them. For Measure 19 there has been a committed expenditure of €81.7 million and a realised expenditure of €31.1 million. This is over 80% of both the committed and realised expenditure for Focus Area 6B. For Measure 7 there has been a committed expenditure of €13.1 million and a realised expenditure of €7.4 million.

The level of committed expenditure for LEADER projects under Measure 19 has been high and as these projects are implemented the expenditure will become realised. The same is true for the IPA Scheme under Measure 7.

Focus Area 6C

The target indicator under Focus Area 6C relates to the Broadband Scheme and the percentage of the rural population benefiting from new or improved services/infrastructures on Information and Communications Technology (ICT).

While the Broadband Scheme has worked with a five projects during the 2014-2020 Programme period none of the projects have reached the stage of applying for, and therefore being approved for, the capital costs associated with the building and installing of the community broadband solutions. As a result, no one in the rural population of Scotland has actually benefited from new or improved services/infrastructures on ICT. Therefore, no progress has been made towards achieving the target of 0.88% of the rural population benefiting from new or improved services/infrastructures on ICT.

Only Measure 7 is programmed under Focus Area 6C and all of the expenditure will be related to the Broadband Scheme. Although the Broadband Scheme has worked with five projects there has been no

committed or realised expenditure in relation to these projects.

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

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

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

As part of the fifth modification of the Programme, approved by the EC in December 2018, two of the Performance Framework Indicator 2018 milestone percentages were altered:

- **Priority 5 – Total Public Expenditure – Milestone altered from 40% to 30%**

It was initially believed that a target of realising 40% of the total public expenditure by the end of 2018 was achievable based on evidence from the 2007-2013 Programme and plans for new schemes under Priority 5. Some of the assumption used to set the 2018 milestone percentage proved to be incorrect, particularly with regard to the Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS).

There was a slower than anticipated uptake of the FGS. This was due to, firstly, the delay of the approval of the SRDP 2014-2020 and secondly the time and cost associated with an applicant compiling a woodland creation grant application. From starting an application it can take up to a year before it is submitted. Following this there is also a time lag between the contract being approved and the associated expenditure starting to be incurred. This has a large impact for forestry contracts as payments can take up to 10 months to be made following the work being carried out and the claim being submitted.

The length of forestry contracts and their annual recurrent element was also not taken into consideration when the milestone percentage was being set. This meant that the assumptions were based on the level of commitments, rather than actual expenditure. Additionally, the economic impact of the UK referendum on EU membership and variations in exchange rates impacted on the ability to achieve the original 2018 milestone.

As a result of these factors, the 2018 milestone percentage was amended to 30% as part of the fifth modification of the Programme.

- **Priority 6 – Total Public Expenditure – Milestone altered from 35% to 30%**

It was expected that both LEADER and the Broadband Scheme, the majority of Priority 6 expenditure, would have activity and associated expenditure from early 2015. As a result, it was believed that a 2018 milestone percentage of 35% was achievable.

The LEADER programme was launched in March 2016, a year later than anticipated. This unforeseen late start of the LEADER programme was due to the delayed approval of the SRDP 2014-2020, additionally the UK referendum result in 2016 had varying impacts across the LEADER landscape with some Local Action Group (LAG) areas pausing or slowing their programme delivery due to the uncertainties around EU funds. This in turn delayed the expenditure associated with LEADER.

In addition, there has been low interest in the Broadband Scheme due to the Scottish Government's Reaching 100 (R100) initiative which was launched around the same time as the Broadband Scheme. It has taken time for the benefits of the R100 initiative to become clear which meant that rural communities that were potentially interested in the Broadband Scheme chose to wait to see which funding avenue was more suitable. As a result there has been no realised expenditure for the Broadband Scheme by the end of 2018.

As for Priority 5, the economic impact of the UK referendum on EU membership and variations in exchange rates also impacted on the ability to achieve the 2018 milestone.

As a result of these factors, the 2018 milestone percentage was amended to 30%, as part of the fifth modification of the Programme.

Priority 2

The first indicator for Priority 2 is the 'Total Public Expenditure'. By the end of 2018 there had been a realised expenditure of €208.2 million, this 61.59% of the target. The 2018 milestone of 40% had already been achieved by the end of 2017. As projects are continued to be supported under Priority 2 for the rest of the Programme period continued progress towards the 2023 target should be made with the aim of achieving the 2023 target.

The second indicator for Priority 2 is the 'Number of agricultural holdings with RDP support for investment in restructuring or modernisation (Focus Area 2A) and the Number of holdings with RDP supported business development plan/investment for young farmers (Focus Area 2B)'. In the period from 2014 till 2018, 3,168 holdings have been supported. Of this over 90% (2,905 holdings) have been supported for investment in restructuring or modernisation and 263 have been supported for business development plan/investment for young farmers. This is 61.26% of the target to support 5,171 holdings during the lifetime of the Programme. The 2018 milestone for this target is 40%, the milestone had also been met by the end of 2017. With nearly two thirds of the 2023 target having already been met the overall target is also on track to be met.

It should be noted that as part of the third modification the planned outputs for the both the number of agricultural holdings with RDP support for investment in restructuring or modernisation and the number of holdings with RDP supported business development plan/investment for young farmers were revised. The planned output for supporting holdings for investment in restructuring or modernisation was reduced from 8,553 to 4,888. While the planned output for supporting business development plan/investment for young farmers was increased from 143 to 283.

The third indicator for Priority 2 is the first of the Alternative Indicators and it is the 'Area supported under Measure 13 (Focus Area 2A)'. There is a similar Alternative Indicator for Priority 4. In Scotland, Measure 13 is currently delivered by the Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS). The scheme is an area based

scheme where land has to be designated as less favoured to be eligible to receive support. The target area to be supported is 1,400,000 ha and during the Programme period to date, 1,169,204 ha have been supported. An additional 2,552 ha were supported in 2018. This is 83.51% of the target and compares to the 2018 milestone value of 90%. The 2018 milestone percentage was set at an ambitious level. By the end of 2018, 92.79% of the 2018 milestone had been achieved. The high level of uptake in the initial years of the 2014-2020 Programme can be attributed to the scheme being well established having been carried forward from the previous Programme period. Since then progress towards the 2023 target and 2018 milestone has slowed.

As this Priority includes three indicators, one of those indicators may have reached 75% of its milestone to deem the Priority as having achieved success in relation to its 2018 milestones. Therefore, as two of the indicators have achieved their milestone targets, with the third having reached 92.79%, Priority 2 has met the necessary criteria for achievement in relation to the Performance Framework.

Priority 3

The first indicator for Priority 3 is the 'Total Public Expenditure'. From the start of Programme period there has been a realised expenditure of €43.6 million, this 49.98% of the 2023 target. The 2018 milestone of this indicator is 30%, the milestone for this indicator had been achieved by the end of 2017.

Most of the realised expenditure for Priority 3 in the initial years of the 2014-2020 Programme period was the result of commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme under the Food Processing, Marketing and Co-operation (FPMC) and Land Manager Options (LMO) Schemes. The commitments relating to LMO under Measures 3 and 14 are purely transitional ones. As would be expected most of the realised expenditure that will be associated with these commitments has come in the early years of the 2014-2020 Programme. The remaining future expenditure will be as a result of new commitments made under the popular FPMC Scheme. Almost half of the 2023 target has been achieved by the end of 2018. It is expected that continued progress towards achieving the 2023 target will be made in future years.

The second indicator for Priority 3 is 'Number of supported agricultural holdings receiving support for participating in quality schemes, local markets/short supply circuits, and producer groups (Focus Area 3A)'. With the introduction of the new Alternative Indicator as part of the third modification of the Programme, the only contributor to this indicator is now the number of holdings that will be supported for co-operation among supply chain actors for the establishment and development of short supply chains and local markets, and for promotion activities under Sub-Measure 16.4 by the FPMC Scheme. The 2023 target is to support four holdings. No new holdings were supported during 2018 but during the life of the Programme two holdings have been supported. Therefore, 50% of the target has been achieved. This compares to the 2018 milestone of 40%, meaning that the milestone has been met.

The number of co-operation projects to be supported throughout the 2014-2020 Programme was reduced from 29 to four as part of the third modification of the Programme. The number of co-operation projects to be supported was reduced as expenditure was originally only to be programmed under Sub-Measure 16.4 for the FPMC Scheme. In the approved version of the Programme the expenditure was split between Sub-Measures 16.2 and 16.3 as well as Sub-Measure 16.4. However, the number of co-operation projects to be supported under Sub-Measure 16.4 was not similarly adjusted. This was corrected as part of the third modification of the Programme. In addition, there has been less interest in applying for co-operation projects in the initial period of the 2014-2020 Programme so the planned number of co-operation projects to be supported was reduced accordingly.

The third indicator for Priority 3 is an Alternative Indicator and it is 'Number of operations supported for

investment (Focus Area 3A)'. There have been 110 operations supported for investment since the start of the 2014-2020 Programme, this is 90.16% of the overall target of 122 operations. The overall target for the number of operations to be supported was increased from 115 to 122 as part of the third modification of the Programme. The 2018 milestone value for this target is 30%, which was exceeded by the end of 2016. This is due to the high number of on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme. With 90% of the the 2023 target having already been achieved and the popularity of the FPMC Scheme it is anticipated that the target will be achieved well in advance of 2023.

The fourth indicator for Priority 3 and the second Alternative Indicator is the 'Cumulative number of holdings supported (Focus Area 3A)'. The indicator was introduced as part of the third modification of the Programme to complement the indicator for the 'Number of supported agricultural holdings receiving support for participating in quality schemes, local markets/short supply circuits, and producer groups (Focus Area 3A)'. Apart from the four holdings that it is anticipated that will be supported under Sub-Measure 16.4 by the FPMC Scheme, all of the agricultural holdings that will receive support for participating in quality schemes, local markets and short supply chains, and producer groups/organisations will be funded under Measure 3. This support is through commitments that were made under the 2007-2013 Programme. These annual recurrent commitments were high in the initial years of the Programme, especially in 2014. They are starting to come to an end and in future year will end completely. As a result there will be no holdings supported under Measure 3 in the latter part of the 2014-2020 Programme period as Measure 3 is not being used for any new commitments under the 2014-2020 Programme. So that the holdings that have been supported under Measure 3 in the initial years of the 2014-2020 Programme period can be recognised and monitored this cumulative indicator was added.

There have been 7,683 holdings supported under Measure 3 during the 2014-2020 Programme period, with no new holdings being supported in either 2017 or 2018. It is not anticipated that any additional holdings will be supported under Measure 3. Therefore, the 2023 target was to support 7,683 holdings. Based on this the 2018 milestone was set to the high level of 90% of the overall target. With no new holdings expecting to be supported under Measure 3 for the remainder of the Programme period both the 2018 milestone and 2023 target have been met.

As all four indicators have achieved their milestone targets, Priority 3 has met the criteria for achievement in relation to the Performance Framework.

Priority 4

The first indicator for Priority 4 is the 'Total Public Expenditure'. There has been a realised expenditure of €389.7 million between 2014 and 2015, this 56.23% of the target. This compares to a 2018 milestone value of 40%. As most of the expenditure for Priority 4 relates to annual recurrent payments, Measures 8, 10, 11, 13 and 15, it is to be expected that good progress towards the 2023 target has been made. In addition, the 2018 milestone was achieved by the end of 2017.

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

new ones come into effect.

During the life of the 2014-2020 Programme, 1,273,899 ha have been under management that contribute to this Indicator. This is 95.56% of the overall target of 1,333,100 ha and compares to a 2018 milestone of 40%. The 2018 milestone has been reached and the 2023 target has almost been achieved, this is due to the large number of on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme. The 2023 Target was increased by 70,100 ha as part of the third modification of the Programme.

The third indicator for Priority 4 is an Alternative Indicators and it is the 'Area supported under Measure 13 (Priority 4)'. As seen previously, there is a similar Alternative Indicator for Priority 2. In Scotland, Measure 13 is currently delivered by the Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS). The scheme is an area based scheme where land has to be designated as less favoured to be eligible to receive support. The target area to be supported is 1,400,000 ha and during the Programme period to date, 1,169,204 ha have been supported. An additional 2,552 ha were supported in 2018. This is 83.51% of the target and compares to the 2018 milestone value of 90%. The 2018 milestone percentage was set at an ambitious level. By the end of 2018, 92.79% of the 2018 milestone had been achieved. The high level of uptake in the initial years of the 2014-2020 Programme can be attributed to the scheme being well established having being carried forward from the previous Programme period. Since then progress towards the 2023 target and 2018 milestone has slowed.

As this Priority includes three indicators, one of those indicators may have reached 75% of its milestone to deem the Priority as having success achieved success in relation to its milestones. Therefore, as two of the indicators have achieved the milestone target, with the third having reached 92.79%, Priority 4 has met the necessary criteria for achievement in relation to the Performance Framework.

Priority 5

The first indicator for Priority 5 is the 'Total Public Expenditure'. By the end of 2018 there has been a realised expenditure of €86.4 million, this 33.63% of the target. As discussed previously, as part of the fifth modification of the Programme the milestone percentage for this indicator was changed from 40% to 30%. As a result the 2018 milestone has now been achieved. Over three quarter of the planned expenditure for Priority 5 will be through the FGS. Due to the length and annual recurrent nature of the FGS contracts it takes time for any expenditure to be fully realised once it is committed. But as the Programme period continues more of the expenditure associated with the FGS commitments will be realised. This will allow continued progresses towards achieving the 2023 target to be made.

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

By the end of 2018, 102,622 ha of land was under management, 90% of which was as a result of the Beef Efficiency Scheme. The remaining area is under forestry management, either as a result of on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme or the FGS. This is 86.78% of the total area that is planned to be supported by 2023. As the 2018 milestone value is 40% of the overall target the milestone has now been met. As more area becomes under forestry management progress towards the achieving the 2023 target will continue to be made.

The 2023 target for this indicator was reduced from 202,600 ha to 139,000 ha as part of the third

modification of the Programme. The forestry area that is planned to be supported actually increased by 2,400 ha, while the area to be supported by the BES decreased from 168,000 ha to 102,000 ha. The reduction in the supported area for BES is due to lower than anticipated uptake of the scheme.

As both of the indicators have achieved their milestone targets, Priority 5 has met the criteria for achievement in relation to the Performance Framework.

Priority 6

The first indicator for Priority 6 is the 'Total Public Expenditure'. During the Programme period to date there has been a realised expenditure of €40.9 million, this 32.39% of the target. As for the 'Total Public Expenditure' indicator for Priority 5, the 2018 milestone percentage was changed as part of the fifth modification of the Programme, with it being changed to 30%. As a result, the milestone has now been achieved. As existing and new LEADER projects continue to incur expenditure progress towards achieving the 2023 target will continue to be made in future years of the Programme.

The second indicator for Priority 6 is the 'Number of operations supported to improve basic services and infrastructure in rural areas (Focus Areas 6B and 6C)'. These operations will be supported as a result of the Improving Public Access (IPA) and Broadband Schemes but the majority of the operations supported will be due to on-going commitments from the 2007-2013 Programme. By the end of 2018, 1,147 holdings had been supported. This is 91.10% of the 2023 target of supporting 1,259 holdings and compared to a 2018 milestone of 35%. In 2018, all but one of the 22 projects were supported through the IPA scheme. The remaining project being an on-going commitment from the 2007-2013 Programme. By the end of 2018 no projects had been supported by the Broadband Scheme.

Of the 1,147 projects that have been supported all but 40 of them have been as a result of commitments made under the 2007-2013 Programme. The number of on-going commitments from 2007-2013 Programme has been much higher than originally anticipated. As these commitments are a result of the previous Programme most of the holdings have been supported at the beginning of the 2014-2020 Programme period. The 2023 target was increased from supporting 1,058 holdings to 1,259 holdings as part of the third modification of the Programme. This was due to the higher than expected number of commitments from 2007-2013 Programme.

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

As all three indicators have achieved their milestone targets, Priority 6 has met the criteria for achievement in relation to the Performance Framework.

1.e) Other RDP specific element [optional]

Not applicable.

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

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

Scotland has taken an active role in the development of the Atlantic Sea basin strategy and shares the Commission's objectives of ensuring the water around Scotland contributes to sustainable economic growth. While the Scottish RDP and Atlantic Strategy can contribute to the same measures, Scottish National Performance Framework outcomes and wider United Nations Sustainable Development Goals there is a degree of separation as these are delivered by a separate UK Managing Authority and Intermediate Body.

The SRDP is contributing through LEADER and agri-environment climate scheme (AECS) by providing support for investment in coastal embankment breaching, lowering or removal and support for the conservation of coastal heaths and coastal floodplains. These are complementary to the Atlantic Sea basin strategy.

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

1.f1) ATLSBS

Priority(s) and objective(s) that the programme is relevant to:

Actions or mechanisms used to better link the programme with the Atlantic SBS

A. Are the Sea Basin Strategic coordinators (mainly National Coordinators, Priority Area Coordinators or members, and/or Objective coordinators or members) participating in the Monitoring Committee of the programme?

Yes No

B. In selection criteria, have extra points been attributed to specific measures supporting the ATLSBS?

Yes No

C. Has the programme invested EU funds in the ATLSBS?

Yes No

D. Obtained results in relation to the ATLSBS (n.a. for 2016)

--

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

The exchange rate used in relation to the SRDP 2014-2020 is £1 to €1.2.

2. THE PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE EVALUATION PLAN.

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

There were no modifications to the evaluation plan during 2018.

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

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

In addition during 2018, meetings were held with policy and delivery leads for all the SRDP 2014-2020 schemes. The meetings were used to identify any areas where data were not being collected as well as identify areas where additional data was already being collected. The impact of the different schemes were also discussed. The merit of conducting any additional evaluations of individual or groups of schemes was also discussed. The results of these discussions have started to be implemented during 2019.

The Scottish Rural Network (SRN) had previously worked with stakeholders to prepare a Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit for Local Action Groups (LAG) to help them ensure that their own Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) frameworks are fit for purpose. This guidance was re-promoted in the early stages of 2018 to the LAG community.

To encourage learning and sharing of best practice the SRN funded two Scottish LAG members to attend the Evaluation Good Practice Workshop (Showing the added value of LEADER/CLLD through evaluation) in May 2018 in Helsinki. SRN communicated the launch of the Farnet Evaluation Handbook for LAGS and FLAGS (launched at the Helsinki event) through various channels and this was followed up with a facilitated discussion at the next LAG Staff meeting (May 2018 in Shetland), where SRN proposed a Scottish LAG M&E Working Group be formed to support learning and sharing of best practice across the Scottish LAG community - this was unanimously agreed.

SRN also promoted the Evaluation Helpdesk Capacity-building Workshop held in Llandudno, Wales in September 2018 to the LAG community and supported Scottish LAG attendance. On the back of this workshop, SRN hosted a scoping event with LAG coordinators to identify opportunities for a LEADER Monitoring and Evaluation Cooperation Project amongst LAG's to evaluate Local Development Strategies in Scotland, which would have included the impact of LEADER. However, LAG's were reluctant to take ownership of a cooperation project and the proposal was not taken forward.

SRN then hosted and facilitated the first LEADER Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group meeting in November where LAG coordinators discussed and agreed the scope and remit of the group. As a result SRN arranged for a Monitoring and Evaluation Yammer group to be set up to facilitate discussion amongst LAGs. This puts the onus firmly on the Scottish LAG community to engage with each other and exchange learning, share best practice (processes, approach, etc) in order to use common criteria and techniques.

Preparation work for an independent evaluation of the Scottish Rural Network and the Network Support Unit was commenced in the last quarter of calendar year 2018. Once the proposal document is complete it will be submitted for Ministerial approval and when granted, the work will be put out to tender. This evaluation will provide an independent assessment of the value of the networking activity undertaken through the auspices of the SRN and the quality of its delivery by the Network Support Unit as part of the Scottish Rural Development Programme.

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

The programme of work, that began early in the 2014-2020 Programme period, continues to ensure that the right systems are in place and that the right information is collected and can be used in a timely manner to inform progress of the programme.

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

Once captured, ICE makes this data available to the schemes through the ICE Reporting Hub. Reports that enable on-going scheme monitoring are now available. These reports provide data for AIRs and allow performance to be more easily reported as and when required.

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

Publisher/Editor	The Scottish Government
Author(s)	The Scottish Government
Title	Process Evaluation of LEADER 2014-2020
Abstract	Initial process evaluation for LEADER 2014-2020 and assessment of its economic, social, cultural and environmental impact on rural communities.
URL	https://www.gov.scot/publications/process-evaluation-leader-2014-2020/

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

There was one evaluation completed in 2018 – the Process Evaluation of LEADER 2014-2020.

The findings of the Process Evaluation of LEADER 2014-2020 were as follows:

The EU funded LEADER programme for rural communities aims to support local rural communities and business networks to build knowledge and skills, and encourage innovation and cooperation in order to tackle local development objectives. This report examines the impact of LEADER 2014-2020 on rural Scotland. It analyses quantitative evidence on budgets and spending of the 21 Scottish Local Action Groups (LAGs) that are responsible for the delivery and coordination of projects. Additionally, it evaluates qualitative evidence based on focus groups. Since the whole of the LEADER budget of €92.9 million has not been committed to projects yet, this paper does not claim to present a comprehensive impact evaluation but rather presents a snapshot of the programme as it is. The remaining €5.5 million of the overall LEADER budget of €98.4 million is being used to fund on-going commitments that were approved under the 2007-2013 Programme.

Policy Background

With the United Kingdom having aimed to exit the European Union on the 29 March 2019, EU programmes such as LEADER needed to be put to the test in order to evaluate to what extent these have had an impact on rural communities. LEADER follows a bottom-up approach, which aims to encourage individuals and organisations at a local level to apply for funding of projects that help to develop rural communities and businesses. Under the current LEADER 2014-2020 programme, LAGs have been allocated an overall budget of €92.9 million.

Research aims and methods

This report is the initial process evaluation for LEADER 2014-2020 and assesses its economic, social, cultural and environmental impact on rural communities. It aims to provide policy recommendations for the current LEADER programme and for a potential follow-up programme post 2021. This is because while there is substantial information available on the type of LEADER projects, their financial budgets and their delivery, there is little information available in Scotland on the actual difference LEADER and its projects have made to life in rural communities.

To gain information on LEADER's impact, the project was divided into two phases – an analysis of administrative data on the Local Actions in Rural Communities system (LARCs) and secondly, the collection and analysis of qualitative data generated through focus groups in four Local Action Groups (LAGs). All LEADER projects and their details are uploaded to LARCs. However, whilst LARCs asks projects to report a number of outcomes that will help to capture economic, social, cultural and environmental impact, data at this stage is very limited due to the low share of completed projects. Therefore, four focus groups were conducted for the second stage of this research. These groups were held in four different LAGs that had been selected based on the status of their projects, budget and types of projects. The four LAGs selected are Highland, Rural Perth and Kinross, Dumfries and Galloway and Outer Hebrides. Focus groups were carried out in April 2018 and attended by project applicants.

Quantitative Findings

One of the findings of the report is that both the budget size per LAG varies considerably, but also that some LAGs are lagging behind in terms of the value they have committed to projects at this stage. The overall budget allocated to 21 Scottish LAGs between 2014-2020 is €92.9 million of which the highest budget is

allocated to the Highland LAG with €10.6 million and the lowest to West Lothian €2.6 million. The average budget is €4.4 million. At the time data was extracted (18 May 2018), LAGs had committed €37.1 million of their budget to LEADER projects. The data shows that the higher the LAG overall budget, the higher the value of commitments at this point are with the exception of for example the LAG Highland. Commitment rates are significantly higher if a LAG has accepted relatively more community projects as opposed to business or farm diversification projects.

Qualitative Findings

The qualitative part of this research report is based on focus groups that were conducted in four LAGs and to which project applicants had been invited. The examples provided highlight the impact LEADER has had on community life, traditions and heritage, social infrastructure and cohesion, and the provision of services for cultural and leisure activities for the rural population. In terms of an environmental impact, LEADER projects help to preserve the environment and engage people with natural heritage. Economically, LEADER has helped to create new employment and training opportunities by investing in tourism, crafts, farm diversification and in small businesses. Projects – sometimes indirectly – support the local rural community and business networks to build knowledge and skills, and encourage innovation and cooperation in order to tackle local development objectives. Despite the positive impact LEADER has had, this report also highlights the challenges applicants face. Key concerns raised by participants were that the payment claims process and the perceived discrimination of small organisations. Additionally, a lack of funding flexibility, transparency and communication were perceived as key issues.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, the report recommends:

Short- and medium-term recommendations

- LAGs should ensure claims are processed promptly, for example within 20 working days. Scottish Government should produce expected standards of services for LAG customers and LAG performance should then be monitored against these standards. In response to poor performance of the LAGs, further options should be explored, including bringing support into Scottish Government, where performance remains unacceptable.
- For the LAGs to evaluate the need to support small organisations by for example setting up networks between more experienced LEADER applicants and inexperienced smaller groups.

Post 2021 recommendation

- The qualitative research showed strong support for a continuation of the decentralised approach of LEADER with its separate Local Development Strategies. These are perceived to ensure a variety of projects with a local identity. However, it needs to be promoted by LAGs or any future administrative bodies more clearly that the funding itself stems from the Scottish Government if the funding approach was continued post-2021.
- For LAGs or any future administrative bodies to encourage funding for small projects and for the Scottish Government to distinguish between small, medium and large grants in terms of applications, reporting and administrating. Easier access to small grants can also encourage more creativity in terms of project ideas.
- For the Scottish Government to allow some payments to be made up front, where legislation permits, either in parts or completely, depending on the grant size.
- For the Scottish Government to ensure that in future funding models LAGs or any future

administrative bodies follow the same regulations and processes in terms of funding periods and flexibility.

- For the Scottish Government to evaluate the principles of the LEADER approach and review whether the focus on innovation truly serves the purpose of rural development.
- For the Scottish Government to look into commissioning or undertaking additional research on the impact of LEADER programmes on rural Scotland and to include an analysis of lessons that could be learned from LEADER programmes in other EU member states.

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

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

Date / Period	09/11/2018
Title of communication activity/event & topic of evaluation findings discussed/ disseminated	Promotion of Process Evaluation of LEADER 2014-2020 report.
Overall organiser of activity/ event	The Scottish Government's Rural & Environment Science and Analytical Services (RESAS) produced the report.
Information channels/ format used	Published on the Scottish Rural Network website and promoted in the Rural Network news newsletter.
Type of target audience	Key stakeholders, beneficiaries and members of the public.
Approximate number of stakeholders reached	1400
URL	https://www.ruralnetwork.scot/news-and-events/news/leader-evaluation-report-published

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

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

<p>Evaluation result relevant for follow-up (Describe finding & mention source in brackets)</p>	<p>Findings and recommendations from the LEADER 2014-2020: process evaluation (LEADER 2014-2020: process evaluation).</p>
<p>Follow-up carried out</p>	<p>Additional research is currently being undertaken following the concluding recommendation of the report to further investigate the impact of LEADER on rural Scotland. The research aims to understand the legacy of 28 years of LEADER by examining past LEADER Programmes as well as the current 2014-2020 Programme. The research will also include lessons learned from LEADER Programmes in other EU member states and international “lookalikes” to LEADER. The research report is expected to be published in autumn 2019.</p>
<p>Responsible authority for follow-up</p>	<p>Managing authority</p>

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

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

The SRDP 2014-2020 will remain under continual review throughout the programme period. As part of the governance procedures, key aspects of the Programme are reported to and considered by the Rural Development Operational Committee (RDOC) and Joint Programme Monitoring Committee (JPMC), with each committee meeting twice a year. Standing items on the agenda for the RDOC (the technical committee to the JPMC) include the provision of scheme information, communications, finance and monitoring and evaluation. RDOC papers are made publically available on the Scottish Government SRDP web pages: <http://www.gov.scot/Topics/farmingrural/SRDP>.

The fifth modification to the programme was adopted by the European Commission (EC) in December 2018. The fifth modification included a number of amendments including minor changes to guidance for Forestry Grant Scheme and LEADER and adjusting the payment rates for LFASS to keep the scheme compliant with EU regulations. Milestones for the level of expenditure under Priorities 5 and 6 were also adjusted to take into consideration the performance of the programme.

The Information and Publicity Strategy, agreed in 2015, was updated in 2017 and an annual Strategic Communications Strategy is prepared and shared with the RDOC and JPMC. Scheme information is available on the Rural Payment and Inspections website (<https://www.ruralpayments.org/publicsite/futures/>) where guidance is presented in a consistent and customer friendly way. More information on the Information and Publicity Strategy can be found in Section 4.

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

Whilst many aspects of the original Action Plan are complete, the impact of some actions will take time to feed through to allow improvements to the error rate to be seen, so this will continue to be an ongoing task.

The Plan will continue to be updated and dialogue is on-going with the EC to endeavour to address the actions and move Scotland out of reservation status.

3.b) Quality and efficient delivery mechanisms

Simplified Cost Options (SCOs) ¹, proxy automatically calculated

	Total RDP financial allocation [EAFRD]	[%] planned SCO coverage out of the total RDP allocation ²	[%] realised expenditure through SCO out of total RDP allocation (cumulative ³)
Fund specific methods CPR Article 67(5)(e)	844,685,131.00	63.47	32.35

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

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

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

E-management for beneficiaries [optional]

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

Average time limits for beneficiaries to receive payments [optional]

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

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

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

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

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

The Action Plan for 2014-2020 was approved by the Rural Development Operational Committee (RDOC) in April 2015.

There is an established annual planning cycle, involving stakeholder engagement to help identify priorities for the annual work programme. Each annual work programme is approved by the MA, with the RDOC and JPMC having an opportunity to offer comments and feedback on it and the development 2018-19 programme is on track.

Network Support Unit

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

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

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

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

The Scottish Rural Network (SRN) continued to operate at full capacity through 2018-19, expanding its website membership, newsletter subscribers and social media followers, producing new SRDP case studies and promotional content and linking in with SRDP stakeholders on events and policy work. Over 2018 SRN:

- Increased their audience across all channels (newsletter subscribers, website views, social media

followers, video views and event attendees), continuing to distribute the latest news on SRDP funding opportunities, application windows, updates on Brexit, local events and opinions pieces.

- Organised the OECD Rural Development Conference in Edinburgh in April 2018. 442 delegates from 27 countries came to Edinburgh to discuss rural innovation and sign the Edinburgh Policy Statement on Enhancing Rural Innovation, promoting the SRDP to an international audience of policy makers.
- Promoted what the SRDP has done for young people in Scotland to tie in with Scotland's Year of Young People 2018 by partnering with the LEADER-funded Rural Youth Project and by running a month-long campaign: 'Rural Youth August' featuring case studies of SRDP funded young people's projects. Insights from the Rural Youth Project survey were directly inputted into the National Council of Rural Advisors' report: 'A Blueprint for Scotland's Rural Economy'.
- Released subtitled versions of the 20 'SRDP on Film' series of short case study films that were originally produced in 2017.
- Linked in with European colleagues at events such as the ENRD Communications Workshop in Prague, where they delivered a presentation on how the SRDP has been promoted through video.
- Delivered the Rural Transport Convention in Inverness, collecting input from a rural audience to the Scottish Government's National Transport Strategy 2.
- Hosted delegation visits from Denmark and Estonia, arranging visits to SRDP funded projects across Scotland and exploring opportunities for partnership working.
- Worked with Scottish Rural Action to deliver the Scottish Rural Parliament in Stranraer in November 2018.
- Coordinated nominations to the ENRD Rural Inspiration Awards, securing nominations for three Scottish SRDP-funded projects, to be announced in Brussels in April.
- Organised a two-day UK and Ireland cooperation workshop to facilitate new LEADER cooperation projects and ensure that budget is spent before the end of the programming period.

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

- EU and UK level engagement has continued through regular informal meetings, bilaterals and formal meetings such as the Rural Development Council and the Annual Examination Meeting.
- UK - We have continued to work with the other UK NRNs and the Irish NRN to share knowledge and good practice and to identify opportunities for harmonisation across the RDPs.
- There have been further national/Ireland NRN meetings held in Birmingham since this event, at which NSU staff attend. The next NRN conference event is provisionally slotted in for September in Wales though this is dependent on Brexit and future funding commitments.

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

The Information and Publicity Strategy was established in early 2015, prior to the approval of the SRDP 2014-2020 and alongside the launch of the first schemes, to ensure that communications plans were in place to inform stakeholders, customers, potential beneficiaries and all delivery partners of progress with the SRDP. The Strategy was presented to the Joint Programme Monitoring Committee (JPMC) at their meeting in May 2015, and then again for formal approval in November 2015 after Commission approval of the SRDP, as required by Article 13 of EU Regulation No 808/2014.

Communications in 2018 continued to raise the awareness of each of the schemes, the procedures of

applying, selection criteria, process and timetables for approvals and payments. Following the UK referendum on EU membership communication has continued to all stakeholders to ensure that they understood how this impacted on the SRDP, and to provide reassurance that the SRDP continued to operate. The UK Government provided funding guarantees for all contracts entered into prior to the date of the UK leaving the EU, this was later supported by a further commitment for all farm payments until the remainder of the UK Governments parliamentary term, which is scheduled to end in 2022. Significant effort continues to be put into explaining the impact of these to stakeholders, and to communicate the “business as usual” position to encourage applications to the programme. EU and UK level engagement has continued through regular informal meetings, bilaterals and formal meetings such as the Rural Development Council and the Annual Examination Meeting.

Over 50 press releases or news articles relevant to the SRDP have been produced by the Scottish Government to ensure stakeholders, applicants and potential beneficiaries are aware of information relating to Brexit, the Single Application Form (SAF). The Royal Highland Show also allowed wider engagement with the agricultural community in June 2018. The Royal Highland Show has over 150,000 visitors each year and is an excellent platform to inform customers of the SRDP support and benefits.

This has been complemented by specific scheme actions including:

- Promotion of the newly-launched RISS as a bottom-up approach to rural innovation, addressing the needs of land managers;
- Stakeholder engagement about the future of the Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS);
- Communication on the future of the new entrant and young farmer start-up grants which have utilised available funding;
- On-going awareness raising of the Farm Advisory Service (FAS) by continued promotion of activity - since the launch of the FAS, 204 events have been held overall delivering to over 3,500 beneficiaries. Further to this 125 Integrated Land Management Plans are underway, with 200 instances of specialist advice, 150 carbon audits and 16 mentoring;
- Continued operation of the LEADER Communications Working Group to drive and coordinate communications and link up Local Action Groups (LAGs) across the Programme;
- Gathering information on LEADER Programme outputs and progress through the Community-Led Local Development (CLLD) Working Group to demonstrate the value of the CLLD approach; and
- Promoting woodland creation element of the Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS).

In addition to the specific communications around the SRDP, the Rural Payments and Services website (<https://www.ruralpayments.org/publicsite/futures/>) has been available from January 2015; providing a single point of information for all CAP support, including scheme guidance and information on inspections, breaches and penalties and appeals and complaints.

5. ACTIONS TAKEN TO FULFIL EX ANTE CONDITIONALITIES

This section applies to AIR(s) 2015, 2016 only

6. DESCRIPTION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF SUB-PROGRAMMES

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

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

7.a) Evaluation questions

7.a1) CEQ01-1A - To what extent have RDP interventions supported innovation, cooperation and the development of the knowledge base in rural areas?

7.a1.a) Answer to evaluation question

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

M01 and M16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

M02: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

M02 and M10: Beef Efficiency Scheme

M04 and M16: Crofting Agricultural Grants Scheme (CAGS)

M04 and M16: Food Processing, Marketing and Cooperation Scheme (FPMC)

M04, M08, M15 and M16: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS)

Rural Priorities (2007-2013) (RP)

Land Managers Options (2007-2013) (LMO)

Financial inputs and output data

A total of €2,463,514 has been spent to the end of 2018 under Measure 1 (allocated to FAs 2A and 4) which is relevant to this Focus Area (O1). €2,335,094 has been spent under KTIF, €17,246 under RP and €111,173 under LMO. KTIF therefore accounted for 95% of expenditure.

€8,732,381 has been spent under Measure 2 (allocated to various FAs) to the end of 2018.

€3,035,521 has been spent under Measure 16 (FAs 2A and 3A, 5B and 5E).

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

Measure 1.1 has supported 2,385 actions/operations relevant to support for vocational training and skills acquisition (2,099 of these, 88%, related to KTIF). Some 286 actions were supported under Measure 1.1 legacy schemes (34 under RP and 252 under LMO (O3)).

The combined number of training days offered to the end of 2018 under Measure 1.1 was 17,684, 17,359 of which were offered under KTIF (98%) (O11). Some 325 training days were offered under the legacy schemes (73 under RP and 252 under LMO).

These training days were utilised by 14,683 participants (these are not necessarily unique participants and it

is likely that some beneficiaries attended more than one course; unique beneficiary data are not collected). The majority (98%) of participants were trained under the KTIF (O12).

Measure 2 (FAS) offered support for the training of advisors through 25 actions/operations, programmed under various FAs to the end of 2018 (O3). Through these actions/operations (O3), training was provided to 907 advisors (O14) and 28 actions offered advice to the 12,535 beneficiaries (O13).

Measure 2 (BES) provided advice for 1,455 beneficiaries (O13).

Measure 16 (non-European Innovation Partnership (EIP)) has so far supported 2 actions under sub-measure 16.3 (cooperation among small operators in organising joint work processes and sharing facilities and resources, and for developing/marketing tourism) (O17); 2 holdings (O9) in 2 cooperation activity (O17) under sub-measure 16.4 (support for cooperation among supply chain actors for the establishment and development of short supply chains and local markets, and for promotion activities), and 5 actions (O17) under sub-measure 16.5 (support for joint action undertaken to mitigate or adapt to climate change, and for joint approaches to environmental projects and practices). Other holdings have been supported, but these are not reported under the Commission's reporting framework.

Measure 16 (EIP) has supported 11 groups undertake 32 cooperation operations to the end of 2018.

Qualitative assessment

Discussions with Scottish Government officials and delivery bodies revealed that the type and content of innovation is very broad. Interpretation encompasses the introduction of the processes (and products) which are novel to the sector as a whole, freshly received from the research and innovation community (see CEQ 2) and "tried and tested" techniques which are innovative for some beneficiaries, but already practised by others. Soil analysis, soil profiling and soil biodiversity measures is one clear example of this latter type of innovation. In reality, there is no clear distinction between the two. For example, in the area of new entrants to farming, there have been innovative discussions and presentations on joint-ventures, business management, etc. to inform potential new entrants of latest technologies and existing good business practices. Other examples of the types of innovation used by beneficiaries are: precision farming techniques; Estimated Breeding Values (EBV) for animal breeding; the provision of electronic benchmarking data; the use of milk recording techniques to improve animal welfare and performance; and, the promotion and demonstration of integrated pest management techniques. The impacts of these on the process of innovation (as well as on farm businesses) will need to be investigated in future evaluations.

The key factor determining the extent to which innovation and cooperation are taken up is the manner in which information is presented to beneficiaries.

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

Measure 1: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

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

Innovation is supported by the KTIF through grants to operational groups which fall under the EIP initiative (operational support rather than capital items). To date, 12 operational groups have been formed (only 10 had received funding by the end of 2018). Some 21 projects have been approved, of which 18 projects had

received funding by the end of 2018, 8 under Measure 1 (skills) and 10 under Measure 16 (cooperation). The total value of the 21 projects approved to the end of 2018 was €6.07 million, of which €3.19 million related to innovation (100% funded for operational costs); including three projects (€201,266) approved before the end of 2018, but not started until 2019. A further six projects have recently been approved. The largest single expenditure involving the EIP is for the ‘Monitor Farm Programme’ (€1.50 million). Nine monitor farms are spread across Scotland, designed to improve profitability, productivity and sustainability through practical demonstration, sharing best practice and discussion of up-to-date issues. Innovation projects can relate to completely new ideas or to existing ideas used in a new context. All aspects of innovation are covered (economic, social, environmental). Most projects are 3-4 years’ duration, and there is a time lag before benefits (impacts) will be seen. One project had been completed by the end of 2018.

A summary of the projects has been provided to the evaluators. Examples of innovation projects include: ***Live lambs***, where the objective is to increase lamb survival rates; ***Skinny milk***, where the intention is to utilise lean management techniques in dairy farms which have formed an association with a dairy in Dumfries where they are trying to optimise their relationship to produce the right quality content rather than focusing on quantity (this is also an example of both horizontal and vertical cooperation); and a project to look at the feasibility of using ***woodchip bedding for livestock***.

A stakeholder confirmed that KTIF has provided for some innovative projects. Another example is the Soil Association project ***Farming with Nature***. This is aimed at enhancing advice and awareness of the importance of nature to farming. Innovative events under this project include ‘worming your way to profit’ (healthy farms and enhanced animal welfare leading to nature benefits) and ‘buzzing about grasslands’ (the importance of species rich grassland for pollinators).

No information on the actual overall impact of supported initiatives was made available. However, key findings by the Soil Association Scotland which delivered several KTIF-funded projects were that:

- Evaluation of outcomes revealed strongly that participants had increased their ***knowledge, ability/skills and confidence*** of sustainable land management practices. Knowledge gain scores the highest, with ***77% of farmers/crofters giving top scores to an increase in knowledge***.
- ***Both horizontal*** [field labs] and ***vertical knowledge exchange*** event formats delivered by Soil Association Scotland KTIF funded programmes ***were highly rated***.
- ***There is evidence of innovation at the farm level, in that 89% of KTIF-funded participants have adopted/or pledged to adopt new sustainable land management practices***. Some 45% have put more than half their holding under new management practices and 21% have implemented new management practice/s across their entire business holding. This amounts to ***over 830 square miles of farmland across Scotland being managed more sustainably***, using evidence-based practices which support the KTIF funded programme objectives.
- Soil Association Scotland commented that SRDP interventions have also had a positive effect on farmer-led innovation. Led by farmers, with input from experts, the Soil Association’s field labs test ideas to find low-input solutions to practical challenges; a lab will usually last around 12-18 months and takes a scientific approach to testing ideas. A new practice is compared against a baseline or control, with a researcher’s input into trial design. Data are collected by the farmers themselves, with support from Soil Association Scotland. Lab participants will meet several times to follow progress and discuss results.

Soil Association also noted that its KTIF-supported activities have encouraged cooperation and thus helped build social capital, which can be expected to improve incomes, productivity and resilience. Analysis of its survey data in its ***Future Farming Scotland*** (FFS) project showed that participants reported increases in social capital across all forms but especially in terms of bonding capital. In the survey, this form of capital

was characterised as networks and relationships ‘within your immediate farming community’, to which 52% of respondents reported an increase ‘somewhat’ and 14.2% ‘a lot’. Respondents reported similar levels of uplift in the other two forms of capital. These results are expected given that the majority of participants at FFS events are farmers / land managers and events tend to be quite local.

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

Evaluators were told that innovation, cooperation and the development of the knowledge base is achieved in many different forms. Under the FAS these occur principally as one-to-many activities and one-to-one activities. The dissemination of active and current datasets in a clear manner should be accompanied by benchmarks to encourage beneficiaries to measure their own performance. The extent to which this achieves impacts is unclear at this stage.

Projects under the one-to-many FAS (delivered by SAC) have sought to promote innovation by demonstrating novel and new practices. Tools include on-farm demonstration in events, workshops, seminars, etc., but also through the provision of technical notes, guidance notes, case studies as well as information on social media and websites. Specific examples of innovations include the use of laminar strips in soils to identify soil microbial activity; this provides a measure of soil biodiversity. Other examples include demonstrations of solar powered water pumps for livestock waterings, etc. (FAS has itself demonstrated an innovate approach by its use of modern social media techniques for distribution of information, including its website, in addition to on-farm meetings and events.)

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

There are initiatives for both horizontal and vertical cooperation. Discussion groups and local meetings with local attendance encourages cooperation between beneficiaries. Meetings are open to other parts of the supply chain, thereby encouraging and developing vertical cooperation.

In addition to the one-to-many activities, there are one-to-one services operated by a different delivery agent (RICARDO). These too can be expected to promote innovation. Evidence will be contained in the individual business plans developed for farms. To provide evidence, the Scottish Government has commissioned a piece of research to explore the quality, focus and effectiveness of the one-to-one part of the FAS, which should identify the outcomes of the support for beneficiary businesses and contribute to understanding the extent to which provision of advice has influenced outcomes. The report can be expected to generate evidence relevant to answering this CEQ for the *ex-post* evaluation.

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

Measure 2: Beef Efficiency Scheme

The Beef Efficiency Scheme uses cattle genetics and lifelong data-collection, both of which can be considered innovative at the farm level, to identify animals that are more efficient and therefore produce

lower GHG emissions, although there are also less advanced management changes that produced environmental benefits and economic gains to the farms involved. There is also a BES advisory service (parallel with the FAS) that helps farmers who are currently behind the best to catch up (for example in monitoring animal weights and making changes following Carbon Audits).

Measure 16: Food Processing, Marketing and Cooperation Scheme

There are two cooperation activities under sub-measure 16.3 (cooperation among small operators in organising joint work processes and sharing facilities and resources, and for developing/marketing tourism) and two under sub-measure 16.4 (support for cooperation among supply chain actors for the establishment and development of short supply chains and local markets, and for promotion activities).

Measure 16: Environmental Cooperation Action Fund (ECAAF)

Sub-measure 16.5, ECAAF, was intended to use a subject expert to bring land managers together to undertake co-operative activity, share knowledge and best practice. However, after an attempted redesign the Scottish Government decided in 2016 not to proceed with the scheme. The aim is now targeted within the AECS scheme by incentivising cooperation (see CEQ 8), support is also potentially available under KTIF (Sub-Measure 16.1).

Measure 16: Forestry Grant Scheme

The link between sub-measure 16.5 and innovation and development of the knowledge base is relatively weak and only €82,114 had been spent under this sub-measure to the end of 2018. The main area where innovation takes place in the forestry sector is in harvesting and processing. The evaluators were told about innovative projects, for example, a solar drying kiln, which were under way. Beneficiaries are also being encouraged to explore new market opportunities. Most of the support (which is spent on woodland creation) and also the woodland management element is less innovative.

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

Measure 16: Crofting Agricultural Grants Scheme (CAGS)

CAGS is primarily concerned with providing capital grants on a range of eligible assets, with enhanced rates for young people (aged under 41 years, and with other conditions applying). However, funding under Measure 16 for CAGS facilitates (by providing a grant) the establishment of properly constituted common grazings committees, responsible for managing and maintaining common grazing. Members are elected by the crofters themselves. This scheme, which applies in the Highlands and Islands Enterprise Area, therefore contributes to cooperation. There is no explicit link with innovation, though some of the investments supported may be viewed as promoting innovation at the farm level.

Other schemes

A case can be made that other schemes also contribute in ways relevant to this question. LEADER is an innovative concept, including the bottom-up approach and the approach to governance. Cooperation is an inherent part of LEADER, both in the development of plans for local strategic developments, within LAGs to carry them out, and increasingly between LAGs in Scotland and elsewhere (trans-national cooperation). LAGs told the evaluators that innovation has been a key feature of at least some projects, although the need

to apply for match funding could work against innovative projects.

There are incentives within the AECS for applicants to cooperate in the provision of landscape-scale benefits.

A stakeholder told the evaluators that a key factor contributing to innovation, cooperation and the development of the knowledge base in rural areas is the relationship built between facilitator/adviser and farmer and the knowledge exchange that takes place. Excellent facilitators can bring about a sea change in the way in which landscape-scale outcomes are achieved and can motivate farmers to make a permanent change in their behaviour. This applies equally to the delivery of other parts of the SRDP. The view of the importance of the quality of the change agents was echoed by Soil Association Scotland, which delivers several KTIF projects.

Soil Association Scotland also drew attention to the impact on innovation from the Rural Innovation Support Service (RISS), funded through the SRDP Technical Assistance budget and part of the Scottish Rural Network. RISS is led by Soil Association Scotland in partnership with the Scottish Agricultural Organisation Society, SAC Consulting, Scotland Food and Drink, and Innovative Farmers. Launched in February 2018, it drives innovation in Scotland *by bringing together different sectors and actors along the supply chain to find innovative ways to improve environmental and economic performance*. In the opinion of Soil Association Scotland, farmers and other land managers often have the best ideas for improving their business, but are often time-poor. RISS brings together groups with a common interest in solving a problem or developing a new opportunity. RISS provides a facilitator to bring the right people (e.g. supply chain expert, vet, researcher, etc.) to work with the group of farmers/land managers to explore their ideas and develop an action plan to put good ideas into practice.

To date, RISS has enabled the creation of 25 groups covering a wide spectrum of innovative ideas, with many more in the pipeline. The aim is to create 42 groups by 2020. Examples of existing groups include innovative actions for:

- Finding cost effective, sustainable ways to dispose/recycle farm plastic waste
- Establishing a sustainable, profitable and long-term supply chain for organic rapeseed
- Addressing the declining profitability of hill sheep farming
- Getting more local vegetables into Scottish schools
- Creating a land matching service for new farmers

Conclusion

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

Recommendation

It is noted that an evaluation of one-to-one advice under the FAS has been commissioned. Further steps should be taken so that the impact of innovation, cooperation and the development of the knowledge base in rural areas can be assessed by the time of the anticipated *ex-post* evaluation. Attention should also be given to how impacts of Measures are allocated to this Focus Area given that none are programmed under it. For example, it would be useful to know the areas in which beneficiaries have received training.

7.a2) CEQ02-1B - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the strengthening of links between agriculture, food production and forestry and research and innovation, including for the purpose of improved environmental management and performance?

7.a2.a) *Answer to evaluation question*

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

M01 and M16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF);

M04 and M16: Food Processing, Marketing and Cooperation Scheme (FPMC);

M04 and M16: Crofting Agricultural Grants Scheme (CAGS);

M04, M08, M15 and M16: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS);

Financial inputs and output data

A total of €3,035,521 has been spent to the end of 2018 under Measure 16 relevant to the strengthening of links between agriculture, food production and forestry and research and innovation, including for the purpose of improved environmental management and performance. Of this, €1,930,175 was spent under KTIF (EIP, allocated to FA 2A and 5B), €1,022,694 under FPMC (sub-measures 16.3 and 16.4, allocated to FA 3A), €82,114 under FGS (FA 5E, sub-measure 16.5) and €538 under CAGS (FA 2A) (O1).

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

Ten EIP groups are supported under KTIF (O16).

A total of 10 cooperation operations have been supported under the cooperation measure to the end of 2018 (O17). One was supported under CAGS (sub-measure 16.0). Two were for cooperation among small operators in organising joint work processes and sharing facilities and resources, and for developing/marketing tourism (sub-measure 16.3); 2 were for support for cooperation among supply chain actors for the establishment and development of short supply chains and local markets, and for promotion activities (sub-measure 16.4); and 5 for support for joint action undertaken to mitigate or adapt to climate change, and for joint approaches to environmental projects and practices (sub-measure 16.5).

Qualitative assessment

Measure 16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

This question focuses on the links between, on the one hand, operators of farms, foresters and food producers and, on the other, members of the research and innovation community. Five of the ten KTIF Operational Groups in projects involving the EIP explicitly contained members from research institutions (an additional two groups have been approved, but had not been funded by the end of 2018). More broadly, the emphasis is on encouraging the uptake of research on the ground, and this applies in some measure to all the KTIF projects (of which there were 21 approved at the end of 2018). These help fill technological gaps by better linking research outputs such as research reports (which otherwise might go unused) to tangible

agricultural practice on the ground. Some of the lessons learned are from research in Scotland, some are from best practice elsewhere.

The Soil Association Scotland, which delivers several KTIF projects, confirmed that its field labs were linking farmers with researchers to test new ways of working which deliver environmental benefits. For example, the Soil Association is running a field lab which is exploring the effectiveness of mob grazing – an innovative practice in Scotland but in use elsewhere – to find out if can be adapted to suit Scotland’s biogeography and climate.

There has been little specific attempt to link the stages of the agri-food sectors, though a project approved in 2017 aims to build resilience into Scotland’s lamb supply chain by getting farmers to work more closely with processors.

Measure 16: Crofting Agricultural Grants Scheme (CAGS)

Some €538 has been spent under CAGS on one cooperation project.

Measure 16: Food Processing, Marketing and Cooperation Scheme (FPMC)

Two cooperation projects have been supported to date under sub-measure 16.3 and two activities have been supported under sub-measure 16.4 (see financial contribution above). During the course of assembling evidence for the 2016 EAIR, a Scottish Government official told the evaluators that trade bodies, such as Quality Meat Scotland, are generally necessary to bring research and producers together. However, even these bodies only reach around a quarter of producers.

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

Although not listed as relevant to this CEQ, discussions with Scottish Government officials suggested to the evaluators that some activities under the Farm Advisory Service were in fact relevant. For many decades, agricultural advisory services have acted as an intermediary between the generators of knowledge and its practice by farmers, crofters and the foresters, though in the UK the degree of state involvement and finance has varied. A review of the process of diffusion of the output of science funded by agriculture departments in England (in which the evaluators participated) has shown that disparities exist between the closeness of links between farmers/growers and the research community, with horticulture’s frequent interaction being at one extreme and the relative isolation of the extensive systems of red meat production at the other. This suggests that for some parts of the Scottish agricultural industry advisors can play a pivotal role in creating and maintaining the farmer-to-research link. Responses from Farm Advisory Service staff in Scotland collected in the 2016 EAIR, and still relevant, indicate that they see themselves as link between farmers and the research/innovation community and form a conduit of knowledge. It is clear that, without this link, the agricultural community would not benefit as much as it currently does, though the extent to which the SRDP has strengthened that link is not easy to establish.

Other schemes

A case can be made that other schemes also affect this link. For example, LEADER can help to bring together the primary production sectors with the research community; SRUC is part of the LAG committee, for example. However, only one LAG told the evaluators that the link between the primary production sector and the research community had been strengthened with most LAGs not providing a response to this question implying that these links are not seen as being important.

There have been links between agricultural production and the processing sector, for example linking apple

production to apple juices (<http://morayleader.org.uk/projects/apple-juice-production>). Less directly, the development of environmental indicators and the undertaking of evaluations generally inevitably involves working the links between the application of policy under the SRDP and the research community. The Beef Efficiency Scheme involves genetic testing, which by its nature involves the science and research community, and Estimated Breeding Values are calculated by SRUC for each female animal.

Conclusion: The SRDP does provide links between primary production and research and innovation, but there is no evidence at this stage on the extent to which the SRDP activities strengthens them.

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

7.a3) CEQ03-1C - To what extent have RDP interventions supported lifelong learning and vocational training in the agriculture and forestry sectors?

7.a3.a) Answer to evaluation question

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

M01 and M16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

Rural Priorities (2007-13)

Land Managers Options (2007-13)

Financial inputs and output data

A total of €2,463,514 has been spent to the end of 2018 under Measure 1 (allocated to FAs 2A and 4) which is relevant to supporting innovation, cooperation and the development of the knowledge base in rural areas (O1). As noted under CEQ 1, 95% of relevant expenditure has been under the KTIF scheme.

Some 14,683 people have been recorded as having received training to the end of 2018 (T3, substantially more than the target of 10,617). These are not unique beneficiaries and some will have benefitted from more than one training activity.

Qualitative assessment

Measure 1: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund

According to documentation provided by the Scottish Government, there are nine projects (eight of which had received support by the end of 2018) linked directly to the aim of lifelong learning and vocational training, and a number of different organisations are involved in delivery. The largest spending example (€414,000) is the '*Future Farming Scotland*' run by the Soil Association in partnership with Duchy Future Farming, Quality Meat Scotland and the Forestry Commission which, together, supply 25% of the funding (the SRDP providing 75%). Another example is the funding of the Scottish Crofting Federation (Crofters Skills Boost Programme, €321,600) as opposed to €343,200 shown in the 2016 EAIR, which reflect both a

change in exchange rate and a reduction).

The view of the Soil Association Scotland, which delivers several KTIF-funded projects, is that these have had a positive impact on life-long learning. Analysis of Soil Association survey data revealed *participants had changed their attitude most positively towards ‘farming and biodiversity’ and ‘farming and climate change’* – with 68% and 56% of respondents respectively answering that they ‘feel more positive and more inclined to address this topic on my own farm/holding’ following their participation at a Soil Association Scotland event.

Other schemes

A case can be made that many of the other schemes funded by the SRDP also have a role in supporting life-long learning. The FAS, in both its one-to-many and one-to-one guises provides material by which farm and forestry operators develop their skills. For the beef sector, the Beef Efficiency Scheme provides similar support of both types. LEADER has involvement with lifelong learning, but support for education itself cannot be provided. For example, the Cairngorms Trust LAG provides a learning opportunity for young people to understand the mountain (flora and fauna, walking, etc.). However, the written submissions provided by LAGs suggested that LEADER is not heavily focused on these issues.

'A Future Strategy for Scottish Agriculture' (<https://www.gov.scot/publications/future-strategy-scottish-agriculture-final-report-scottish-governments-agriculture-champions/>) recommends that consideration should be given to making future support payments contingent on participation in schemes or training which would institute a form of lifelong learning.

Conclusion: Over 14,000 trainings have taken place to the end of 2018 (these are not unique beneficiaries). Therefore it can be concluded that RDP interventions, in the form of the schemes mentioned, have supported lifelong learning and vocational training in the agriculture and forestry sector (together).

Recommendation: It would be helpful to have information on the number of unique beneficiaries so a judgement can be made on whether the training provided reaches a sufficiently wide audience. It is also recommended that details of the breakdown of the results indicator into agriculture and forestry is made available, and that an evaluation is carried out to assess the additionality of this training. We note that the impact of training on beneficiaries and the businesses in which they work is not relevant to this CEQ, but a proper evaluation should examine these issues as these are more important to the SRDP objectives than the simple result indicator.

7.a4) CEQ04-2A - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to improving the economic performance, restructuring and modernization of supported farms in particular through increasing their market participation and agricultural diversification?

7.a4.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes are programmed under this FA:

M01 and M16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

M02: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

M04 and M16: Crofting Agricultural Grants Scheme (CAGS)

M04: New Entrants Capital Grants Scheme (NECGS)

M04: Small Farms Grants Scheme (SFGS)

M04: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS)

M06: New Entrants Start-Up Grants (NESUG)

M13: Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS)

Rural Priorities (2007-13)

Land Managers Options (2007-13)

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

Financial inputs and output data

A total of €2,407,124 has been spent to the end of 2018 under Measure 1 under FA 2A (O1). Of this, €2,278,705 has been spent under the KTIF, €17,246 under RP and €111,173 under LMO. The KTIF therefore accounted for 95% of relevant expenditure.

Some €3,191,197 of public money has been spent under Measure 2 under FA 2A (O1) and a further €34,002,001 under Measure 4. The majority of spend under Measure 4 has been under the Rural Priorities scheme from the 2007-2013 programming period (€14,863,003, 44%). Spending under CAGS was €11,024,648 (32%), NECGS €6,877,779 (20%), FGS €632,185 (2%), Land Manager Options €353,165 (1%) and SFGS €251,220 (1%).

Total public expenditure to the end of 2018 has been €593,718 under Measure 6 (New Entrants Start-Up Grants).

Some €151,555,628 had been spent under FA 2A under Measure 13 (Less Favoured Area Support Scheme) by the end of 2018.

The percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP support for investments in restructuring or modernisation to the end of 2018 is 5.55% (T4). As noted above, quantitative data are not available for the other relevant indicators.

Measure 1.1 has supported 2,379 actions/operations under FA 2A (2,093 of these, 88%, related to KTIF, the balance legacy schemes (RP and LMO) (O3).

The combined number of training days offered to the end of 2018 under Measure 1.1 was 17,672, the vast majority of which were offered under KTIF (O11).

These training days were utilised by 14,431 participants (these are not necessarily unique participants and it is likely that some beneficiaries attended more than one course; unique beneficiary data are not collected).

Measure 2 (FAS) supported 7 actions/operations under FA 2A (O3), under which 3,008 beneficiaries were advised (O13). Two actions/operations supported the training of advisors (O3) under which 152 advisors

received training (O14).

With respect to EIP activity, Measure 16 has funded 10 groups undertaking 29 cooperation operations to the end of 2018 under FA 2A (O16) with financial support of €1,909,394 (a further two groups have been approved but had not received funding by the end of 2018).

A total of 2,905 holdings had been supported to the end of 2018 under Measure 4 (O4). The largest group of beneficiaries (1,423, 49%) were male and aged over 40. Some 19% (564) were male and aged 40 or under, 13% (373) were female and aged over 40 and 5% (144) were female and aged 40 or under. In addition, 14% (401) of beneficiaries were 'other non individuals' such as group or an association. .

The main means of support was the Crofting Agricultural Grants Scheme, under which 1,914 holdings were supported (66% of the total under this measure). A further 590 holdings were supported under legacy schemes (402 under Land Manager Options, 14%, and 188, 6%, under Rural Priorities). The New Entrants Capital Grants Scheme provided support to 379 holdings (13%) to the end of 2018 and the Small Farms Capital Grants Scheme supported a further 22 holdings (<1%).

The New Entrants Start-Up Grants under Measure 6 had supported 49 holdings by the end of 2018. Some 6,057 holdings had been supported to the end of 2018 under Measure 13, the Less Favoured Area Support Scheme, under FA 2A.

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

Qualitative assessment

Measure 1: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

This scheme works through grants to Operational Groups. There are currently 21 projects with such groups, of which 12 (two of which had not received any funding by the end of 2018) fall under the European Innovation Partnership (EIP) initiative (operational support rather than capital items). Scottish Government officials told the evaluators that the Operational Groups non-EIP projects are of relevance; judged by their summary descriptions, examples include the **Scottish Dairy Business Impact Groups** (AHDB Dairy) and **Livestock Development Programme** (ANM Group). However, some of those introducing innovation (such as monitor farms) will also contribute; projects often have impacts across more than one Focus Area.

Important to assessing impact, each KTIF project has to provide interim and final reports which comment on performance metrics; the 2018 summary report on project progress has been made available to the evaluators by the Scottish Government. Only one project appears to have been completed, **Future Farming Scotland**, delivered by Soil Association Scotland, and this has been subject to an independent evaluation. The focus was on knowledge transfer and *inter alia* concluded that there was strong evidence that participants had increased their knowledge, abilities/skills and confidence of sustainable land management practices. These reports will be a source of (at least some) quantitative results in time. Most projects are of three to four years' duration, and then there is a lag time before benefits (impacts) will be seen.

The view of the Soil Association Scotland was that, for the KTIF projects it administers, that they have enhanced economic performance. They promote the reduced use of externally purchased inputs (including

synthetic fertilisers, feed concentrates, etc.) by increasing recycling, re-use and efficient management of existing on-farm resources. Though there are no specific economic figures, there is anecdotal evidence through case studies in the Soil Association Scotland 'Farming for the Future: Our work in Scotland Report' (<https://www.soilassociation.org/media/17814/farming-and-land-use-report-web.pdf>), which demonstrates how farmers participating in KTIF-funded projects have managed to reduce their costs.

The monitor farm programme (administered by Quality Meat Scotland / AHDB) was assessed during the previous programming period and that evaluation was used to inform the current implementation.

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service – FAS

The 2016 EAIR noted that increasing profitability of farms and crofts in Scotland is a clear aim of the FAS, with a focus on technical and environmental performance designed to build resilience in all beneficiaries in order that these businesses can be financially and environmentally sustainable and viable. The economic performance of farms is expected to have improved through the activities of the FAS interventions, such as knowledge transfer. Farm Business Income measures are reported annually, but are also heavily influenced by external factors such as exchange rates, weather, and global market forces. When collecting evidence for this 2018 EAIR the evaluators were told by Scottish Government officials that beneficiaries are asked whether they intend to make changes in their businesses, but it is not known whether they actually make the changes. This is easier to follow up for one-to-one advice than it is for one-to-many advice. A contract is underway to investigate the actual changes made following one-to-one advice, but this is not yet available.

Building resilience in modern farming businesses is a key aim of the FAS and this should provide improved financial performance.

Modernisation on individual units has taken place where there is uptake of new practices following the demonstration of new techniques on demonstration farms and focus farms. Some practices are straightforward; others involve more fundamental change in the business, particularly in terms of enterprise management and enterprise structure.

Evidence for significant farm restructuring is limited. In some cases where beneficiaries have sought to improve performance they will have changed enterprises and restructured their business. Major restructuring will take some time to be reflected in improved economic performance.

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

Agricultural diversification is excluded from the delivery of the FAS and is dealt with under other delivery aspects of the SRDP. For example, diversification into woodland is encouraged under Measure 8 by the Forestry Grant Scheme and is reported in the answer to CEQ 16. The evaluators were told in 2019 that the Scottish Government has provided a steer to the deliverer of FAS one-to-many activities (SAC) not to get involved in diversification (and product branding), but rather to focus on primary agricultural production.

The deliverer of the one-to-many activities of the FAS (SAC) has also told the evaluators that a lot of the information available is about outputs and intentions. However, it is possible to glean some idea of the impacts indirectly. For example, the *Soil Nutrient Network* has a series of meetings which attract the same people over time; this covers, amongst other things, the need to add lime in certain situations. It has been noticed in one case that sales of lime have increased and this is thought to be as a result of interaction with FAS; SAC is examining ways in which this impact might be quantified. Another indicator is the use of

benchmarking information, where SAC datasets are increasingly used in farm advice. However, despite the above, it is generally hard for SAC to assess the impact with the remit they have been given.

The deliverer of FAS one-to-one advice (Ricardo) has told the evaluators that impact on economic performance (and other aspects of change) is covered in the monitoring system currently in place for one-to-one advice. There is a feedback form, and payment is not made until a completed form is received from the farmer. Collated evidence from feedback forms was made available to the evaluator, as well as a review of applicant metrics. The impacts, reported as intensions by farmers, is sub-divided into that for Integrated Land Management Plans, specialist advice, Carbon Audits, and mentoring. The only evidence available to date on economic impacts is from farmer feedback forms; this is contained within the Annual Reports for the Scottish Government: <https://www.fas.scot/about-us/>. The present contract for one-to-one advice does not include following up beneficiaries (after six months or so) to investigate the actual impact of receiving advice at that stage. However, the Scottish Government has commissioned a series of follow-ups via telephone survey. This work will ask beneficiaries whether they have made the changes that they said they would. The Carbon Audit also sets out actions which farmers need to undertake and these could also be followed up.

In terms of business restructuring, it is pointed out that farmers come to one-to-one services with specific issues and the advice given is therefore also specific. Some farmers are interested in restructuring, some are interested in creating biodiversity, others in diversification (around 15%). There is therefore no standard advice. It would be possible to collate the advice objectives, but this is not currently done.

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

The evaluators were told by Scottish Government officials when preparing the 2018 EAIR that CAGS grants are used for capital items such as sheds, fencing, drainage, equipment, etc. The implication is that these investments will contribute to modernisation, although many crofters are not operating as commercial farmers. There is a 2018 report ‘Economic Condition of Crofting’ (<https://www.gov.scot/publications/survey-economic-conditions-crofting-2015-2018/>) which covers CAGS (as one of the several sources of support for this type of activity); this states that CAGS is designed to aid and develop agricultural production on crofting businesses, thereby sustaining the economic basis of crofting, and helping retain people in rural communities. Funding supports crofters in carrying out individual or collective investments that reduce production costs. However, with the exception of modernisation, the part played by CAGS on economic performance and other parameters implied by the CEQ is not demonstrated.

Restructuring is addressed through the new entrant schemes, both the capital grants schemes (Measure 4) and the start-up grant schemes (Measure 6, see below). These two groups of schemes are expected to work together, in that beneficiaries are expected to use different grants for different purposes. The evaluators have been told that the Scottish Government distinguishes between “genuine new entrants” and new entrants taking over a family business; the Government’s intention is to support genuine new entrants. All applications funded so far have been scored and funds allocated accordingly. At the time of the 2016 EAIR three-quarters (75%) had been classified as genuine new entrants. The remaining 25% were effectively successors and therefore had had an impact on restructuring at the sector level. We were told when collecting evidence for this 2018 EAIR that the NECGS is also relevant for restructuring and modernisation, but that uptake was very low, so impact will be modest.

A stakeholder representing crofters told the evaluators that CAGS is a good scheme that has enabled crofters to invest in their crofts; it has therefore contributed to improving the economic performance, restructuring

and modernization of supported crofts. However, to increase its effectiveness the scheme needs an up-front payments element or a bridging loan for capital-poor crofters. We were also told that the scheme did not apply to woodland crofts – a major drawback. There are further operational issues, attention to which could improve performance. We were told that the scheme needs to reintroduce the use of standard costs for investment activities on crofts; the need for multiple quotes does not work for remote areas as there are few contractors.

Measure 4: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS)

Some €632,185 has been spent under FA 2A on the provision of access roads to small woodland areas on farms that would not otherwise be exploitable. A Scottish Government official told the evaluators that in order to determine whether support will be granted, a judgement has to be made on the relative value of the timber made available and the cost of the access road – a positive decision is more likely if the road is short. There is no monitoring system in place that looks at the benefit arising to the farm business involved; this is not seen as proportionate given that the impact on the business is likely to be small. The decision to invest is not taken on the basis of the likely impact on the business, but on other criteria, based on timber values and the cost of making access feasible.

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

The evaluators were told, at the time of the 2016 EAIR, that these were originally one scheme, but this was split into two before the SRDP was finalised. NESUG (programmed under FA 2A) is designed for smaller farms and has no upper age limit, YFSUG (programmed under FA 2B, but also relevant here) is designed for higher output farms and is also age-restricted. Both NESUG and YFSUG are concerned with helping farmers into the industry; there is no use made of the provision to assist diversification. These businesses are starting from scratch and so they are bringing new business activity into the market; by definition there is therefore more market participation. Most business development plans for entrants aim to increase the standard output over the period of time reflected in the plans. However, the schemes are not themselves aimed at improving businesses and the impacts they have are therefore indirect. Similarly, with respect to modernisation, new businesses tend to be relatively modern anyway.

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

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

New businesses supported by the various start-up schemes supported under the SRDP have to put milestones in their business plans which are linked to payments. and these data will be available in due course and could be followed up to see how benefits have been felt by the business. They may map onto the additional results indicators. Many of the impacts of capital grants will though take some time to manifest. Beneficiaries are also guided towards the available advice under other aspects of the SRDP.

A stakeholder representing crofting indicated that this was a good scheme for crofts but there was not a large enough budget and so did not last long enough.

Other Schemes

Measure 19: LEADER

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

LFASS

A stakeholder representing crofters has pointed out that LFASS enables crofts to survive so without it, many crofts would not be able to operate and thus contribute to improving the economic performance and other issues covered in this CEQ.

Conclusions: Spending under the relevant measures has contributed to improving the economic performance, restructuring and modernization of supported farms, in particular through increasing their market participation (diversification is supported under Measure 19 through LEADER). However, the extent of this improvement cannot be quantified at present. It appears that several of the schemes covered either already collect data on intended changes via application forms or business development plans. Furthermore, a follow-up exercise of actual changes flowing from one-to-one advice has been commissioned for this part of the FAS.

Recommendation: The lack of data to populate results indicators is an issue that will need to be addressed in time for the anticipated *ex-post* evaluation. Meanwhile data can be found on intended changes under several schemes, although this may not translate into actual change. The Scottish Government should give consideration as to how this information would best be collated. Follow-up surveys to ascertain the extent to which intentions are turned into actual impacts should be undertaken (beyond the one-to-one part of the FAS already underway), and that this evidence form part of evaluations.

7.a5) CEQ05-2B - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the entry of adequately skilled farmers into the agricultural sector and in particular, generational renewal?

7.a5.a) *Answer to evaluation question*

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this FA:

M01 and M16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (not programmed)

M02: Farm Advisory Service

M06: Young Farmers Start-Up Grants

Rural Priorities (2007-13)

Financial input and output data

Some €797,017 had been spent under Measure 2 (Farm Advisory Service) to the end of 2018 under FA 2B. Most public expenditure in this FA was under Measure 6 where €13,767,638 had been spent to the end of 2018. The majority of this (€12,896,938, 94%) was spent under Young Farmers Start-Up Grants with the

remainder committed under the Rural Priorities scheme in the 2007-2013 programming period.

Some 1,752 beneficiaries received advice under Measure 2 under FA 2B to the end of 2018.

Some 263 holdings/beneficiaries had been supported to the end of 2018 under Measure 6 (O4). Of these, 204 (78%) were supported under Young Farmers Start-Up Grants (143, 70% male and 61, 30% female) with the balance supported under the Rural Priorities scheme from the 2007-2013 programming period.

By the end of 2018, 0.50% of agricultural holdings had RDP supported business development plan/investments for young farmers (R3/T5).

Qualitative assessment

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

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

The 2016 EAIR recorded that these were originally one scheme, but this was split into two before the SRDP was finalised. NESUG is targeted at small farms and has no upper age limit, YFSUG is targeted at higher output farms and is age-restricted. The evaluators were told that these schemes are aimed at providing money up front, which makes them unique within the SRDP; other schemes require work to be carried out before support is released. It is possible for beneficiaries of these schemes to also apply for capital grants, and, according to the Scottish Government, there could be synergies here. The support drawn from different schemes must be for different initiatives to avoid double funding.

Both NESUG and YFSUG are concerned with helping farmers into the industry. The evaluators were told (when compiling the 2016 EAIR) that most beneficiaries (both schemes) are genuine new entrants, but some are successors to an established business (generational renewal). Over both schemes, some 75% of successful applicants are thought to be genuine new entrants (no involvement in the previous business and farm bought on open market) while 10% are successors to an existing business. The remaining 15% are new businesses with land not acquired on the open market, i.e. taken from existing businesses; this group is closer to successors than to genuine new entrants. The majority of beneficiaries are male (70% under YFSUG and 57% under NESUG; 43% of NESUG beneficiaries are aged 40 or under).

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

It is difficult to determine whether more young farmers have entered the sector with the support provided, but we have been told that the support is very important in helping young farmers develop a successful business. The scoring system tries to avoid deadweight by weighting towards genuinely new entrants, who must not have been head of any business for 18 months and should have acquired the land on the open market, though the system is not foolproof. It should though be noted that successors contribute to

generational renewal. The EU legislation refers to “successors”, which means that it is not possible for the Scottish Government entirely to exclude family members from receiving support; deadweight cannot be completely avoided. The Scottish Government attempts to make sure that there is no family relationship between the applicant and the seller of the business, although this would seem to work against generational renewal. So far, 204 applicants have been supported under the YFSUG. Those not successful in their application are still likely to enter the industry, but will not have the financial support. The scheme is regarded by the Scottish Government as being effective for genuine new entrants.

According to Scottish Government officials, many individuals involved in the New Entrants programme have the skills and business acumen to go forward and prove themselves as farmers. However, many are waiting for opportunities or are saving to purchase their own land. When preparing the answer to the 2018 EAIR, the evaluators learned about the Scottish Government’s ***Farming Opportunities for New Entrants*** (FONE) programme, initiated in 2016, that aims to facilitate entry by, *inter alia*, providing easier access to publicly-owned land. New Entrants to farming were first offered the chance to lease part-time starter units on Scotland's National Forest Estate as part of a pilot initiative introduced in January 2012. Following the success of the initial pilot, the programme was rolled out and in total, nine tenancies have been created on the National Forest Estate; in addition, a further Starter Farm has been created on the estate of the Scottish Government's Rural Payments and Inspections Division (RPID). The Starter Farms initiative is part of a wider Scottish Government commitment to developing opportunities for New Entrants across Scotland. Start-up grants, access to Basic Payments allied to advice and skills programmes are all designed to facilitate entry and allow individuals to develop.

For potential successors there is a more tangible impact of support for young people/new entrants; the Scottish Government has been told in feedback that these people are now being more involved in the business side and decision-making of running the farm. Their attendance at workshops has shown the older generation that they are willing to learn and have brought new ideas home.

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

Evaluators were told, when compiling the 2016 EAIR, that a significant component of the FAS one-to-many delivery activities is its ‘new entrants’ programme. This is a distinct and focused initiative that utilises around 7% of the FAS one-to-many budget and the evaluators were told that this has been well received by the industry in the widest sense.

As part of FAS there have been 14 groups aimed specifically at new entrants, spread geographically across Scotland, including as the Western Isles, Skye, Orkney and Oban. The intention is to equip new entrants with a broad range of business and technical skills to enable them to enter the industry fully equipped with knowledge and ability. The evaluators of the 2018 EAIR were told that, on average, there are 12 people per group, resulting in an impact over 168 individuals/businesses (somewhat lower than the 200 reported in the 2016 EAIR, though that may have been a broad estimate). These include a wide range of types of people including, crofters, farmers, successors, and totally new blood in to farming, etc. Among the metrics of people attending, age is recorded. The body that delivers one-to-many training for the FAS (the SAC) points to some multi-year projects, where the continuing relationship helps achieve impact. A total of 1,752 (non-unique) beneficiaries had received training by the end of 2018.

There is a ***New Entrant Network*** which runs meetings on a range of projects. There is an annual new entrants’ gathering, which has been running for six years now, that has been at the forefront of helping new entrants, both those who are new to the industry as well as those who wish to enter the industry, but have not yet done so.

One-to-one advice provided by the FAS tends to pick up on one-to-many advice and develop it further in a

more targeted way. There is no automatic forwarding of people from one-to-many advice to one-to-one advice, but people are signposted appropriately where there is a specific identified need. Any new entrants to farming can have an Integrated Land Management Programme (ILMP), Carbon Audit or mentoring. The only requirement is that they are a registered business. Four days of mentoring are available for those who have been head of the business for no more than five years. Mentoring also helps encourage the acquisition of skills to an adequate level. We were told that feedback from new entrants has been very good. One of the main stated outcomes is increased confidence.

Although many of the workshops run for new entrants include exercises and assessments to see that principles and practices have been understood, there is no formal testing. No certificates have been awarded as a result of the FAS delivery.

In 2018 a *planning for the future* roadshow took place in collaboration with the NFUS and the Scottish Land Commission. In the opinion of Scottish Government officials, this aided generational renewal greatly by, in the context of an informal form of lunch meeting, laying out the fundamentals of succession and introducing different options for retirement e.g. joint venture farming. Feedback from these events showed people actively going home and putting wheels in motion for the next generation to succeed in the business.

FAS resources have also been used for case-study work, disseminating ‘good news’ stories of how different people have got on to the agricultural ladder in various different ways (tenancy, purchasing, seasonal land, etc.). The evaluators were told that feedback on these has been extremely positive, giving people that further thirst to go and succeed in the industry. Several of the case studies produced in 2018 were success stories of people who have been at the group workshops.

The evaluators have been told by Scottish Government officials that so far there has been no significant impact on the age profile of farmers at the aggregate level, nor is this expected; the budget is not considered to be sufficient to result in major change for the sector. The demographics reported annually for farmers are such that the share of activity that is being undertaken by young farmers is not increasing rapidly. The SRDP, and the FAS in particular, seeks to address this by providing skills and helping young farmers to identify opportunities. However, there are many other factors, notably land tenure regulations, that provide other barriers to entry for young farmers. The *Farming Opportunities for New Entrants* (FONE) programme, initiated in 2016, aimed to facilitate entry by, *inter alia*, providing easier access to publicly-owned land.

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

There is nothing specific in the KTIF for new entrants, but they can attend any activities (age and gender are recorded, which may help with evaluation). It would be expected that knowledge transfer will have a generic impact on skills and generational renewal. The Measure 6 new entrants’ start-up grants include an eligibility criterion that farmers must have appropriate agricultural qualifications. The infrastructure is therefore in place to allow new entrants to gain adequate skills if they do not already possess these.

Synergies with other Schemes

Discussions with Scottish Government officials have shown that many crofters supported by *CAGS* are new entrants. Furthermore, under the YFSUG scheme, the young farmers are guided towards the available advice, such as from FAS. YFSUG Business Plans will contain details of plans to improve skills, and these could (in a subsequent evaluation) be followed up to see how skills improvement benefited the business.

Overall impact

'A Future Strategy for Scottish Agriculture' (<https://www.gov.scot/publications/future-strategy-scottish-agriculture-final-report-scottish-governments-agriculture-champions/>) explains that generational renewal has been an issue for a long time. However, assessing the impact of the support of the above schemes on entry of adequately skilled farmers into the agricultural sector and in particular, generational renewal, is complicated. Entry is itself a complex process as well as a sensitive one as explained in the 2017 Scottish Government report 'Women in Farming and the Agriculture Sector' (<https://www.gov.scot/publications/women-farming-agriculture-sector/>). In the UK it is often gradual and involves transitional stages of financial responsibility within businesses owned by families. The perception is that the majority of Scotland's new entrants are from existing farming families; this may imply some deadweight in that most would have entered the industry without the advice and support of SRDP schemes. Evidence given to the 2016 EAIR indicated that around 50% to 70% of beneficiaries would come into the category of being genuinely new, with around 30% to 50% having the opportunity to more actively participate in the family farm. Some would have been previously contractors with seasonal grazing enterprises and who were looking to expand this activity as fully-fledged farmers. It seems unlikely that this percentage has changed in the period to 2018.

But just because people come from a farming family does not mean there are no barriers to entering the sector. 'Women in Farming and the Agriculture Sector' notes that the cultural practice of passing on large farms intact to one son is the single biggest barrier to women's entry into agriculture. Irrespective of gender, capital might be needed to buy in to the business or to restructure a business which has been in decline, etc. The FAS events for new entrants are designed to challenge people and make them think how they should run a farm and so offer benefits beyond simply helping people enter the sector. According to Scottish Government officials, these groups have given young people a refreshing look into the business angle of farming.

Stakeholder views

According to a stakeholder (reported in the 2016 EAIR), the SRDP has helped to raise the quality of new entrants to Scottish agriculture and this complements Lantra's work in the same direction, such as the annual Land-Based and Aquaculture Learner of the Year Awards. The introduction of support for 'industry champions' will help to ensure that new entrants can also act as ambassadors for the industry (for example, as speakers at industry engagement and school careers events). However, this stakeholder had a concern that the focus on entrants from outside the farming community could under-value the contribution to skills development in the sector by successors taking over family farms.

In the view of a stakeholder representing crofting, the start-up schemes for new entrants probably did not stimulate older crofters to leave, certainly not noticeably. However, they did help the new entrants to get started, probably more so than for someone inheriting a croft. That said, there would need to be better mechanisms if generational renewal is the aim.

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

Recommendation: That the monitoring system should be made capable of populating the additional result indicator, and that information is gathered, based on business development plans, that can show the impact of the SRDP interventions assisting young/new entrants on individual economic circumstances.

7.a6) CEQ06-3A - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to improving the competitiveness of supported primary producers by better integrating them into the agri-food chain through quality schemes, adding value to the agricultural products, promoting local markets and short supply circuits, producer groups and inter-branch organization?

7.a6.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this FA:

M04 and M16: Food Processing, Marketing and Cooperation Scheme (FPMC)

Rural Priorities (RP) (2007-13)

Land Managers Options (LMO) (2007-13)

Financial inputs and output data

A total of €35,739,252 of public money has been spent under Measure 4 (4.2 - support for investments in processing/marketing and/or development of agricultural products) under this FA with a further €1,022,694 spent under Measure 16 (O1). Almost all of Measure 4 expenditure has been under the Food Processing, Marketing and Cooperation Scheme with the remainder committed under legacy schemes (RP, €53,880). All expenditure under Measure 16 has been under the Food Processing, Marketing and Cooperation Scheme.

Total investment under Measure 4 has been €129,662,828 to the end of 2018 (O2).

There has also been transitional expenditure under Measure 3 (LMO) of €959,365 and under Measure 14 (also LMO) of €5,501,385.

Some 110 actions/operations have been supported under Measure 4 to the end of 2018 (O3) while 2 holdings (O9) have completed 2 cooperation operations (O17) under sub-Measure 16.3 - cooperation among smalls operators in organising joint work processes and sharing facilities and resources, and for developing/marketing tourism and 2 under sub-measure 16.4 - support for cooperation among supply chain actors for the establishment and development of short supply chains and local markets, and for promotion activities.

Support has been provided to 12.57% of Scottish agri-food businesses (PST13A) while 14.69% of agricultural holdings have received support for participating in quality schemes, local markets and short supply circuits, and producer groups/organisations (R4/T6).

Qualitative assessment

Before moving to the qualitative assessment it should be noted that the 2016 EAIR was critical of the quantitative data specified to help answer this CEQ. It pointed to a mismatch between the judgement criteria and the Common Results Indicators set within the CMEF; the first two listed criteria are concerned with increases whereas the indicators relate to static percentages. Further, the Additional Results Indicator chosen for competitiveness is partial and potentially misleading (high output farms are not necessarily more competitive), and an increased percentage of price retained by primary producers is not necessarily something that is beneficial (and again the proposed indicator is a static observation, which is inappropriate). While an increase in added value of primary producers would be a more acceptable in the context of assessing a contribution to greater competitiveness, no such additional indicator is proposed.

Because of these fundamental problems, it is perhaps not a drawback that currently no data are available for these indicators.

Measure 4 and Measure 16: Food Processing, Marketing and Cooperation Scheme

According to Scottish Government officials interviewed in the course of undertaking this 2018 EAIR, it is not the purpose of the FPMC Scheme to improve the competitiveness of primary producers (the central issue to which the CEQ is directed). This echoes the ‘explanatory notes and additional information for the assessment, scoring and decision making/recommendations of FPMC applications’ (Scottish Government, August 2016) that states, rather, that the primary purpose of the FPMC Scheme (Measures 4 and 16) is to support more sustainable economic growth of the food industry through greater cooperation and collaboration, from primary production to final market. Thus, any impact on primary producers is indirect (unless they happen also to be food processors, as some are). Nevertheless, it is hoped that the support of processors will lead to greater use of local Scottish produce, which will benefit primary producers, though there is no way to ensure that local produce is used.

Support under this Focus Area has been directed almost entirely at assisting capital investments (Measure 4) rather than cooperation (Measure 16). According to Scottish Government officials, the investments, which are primarily in the food processing sector, should have a positive (but indirect) impact on primary producers and their competitiveness and enhance their value added; this in line with the intervention logic. Most of the cooperation that takes place under the FPMC tends to be vertical through integration. There is some horizontal cooperation at the primary producer level (grain silos and drying facilities for example) and 3-4 of these have been supported by the FPMC (issues of commercial sensitivity inhibit cooperation further up the food chain). Some projects fund farmers who wish to undertake on-farm processing; in these cases it is likely that there will be an increase in the added value of primary producers. These cases where there is a direct benefit for primary producers are, the evaluators were told, not typical of FPMC-assisted activities.

The impact on prices received by primary producers, and hence their margin in the final price of agricultural products (one of the additional results indicators) is uncertain.

There are monitoring forms to follow up activities. This form does follow up job creation and other metrics which are included in the application process. However, no question is asked on the impact on value added to primary producers or their prices.

Thus, at the end of 2018 there is no evidence for an impact on the participation of primary producers in short-circuit schemes, quality-orientated producer groups and inter-branch organisations, though it is possible that this may emerge subsequently as recent projects mature. Similarly, there should be an impact on short supply chains, which are examined closely in the assessment process. There may be more use of local markets by supported projects, though this is not something that is specifically targeted.

A bespoke piece of work would be required to gather the information required under this CEQ. There is evaluation work being undertaken currently within the FPMC, but this does not seem to focus on the issues contained in this CEQ. It focuses on what is on the application form and measures success in respect of, for example, projected increased sales, volumes, new market opportunities, inward investment, sustainability, etc. If it is necessary to provide information to address this CEQ, then this is something that could, in theory, be added to this piece of research.

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

to the competitive or uncompetitive nature of the primary producers. More generally, there seems to be a mismatch between additional results indicators and the objectives of the Measure, and the FPMC does not seem to be well-oriented to benefitting primary producers, though it is capable of bringing economic gains to other parts of the food chain and, to the extent that the firms are located in rural areas, to the economy there.

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

7.a7) CEQ07-3B - To what extent have RDP interventions supported farm risk prevention and management?

7.a7.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this FA:

M01: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (programmed under other Focus Areas, but contributing to FA 3B)

M02: Farm Advisory Service

Financial inputs and output data

A total of €400,073 had been spent under Measure 2 (Farm Advisory Service) to the end of 2018 under FA 3B.

By the end of 2018, 3,568 beneficiaries had been advised under Measure 2 under this FA. Twelve actions/operations had been undertaken under sub-measure 2.3 - support for training of advisors (O3). A total of 334 advisors had received training (O14).

Qualitative assessment

When preparing the 2016 EAIR the evaluators were told by Scottish Government officials that the explicit risk management tools provided within the RDP Regulation were not taken up because the expectation was that this issue should be dealt with by the sector itself.

Measure 1: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (programmed under other Focus Areas, but contributing to FA 3B)

Though risk management was within the scope of the KTIF, at the time of the 2016 EAIR there were no KTIF projects that linked explicitly to risk management. Since then some new projects have been put in place that pick up risk prevention and management themes. For example, the *Farming for the Future* project (Soil Association) considers sustainable approaches to build financial and environmental resilience in a changing climate. Resilience also features in projects concerned with two dairying projects (*antimicrobial use*, and *Grass to Milk Organically*). Some of the Monitor Farms also pick up on these issues.

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service

The FAS seeks to address risk and risk management through several activities, but mainly by providing examples of good practice and performance thereby minimising risk. Scottish Government officials have told us there has been a range of events relating to risk prevention and management. In particular, 2018 was quite challenging and a lot of material was produced on weather risk. The objective is to improve resilience and minimise risk in several areas, but particularly in crop health, animal health and climate change, as well as cross-compliance. These themes are addressed through a range of techniques including on-farm events, technical notes, guidance notes, and advice through the telephone advice-line and the website. Risk management is also one aspect what is covered in the one-to-one system of advice.

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

In preparing the 2016 EAIR we were told by Scottish Government officials that many intervention actions to manage risk focused on technical issues, including grassland management to ensure adequate forage supplies, enterprise mix changes to improve profitability, management practice changes to ensure efficient use of fertilisers, and integrated pest management measures undertaken to improve crop health and technical performance of the crop gross margins by reducing variable costs to acceptable levels.

We have been told that there are multiple drivers of farmer actions to cope with risk, of which the most fundamental is the financial one; increased financial and economic performance as a result of minimising risk will motivate farmers most. By demonstrating a financial benefit to minimising risk, the likelihood of the adoption of such practices is markedly increased. This, therefore, becomes a major factor in encouraging uptake by proving or demonstrating improved financial performance and benefit.

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

In terms of assessing impacts, the one-to-one advice delivery contractor (Ricardo) has in place a monitoring system that gathers information from farmers on their intention after advice, which where appropriate will include risk management, though this information is not currently collated. A further contract is being issued to follow-up by telephone interview these intentions after a period of delay and to explore the actual impacts that have occurred. However, this evidence will only be available at some time in the future.

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

Recommendation: That data are collected to populate the indicators, and that further information is obtained at farm level that can be used in the evaluation of the interventions. A breakdown of the proportion of training and advice activities which relate to risk management should be made available to subsequent evaluations. A form of this would be the collation and analysis (to show risk-related components) of monitoring data currently collected and held under the one-to-one advice system and to be gathered in follow-up surveys.

7.a8) CEQ08-4A - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the restoration, preservation and enhancement of biodiversity including in Natura 2000 areas, areas facing natural or other specific constraints and HNV farming, and the state of European landscape?

7.a8.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this FA:

M01 and M16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

M02: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

M04, M08, M11 and M15: Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme (AECS)

M04, M08 and M15: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS)

M13: Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS)

Rural Priorities (RP) (2007-13)

Land Managers Options (LMO) (2007-13)

Financial inputs and output data

Monitoring data are for FA 4 are not disaggregated because actions in this area are deemed to be relevant for biodiversity (4A), water management (4B) and soil erosion (4C). However, the nature of the activities supported allows some differentiation by FA in our reporting.

A total of €56,389 was spent to the end of 2018 under Measure 1 (KTIF) (O1).

Public expenditure under Measure 2 under FA 4 amounted to €2,406,700 by the end of 2018 (O1).

Total public expenditure under Measure 4 under FA 4 reached €20,003,668 by the end of 2018 (O1). Some 78% of this spend related to AECS with the balance commitments entered into in the 2007-2013 programming period (RP). Total investment was €24,413,887 as a result of leverage under the RP scheme.

Some €78,383,182 of public expenditure took place under Measure 8 to the end of 2018 (O1). Some 78% of this related to ongoing commitments from the 2007-2013 programming period under RP (€61,340,145); the FGS contributed the remaining 22%.

Data relating to Measure 10 can sometimes be assigned to specific FAs, although the fact that this has not formally been done by the Managing Authority suggests that in practice, support for activities may have impacts across several FAs depending on circumstances. Total public expenditure under Measure 10 relevant to FA 4 to the end of 2018 was €113,305,427. Of this, €97,670,293 (86%) was disbursed under commitments made in the 2007-2013 programming period.

Total public expenditure under activities which can be expected to have an impact on FA 4A was €106,517,715 by the end of 2018 (94% of the total). The areas of activity included here are (in some cases the same spend can be expected to have impacts relevant to FAs 4B and 4C as well):

- Cultivation practices: soil cover, ploughing techniques, low tillage, conservation agriculture (€795,043, 1%)

- Management of landscape, habitats, grassland, HNV farming: creation, upkeep of ecological features (e.g. field margins, buffer areas, flower strips, hedgerows, trees) (€51,324,160, 48%)
- Management of landscape, habitats, grassland, HNV farming: maintenance of HNV arable and grassland systems (e.g. mowing techniques, hand labour, leaving of winter stubbles in arable areas), introduction of extensive grazing practices, conversion of arable land to grassland (€54,398,511, 51%)

Total expenditure under Measure 13 relevant to FA 4 (LFASS) amounted to €151,555,628 by the end of 2018.

Total public expenditure under Measure 15 relevant to FA 4 (FGS, Rural Priorities and Land Manager Options) amounted to €13,122,048 to the end of 2018; this cannot be broken down by FA and is assumed to be relevant to FAs 4A, 4B and 4C. Of this, €554,042 was spent under FGS, there was no expenditure under AECS.

By the end of 2018, 19.66% of agricultural land was under management contracts supporting biodiversity and/or landscapes (R7/T9), as was 4.68% of forest/other wooded area (R6/T8). Both these figures relate specifically to FA 4A.

Some €56,389 was spent under Measure 1 under FA 4 to the end of 2018 to train 252 beneficiaries.

Five actions/operations on the training of advisors relevant to FA 4 had taken place by the end of 2018 under Measure 2 (FAS) (O3) with 185 advisors trained by the end of 2018 (O14). Ten actions/operations related to support to help people benefit from the use of advisory services (O3) under which 3,134 people were advised (O13).

Support for investments in infrastructure related to development, modernisation or adaptation of agriculture and forestry (sub-measure 4.3) was provided for 4 actions/operations by the end of 2018 (O3), all under AECS.

Support for 1,246 non-productive investments linked to the achievement of agri-environment-climate objectives had been delivered under Measure 4 (sub-measure 4.4) (O3); of these 68% were delivered under the AECS with the remainder delivered under legacy schemes (RP).

The FGS provided support for afforestation/creation of woodland under sub-measure 8.1 to 561 hectares in 2016, 1,480 in 2017 and 936 hectares in 2018 (O5). A further 167 hectares had received support under sub-measure 8.4 for the restoration of damage to forests from forest fires and natural disasters and catastrophic events (O5); this support related to 44 holdings/beneficiaries (O4). Sub-measure 8.5, also supported 329 actions/operations to improve the resilience and environmental value of forest ecosystems which covered 14,354 hectares (O5). These data cannot be sub-divided.

The Measure 10 aspects of AECS have been implemented from 2017. With respect to FA 4A, 9,027 ha were under agreement for the management of landscape, habitats, grassland, HNV farming: creation, upkeep of ecological features (e.g. field margins, buffer areas, flower strips, hedgerows, trees) in 2018 and, in the same year, 326,882 ha under management of landscape, habitats, grassland, HNV farming: maintenance of HNV arable and grassland systems (e.g. mowing techniques, hand labour, leaving of winter stubbles in arable areas), introduction of extensive grazing practices, conversion of arable land to grassland.

A total of 1,169,204 ha of land was under agreement under Measure 13 (LFASS) under FA 4 by the end of 2018 (O5). This area related to 6,055 holdings/beneficiaries. No further breakdown is possible.

Some 7,200 ha were under agreement under Measure 15 (FGS) in 2017 and 3,205 ha in 2018. Much larger areas were under agreement under Measure 15 under legacy schemes (RP and LMO).

Qualitative assessment

The evaluators were told by Scottish Government officials that the SRDP integrates environmental and biodiversity performance across all delivery aspects, the objective being to prove that a “win-win” situation exists, and improvements in financial performance can also achieve environmental improvements and increased business resilience.

Measure 1: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

Several KTIF projects are relevant to biodiversity aims. The evaluators were provided with a list of projects, three of which are run by the Soil Association and appear to have a strong biodiversity element: *Future Farming Scotland*, *Farming with nature* and *Farming for the future*.

The Soil Association Scotland states that the KTIF projects it administers have had a positive impact on biodiversity. Analysis of its KTIF-funded programme participants found that **68% had changed their attitude most positively towards ‘farming and biodiversity’**. Its Farming with Nature (FWN) project specifically promotes and supports evidence-based land management practices which deliver integrated benefits for biodiversity and farming/crofting businesses. The majority of FWN participants manage land designated LFA and/or HNV, which provides valuable habitat for wildlife (including priority species and habitats) dependent on traditional farming and land use practices. The Soil Association’s recent evaluation found that over **400 farmers who have participated in our FWN themed events are currently undertaking a range of projects to benefit biodiversity on their land** including pollinators, farmland wading birds and peatland. Examples of integrated biodiversity and business benefits promoted by FWN include:

- Conservation grazing for species-rich grassland and better ewe management
- Integrating peatland restoration with active livestock hill farming and crofting
- Using non-chemical strategies for controlling soft rush on pasture and creating habitat for rare breeding farmland waders
- Highlighting ‘win-win’ situations on farms where AECS options management can benefit both wildlife and production
- Showing how to make Ecological Focus Areas work for farming and biodiversity

Biodiversity (and the other environmental impact areas) is a compulsory aspect of the *Monitor Farms programme* (run by Quality Meats Scotland).

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

Scottish Government officials told the evaluators that all the FAS programme elements are designed to achieve some aspects of enhanced environmental and biodiversity performance. The one-to-many element of FAS has sought to integrate improvements in biodiversity and environmental performance with all other aspects of improvement, both financial and economic. Events have taken place under each of the three areas under CEQs 8-10 (of which biodiversity is the first). There are events specifically targeted at LFA/HNV types of farming. There are also events targeted at deer management, grassland management, etc. No individual species have been especially targeted, but corncrakes, corn bunting, waders, pollinators and invasive species have all been addressed at various meetings. Biodiversity in terms of the microflora and fauna of the soil has also been addressed.

In the one-to-one programme, each Integrated Land Management Plan (ILMP) examines each of the

elements set out in CEQs 8-10. The uptake of specialist advice will show where the focus of advice is. The content of these plans would appear capable of providing the basis of subsequent evaluations.

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

Scotland has had an AEC scheme since the early 1990s and has developed a suite of interventions that benefit Scotland's biodiversity. AECS management options are separated into groups based on the type of farming system and activity they fund. The groups indicate the wide range of environmental objectives pursued by the scheme:

- Arable options,
- Grassland options
- Upland, peatland, moorland and heath options
- Farmland habitat and feature options
- Wetland and bog options
- Small units
- Control of invasive non-native species options
- Managing water quality and flood risk options (see answer to CEQ 10)
- Organic conversion and maintenance

The scheme also offers a full list of capital items.

The evaluators were told, when preparing the 2016 EAIR, that evidence from previous programmes has demonstrated the benefits of AEC measures in supporting biodiversity. The evaluators have been told also that, according to the *ex-post* evaluation, many of Scotland's environment-related problems associated with land use were addressed to a considerable extent by the SRDP 2007-2013. The principal changes for the 2014-2020 period relating to biodiversity have been with respect to successful engagement with recovery strategies for some bird species such as corncrake, chough and corn bunting.

There is a total of 1,866 protected areas in Scotland, which host 5,368 natural features (habitats, species populations and earth science interests) which are routinely monitored through Scottish Natural Heritage's Site Condition Monitoring programme. Where management is required to improve the special features, land managers are encouraged to seek SRDP support. Management Agreements and SRDP agri-environment contracts are legal contracts over land with the purpose of supporting natural heritage management. Payments are offered in return for an agreed work programme, and relate to income forgone and costs incurred for the alternative management. Scotland's Biodiversity: A Route Map to 2020" (<https://www.gov.scot/publications/scotlands-biodiversity-route-map-2020/>), which was developed to help direct priorities for action to achieve the Scottish Biodiversity Strategy, sets out the favourable condition target of at least 80% of designated 'features' in favourable condition by 2016. In May 2017, Scottish Natural Heritage released figures tracking the proportion of Scottish protected natural features in favourable or recovering status. The main findings showed that 80.3% of the natural features on protected nature sites in Scotland were either in favourable condition, or unfavourable but recovering towards a favourable condition. It might be possible to measure supported features such as hedgerows, but this is not done at the moment.

It has been found that one-to-one advice to land managers to explain the schemes and what is possible on their holding works best to achieve results. In preparing the 2018 EAIR evaluators were told that the loss of the Environmental Cooperation Action Fund (ECAAF) (terminated in 2016) has been compensated for by rewarding applications to AECS through the scoring system where there is collaboration which can deliver a more landscape-scale approach. This is an internalisation of the approach under ECAF which was more

proactive in seeking collaboration. That said, there is no dedicated facilitation service whose purpose is to help bring applicants together, however KTIF can help form Operational Groups, including those that aim to test out new ideas through projects which adapt existing techniques/practices to new geographical/environmental contexts.

It is difficult to provide commentary on outcomes at this stage, though a monitoring and evaluation project was being launched in 2019 (though delayed). It is understood that environmental outcomes will be covered, so it is reasonable to expect that this exercise will cover issues relating to this CEQ.

As an interim, scheme uptake and the outputs show where the money has been spent, and this is a reasonable proxy for outcomes on the principle that if the management prescriptions are followed properly (and this is inspected), then the outcomes should follow. There are 14 priority species which are mapped to the prescriptions in the areas on which they are targeted. Other species could have been targeted, but there was less confidence that measures could clearly result in the desired improvements. The breakdown of expenditure for AECS options shows that a significant part of the funds was allocated to interventions that will deliver core objectives supporting the recovery vulnerable species, the farmland bird index, HNV farming and Natura 2000 (94% of the total, see above):

- Wader grazed and mown grassland options – which will support waders, and other wildlife. The farmland bird index shows a declining trend for waders
- Retention of winter stubbles for wildlife and water quality – supporting seed-eating birds which have a more stable trend
- Stubbles followed by green manure – supporting bird species and pollinators
- Corncrake Management: identified as a vulnerable species
- Moorland Management (including stock disposal and away wintering) – supporting HNV farming systems and Natura 2000 (heather and blanket bog)

It should be noted that crofting is used as a proxy for HNV farming. There are data on AECS scheme uptake which can be broken down by crofting area.

According to a stakeholder, overall the AECS is delivering its core objectives of supporting the preservation and enhancement of biodiversity, including Natura 2000 areas and designated sites. However, another stakeholder, representing crofting stated that the scheme is too difficult to get into for small units. There is substantial complexity for the possible reward. There is much too much effort for small pieces of land (yet many crofts add up to a lot of land - there are 770,000 hectares under crofting tenure, representing 25% of the agricultural land area in the Highlands and Islands, and 12.5% of Scotland's agricultural land). It is noted in this context that 'A Future Strategy for Scottish Agriculture'

(<https://www.gov.scot/publications/future-strategy-scottish-agriculture-final-report-scottish-governments-agriculture-champions/>) has as a headline recommendation that support schemes must be kept simple and must not attempt to please everybody.

Measure 13: Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS)

Some 85% of agricultural area in Scotland is classed as LFA. The LFA maps quite well onto HNV areas. The LFASS supports 6,055 farmers and crofters under this Focus Area. Though within Pillar 2, it acts similarly to a Pillar 1 scheme of income support and, the evaluators were told, is more important than the latter for many farmers; for these, viability depends on the LFASS payments and without these payments there is a likelihood that land abandonment would follow, with negative socio-economic and environmental consequences. LFASS supports livestock systems in remote and fragile areas and there is an implied impact

on biodiversity.

However, when preparing the 2018 EAIR, the evaluators were told by Scottish Government officials that there are no specific data to show an impact on biodiversity. Nevertheless, part of the scheme requires the maintenance of livestock and there is a lot of evidence that appropriate livestock grazing is good for biodiversity. Grazing helps to maintain habitats and reduce rank grassland and monoculture species. Sheep grazing in remote areas provides greater environmental enhancements than does cattle grazing. The evaluators were told that previous studies have suggested that there are environmental benefits as a result of the scheme. LFASS is seen in 'A Future Strategy for Scottish Agriculture' as very much part of the future policy provision.

A stakeholder representing crofters commented that LFASS enables crofts to survive, so without it many crofts would not be able to operate and provide the benefits to restoration, preservation and enhancement of biodiversity in Natura 2000 areas, areas facing natural or other specific constraints and HNV farming, and to contribute to the state of European landscape in the ways they currently do. However, in its view LFASS is misdirected, directing money to better land.

Measure 15: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS)

There are specific habitat and species options within the FGS, both for capital and ongoing management works, and there are biodiversity benefits both from management and establishment of woodland.

Almost all woodland management schemes have a capital element (putting a fence up, weed control, etc.) and also annual maintenance and monitoring. Support is provided subject to a plan which has a biodiversity dimension and that can then be monitored annually. This information is reviewed to ensure satisfactory progress before payment is released. This information is not collated at the moment, but the basic data is in place to allow this as part of a specific evaluation exercise. There has been a discussion with the SRDP team to see how this material can be brought together. There are 53 schemes on native woodland management (SSSIs), and 86 on species control.

Afforestation also counts as supporting biodiversity, and this applies both to native woodland creation and commercial wood production species. Around 500 native woodland creation schemes have been supported. There are management checks to make sure that the right number of trees have been planted. However, as the scheme started in 2016, these checks are only about to begin now. All schemes are now of mixed design; they cannot be simply commercial, and they must offer other benefits. There is a limit on commercial planting, so 70-75% can be single species, but the remainder would provide biodiversity, etc. benefits. The evaluators were told, when preparing this 2018 EAIR, that the biodiversity aspects are evaluated periodically, though no evidence was provided.

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

Recommendations: That steps are taken to quantify the impacts that the various schemes, individually and collectively, have on biodiversity. Monitoring and evaluation exercises of AECS and FAS are being launched (in 2019), but similar projects should be encouraged in the other schemes that potentially impact on biodiversity. This will mean that adequate monitoring data are required, although the difficulties in

establishing a baseline and assigning causality are recognised.

7.a9) CEQ09-4B - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the improvement of water management, including fertilizer and pesticide management?

7.a9.a) *Answer to evaluation question*

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this FA:

M01 and M16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

M02: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

M04, M08, M11 and M15: Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme (AECS)

M04, M08 and M15: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS)

M13: Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS)

Rural Priorities (RP) (2007-13)

Land Managers Options (LMO) (2007-13)

Financial inputs and output data

Monitoring data are collected for FA 4 in total and are not split into 4A, 4B and 4C. This is because actions in this area are deemed to be relevant for biodiversity (4A), water management (4B) and soil erosion (4C). While the European Commission reporting requirements do not require a split of data for Measure 10, the nature of the activities supported allows some differentiation by FA in our reporting.

A total of €56,389 was spent to the end of 2018 under Measure 1 (Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund) (O1).

Public expenditure under Measure 2 under FA 4 amounted to €2,406,700 by the end of 2018 (O1).

Total public expenditure under Measure 4 under FA 4 had reached €20,003,668 by the end of 2018 (O1). Three-quarters of this spend (78%) related to AECS with the balance commitments entered into in the 2007-2013 programming period (Rural Priorities scheme). Total investment amounted to €24,413,887 as a result of leverage under the Rural Priorities scheme.

Some €78,383,183 of public expenditure took place under Measure 8 to the end of 2018 (O1). Three-quarters of this related to ongoing commitments from the 2007-2013 programming period under Rural Priorities (€61,340,145, 78%); the Forestry Grant Scheme contributed the remaining fifth.

Data relating to Measure 10 can sometimes be assigned to specific FAs, although the fact that this has not formally been done by the Managing Authority suggests that in practice, support for activities may have impacts across different and/or multiple FAs depending on circumstances. Total public expenditure under Measure 10 relevant to FA 4 to the end of 2018 amounted to €113,305,427. Of this, €97,670,293 (86%)

was disbursed under commitments made in the 2007-2013 programming period.

Total public expenditure under activities which can be expected to have an impact on FA 4B amounted to €108,889,147 by the end of 2018 (96% of the total). The areas of activity included here are (in some cases the same spend can be expected to have impacts relevant to FAs 4A and 4C as well):

- Cultivation practices: soil cover, ploughing techniques, low tillage, conservation agriculture (€795,043, 1%)
- Management of landscape, habitats, grassland, HNV farming: creation, upkeep of ecological features (e.g. field margins, buffer areas, flower strips, hedgerows, trees) (€51,324,160, 47%)
- Irrigation/drainage: Reduction of drainage, management of wetlands (€2,371,433, 2%)
- Management of landscape, habitats, grassland, HNV farming: Maintenance of HNV arable and grassland systems (e.g. mowing techniques, hand labour, leaving of winter stubbles in arable areas), introduction of extensive grazing practices, conversion of arable land to grassland (€54,398,511, 50%)

Total expenditure under Measure 13 relevant to FA 4 (Less Favoured Area Support Scheme) amounted to €151,555,628 by the end of 2018.

Total public expenditure under Measure 15 relevant to FA 4 (FGS, Rural Priorities and Land Manager Options) amounted to €13,122,048 to the end of 2018; this cannot be broken down by FA and is assumed to be relevant to FAs 4A, 4B and 4C. Of this, €554,042 was spent under FGS, there was no expenditure under AECS.

By the end of 2018, 16.30% of agricultural land was under management contracts to improve water management (R8/T10), as was 4.68% of forest/other wooded area (R9/T11). Both these figures relate specifically to FA 4B.

Some €56,389 was spent under Measure 1 under FA 4 to the end of 2018 to train 252 beneficiaries.

Five actions/operations on the training of advisors relevant to FA 4 had taken place by the end of 2018 under Measure 2 (FAS) (O3) with 185 advisors trained by the end of 2018 (O14). Ten actions/operations related to support to help people benefit from the use of advisory services (O3) under which 3,134 people were advised (O13).

Support for investments in infrastructure related to development, modernisation or adaptation of agriculture and forestry (sub-measure 4.3) was provided for 4 actions/operations by the end of 2018 (O3), all under AECS.

Support for 1,246 non-productive investments linked to the achievement of agri-environment-climate objectives had been delivered under Measure 4 (sub-measure 4.4) by the end of 2018 (O3); of these 68% were delivered under the Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme with the remainder delivered under legacy schemes (RP).

The FGS provided support for afforestation/creation of woodland under Measure 8, sub-measure 8.1 to 561 hectares in 2016, 1,480 in 2017 and 936 hectares in 2018 (O5). A further 167 hectares had received support under sub-measure 8.4 for the restoration of damage to forests from forest fires and natural disasters and catastrophic events (O5); this support was spread across 44 holdings/beneficiaries (O4). Measure 8, sub-measure 8.5, also supported 329 actions/operations to improve the resilience and environmental value of forest ecosystems which covered 14,354 hectares (O5). These data cannot be sub-divided.

The monitoring data held on outputs under Measure 10 is complicated because under some schemes area supported can address multiple issues and there is therefore the potential for double counting. This applies to the area under the Land Managers Options scheme whereas the Rural Priorities scheme is unique. Data cannot be summed across years without double counting areas. It is also not always possible to be certain where the output recorded under some codes (for example, “other”) will have an impact.

The Measure 10 aspects of the new Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme have been implemented from 2017. With reference to FA 4B, some 4,771 hectares were under agreement for the management of landscape, habitats, grassland, HNV farming: creation, upkeep of ecological features (e.g. field margins, buffer areas, flower strips, hedgerows, trees) in 2017 and 9,027 hectares in 2018; 101,717 hectares were under management of landscape, habitats, grassland, HNV farming: maintenance of HNV arable and grassland systems (e.g. mowing techniques, hand labour, leaving of winter stubbles in arable areas), introduction of extensive grazing practices, conversion of arable land to grassland in 2017 and 326,882 hectares in 2018; and 1,887 hectares were under management in 2017 with respect to irrigation/drainage: reduction of drainage, management of wetlands.

A total of 1,169,204 hectares of land was under agreement under Measure 13 (Less Favoured Area Support Scheme) under FA 4 by the end of 2018 (O5). This area related to 6,055 holdings/beneficiaries. No further breakdown is possible.

Some 7,200 hectares were under agreement under Measure 15 (FGS) in 2017 and 3,205 hectares in 2018. Much larger areas were under agreement under Measure 15 under legacy schemes (RP and LMO).

Qualitative assessment

Measure 1: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

As noted in the 2016 EAIR, several KTIF-funded projects are relevant to this question. Whilst none appear to be focused specifically on water management, several are concerned with input use, primarily for biodiversity reasons, and these will also be relevant to water quality. Water quality (with the other environmental impact areas) is a compulsory aspect of the KTIF Monitor Farms programme.

The Soil Association Scotland, which administers several KTIF-funded projects, is of the view that these have had a positive impact on improved fertiliser and pesticide management. They promote and support evidence-based soil management practices which aim to minimise the use of synthetic nitrogen-based fertilisers and chemical pesticides. As an example, the non-chemical control of soft rush is a popular topic, as land being treated with chemicals cannot be used for grazing. Some 380 farmers/crofters who have participated in the Soil Association’s KTIF funded programmes are currently progressing non-chemical strategies for controlling invasive soft rush.

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

The FAS one-to-one advice system (with its Integrated Land Management Plans) and the FAS one-to-many activities both deliver on this environmental topic.

Water management and pesticide and fertiliser management is included as a significant component in the FAS one-to-many delivery activities. The *Soil Nutrient Network* farms, the *Farming for a Better Climate* initiative, and the *Farming and Water Scotland* initiative are interventions aimed at improving water management, as well as fertiliser and pesticide management. The inclusion of integrated pest management under the crop health initiatives creates further significant delivery. The Scottish Government believes that Farming for a Better Climate and the Soil Nutrient Network farms in particular have had significant impact

on the interventions as far as water management and fertiliser and pesticide management are concerned. Many agreements are multi-annual and long-term in nature, and so short-term impacts will not yet have emerged. It is believed that, in particular, the creation of catchment area discussion groups will encourage cooperation amongst participants, to the benefit of the catchment area.

SAC, which delivers the one-to-many part of FAS, has a close working relationship with the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA), a leading implementor of the Water Framework Directive in the EU. FAS/SAC delivers important knowledge transfer related to this. Amongst other things, FAS is used to raise awareness of audits on farm.

Concerning the one-to-one advice delivered by Ricardo, apparently there is no direct evidence on impacts on water quality, but an indication of intensity of activity on this objective can be taken from the extent of specialist advice that has been given on this issue.

It is not clear at this stage whether the monitoring and evaluation of FAS, initiated in 2019, will adequately cover issues relating to this CEQ.

Measures 4 and 10: Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme

According to Scottish Government officials interviewed for the purpose of assembling an answer to this question in the 2018 EAIR, there is less of a central role for AECS here, although there are elements of the AECS which will have an impact in this area. This seems rather muted compared with the evidence collected for the 2016 EAIR, when the Scottish Government told the evaluators that the design of the AECS is intended to deliver benefits in water management, including fertilizer and pesticides management. Diffuse pollution mitigation is a national priority within AECS. The evaluators were told that every AECS application has to consider the diffuse pollution pressures as part of the environmental assessment of the holding. This process requires that applicants carry out a diffuse pollution assessment to identify risks on farm and identify the options to reduce pollution risk.

The Scottish Government told the evaluators that AECS has a number of options available which, if appropriately located, will benefit water quality. Water quality actions are targeted at vulnerable catchment areas (nitrate vulnerable zones, for example) which have been identified by SEPA. Under the intervention logic, impacts should follow. These options include: riparian and in-field buffers, ponds, wetlands, swales, sediment traps, bridges, alternative watering facilities, etc.

Some new capital items have been developed to help address diffuse pollution pressure, for example, Rural Sustainable Drainage capital items. The availability of several capital items dealing with diffuse pollution has been restricted to areas of Scotland identified as priorities for addressing diffuse pollution in order to target support at the areas with the greatest need for intervention. Funding is also available for irrigation ponds within specific target areas; these are aimed at helping farmers store more water over the winter for summer use to reduce the amount of water abstracted from rivers during dry weather. Funding to take forward natural flood management, for example, embankment removal, is also possible. In terms of fertiliser management, the slurry storage option will help farmers to better apply slurry at times of the year when best use can be made of the nutrients. With regard to pesticide management, options are available to help improve handling and mixing areas, such as funding options for concrete pads, biobeds, etc.

There are organic maintenance and conversion options within AECS and these will have an impact on the use of fertilisers and pesticides. There are also restrictions on input use in permanent habitats, these prohibit improvement techniques such as the use of fertiliser.

SEPA carries out farm visits on water quality, but it may not be possible to relate the outcomes to

participation in AECS.

Inspections clarify whether management options have been carried out as planned. If they have, the water quality etc. outcomes should follow. However, it is assumed that the AECS monitoring and evaluation initiative, launching in 2019 and to include an external evaluation, will give a more direct assessment of impact.

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

- Scotland's climate change targets by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture and securing carbon stores in peatlands and other organic soils
- Meeting obligations to improve water quality under the EU Water Framework Directive by reducing diffuse pollution
- Control of flooding through natural flood risk management
- Support of organic farming

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

Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS)

Scottish Government officials have told us that, to meet the eligibility criteria for LFASS, applicants must meet cross-compliance conditions. There are two sets of requirements, which are based on European and Scottish legislation:

- Statutory Management Requirements (SMRs)
- Good Agricultural and Environmental Conditions (GAECs)

These requirements are about how the business is managed. They cover the environment, public, plant and animal health and animal welfare. The implication is that there will be a positive impact on issues of water quality.

Measure 15: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS)

There is a water management theme within the woodland creation element of the FGS. This is targeted in various ways including support for woodland in areas where there are water quality and/or flooding issues. Forestry is supported on farms where it creates buffers between agricultural activity and water courses. The intention is to reduce diffuse pollution and flooding. SEPA identified areas where there are water quality and flooding concerns (flood risk areas or which do not reach current standards) and applications from these areas are targeted by attracting support at a higher rate (90% rather than 80%) of costs.

There are restrictions on fertiliser, herbicide or ploughing on some sites where water quality could be negatively impacted. However, compared to arable land, fertiliser and herbicide use is very low.

Improving water quality and/or preventing flooding is one of the many benefits that woodland delivers, but it is not routinely monitored.

Conclusion: RDP interventions have supported the improvement of water management, including fertilizer

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

Recommendation: That steps are taken to quantify the impacts that the various schemes, individually and collectively, have on water management. This will mean that adequate monitoring facilities are required, although the difficulties in establishing a baseline and assigning causality are recognised. The initiation of a monitoring and evaluation exercises for the AECS and FAS in 2019 should be noted.

7.a10) CEQ10-4C - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the prevention of soil erosion and improvement of soil management?

7.a10.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this FA:

M01 and M16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

M02: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

M04, M08, M11 and M15: Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme (AECS)

M04, M08 and M15: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS)

M13: Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS)

Rural Priorities (RP) (2007-13)

Land Managers Options (LMO) (2007-13)

Financial inputs and output data

Monitoring data are collected for FA 4 in total and are not split into 4A, 4B and 4C. This is because actions in this area are deemed to be relevant for biodiversity (4A), water management (4B) and soil erosion (4C). While the European Commission reporting requirements do not require a split of data for Measure 10, the nature of the activities supported allows some differentiation by FA in our reporting.

A total of €56,389 was spent to the end of 2018 under Measure 1 (Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund) (O1).

Public expenditure under Measure 2 under FA 4 amounted to €2,406,700 by the end of 2018 (O1).

Total public expenditure under Measure 4 under FA 4 had reached €20,003,668 by the end of 2018 (O1). Three-quarters of this spend (78%) related to AECS with the balance commitments entered into in the 2007-2013 programming period (Rural Priorities scheme). Total investment amounted to €24,413,887 as a result of leverage under the Rural Priorities scheme.

Some €78,383,183 of public expenditure took place under Measure 8 to the end of 2018 (O1). Three-

quarters of this related to ongoing commitments from the 2007-2013 programming period under Rural Priorities (€61,340,145, 78%); the Forestry Grant Scheme contributed the remaining fifth.

Data relating to Measure 10 can sometimes be assigned to specific FAs, although the fact that this has not formally been done by the Managing Authority suggests that in practice, support for activities may have impacts across different and/or multiple FAs depending on circumstances. Total public expenditure under Measure 10 relevant to FA 4 to the end of 2018 amounted to €113,305,427. Of this, €97,670,293 (86%) was disbursed under commitments made in the 2007-2013 programming period.

Total public expenditure under activities which can be expected to have an impact on FA 4C amounted to €55,193,554 by the end of 2018 (49% of the total). The areas of activity included here are (in some cases the same spend can be expected to have impacts relevant to FAs 4A and 4B as well):

- Cultivation practices: soil cover, ploughing techniques, low tillage, conservation agriculture (€795,043, 1%)
- Management of landscape, habitats, grassland, HNV farming: maintenance of HNV arable and grassland systems (e.g. mowing techniques, hand labour, leaving of winter stubbles in arable areas), introduction of extensive grazing practices, conversion of arable land to grassland (€54,398,511, 99%)

Total expenditure under Measure 13 relevant to FA 4 (Less Favoured Area Support Scheme) amounted to €151,555,628 by the end of 2018.

Total public expenditure under Measure 15 relevant to FA 4 (FGS, Rural Priorities and Land Manager Options) amounted to €13,122,048 to the end of 2018; this cannot be broken down by FA and is assumed to be relevant to FAs 4A, 4B and 4C. Of this, €554,042 was spent under FGS, there was no expenditure under AECS.

By the end of 2018, 17.91% of agricultural land was under management contracts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion (R10/T12), as was 4.68% of forest/other wooded area (R11/T13). Both these figures relate specifically to FA 4C.

Some €56,389 was spent under Measure 1 under FA 4 to the end of 2018 to train 252 beneficiaries.

Five actions/operations on the training of advisors relevant to FA 4 had taken place by the end of 2018 under Measure 2 (FAS) (O3) with 185 advisors trained by the end of 2018 (O14). Ten actions/operations related to support to help people benefit from the use of advisory services (O3) under which 3,134 people were advised (O13).

Support for investments in infrastructure related to development, modernisation or adaptation of agriculture and forestry (sub-measure 4.3) was provided for 4 actions/operations by the end of 2018 (O3), all under AECS.

Support for 1,246 non-productive investments linked to the achievement of agri-environment-climate objectives had been delivered under Measure 4 (sub-measure 4.4) by the end of 2018 (O3); of these 68% were delivered under the Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme with the remainder delivered under legacy schemes (RP).

The FGS provided support for afforestation/creation of woodland under Measure 8, sub-measure 8.1 to 561 hectares in 2016, 1,480 in 2017 and 936 hectares in 2018 (O5). A further 167 hectares had received support under sub-measure 8.4 for the restoration of damage to forests from forest fires and natural disasters and

catastrophic events (O5); this support was spread across 44 holdings/beneficiaries (O4). Measure 8, sub-measure 8.5, also supported 329 actions/operations to improve the resilience and environmental value of forest ecosystems which covered 14,354 hectares (O5). These data cannot be sub-divided.

The monitoring data held on outputs under Measure 10 is complicated because under some schemes area supported can address multiple issues and there is therefore the potential for double counting. This applies to the area under the Land Managers Options scheme whereas the Rural Priorities scheme is unique. Data cannot be summed across years without double counting areas. It is also not always possible to be certain where the output recorded under some codes (for example, “other”) will have an impact.

The Measure 10 aspects of the new Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme have been implemented from 2017. With reference to FA 4C, some 101,717 hectares were under management of landscape, habitats, grassland, HNV farming: maintenance of HNV arable and grassland systems (e.g. mowing techniques, hand labour, leaving of winter stubbles in arable areas), introduction of extensive grazing practices, conversion of arable land to grassland in 2017 and 326,882 hectares in 2018.

A total of 1,169,204 hectares of land was under agreement under Measure 13 (Less Favoured Area Support Scheme) under FA 4 by the end of 2018 (O5). This area related to 6,055 holdings/beneficiaries. No further breakdown is possible.

Some 7,200 hectares were under agreement under Measure 15 (FGS) in 2017 and 3,205 hectares in 2018. Much larger areas were under agreement under Measure 15 under legacy schemes (RP and LMO).

Qualitative assessment

Measure 1: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

A number of KTIF-funded projects are relevant to this question. Whilst none appear to be focused specifically on soil management, several are concerned with input use, primarily for biodiversity reasons, and these will also have some relevance for soil erosion and soil management. In a response from the Soil Association Scotland, which administers several KTIF-funded projects, it is indicated that a substantial proportion (around half) of Soil Association Scotland KTIF-funded programme content has a focus on good soil management as the fundamental basis for a productive and profitable farming system. The Soil Association Scotland estimates that around 1,000 land managers are implementing management practices (including reducing fertiliser) to improve soil management on their land as a result of participating in its projects.

Soil erosion and management is an issue integral to the KTIF Monitor Farms (as are biodiversity and water quality issues (covered in CEQs 8 and 9).

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

Both the one-to-one aspects (Integrated Land Management Plans, for example) and one-to-many aspects of FAS deliver on environmental topics, including that of soil erosion, improvement and management. The FAS one-to-many component has a significant input into soil erosion and more particularly soil improvement. Evaluators were told, when assembling information for the 2016 EAIR, that the creation of 12 *Soil Nutrient Network* farms as demonstration sites across Scotland covering a wide range of agricultural systems as well as soil types, including some of the most fragile soils in the country, was evidence of the focus and determination of the programme to address this particular aspect. The Soil Nutrient Network farm initiative is set to run throughout the FAS one-to-many delivery period, through to December 2020, and was expected to use around 9% of the annual funding. These Soil Nutrient Network

farms were believed to be highly effective, as was attendance at prominent agricultural shows throughout the country by FAS. The impact of the Soil Nutrient Network farms will be more evident over time once results of management practices can be demonstrated.

The focus on soil biodiversity is relatively novel and is considered by Scottish Government officials to be of great importance in encouraging good practice. Attendance at agricultural shows under the Farming and Water Scotland banner is also focused on soil improvements. According to SAC, the organisation that delivers one-to-many parts of FAS, soil management material is very well received (by farmers) and evidence of impacts should be forthcoming in time. (The evaluators were told that it is useful to build in messages on diffuse pollution and climate change as this presents an opportunity for some soft lobbying while farmers are interested in the economic benefits.)

The evaluators have been told that data relating to the one-to-one system of FAS, should be available on the extent to which soils have been the subject of specialist advice.

The Scottish Government has announced that a monitoring and evaluation of FAS is to be initiated in 2019. As environmental objectives are to be included, it appears that it will cover issues relating to this CEQ.

Measures 4 and 10: Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme

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

The Scottish Government has announced that it intends to commission an AECS evaluation in 2019, which should provide information on the impacts achieved.

Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS)

According to Scottish Government officials, LFASS helps to promote good management of grassland by keeping farmers on the land. To be eligible for LFASS applicants must comply with Good Agriculture and Environmental Conditions; this includes measures to protect soil against erosion and maintaining soil organic matter.

Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS)

According to Scottish Government officials, erosion of soil on farms is a big issue in the FGS when schemes are implemented. There is extensive guidance on the type of cultivation that can be used on forestry operations. Where old networks of field drains have broken down and become water courses, a forestry scheme would initiate a buffer system to stop the water running straight into a water course. The prevention of erosion in such circumstances is an implied outcome in the scheme requirements.

Conclusion: It is likely, based on the intervention logic, that SRDP interventions have contributed to supporting the prevention of soil erosion, promote soil improvement and have led to better soil management. However, the extent cannot be quantified at this stage. Also, some impacts may not have yet had time to show themselves.

Recommendation: That a monitoring system is set up adequate to enable this question to be answered at the anticipated *ex-post* evaluation. It should be noted that monitoring and evaluation exercises for AECS and FAS are being initiated in 2019. It is not unreasonable to expect that these will assess the impacts on soil erosion and soil management. Similar steps for the other schemes that contribute to this CEQ are to be encouraged.

7.a11) CEQ11-5A - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to increasing efficiency in water use by agriculture?

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

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

7.a12) CEQ12-5B - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to increasing efficiency in energy use in agriculture and food processing?

7.a12.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this FA:

M01 and M16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

M02: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

Financial inputs and output data

A total of €2,463,513 has been spent to the end of 2018 under Measure 1 (allocated to FAs 2A and 4) which is potentially relevant to increasing efficiency in energy use in agriculture and food processing (O1). As noted under CEQ 1, 95% of relevant expenditure has been under the KTIF scheme.

Some €1,206,480 has been spent to the end of 2018 under Measure 2 under FA 5B.

None of the outputs related to Measure 1 (KTIF) can be assigned to this FA. However, 4 actions/operations relating to the training of advisors took place under Measure 2 (FAS) (O3), under which 206 advisors were trained (O14).

Four actions/operation have been supported for giving advice and FAS has advised 1,073 participants under this Focus Area by the end of 2018 (O13). The Managing Authority advised the evaluators that no actions have been delivered against Common Result Indicator 14 (increase in efficiency of energy use in agriculture and food-processing in RDP supported projects); there is also no programmed target for Common Result Indicator 15 (total investment for energy efficiency).

Qualitative assessment

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

Evaluators have been told by Scottish Government officials that energy efficiency is within scope of the

projects which can be supported by KTIF. For example, the Skinny Milk project has considered energy use. The final report on this might have some information on impacts, but this is just at the draft stage so is not yet available.

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

When assembling evidence for the 2016 EAIR evaluators were told by Scottish Government staff that the FAS one-to-many delivery activities have a focus through the *Farming for a Better Climate* initiative on energy efficiency and its use in agriculture. The use of climate change focus farms to demonstrate management practices including energy efficiency is an effective way of showing to a large audience (open days are well attended) the benefits that can be achieved. The objective is to show the financial and economic benefits of the actions taken on the focus farms and encourage adoption of techniques on a wide basis. As part of the delivery under Farming for a Better Climate, utilising new technologies to improve energy efficiency is a key topic area (along with renewable energy). However, at this stage there is no evidence on impacts resulting from these activities.

In 2019 the evaluators were told that various one-to-many FAS events have contained information on energy use (but may not be focused on this). The delivery body (SAC) explained that there are events on energy efficiency, but it is not a major area of action. Last year there was a well-attended event on on-farm battery storage for those with renewable energy generation sources. There has been a lot of work on renewable energy in the past and this will continue with work on smart energy networks scheduled for 2019. Among one-to-one advice the Carbon Audits will make recommendations which farmers may or may not take up, there is a need to collect information on one-to-many activities. Similarly, the delivery body (Ricardo) told us that Carbon Audits result in an Action Plan which sets out areas where the farmers can make improvements which might lead to increases in energy efficiency, although this is not a target *per se*.

This was confirmed by a stakeholder, who told us that, under the FAS, Carbon Audits are being delivered and are likely to impact positively on energy efficiencies.

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

Recommendation: That progress is made in developing data to populate the indicators. It will also be necessary to investigate impacts; some information may be available (for example in KTIF project reports and Carbon Audit action plans) but not collated.

7.a13) CEQ13-5C - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to the supply and use of renewable sources of energy, of by-products, wastes, residues and other non-food raw material for purposes of the bio-economy?

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

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

7.a14) CEQ14-5D - To what extent have RDP interventions contributed to reducing GHG and ammonia emissions from agriculture?

7.a14.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this FA:

M01 and M16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF) (not programmed)

M02: Farm Advisory Service (FAS) (not programmed)

M04: Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme (AECS)

M10: Beef Efficiency Scheme (BES)

Financial inputs and output data

A total of €2,463,513 has been spent to the end of 2016 under Measure 1 (allocated to FAs 2A and 4) which is potentially relevant to reducing GHG and ammonia emissions from agriculture (O1). As noted under CEQ 1, 95% of relevant expenditure has been under the KTIF scheme.

Some €73,487 was spent via AECS under FA 5D in 2018. This expenditure supported 2 actions/operations under which 149 LUs were supported.

The BES spent €730,914 in 2018 under FA 5D. This supported one action/operation under which 1,455 beneficiaries have been advised.

Some 18.27% of agricultural land was under management contracts targeting the reduction of GHG and/or ammonia emissions by the end of 2018 (T18) and 0.01% of Livestock Units were concerned by investments in livestock management in view of reducing GHG and/or ammonia emissions (T17).

Qualitative assessment

Measures 1 and 16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund

The evaluators were told by Scottish Government officials that, even though KTIF is no longer programmed under this Focus Area, several supported projects have contributed to reducing GHG and ammonia emissions from agriculture. These include the *Monitor Farms* programme, the *Pig Production Efficiency* and *Grass to Milk: Organically* projects which have addressed this issue.

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

The evaluators have been told by Scottish Government officials that significant contributions have been made towards climate change from the FAS, and in particular reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Ammonia emission is mainly tackled through work on diffuse water pollution.

The *Farming for a Better Climate* initiative is particularly focused on this area; this initiative, which is funded by the Scottish Government and delivered by SRUC is separate from the SRDP but has good links to the FAS; the FAS also provides some funding support for specific elements of Farming for a Better Climate, on GHG in particular. The five key action areas include carbon sequestration; improve nutrient use; optimising livestock performance; along with energy and fuel use; and, renewable technologies. The evaluators have been told that the first three action areas are very much about reducing greenhouse gas

emissions from agriculture. By optimising livestock performance and improving nutrient use and adopting carbon sequestration whenever possible, reductions in greenhouse gas emissions are achievable. These are promoted using a whole range of techniques, including the use of Marginal Abatement Cost Curves (MACC) that show where the biggest returns come to the business in financial terms as well as carbon terms.

Within the FAS one-to-many activities, delivered by SAC, there were five well-attended events on slurry storage in 2018, covering both water (mainly) and air quality. The FAS uses a range of techniques to get the message across about reducing GHG gases, including the climate change focus farms (part of the Farming for a Better Climate initiative), a series of practical guides to highlight the key adaptation and mitigation options, the production of farmer case studies, and guidance notes, as well as social media and video footage.

Within the FAS one-to-one activities this issue is addressed through the Carbon Audits. It is not an area of focus for the ILMPs, but some of the actions under them will have positive impacts in this area.

Measure 4: Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme

The design of the AECS is intended to contribute to reducing GHG and ammonia emissions from agriculture. AECS has a 'slurry store option' which allows farm businesses to apply for a contribution to modern facilities which will reduce GHG and ammonia emissions, and contribute to the Scottish Government's Climate Change Plan. The evaluators were told that future GHG benefits will accrue from better timing of application of slurry, but reduced ammonia emissions will only be realised if improved application methods are also implemented. This is something that will need to be followed up in future evaluations.

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

Measure 10: Beef Efficiency Scheme (BES)

The BES has a climate change objective, though it is also about providing support to the beef sector (it is referred to as an income support scheme in 'A Future Strategy for Scottish Agriculture' (<https://www.gov.scot/publications/future-strategy-scottish-agriculture-final-report-scottish-governments-agriculture-champions/>)); the rationale is that improvements in production efficiency that lowers GHG emissions will also increase profitability. Carbon Audits (an integral part of the BES and in which farmers are assisted by the BES Advisory Service) guide management changes that in the short-term result in emissions reduction. Other actions taken to improve efficiency and thereby lower the carbon footprint include reseeded and carrying out soil analysis; the BES Advisory Service is useful here in communicating best practice. The evaluators have been told that any genetic improvement (another output of the BES) is unlikely to make any difference in the early years of the scheme. BES is a five-year scheme, but payments are only made in the first three years, the thinking behind this being that by then some of the efficiency improvements would be coming through and the farm would be more economically viable. Ammonia emissions will only be reduced as the planned management of the way in which organic manures are stored or applied to land (for example, by injecting slurry rather than broadcast spreading) come into effect. At present no evaluation of the BES, which would be expected to cover its impact on GHG and Ammonia emissions, is planned; despite this lack of evidence of impact, 'A Future Strategy for Scottish Agriculture' sees the scheme as one to be retained and built on.

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

evidence we have gathered relating to the SRDP, it is necessary to make the point that this focuses on outputs rather than outcomes, and it will be necessary in the future to consider impacts.

Recommendation: That steps are taken to populate gaps in indicators in preparation for the anticipated *ex-post* evaluation. Attention will need to be given to assessing impacts on-farm.

7.a15) CEQ15-5E - To what extent have RDP interventions supported carbon conservation and sequestration in agriculture and forestry?

7.a15.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this FA:

M01 and M16: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF) (not programmed)

M02: Farm Advisory Service (FAS) (not programmed)

M08 and M16: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS)

Rural Priorities (RP) (2007-13)

Land Managers Options (LMO) (2007-13)

Financial inputs and output data

A total of €2,463,513 has been spent to the end of 2016 under Measure 1 (allocated to FAs 2A and 4) which is potentially relevant to supporting carbon conservation and sequestration in agriculture and forestry (O1). As noted under CEQ 1, 95% of relevant expenditure has been under the KTIF scheme.

A total of €73,941,645 has been spent under Measure 8 to the end of 2018 (O1). Two-thirds (€47,545,988, 64%) was spent under the Forestry Grant Scheme with the remainder spent under the legacy schemes (almost all under Rural Priorities, spend under Land Managers Options was marginal).

A total of 12,300 hectares had been supported under sub-measure 8.1: support for afforestation/creation of woodland (establishment only) (O5) across 582 holdings (O4) by the end of 2018.

A total of 1,252 actions/operations had been supported under sub-measure 8.5: support for investments improving the resilience and environmental value of forest ecosystems by the end of 2018 (O3). These supported actions covered 162,842 hectares (O5).

By the end of 2018, 13.23% of agricultural and forest land was under management contracts contributing to carbon sequestration and conservation (R20/T19).

Qualitative assessment

Measure 8: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS)

The main anticipated impact on carbon conservation can be expected to come from projects under Measure 8 in the form of the FGS. Carbons sequestration is a key rationale of the FGS. Scotland has a climate

change plan and a suite of actions to reduce and mitigate emissions. The main sequestration contribution is planting new woodland, which accounts for about 80% of spend under the Scheme, the remainder being accounted for by forestry management (which has an impact on carbon conservation, though this is not the main focus of the support).

We have been told by Scottish Government officials that woodland creation is a significant component of delivering Scotland's climate change target; there is what amounts to a legal commitment to which the FGS contributes. The evaluators were told in 2019 that the target is to plant 10,000 hectares annually (up from 7,000 hectares mentioned in the 2016 EAIR). The level of new woodland would absorb almost 15% of total annual emissions. This was not achieved in the first two years of the SRDP 2014-2020 due to a lag caused by the transition from the 2007-2013 programming period to the current one, though the evaluators have been told that planting started to catch up from 2017 and there is confidence within the Scottish Government that the targets will be delivered. Plantation forests are dominated by Sitka Spruce, but beneficiaries are being encouraged to use a wider range of species which are more climate-resilient.

In terms of the conservation of carbon, the focus is on existing woodland through increasing species diversity and adaptation to climate change and removing threats such as browsing mammals and non-native species such as rhododendron. If landowners can overcome these threats, it will secure the future of these woodlands and the carbon that they lock up.

Estimates of the amount of carbon sequestered come from a model that brings together two elements. This was explained to evaluators conducting the 2016 EAIR. First, a typology (nine categories) of woodland plantation/commercial forestry that have different specifications and carbon sequestration potentials; and, second, the numbers of hectares planted of each type. Account is taken of the lower growth rate in specific geographical regions, such as the highlands and islands. In view of the interest in net changes in woodland area, the National Forest Inventory measures the overall change in forested area. However, deforestation is much less of an issue in Scotland than in England.

A stakeholder with an interest in woodland commented that the FGS has supported significant woodland creation which will in time lead to substantial carbon sequestration (but actual carbon sequestration to date is minimal because very young trees do not grow very quickly; it takes 15 years before significant carbon uptake occurs). This stakeholder also stated that the FGS has had very little impact on supporting better management of carbon stocks in existing forests. Overall, the feeling was that the FGS has had no impact on carbon conservation and sequestration in agriculture; the lack of a baseline means it will be impossible to tell).

Measure 1: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

Evaluators were told by a Scottish Government official that there has been nothing specific to this issue under KTIF. However, it is within scope of the projects which could be supported.

Measure 2: Farm Advisory Service (FAS)

FAS contributes to carbon conservation and sequestration through advice delivered to farmers. Woodlands are a topic under the one-to-many FAS activities, with all aspects of woodland establishment, management and harvesting addressed. The FAS contributes in this area by encouraging good soil management practices on high carbon soils and by encouraging good farm woodland practices. There is activity relating to common grazing, and there are peatland restoration events, and also Carbon Audits which can be expected to have an impact in this area.

FAS also signposts clients towards the other delivery components in the SRDP that deal directly with this

issue (such as the FGS). Again, the translation of advice into impacts is important and the extent to which this takes place is unknown at this time.

According to a stakeholder, FAS specifically supports farm Carbon Audits by reviewing enterprises and use of fuels in considerable detail. Another stakeholder pointed to the possible losses to biodiversity, landscapes and other environmental and cultural benefits if too much emphasis is given to carbon sequestration within forestry policy.

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

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

7.a16) CEQ16-6A - To what extent have RDP interventions supported the diversification, creation and development of small enterprises and job creation?

7.a16.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this FA:

M04 and M08: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS)

Rural Priorities (RP) (2007-13)

Financial inputs and output data

Total public expenditure under Rural Priorities (programmed under Measure 6) amounted to €1,546,768 by the end of 2018.

Total public expenditure under Measure 8 (FGS) to the end of 2018 amounted to €912,587. Total investment was €2,281,467.

Some 37 actions/operations were supported under sub-measure 8.6: support for investments in forestry technologies and in processing, mobilising and marketing of forest products (O3). Under Measure 6, the target total of 17 jobs had been created under legacy schemes (Rural Priorities) by the end of 2018, of which 15 were male and 2 female (R21/T20) (O4).

Qualitative assessment

Measure 8: Forestry Grant Scheme (FGS)

With respect to Measure 8 (FGS), increasing forestry on farms is clearly one form of diversification, both of farm businesses and of the rural economy. Interviews with Scottish Government staff for the 2016 EAIR found that most of the woodland created had been on farms. Factors that inhibit this form of diversification include the relatively high price of land and the long period of waiting between planting and the flow of income, a gap that necessitates public intervention and without which planting would not take place. The

cost of public intervention varies with *inter alia* the price of land. Related investments in machinery and access similarly would not be viable without support that is designed to enable projects to become viable.

There are undoubtedly positive impacts on rural business and jobs created that extend beyond the farms that undertake this form of diversification. According to Scottish Government officials interviewed for the 2018 EAIR, a large amount of money is going into rural areas via the FGS, and there are significant positive effects on contractors, agents and managers, nurseries producing and planting trees, and this will create jobs. However, this is seen as a secondary benefit though to getting the woodland and its environmental benefits (biodiversity, carbon sequestration and other impacts). There is a harvesting and processing grant within the FGS which can be used to buy machinery, etc. and 83 projects have spent €1.68 million so far (the average has been less than €24,000). There will be benefits to these other businesses concerned with providing capital items and delivering access infrastructure so the timber which would not otherwise be viable can be brought to market. It was noted in the 2016 EAIR that in total some €36-€48 million is being injected into the Scottish economy, and this will inevitably have an impact.

Information is provided on FGS application forms about planned changes in employment, business turnover, etc. There is an intention by the Scottish Government to start checking outcomes against these expectations in the near future (the delay allows for the lag between support being provided and the impacts becoming apparent). Previous discussion (2017) suggested that this would involve a sample of about 100 cases, though this has not been confirmed. This information will be available for use in evaluations at some point. The numbers of jobs created can also be assessed from knowing the labour requirements of activities such as tree planting, though this is more difficult in the timber processing stages.

A stakeholder with an interest in woodland commented that the FGS has had some impact in respect of supporting contract labour in woodland creation (fencing, ground prep, planting); many of the workers in these areas are notionally self-employed although contracted to large private sector enterprises. However, the focus on woodland creation has ensured that FGS has had very little impact on supporting development and diversification of forest enterprises.

Measure 19: LEADER

The evaluators were told that, although not programmed under this Focus Area, LEADER provides the main support for diversification under the SRDP; this was born out in the written submissions received from LAGs. Diversification has always been covered under LEADER, but there are specific targets in this programming period for farm diversification (into non-agricultural activities) and for focusing on small enterprises. At least €16.8 million was set aside for these activities (this is a minimum and can be exceeded). Not all projects in these areas have been completed yet, but more than 800 have been approved. The diversification activity can be undertaken on the farm (alpaca trekking, on-farm accommodation or a cafe for example).

The main barrier to farm diversification from a LEADER perspective is that farmers are more used to working through other SRDP funding streams, and therefore to contacting RPID area officers for advice and support rather than the bottom-up LEADER approach. As such it can be harder to get farmers to engage with LEADER. A barrier to creating small enterprises is that it can be challenging to assess these projects given that there are commercial sensitivities and the assessment is carried out by local people from the same community. This is partly because areas with more enterprise experience progressed earlier in the programme period.

In terms of impacts, particularly numbers of jobs created, there are case studies on the SRN website which provide evidence of job creation, etc. The basic data are available in terms of funding provided rather than outputs or outcomes. A Scottish Government official has indicated that a total of 233 jobs have been

created (counting all, irrespective of gender).

According to a stakeholder, LEADER has had a considerable impact in this respect, although the impact could have been greater had the programme and IT systems been better designed. It would also have been helpful in this stakeholder's view if a greater proportion of the overall SRDP budget were committed to LEADER. In consequence, the performance of LEADER has been disappointing, and this disappointment also characterises other schemes. The stakeholder points to a mismatch between rhetoric and reality. On the one hand, the Scottish Government PR highlights climate change mitigation and rural/community development benefits from SRDP but, on the other, in reality only a very small proportion of the overall funding pot has been allocated to delivering these outcomes and the impacts have been small. LEADER has become an overly complex and bureaucratic scheme, while the primary climate change mitigation measure (woodland creation) will not have a significant impact for many years.

Conclusion: The SRDP has supported the diversification, creation and development of small enterprises and job creation. The extent of the impact up to the end of 2018 has not been fully quantified under the FGS, though data exist by which this may be done, at least for a sample of projects. Indirect calculation is also possible. We expect other parts of the SRDP to also contribute to these aims. In particular there is evidence that LEADER has been responsible for the creation of some 233 jobs.

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

7.a17) CEQ17-6B - To what extent have RDP interventions supported local development in rural areas?

7.a17.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this FA:

M07: Improving Public Access (IPA)

M19: LEADER

Rural Priorities (RP) (2007-13)

Land Managers Options (LMO) (2007-13)

Financial inputs and output data

A total of €7,392,930 of public money has been spent under Measure 7 under FA 6B to the end of 2018, only €1,431,416 (19%) comes from commitments under IPA; the majority was committed in the 2007-2013 programming period (RP and LMO, O1). Total investment under FA 6B totals €11,685,265 (O2). This money has been spent under sub-measures 7.4 - support for investments in the setting-up, improvement or expansion of local basic services for the rural population; 7.5 - support for investments for public use in recreational infrastructure, tourist information and small-scale tourism infrastructure; and, 7.6 - support for studies/investments associated with the maintenance, restoration and upgrading of the cultural and natural heritage of villages, landscapes and HNV sites. There is no breakdown of spend by sub-measure.

A total of €31,062,416 of public money has been spent to the end of 2018 under Measure 19 (O1). Of this, €17,984,702 (58%) has been spent under sub-measure 19.2 - Support for implementation of operations under the community-led local development strategy; €12,247,141 (39%) has been spent under sub-measure 19.4 - Support for running costs and animation; €830,573 (3%) has been spent under sub-measure 19.3 - Preparation and implementation of cooperation activities of the local action.

Four actions have been supported under sub-measure 7.4 - support for investments in the setting-up, improvement or expansion of local basic services for the rural population; 161 have been supported under sub-measure 7.5 - support for investments for public use in recreational infrastructure, tourist information and small scale tourism infrastructure; and, 982 under sub-measure 7.6 - support for studies/investments associated with the maintenance, restoration and upgrading of the cultural and natural heritage of villages, landscapes and HNV sites (O3).

The population covered by 21 LAGs (O19) is 2,100,000 (O18), some 86.8% of the rural population (T21). Of these 21 LAGs, 14 are multi-funded (O19). Some 962 Leader projects have been funded under sub-measure 19.2 - Support for implementation of operations under the community-led local development strategy (O20), as have been 38 inter-territorial cooperations and 15 transnational cooperations (O21). These have involved 28 and 9 unique LAGs respectively (O23).

Some 233 jobs have been created in LEADER projects under this Focus Area (T23) and 2.61% of the rural population is benefiting from improved services/infrastructure (T22).

Qualitative assessment

Measure 7: Improving Public Access (IPA)

Evaluators were told by Scottish Government officials in connection with the 2016 EAIR that, under the SRDP 2014-2020, the IPA scheme sits within the Agri-Environment Climate Scheme, but draws on a different Measure (M07: Art. 20: “Basic services and village renewal in rural areas”). Contracts awarded after the first (2015) application round resulted in claims from in early 2017.

In connection with the 2018 EAIR evaluators were told that the IPA scheme provides a menu of fixed cost capital items for applicants to choose from when designing a path project for the benefit of their rural area. The access projects have to include certain elements such as new or upgraded path or bridges all of which can have associated items added alongside such as signage, benches, gates or drainage. The type of projects can vary in scale from very simple lengths of linking path and signs at either end to much more complex networks of path connecting communities or features of interest in the local area.

The IPA projects support local development in rural areas in many ways, including through the improvement or creation of new paths facilitating access and recreational opportunities for residents in the area and visitors. They provide the means for enjoyment of the countryside, but also associated health and well-being benefits, functional and active travel routes between rural communities or within them connecting people to places.

Examples of projects that have or will contributed to the local development of rural areas include:

- ***Here We Are - Cairndow to Clachan Community Link path***: a 2,250 metre path, with bridges, culverts and signage will connect a small rural settlement to places of work and recreation/tourism hub, as well as providing a safe off road path for all at the head of Loch Fyne.
- ***Channing Farm path***: a short 965 metre of new path linking to the National Nature Reserve and wider network of paths including core paths and the national cycle network. It opens up access

between the farm-based services and a wider circular route for walkers and cyclist round Loch Leven.

The basic rationale of the IPA scheme is to support local development in rural areas by improving infrastructure, in the form of increasing the connectivity of existing path networks and removing barriers to allow walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders to use the network. IPA responds to locally produced proposals to create and enhance path networks. Applicants from a broad spectrum are eligible, including local authorities, public bodies, community groups and private landowners.

The IPA comprises entirely of grants to support capital investment in assets relating to public access; there is no support to current activities or management. Consequently, local development comes from the way that these assets impact on improved public access and on the economic agents involved in the provision of these supported assets.

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

The IPA outputs can be summarised as follows:

- 138 path improvement projects (funding contracts agreed)
- Consisting of 167 km of new or improved path
- Projects located across 19 of Scotland's 32 local authority areas
- Paths which provide a physical means of accessing the countryside and associated places have been increased by 160 km

All projects are located in rural areas of Scotland

The extent to which his output has raised the usage of the existing networks to which they connect is not known.

The economic benefits (incomes, jobs, etc.) of this increased public access have not yet been assessed, though local accommodation facilities are expected to gain; new and improved routes are publicised through opening events and then by local stakeholders as they promote tourism. There are plans to undertake a sample of case studies later this year to assess the scheme and look at levels of use.

Measure 19: LEADER

The design of LEADER is directly aimed at supporting local development in rural areas. It has a bottom-up approach that develops priorities which are relevant to the specific local area, covering economic, social and environmental impacts (to the extent that these can be supported under LEADER and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF)). Because support is provided for projects which address the needs identified in Local Development Strategies (LDSs), the rationale suggests that it ought to provide the impacts that are required. The current LEADER has seen an increase in coverage by LDSs to effectively 100% of the territory of rural Scotland, up from about 90% of coverage in the 2007-2013 period; this covers 86% of the population of rural Scotland. There are 21 signed Service Level Agreements with Local Action Groups (LAGs), made up from representatives of local councils, public agencies, community groups etc.

For the 2018 EAIR the evaluators were told that NFU Scotland sits on some LAGs, although farmers

themselves are often more focused on agricultural aspects of the SRDP than they are on LEADER; however, the farm diversification element has helped to pull some farmers in. The visibility of farmers may be masked because some agricultural projects might be contained within enterprise projects where the support is to expand existing agricultural projects. Each LAG typically has 3-4 staff, an accountable body and a LAG Committee with some ten people in each; in total some 500 people are involved in delivering LEADER across Scotland. As noted in the answer to CEQ 16, a Scottish Government official has indicated that, up to the end of 2018, LEADER is estimated to have created 233 jobs.

Though LEADER may result in job creation, the sense of this question is a much broader approach to development. Social capital, social capacity and resilience can also be enhanced, and the economic base of rural areas broadened. These changes are likely to have long-term impacts. A stakeholder explained that the SRDP contributes to supporting local developments in rural areas by providing support to individual agricultural businesses and through the LEADER programme. It is clear, however, that LEADER extends beyond the agricultural sector. Local people are able to participate in, and benefit from, local actions through representation on LEADER LAGs (this is evidenced by meeting minutes). Stakeholders work together through the LEADER LAGs and through Community Planning partnerships and other localised structures.

Nevertheless, LEADER also promotes the economic sustainability of LDS areas. The evaluators have been told that LEADER provides the main support for diversification under the SRDP; some €12 million is allocated to diversification projects which are determined at the local level through the LAGs. LEADER is designed to draw on supportive and synergistic relationships with other parts of the SRDP, in particular with the Scottish Rural Network and its encouragement of cooperation, but also extending to many other areas. The evaluators have been told that the SRN is also good at promoting LEADER. LEADER also supports trans-national cooperation by LAGs, such as with Northern Ireland and other non-UK Member States.

In terms of the performance of LEADER, the 2016 EAIR noted that improvements, compared with the previous programming period, have been made to communications and governance, with careful consideration of the optimum share of costs that is spent on administration. Some other Managing Authorities have reduced the percentage of spend on administration and animation, but the Scottish Government considered it necessary to invest in animation to improve the quality and breadth of projects and, for this reason, the allocation to animation remains at 25% of total spend.

Many LAGs were launched only in 2016 so there was generally a lack of output from their activities at the time of the 2016 EAIR; the wider political context of Brexit has also caused delay. LEADER has a Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy against which LAGs will report, covering, *inter alia*, improved infrastructure, services, access to them, and other local benefits. A stakeholder told the evaluators that each LAG conducts its own evaluation and that, without a standard template, these are there undertaken in different ways and to different depths (some are carried out in-house). This means that while a clear picture of the impact of LEADER is likely at the local level, it may be difficult to bring these together to provide a coherent national picture. However, the Scottish Government told the evaluators that a set of common questions might be put in place for LEADER so that a consistent picture of the impacts of LEADER in Scotland can be gained.

A process evaluation of LEADER was published in 2018. To gain information on LEADER's impact, the project was divided into two phases – an analysis of administrative data on the Local Actions in Rural Communities system (LARCs) and secondly, the collection and analysis of qualitative data generated through focus groups in four Local Action Groups (LAGs). All LEADER projects and their details are uploaded to LARCs. However, whilst LARCs asks projects to report a number of outcomes that will help to capture economic, social, cultural and environmental impact, data at this stage is very limited due to the low

share of completed projects. Therefore, four focus groups were conducted for the second stage of this research. These groups were held in four different LAGs that had been selected based on the status of their projects, budget and types of projects. The examples threw light on the impact LEADER has had on community life, traditions and heritage, social infrastructure and cohesion, and the provision of services for cultural and leisure activities for the rural population.

From the information collected from the focus groups it appears that, in terms of an *environmental impact*, LEADER projects help to preserve the environment and engage people with natural heritage.

Economically, LEADER has helped to create new employment and training opportunities by investing in tourism, crafts, farm diversification and in small businesses. Projects (sometimes indirectly) support the local rural community and business networks to build knowledge and skills and encourage innovation and cooperation in order to tackle local development objectives.

Despite the positive impact LEADER has had, this process evaluation also highlighted the **challenges** applicants face. Key concerns raised by participants were that the payment claims process and the perceived [unintended] discrimination against small organisations. Additionally, a lack of funding flexibility, transparency and communication were perceived as key issues.

The evaluators were also told about a further project to evaluate the role of LEADER post-Brexit, with the aim of understanding the evolution of the LEADER approach and its impacts in rural/coastal Scotland since the early 1990s, and to identify options for the future. Part of this will explore the impact and legacy of LEADER, both in terms of ‘harder’ (usually short-term) economic impacts and also ‘softer’ (often longer-term) social and cultural impacts.

According to a stakeholder with interests in woodland, LEADER has had a considerable impact in this respect, although the impact could have been greater had the programme and IT systems been better designed. It would also have been helpful if a greater proportion of the overall SRDP budget were committed to LEADER.

Written responses from LEADER LAGs noted substantial activity under this Focus Area. Different approaches to supporting local development in rural areas have taken as would be expected under the bottom-up approach; one LAG chose to focus on the sector level (e.g. funding business hub managers) rather than supporting individual businesses. Job creation was commonly cited as an expected impact and details are recorded in project paperwork. It was expected that evidence on actual employment creation would be available later.

Conclusion: the IPA scheme can be expected to support local development, though at present there is no information by which this can be assessed. Similarly, the design of LEADER is such that local development in rural areas can be expected, and local strategies and delivery groups now extend to virtually 100% of rural Scotland. There is a monitoring system in place which will provide evidence for the economic, environmental and social impacts, though it is too early for this system to have generated adequate data for use in evaluations. Nevertheless, a process evaluation that used focus groups has identified examples of the presence of environmental and economic impacts.

Recommendation: while a full economic impact analysis of IPA would be disproportionate at this stage, a simple extension of monitoring to cover output (length of new paths, number of connections to existing networks, etc.) should be started. For LEADER, a watch should be kept on the accumulating data as it flows in and steps taken to fill gaps in the evidence necessary to answer this CEQ in the anticipated *ex-post* evaluation. The planned separate evaluation of this part of the SRDP for a possible post-Brexit role should be noted.

7.a18) CEQ18-6C - To what extent have RDP interventions enhanced the accessibility, use and quality of information and communication technologies (ICT) in rural areas?

7.a18.a) Answer to evaluation question

The following schemes contribute to the objectives of this FA:

M07: Broadband

Qualitative assessment

Evaluators were told, when collecting evidence for the 2016 EAIR, that remedying the lack of Broadband was high on the list of priorities for rural areas, many of which have levels of service that are the cause of well-documented dissatisfaction among rural residents. The lack of Broadband facilities means that rural businesses cannot operate in the global market. People cannot work from home, business leaks out of the area, new businesses cannot start-up, tourism is affected because businesses cannot promote themselves and holiday makers demand access to the internet. The evaluators were provided with research reports evidencing this importance of Broadband services to rural areas (see for example, Analysys Mason (2009) 'Telecoms connectivity in the Highlands and Islands' (<http://www.hie.co.uk/common/handlers/download-document.ashx?id=ae811a4f-196a-4806-8bcb-01a89f009bc8>)). The importance of ICT to the attractiveness of rural areas was also stressed by a stakeholder who provided comments relevant to this question.

It was the intention, under the SRDP 'Broadband Scheme' to make funds available to community groups to allow them to procure a private sector provider to design, build and operate a broadband network in their area. The Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK) scheme, which is run by the UK Department of Media and Sport and supported by State Aid (<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/broadband-delivery-uk>), would not recognise a project as valid until the community group had completed the procurement phase.

At the time of the 2016 EAIR, the Scottish Government staff indicated that there were 16 projects in the pipeline where assistance has been provided to scope demand and to meet the State Aid requirements. Five groups were about to complete their procurement phase, at which point information on project costs would become apparent.

However, during the course of carrying out this 2018 EAIR the evaluators were told that, due to the success of the Scottish Government's R100 (Reaching 100%) programme, the SRDP's separate Broadband Scheme is not being carried forward.

Several LAGs told the evaluators that developing digital connectivity is seen as critical to achieving many other aims of the SRDP. Its poor standard in some areas was identified as a constraining factor and, in some areas, supported projects had provided some assistance. However, some LAGs felt that little if any progress had actually been achieved.

Conclusion: it appears that the Scottish Government has chosen to meet the needs of broadband users in rural areas using alternative mechanisms and outside the framework of the SRDP.

Recommendation: in view of the strongly expressed needs, watch should be kept on the effectiveness of the alternative mechanisms chosen.

7.a19) CEQ19-PE - To what extent have the synergies among priorities and focus areas enhanced the effectiveness of the RDP?

7.a19.a) Answer to evaluation question

The SRDP programme document sets out the combination and justification of rural development Measures selected under each Focus Area. In each case the needs identified in the SWOT are set out, followed by an explanation of the way in which the relevant Measures were expected to come together to address these needs. In essence, Measures are brigaded together to offer a comprehensive and coherent intervention. Scottish Government officials confirmed to the evaluators working on this 2018 Enhanced AIR that this intervention logic remains valid.

The main area of synergy within the SRDP relates to Priority 1: Fostering knowledge transfer and innovation in agriculture, forestry and rural areas. No spend is programmed under Focus Areas 1A, 1B or 1C under Priority 1, but Measure 1 has an impact across the programme. Aspects of Measures under Priorities 2-5 are also likely to have indirect impacts under Focus Areas 1A, 1B and 1C. This synergy is to be expected given the architecture of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013.

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

A review of the schemes employed shows that there are multiple areas where synergy can be expected. Synergy is clearly present in the design stage; for example, in the suite of grants for young farmers/new entrants (Measures 4 and 6) where support for business planning can be used alongside support for investments; actions taken at the local level under LEADER (Measure 19) can be used with support for greater connectivity under the Improved Public Access scheme (Measure 7); the suite of cooperation sub-measures under Measure 16 where the Scottish Government told the evaluators of the 2016 Enhanced AIR that these were designed to ensure coherence from the customer point of view; and, the link between innovation and the provision of training and advice provided under Measures 1, 2 and 10 and through the SRN.

There is evidence, collected as part of the 2018 EAIR, that synergy happens in practice. The view of several scheme managers is that synergy is 'hard-wired' into the SRDP. This is borne out by reality. For example, FAS encourages participants to link schemes together where they can to deliver better outcomes; specifically, the *New Entrants* schemes are linked to *FAS* so that appropriate advice is provided. There is also a link between agri-environment activity (AECS, FGS, BES, etc.) and *KTIF* as well as to *FAS*; the FAS Steering Group looks across all aspects of the SRDP, as does the Crofters' Commission and SNH to foster synergy. The managers of the *FPMC* scheme reported synergy with parts of the SRDP concerned with training but, moreover, were aware that further opportunities existed, on which they were working. The evaluators were told by Scottish Government officials that *LFASS* is complementary to *AECS*, which require livestock grazing as a base from which to build more targeted options to deliver environmental

benefits.

It is easy to demonstrate practice to make schemes complementary by covering gaps (which does not necessarily mean synergy, where additional benefit is generated by collaboration). For example, there is complementarity between the *Improving Public Access* (IPA) scheme and the *Forestry Grant Scheme* (which supports maintenance and management of existing paths in woodlands); the differences in scheme design and priorities means that they complement each other in a rural context, with the IPA focusing on new and improved infrastructure and the FGS on management and maintenance. Similarly, *IPA* and *LEADER* are complimentary, the latter funding path/access related projects that cannot be delivered by IPA. There are also examples where *LEADER* and the *FPMC* work together with the former supporting customer-facing elements of projects and the latter supporting investments in production. However, several LAGs also criticised the SRDP for having a predominantly silo mentality.

There are also conscious cases of signposting. For example, *AECS* and *FGS* are run side by side, and agents providing advice to farmers will guide them towards the correct SRDP scheme for their needs. The *FAS* will direct farmers to the other opportunities within the SRDP as part of its advisory role. The Soil Association Scotland, which administers several *KTIF*-funded projects, has commented that these have directly supported the *AECS* and the *FGS* by raising awareness and encouraging uptake. LAGs told the evaluators that there is some signposting within *LEADER* to ensure that applicants are directed to the appropriate SRDP scheme.

Perhaps even more telling was the finding that no areas of conflict or counter-working were brought to the attention of the evaluators in any of the interviews with scheme managers. Rather, the emphasis is on working together; for example, while Carbon Audits can be undertaken both under the *BES* and *FAS*, the approach between the two schemes is now more joined-up (the majority taking place under *BES*, though farmers not in this scheme have access through *FAS*). Similarly, the provision of advice under the *BES* and *FAS* at one-to-many events involve the schemes working together.

In terms of synergy between the SRDP and other policy initiatives, the *ex-ante* evaluation noted the strong synergy between green belt policy, vacant and derelict land (VDL) policy/support and the vision and objectives of the Central Scotland Green Network (CSGN). This is a key area where there is potential for targeted SRDP investment to deliver multiple benefits.

Thus, the evaluators conclude that there are synergies between Priorities and Focus Areas, manifest by SRDP schemes, that enhance the effectiveness of the overall programme. Furthermore, there are multiple attempts to make schemes complement each other, with no significant examples of conflict in operation brought to our attention. However, it is not possible at this stage in the programming period to come to a definitive conclusion on the extent to which synergies among Priorities and Focus Areas, manifest as SRDP schemes, have enhanced the effectiveness of the RDP. Whilst it may be possible to present evidence to quantify synergies in the anticipated *ex-post* evaluation, the inherent challenges in apportioning impacts/outcomes between Focus Areas is likely to remain.

Conclusion: it is clear that the SRDP 2014-2020 was designed with synergies between Measures in mind and the intervention logic for the programme strongly suggests that synergies will be delivered. However, this cannot be demonstrated in quantitative terms at this point in time.

Recommendation: it is recommended that the Scottish Government considers how best to provide evidence of synergy in quantitative terms for the anticipated *ex-post* evaluation. This should include attention to synergies in any single-scheme evaluations carried out during the life of the SRDP 2014-2020.

7.a20) CEQ20-TA - To what extent has technical assistance contributed to achieving the objectives laid down in Art. 59(1) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 and Art. 51(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013?

7.a20.a) Answer to evaluation question

As was noted in the 2016 EAIR, the Scottish Government has built up considerable institutional experience of implementing the SRDP over successive programming periods. It is clear from previous evaluations that lessons learned have been used to continually improve the implementation of the SRDP over time. The *ex-ante* evaluation of the SRDP 2014-2020 made clear that there had been careful consideration of possible improvements to implementation. Examples provided include a considerable simplification of implementation, minimising bureaucracy for Scottish Government staff and delivering improvements to customer services. Specifically with reference to Technical Assistance, the IT systems and processes for rural payments and inspections were updated, and the budget for the SRN was increased substantially to allow it to play a more significant role in improving implementation (see also CEQ 21). The SRN accounts for the majority of TA spending.

Our discussion with Scottish Government officials in preparing the 2018 EAIR indicates that the general picture of the performance of activities that use TA funding is consistent with previous findings, with some marginal improvements.

At a general level, promotion of the SRDP is an activity undertaken by the Scottish Government's central communications team. In addition to this there is also a communication team with the Rural Payments and Inspections Directorate (RPID), which has a more specific function. The SRN also has an important communication role with respect to the SRDP, and our 2019 discussions with Scottish Government officials found that their opinion was that its performance in this respect was good. These three units work together with the Technical Assistance funds relating to communication routed through the SRN.

According to Scottish Government officials in 2019, there is now an increased emphasis on evaluation and the evaluations undertaken are considered by the Scottish Government to be robust. This is in line with the increase in the budget for monitoring and evaluation in the 2014-2020 programming period compared to the 2007-2013 programming period. The funds are starting to be used for evaluations now as there are some impacts on which to report. While there has not been any change in the overall approach taken to evaluation, there have been improvements in terms of the availability of data (this has not been paid for under Technical Assistance). The 2016 EAIR reported the high importance being attached by the Scottish Government to the complex issue of evaluating impacts on biodiversity, including its dominance of discussions in the Monitoring and Evaluation Steering Group. This 2018 EAIR can record that evaluations on FAS and AECS are now in progress, and that others are planned and will be carried out in due course.

There have been several examples of the use of TA funds to enhance cooperation within the wider UK and elsewhere in the EU. This has included in evaluation activities and the SRN. In the opinion of Scottish Government officials, the same level of engagement across the EU would not have been possible without the Technical Assistance funds.

As was noted in the 2016 EAIR, the increase in budget for key Technical Assistance activities demonstrates that the institutional and administrative capacities for the effective management of the RDP have been strengthened.

Conclusion: Technical Assistance has clearly contributed to achieving the objectives laid down in Art.

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

Recommendation: the 2016 EAIR recommended that a further evaluation of the SRN should be undertaken to capture the improvements more thoroughly than is possible in this Enhanced AIR. We can report that this is in the process of being put out to tender. In the meantime there is a range of self-evaluation activities. These include an ongoing users' review of the website to improve navigation and user experience, and a continual internal reflection in terms of what can be done differently and what expertise is needed to do things better.

7.a21) CEQ21-RN - To what extent has the national rural network contributed to achieving the objectives laid down in Art. 54(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013?

7.a21.a) Answer to evaluation question

The Action Plan for the Scottish Rural Network (SRN) sets out four objectives required by Art. 54(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013. To achieve these the SRN has developed specific SRN objectives which remain unchanged since the 2016 EAIR. There is an Annual Action Plan which sets out the activities for the SRN and an Operational Plan that sits under the Action Plan and sets out what the SRN will do to meet its objectives. The SRN takes part in two meetings per year with the other UK NRNs which can assist with information exchange, and there is also participation at the EU level and many one-to-one contacts with other Member State counterparts.

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

The 2016 EAIR set out the lessons learned by the SRN (principally from operating in the previous programming period) which were incorporated into current implementation. This material is not repeated here. This answer is constructed according to the four objectives of the Regulation.

Objective 1: Increase the involvement of stakeholders in the implementation of rural development

The evaluators were told by Scottish Government officials that the overall level of SRN activity has increased since 2017, and 2018 was a busy year for working with stakeholders. Some activities are now linked to Scottish Government thematic years; 2018 was the Year of Young People and the SRN promoted the SRDP activities related to young people, with LEADER funding events and projects linked to young people. These were promoted by the SRN through a specific campaign (#RYA) to promote diversity, LEADER benefits, etc. [In 2020 it will be the year of Coast and Waters and the SRN is starting to scope out how relevant SRDP schemes can be promoted.]

Social media campaigns are now widely used to reach stakeholders and there has been a substantial increase in the number of Facebook users (growth of 42% between 2018 and 2019). This has meant much more resources are utilised in this area, but these work well. There is an Annual Communications Review which provides statistics. This was first undertaken in 2018. The rationale was that a lot of work was being done which had not really been documented in one place (it is not possible to comment on this here due to space limitations).

The SRN has also become more proactive in its approach to LAGs to help their monitoring and evaluation activities and horizon scanning.

There has been greater stakeholder engagement through wider involvement in events, and several events to promote the SRDP to stakeholders (see below). There are case studies demonstrating this.

Objective 2: Improve the quality of implementation of the RDP

According to Scottish Government officials, the extra resource (compared to the 2007-2013 programming period) has been key to improving the quality of the implementation of the SRDP associated with SRN activities. There is a lot more partnership working now and the SRN is better at responding to what partners want. There are regular meetings with FAS, Forestry Commission, Pillar 1, SAC Consulting, SNH to ensure that activities are complementary and do not overlap. There is cross-promotion where this is relevant.

Social media has been very helpful and there is greater proactivity in the relationship with LEADER. It is hard to quantify whether the SRN has brought more people to the SRDP, as this metric is not recorded. The main SRDP website is hosted on the Rural Payments and Services site, on which the SRN is not so prominent as the focus is agriculture and land use. The SRN has focused more on LEADER, partly as the result of the obligation to do this in the Regulation. The evaluators have been told by Scottish Government officials that the SRN has helped to improve the quality of the implementation of the SRDP in various ways, such as:

- Continued promotion of LEADER via good news stories, case studies and cooperation opportunities via social media (SM), newsletters and events including specific SM campaigns e.g. short supply chain campaign in run up to Christmas with dedicated hashtag (#SupportLocal)
- Signposting to SRDP schemes via the website and social media
- Creation of video content promoting schemes across the SRDP (although LEADER features heavily) and promoted across communications channels. More in-house production of video and photographic content has created efficiencies of cost, production timescale, etc.
- Made sign-in process to access the website easier
- Continued efforts to refine the SRDP Communications plan, with recent adaptations to reflect how people engage with channels e.g. shorter video content, use of Instagram, etc. There is an ongoing users' review of the website to improve navigation and user experience; this is part of the broader SRN self-evaluation process. There is work with the LEADER communications group, with the SRN pushing for more outreach to Ministers, etc. to attract more media coverage.

However, there have been some frustrations in terms of helping to improve implementation of specific elements of the SRDP. For example, anticipated work with KTIF on innovation did not work out as planned. There tends to be a degree of path dependency in the way in which schemes are operated.

Relating to this objective, the 2016 EAIR noted that several additional judgement criteria are specified to be used when forming an answer to CEQ 21. One concerns what the SRN has done to increase the capacity of

SRDP beneficiaries. Qualitative information collected by interview with administrators indicated that this was best illustrated by changes in LEADER; the SRN has funded various stakeholders to attend events run by EIP, ENRD, etc. Related to capacity, following SRN involvement, a simpler LEADER application process has been devised that makes it easier for beneficiaries to take the first step through using a common Expression of Interest form.

Objective 3: *Informing the broader public and potential beneficiaries on rural development policy and funding opportunities*

The SRN has been quite proactive in informing the public with social media, national and international events. The SRN has also hosted parliamentary events. Care is taken to work in cooperation with other parts of the SRDP; for example, FAS has good social media accounts and deals more with farmers as potential beneficiaries of the SRDP, while the SRN focuses more on the wider rural aspect of the SRDP.

The evaluators have been told by Scottish Government officials of the following examples of how information about the SRDP has been promoted to the public by the SRN:

- Hosted the 11th OECD Rural Development Conference (442 delegates from 27 countries), which attracted wide press coverage
- Hosting a Ministerial parliamentary event celebrating LEADER, with a key-note speech from the Minister
- As a member of the LEADER Comms Work Group, the SRN has continually advocated that LAG's engage with Ministers, MEPs, MSPs etc. to promote LEADER-funded projects. This has resulted in several LAGs hosting Ministers at project launches, celebration events, etc. which in turn has attracted media coverage
- The SRN has scoped, designed, facilitated and hosted a funding workshop, including providing a range of subject-matter specialists on alternative funding methods to enhance RDP funded projects
- Co-hosting Scottish Rural Parliament (SRP), Stranraer 2018. As key delivery partner in the SRP, the SRN was fully involved in the development of the programme which included promoting to the general public the benefits of RDP through hosted project visits to a variety of LEADER funded projects

In terms of informing potential beneficiaries, the SRN has:

- Engaged in social media activity (which has increased during the life of this RDP) to signpost to funding opportunities, innovation (not just RDP), good practice and promote community and individual resilience. Increase in subscribers and viewers which indicate reach of communication activity is increasing
- Promoted SRDP funding further opportunities to existing beneficiaries e.g. LEADER for farm diversification projects
- Promoted case studies sharing good practice, funding opportunities and support
- Provided a dedicated funding webpage
- Published a weekly funding newsletter available to subscribers
- Represented the SRN at LAG funding workshops to raise awareness of RDP schemes, including use of flyers to signpost interested parties
- Proactively engaged with LAG coordinators to identify opportunities to support development of cooperation, promotional opportunities to raise profile of schemes and impacts of rural communities, etc.

The 2016 EAIR mentioned further methods of informing the general public and potential beneficiaries of

SRDP opportunities which are not repeated here. Much of this is done electronically and metrics on this are collected.

The communication efforts being made represent a substantial improvement on the previous programming period in which, according to the *ex-ante* evaluation, effectiveness was judged to have been compromised by design and delivery flaws. The recommendations made by the evaluators of the communication plan (2013) appear to have been taken seriously.

In the view of the Soil Association Scotland, which administers several KTIF projects, the SRN has helped to effectively promote these projects, and the Rural Innovation Support Service (RISS) to a wide audience across Scotland (see below).

Objective 4: Foster innovation in agriculture, food production, forestry and rural areas

An initiative taken since the 2016 EAIR reported has substantially enhanced the attention of the SRN to innovation, though it is too early to assess its impact on the rate of innovation or the sorts of changes it will bring about. The RISS was launched by the SRN in February 2018 and absorbs part of the SRN budget. There is a wider national initiative to transform the food and drink supply chain, but the RISS fills a gap by providing support to build partnerships. RISS is contracted out to a third party (the Soil Association) which operates the service with sub-contracted partners.

RISS is a service available to farmers, foresters or crofters which facilitates innovation by giving access to subject specialists and managing working groups, which develop options until a viable project plan is produced. The intention is to drive innovation at the business level. Over 60 potential ideas have been presented by farm businesses, around 30 of which have been brokered and some (three) have received funding under the EIP. A number of workshops have been run in partnership with the NFU Scotland. According to Scottish Government officials, this is probably a unique approach in the EU, although is probably what was envisaged by the Commission when thinking about innovation. The evaluators have been told that innovation at the scheme level could be better; there are problems with schemes which straddle primary production and the processing industry where operators cannot be brought together very easily due to support eligibility issues.

There have been cases where people have used the plan developed within RISS to then apply for funding if needed to other parts of the SRDP (including schemes such as KTIF, FPMC and LEADER). But some have then gone to banks for funding rather than schemes under the SRDP.

The SRN has promoted some innovative initiatives to other Member States. For example, there is a community abattoir on Mull which was of interest to Estonia. Danish MPs and Swedish academics have also shown interest in the innovation activities undertaken in Scotland, as have MEPs who were particularly interested in how innovation has been fostered. Ireland is another Member State which is interested in learning from this approach. A workshop was hosted in Brussels in May 2018 which brought academics together to showcase what Scotland is doing in the innovation field. Bringing researchers and businesses together is part of what the SRN does.

In addition to RISS the SRN has promoted innovation in the following ways:

- Hosting knowledge exchange visits, preparing and developing a relevant programme of project visits, liaising with stakeholders to deliver successful events e.g. Danish Local Action Group (LAG) members from the Jammerbugt-Vesthimmerland region interested in the food development and sustainable growth fields and short supply chains
- Taking forward grant funding for the Woodland Croft Project – a project to encourage

diversification of crofting through woodland planting with support and advice for both existing and prospective woodland crofters

- Developing SRN operational planning to utilise on-line tools which will make project management of individual work streams more robust

In the view of a stakeholder (the Soil Association Scotland) which also administers several KTIF projects, the SRN has had a positive and significant impact on developing and supporting grassroots innovation across Scotland. This is through the Rural Innovation Support Service (RISS) which, funded through the SRDP Technical Assistance budget, is led by Soil Association Scotland in partnership with the Scottish Agricultural Organisation Society (SAOS), SAC Consulting (part of Scotland's Rural College), Scotland Food and Drink, and Innovative Farmers. As noted in the answer to CEQ 1, it drives innovation in Scotland by bringing together different sectors and actors along the supply chain to find innovative ways to improve environmental and economic performance. In the opinion of Soil Association Scotland, farmers and other land managers often have the best ideas for improving their business, but are often time-poor. RISS brings together groups with a common interest in solving a problem or developing a new opportunity. RISS provides a facilitator to bring the right people (e.g. supply chain expert, vet, researcher, etc.) to work with the group of farmers/land managers to explore their ideas and develop an action plan to put good ideas into practice.

To date, RISS has enabled the creation of 25 groups covering a wide spectrum of innovative ideas, with many more in the pipeline. The aim is to create 42 groups by 2020. Examples of existing groups include innovative actions for:

- Finding cost effective, sustainable ways to dispose/recycle farm plastic waste
- Establishing a sustainable, profitable and long-term supply chain for organic rapeseed
- Addressing the declining profitability of hill sheep farming
- Getting more local veg into Scottish schools
- Creating a land matching service for new farmers

SRN and evaluation

Beyond these Regulation objectives, and in pursuit of general effectiveness of SRDP activities, the SRN has taken action to increase the awareness of evaluations. First, an evaluation of the SRN itself is in the process of being procured. Scottish Government officials told the evaluators that there is also continual internal reflection in terms of what can be done differently and what expertise is needed to do things better. The SRN is constantly questioning its own activities, seeking improvement.

Second, the SRN has also helped scope and design an evaluation toolkit for LAGs which has been promoted through Yammer groups. LEADER bodies have been funded to attend evaluation and monitoring learning groups. The SRN has promoted the FARNET guidance to LEADER staff through Yammer and at meetings. The focus is now shifting from monitoring toward evaluation. A set of common questions might be put in place for LEADER so that a consistent picture of the impacts of LEADER in Scotland can be gained. There has been funding for coordination staff and monitoring and evaluation workshops. Practical advice has been provided to colleagues in Brussels about how to monitor and evaluate LEADER because the advice provided by the Commission was seen as being too remote from practice to be implemented.

Third, the SRN has also produced short and accessible summaries of evaluations of the SRDP undertaken for the EU Commission for dissemination by social media and eNewsletter and thus reached more beneficiaries than would have access to the evaluation itself.

Views of SRN by other parts of the SRDP (schemes)

Scottish Government officials responsible for each of the SRDP schemes were asked how the SRN had affected their activities. This demonstrated a widely varying relationship. The picture seems to be that the SRN appears to assist one scheme (**LEADER**) in ways that probably meet all its Regulatory objectives, while for most of the others it focuses on only one (communication) and plays a relatively marginal role.

We were told that the SRN is a huge part of enabling **LEADER** to be delivered, done through connecting people together and providing workshops, etc. for LAGs. There is a more formal governance structure in place now and the SRN and LEADER hold frequent meetings with Local Development Strategy Chairs which the SRN help to facilitate. The SRN has held workshops to help promote LEADER projects locally. The SRN provided LAGs with a communication toolkit. Delivery took longer than anticipated, partly due to trying to understand what the LAGs really wanted; a survey later found that the usage (of the toolkit) was quite low, implying that it had not really delivered what was needed/wanted. Clearly understanding specific needs is important; improvement is always possible.

According to the **KTIF**, the SRN was envisaged as an innovation broker linking to **KTIF**, but this did not really happen. However, now the Rural Innovation Support Service has been established, this should improve; three projects have been taken forward. Farmers in Scotland tend to communicate with FAS rather than the SRN; farmers simply do not appear to link in to it. There have been attempts to promote KTIF through a video produced by the SRN, but this was not considered to be very successful. For the **FGS**, there is modest involvement with the SRN; some case studies have been provided to the SRN and these have been promoted. There has also been some work with the technology transfer groups. The SRN can reach out to a wider group of people, though it takes time to build momentum. Concerning **LFASS**, there is no direct link with the SRN (LFASS is a long-established scheme) though LFASS has provided information relevant to the SRN on its website.

Scottish Government officials responsible for the **AECS** stated that its direct communication with farmers is through the Rural Payments Agency (RPA) system rather than SRN; farmers and their agents sign up to their preferred communication channel and there are regular updates on the scheme. However, the SRN also send these communications out through its channels. There has been no criticism of the SRN's communication activities and the RPA and SRN activities are seen as complementary.

Concerning the FPMC scheme, the SRN has acted mainly as a signpost by advertising FPMC deadlines for applications, etc. They also direct potential applicants to the FPMC team, publish case studies, etc. There was an effort by the SRN to encourage uptake of the cooperation element of the FPMC; however, the sector is quite competitive and there is not really a cooperative spirit in the FPMC sector.

Views of external stakeholders

One stakeholder presented a quite negative view of the SRN, stating categorically that the SRN has not contributed to achieving the objectives of the SRDP and has not improved the quality of its implementation. Its role appears to be to function as the Scottish Government PR department for the RDP, and in this respect it has probably increased awareness of the programme, although generally only within the usual stakeholder bubble, rather than with the general public. According to this stakeholder the use of the word "network" is somewhat of a misnomer as the SRN has operated entirely in a top-down manner, it functions to distribute PR rather than facilitate genuine bottom-up input.

7.a22) CEQ22-EM - To what extent has the RDP contributed to achieving the EU 2020 headline target of raising the employment rate of the population aged 20 to 64 to at least 75 %?

7.a22.a) Answer to evaluation question

Employment data supplied by the Scottish Government shows an overall employment rate of 76.6% in 2018 for people aged 20-64. The rate is actually higher in rural areas (79.6% than in urban areas (76.0%). The employment rate is higher for males than it is for females in both rural and urban areas. In addition, the Scottish Government's 'Rural Scotland Key Facts 2018' (<https://www.gov.scot/publications/rural-scotland-key-facts-2018/>) publication shows the rate of employment of the population 16-64 in areas classified according to the Scottish Government's Urban-Rural classification (2016) for 2017. In remote rural areas this rate was 78%, in accessible rural areas 77% (both above the EU 2020 headline target) and in the rest of Scotland 74%; data came from the 2017 annual population survey, and other sources may give different rates. However, these figures suggest that low employment rates are not a particular problem in rural Scotland. It is also worth noting that the percentage of people deemed to be 'employment deprived' was lower in remote rural areas (7%) and accessible rural areas (also 7%) than in the rest of Scotland (11%).

It is unlikely that the SRDP could have made a substantial contribution to raising the employment rate of the population aged 20-64 as a whole in the period to 2018. According to data provided by the Scottish Government, it appears that 17 jobs have been created by spending under FA6A (on-going commitments relating to Rural Priorities) and 233 jobs under FA6B (LEADER). However, the main contribution is likely to come from the Food Processing, Marketing and Cooperation (FPMC) scheme. According to information from application forms, projects supported under this scheme are expected to lead to the creation of 1,144 full-time jobs, 75 part-time jobs (information on how many FTEs this equates to is not collected) and 75 seasonal jobs (again, not recorded as FTEs). This scheme is also expected to safeguard 5,719 full-time jobs, 92 part-time jobs and 1,140 seasonal jobs. Of course, it remains to be seen whether the jobs expected to be created and safeguarded actually materialise and in attempting to establish this it will be necessary to consider both additionality and deadweight.

In addition, jobs may have been either supported or created indirectly under other schemes, and in the delivery process itself; for example, about 500 people are involved with delivering LEADER across Scotland (see CEQ 16), and this activity may have formed part of the reason why some of these people were in employment. Scottish Government officials told the evaluators that schemes such as LFASS and CAGS may have contributed to maintaining employment by supporting the continuation of farming.

However, these figures are very small when compared with the size of the entire working population; the total number of people employed in remote rural areas, accessible rural areas and the rest of Scotland were 146,900, 303,700 and 2,082,800 respectively. Agriculture, forestry and fishing accounted for only 15% of employment in remote rural areas in 2017 and 13% in accessible rural areas (and less than 1% in other areas), so a sizable expansion in the primary sector could hardly make a significant impact on aggregate employment. Another factor is the relatively small scale of the SRDP compared to other influences on economic activity and employment, including investments under the other Structural Funds. Some SRDP-supported innovations and improvements in efficiency may even have lowered employment in the primary sector. Nevertheless, some schemes, in particular LFASS and CAGS (together with Pillar 1 CAP support), may have maintained jobs that otherwise would have disappeared. In some communities this job retention may have been critical to its viability.

In conclusion, the SRDP 2014-2020 has contributed to achieving the EU 2020 headline target of raising the employment rate of the population aged 20-64 to at least 75% or beyond, but only to a small extent.

7.a23) CEQ23-RE - To what extent has the RDP contributed to achieving the EU2020 headline target of investing 3 % of EU's GDP in research and development and innovation?

7.a23.a) Answer to evaluation question

According to Scottish Government statistics, Scotland's Gross Expenditure on Research and Development (GERD) was €3.03 billion in 2017, 7.3% of the UK total (<https://www2.gov.scot/Resource/0054/00546950.pdf>). For Scotland this represented an increase of 8.3% in real terms on 2016 (€232 million), a percentage change larger than for the UK as a whole (2.8%). Most of the total in Scotland was accounted for by Business Enterprise (€1.50 billion) and Higher Education (€1.29 billion), the rest coming from government and private (non-profit) sectors. The research and development expenditure figures have been converted to Euros using the exchange of £1 to €1.2. In Scotland, GERD was at its highest level in the series, which goes back to 2001. Scotland's GERD in 2017 represented 1.63% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP), just below that for the UK (1.69%), the EU (1.96%) and the OECD (2.37%). Spending on R&D in Scotland increased between 2016 and 2017, from 1.53% of GDP in 2016 to 1.63% in 2017. However, this is still substantially lower than the headline target mentioned in the CEQ.

The SRDP 2014-2020 has specific initiatives which are related to innovation, most notably the European Innovation Partnership operated under KTIF (see CEQ 1) and the Rural Innovation Support Service operated by the Scottish Rural Network (SRN). Links between the primary sector and the research and development community, fostered by several schemes including FAS, were covered in the answer to CEQ 2. However, these are concerned with disseminating research findings rather than investing in primary research and development, which cannot be funded under these schemes. That said, there are some supported KTIF projects which are carrying out small-scale research and development activities within groups. The proportion of total SRDP funding devoted to research and development is very small.

In conclusion, the SRDP 2014-2020 has contributed to achieving the EU 2020 headline target of investing 3% of EU's GDP in research and development and innovation, but on a very minor scale in proportion to the total funding.

7.a24) CEQ24-CL - To what extent has the RDP contributed to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to achieving the EU 2020 headline target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by at least 20 % compared to 1990 levels, or by 30 % if the conditions are right, to increasing the share of renewable energy in final energy consumption to 20 %, and achieving 20 % increase in energy efficiency?

7.a24.a) Answer to evaluation question

Scottish Government figures on GHG emissions released on 11 June 2019 show that source emissions were down by 46.8% in 2017 compared to 1990 (<https://www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-greenhouse-gas-emissions-2017/>). Adjusted emissions (to account for Scotland's participation in the EU Emissions Trading System (EU-ETS), adjusted emissions are used to measure progress against the targets set in the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009) were down by 39.1% in 2017 from the baseline position (which the evaluators assume to also be 1990). Although this meets the EU 2020 headline target, it actually misses the target for 2017 set in the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009(43.946 MtCO₂e, against performance of 46.410

MtCO₂e).

Emissions of GHG from agriculture amounted to 23.9% of the total in 2017 (9.7 MtCO₂e), although these were almost offset by the emissions sink provided by the forestry sector (-23.6%, -9.5 MtCO₂e). Since 1990 there has been a reduction of -4.0 MtCO₂e (29.4%) in emissions from the agriculture and related land use sector. The Forestry sink has increased over this period (-2.5 MtCO₂e absolute change, an increase of 34.9%).

The material needed to answer this question is largely contained in answers to previous CEQs.

Actions supported under the SRDP are designed to have direct impacts in terms of reducing GHG and ammonia emissions from agriculture (see CEQ 14) and in fostering carbon conservation and sequestration in agriculture and forestry (see CEQ 15). Indirect impacts are also expected via increasing the efficiency of energy use in agriculture and food processing (see CEQ 12) and by increasing the supply of renewable energy (CEQ 13). Key support for these actions is provided through knowledge transfer and advice activities.

Our conclusion in respect of CEQ 14 was that SRDP interventions, which principally take the form of grants to investment, advice and projects, have contributed to reducing GHG and ammonia emissions from agriculture, but the extent of this cannot be quantified at the present time. The evidence for this direction of change focuses on outputs and assumed relationships within the intervention logic, rather than impacts directly, and it will be necessary in the future to consider a direct approach to impacts. We recommended that steps are taken to populate gaps in indicators in preparation for the anticipated *ex-post* evaluation.

Our conclusion in respect of CEQ 15 was that the SRDP, principally through the FGS (Measure 8), is supporting carbon conservation and sequestration and is doing this through the planting of new woodland, with better management of existing woodland providing some additional impact. A contribution is also made under FAS (Measure 2). We recommended that information is made available on net changes in woodland area (though loss of woodland area is less of a problem in Scotland than in England) and that modelled estimates of carbon sequestration and conservation are made available to the evaluators to allow this question to be addressed more directly.

In answering CEQ 12, we concluded that SRDP interventions have the potential to contribute to increasing efficiency in energy use in agriculture and food processing and may have done so through the FAS. However, the extent of the impact cannot be assessed at this time. We recommended that impacts are investigated; some information may be available already (for example in KTIF project reports and Carbon Audit action plans) but not collated.

Finally, under CEQ 13, we concluded that SRDP interventions have potentially contributed to the supply and use of renewable sources of energy, of by-products, wastes, residues and other non-food raw material for purposes of the bio-economy. However, evidence on changes made on-farm and the impacts of these changes is not available at this time, and results indicators are not available. We recommend that this information gap is closed. In particular, this might include scrutiny of the contents of ILMPs for appropriate evidence.

Mitigating climate change is clearly an important theme within the SRDP 2014-2020 and there has been a contribution to a reduction in GHG and ammonia emissions. There has also been a contribution to carbon sequestration and capture. Hence the SRDP 2014-2020 is judged by the evaluators to be contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to achieving the EU 2020 headline target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, to increasing the share of renewable energy in final energy consumption to 20% and achieving 20% increase in energy efficiency. However, the extent of this contribution cannot at present

be quantified.

7.a25) CEQ25-PO - To what extent has the RDP contributed to achieving the EU 2020 headline target of reducing the number of Europeans living below the national poverty line?

7.a25.a) Answer to evaluation question

According to the Scottish Government website ‘Poverty in Scotland’, in 2014-15 some 15% of people (800,000) of working age were living in poverty, some 70,000 more than the year before. The percentage was a little higher among children (17%) but similar for people of working age and pensioners (15%). (Figures after housing costs (AHC) were 18%, 22%, 19% and 12% respectively.) It should also be noted that the percentages of people deemed to be income deprived was lower in remote rural areas (8%) and accessible rural areas (also 8%) were lower than in the rest of Scotland (13%).

Further breakdowns available online show that in the 2015/16-2017/18 period, 170,000 people in rural areas were living in relative poverty AHC (below 60% of UK median income) compared to 870,000 in urban areas. The figures for people in severe poverty AHC (below 50% of UK median income) were 120,000 and 610,000 respectively.

The SRDP 2014-2020 does not have a direct and explicit role in alleviating poverty. By increasing the economic viability of businesses and (relatively minor) job creation, it is likely to have made a contribution to increasing the standard of living for some beneficiaries. However, there is no evidence on the extent to which SRDP beneficiaries fall below the national poverty line and therefore it is not possible to comment on the extent to which the SRDP has contributed to reducing the number of people living below the national poverty line. In any case, it should be noted that poverty is a far greater problem in urban areas than it is in rural areas.

7.a26) CEQ26-BI - To what extent has the RDP contributed to improving the environment and to achieving the EU biodiversity strategy target of halting the loss of biodiversity and the degradation of ecosystem services, and to restore them?

7.a26.a) Answer to evaluation question

Environmental and climate related measures, plus support to agriculture in Less Favoured Areas that contain HNV farming account for over three-quarters of total SRDP 2014-2020 funding. The impact of the SRDP in improving the environment, halting the loss of biodiversity and the degradation of ecosystem services and restoring them has been covered in a number of CEQs under Priority 4.

Under CEQ 8, we concluded that SRDP interventions have supported the restoration, preservation and enhancement of biodiversity, including in Natura 2000 areas, areas facing natural or other specific constraints and HNV farming. However, the extent of these impacts are not quantified at this stage and in many cases it is too early to expect impacts from this programming period to have emerged. That said, it is clear that the general direction of travel over successive programming periods has been positive, and this is expected to continue. While this falls short of the biodiversity strategy’s aim of halting the loss of biodiversity, mentioned in this CEQ, it helps.

We recommended that steps are taken to quantify the impacts that the various schemes, individually and collectively, have on biodiversity. Monitoring and evaluation exercises of AECS and FAS are being launched (in 2019), but similar projects should be encouraged in the other schemes that potentially impact on biodiversity. This will mean that adequate monitoring data are required, although the difficulties in establishing a baseline and assigning causality are recognised.

When considering other aspect of the environment, CEQ 9 examined the extent to which SRDP interventions have supported the improvement of water management, including fertiliser and pesticide management (and hence diffuse pollution). We concluded that SRDP interventions have supported the improvement of water management, including fertilizer and pesticide management. However, the extent of their impact cannot be adequately assessed at this stage and in many cases it is too early to expect impacts from this programming period to have emerged. That said, it is clear that the general direction of travel over successive programming periods has been positive and this is expected to continue. We recommended that steps are taken to quantify the impacts that the various schemes, individually and collectively, have on water management. This will mean that adequate monitoring facilities are required, although the difficulties in establishing a baseline and assigning causality are recognised. The initiation of a monitoring and evaluation exercises for the AECS and FAS in 2019 should be noted.

Other contributions to halting biodiversity decline and the degradation of environmental service (and help with their restoration) were encountered in many SRDP schemes, not just those most clearly directed at the environment (such as AECS and FGS). The ability of investment in human and social capital (such as KTIF, FAS, LEADER and LFASS) to contribute to this aim should be noted.

The key problem in drawing a definitive conclusion on the impact of the SRDP 2014-2020 is a lack of quantitative evidence. In part this reflects a long lag between action and impact, but there are also issues around the collection of a suitable baseline. However, the evaluators are satisfied that the SRDP 2014-2020 is designed to provide a positive contribution to the environment and that this is generally being delivered via suitable agri-environment schemes and also through specific grant schemes and the provision of a range of relevant advice.

7.a27) CEQ27-CO - To what extent has the RDP contributed to the CAP objective of fostering the competitiveness of agriculture?

7.a27.a) Answer to evaluation question

The answer to CEQ 4 dealt explicitly with the extent to which factors associated with competitiveness have been addressed by the SRDP 2014-2020. The conclusion was that that many of the activities available under the KTIF umbrella and FAS will contribute to improving economic performance (and hence competitiveness) through improving human and social capital; several other schemes (NECGS, SFSGS, CAGS) are likely to make a contribution through improving physical capital. The answers concerned with innovation, cooperation, development of the knowledge base (CEQ 1), with strengthening the link between agriculture and the research and innovation community (CEQ 2) and lifelong learning (CEQ 3) also impinges on the competitiveness of agriculture. However, at this stage in the programme there is a notable lack of evidence with which to demonstrate the actual impact of the various' activities, exacerbated in the case of capital spending by the time lag between action and impact.

At this point is may be appropriate to underline the recommendations made in relation to earlier questions that emphasised the need to collect appropriate monitoring data and for independent evaluations that drew

on these data, as well as additional information. It is also noted that various schemes have the intention of collating information relevant to competitiveness taken from application forms. The Scottish Government has plans to evaluate the impact of several schemes, including FAS, and individual KTIF projects will be reporting on their outcomes. Nevertheless, it is recommended that greater attention be paid to ways in which the impact on economic performance and competitiveness might be assessed to allow the Scottish Government to understand the relative impact of the different activities contributing in this area. This will provide useful information in deciding the most effective ways of helping the industry improve economic performance and competitiveness.

7.a28) CEQ28-SU - To what extent has the RDP contributed to the CAP objective of ensuring sustainable management of natural resources and climate action?

7.a28.a) Answer to evaluation question

This CEQ is very much related to CEQ 24 and CEQ 26 in that schemes which have positive impacts in the areas covered by those CEQs will also have positive impacts here. To recap, the SRDP 2014-2020 has made a positive contribution to a reduction in GHG and ammonia emissions and to carbon sequestration and capture. There has also been a positive contribution to the environment through a combination of agri-environment schemes, specific investment grants and the provision of a range of relevant advice. There has therefore been a contribution to the CAP objective of ensuring sustainable management of natural resources and climate action. Whether alternative forms of intervention could have been more cost-effective is, of course, another issue that must await detailed evaluation.

7.a29) CEQ29-DE - To what extent has the RDP contributed to the CAP objective of achieving a balanced territorial development of rural economies and communities including the creation and maintenance of employment?

7.a29.a) Answer to evaluation question

The SRDP 2014-2020 contributes by design at the EU level and then again within the context of the national plans to the CAP objective of achieving a balanced territorial development of rural economies and communities including the creation and maintenance of employment. However, it is unlikely that the SRDP will have made a substantial contribution due to the relatively small scale of activities compared to the more substantial investments under the other Structural Funds and other influences on economic activity and employment.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that LFASS and CAGS focus on areas where agriculture and the rural economy might be considered to be most vulnerable and in particular to be sensitive to the loss of employment opportunities in agriculture. LEADER can be expected, though its tailoring of interventions to local development strategies and operated by LAGs, to be tackling problems of rural areas in ways that are appropriate to the particular territorial needs. Furthermore, LEADER has the ability to reach beyond the agricultural sector and to promote diversification at both the level of the individual business (which will expand or protect employment, and within the broader rural economy.

CEQ 22 dealt specifically with the creation and maintenance of employment and noted that while some

SRDP-supported innovations and improvements in efficiency may have lowered employment in the primary sector, there are examples of (relatively small-scale) job creation under specific SRDP schemes. LEADER has been credited by a Scottish Government official with creating 233 jobs.

In conclusion, the SRDP 2014-2020 has contributed to achieving a balanced territorial development of rural economies and communities including the creation and maintenance of employment, but only in a relatively minor way in line with the overall level of support available and its main focus specifically on the agricultural sector.

7.a30) CEQ30-IN - To what extent has the RDP contributed to fostering innovation?

7.a30.a) Answer to evaluation question

The definition of 'innovative' matters to the interpretation and answer to this over-arching question. The evaluators take the view that it can include both innovation at the industry level (new products, new processes, etc.) and at the farm level, when operators initially some way behind the leaders are brought somewhat closer to the production possibility boundary.

The answer to CEQ 1 dealt explicitly with innovation in rural areas. The conclusion was that there has certainly been considerable effort in the design of the SRDP 2014-2020 to support innovation. This is seen most clearly in the set of KTIF projects; of greatest note here are those 12 that draw on the European Innovation Partnership (EIP) and receive 100% funding.

Many examples exist within the FAS of attempts to encourage individual farmers to take up improvements in the way that they operate their farms, through tools that range from relatively impersonal one-to-many activities and events through to one-to-one advice. The FAS also attempts to encourage farms to take up new ways of operating. Advice is also offered via other SRDP schemes, such as the Beef Efficiency Scheme.

There is also an attempt to improve the link between the generators of research and innovation and the agricultural, food and forestry community, thereby assisting the rate of flow of ideas that are the basis of innovatory behaviour (see the answer to CEQ 2).

Lifelong learning, which implies innovation at the level of the individual, is embedded in much of the SRDP 2014-2020, especially in the activities under KTIF, and this learning is likely to be a vehicle for innovation in agricultural businesses (see the answer to CEQ 3). Modernisation and agricultural diversification often go hand-in-hand with innovation (see the answer to CEQ 4).

There are also examples of innovative approaches to the delivery processes of schemes, projects, etc. throughout the SRDP 2014-2020. A good example is the Rural Innovation Support Service (RISS). Under the SRN there is a new initiative in the form of the RISS.

A key problem in relation to innovation is a lack of evidence at this stage with which to understand the outcomes and impacts of the activities undertaken. This means that, while it is possible to conclude that the SRDP 2014-2020 should have had positive impacts on innovation, it is not possible to conclude that it has actually occurred. That said, it is acknowledged that efforts are being made through various planned

evaluations, and through the internal efforts within certain elements of the SRDP to gather an evidence base for future use.

7.a31) PSEQ01-FA - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

There are no Programme specific Focus Areas in the SRDP 2014-2020.

7.a32) PSEQ02-FA - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

There are no Programme specific Focus Areas in the SRDP 2014-2020.

7.a33) PSEQ03-FA - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

There are no Programme specific Focus Areas in the SRDP 2014-2020.

7.a34) PSEQ04-FA - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

There are no Programme specific Focus Areas in the SRDP 2014-2020.

7.a35) PSEQ05-FA - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific focus areas

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

There are no Programme specific Focus Areas in the SRDP 2014-2020.

7.a36) PSEQ01-TOPIC - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

There are no Programme specific evaluation topics in the SRDP 2014-2020.

7.a37) PSEQ02-TOPIC - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

There are no Programme specific evaluation topics in the SRDP 2014-2020.

7.a38) PSEQ03-TOPIC - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

There are no Programme specific evaluation topics in the SRDP 2014-2020.

7.a39) PSEQ04-TOPIC - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

There are no Programme specific evaluation topics in the SRDP 2014-2020.

7.a40) PSEQ05-TOPIC - Programme specific evaluation question linked to programme specific evaluation topic

This question is marked as not relevant for this AIR version

There are no Programme specific evaluation topics in the SRDP 2014-2020.

7.b) Table of result indicators

Result indicator name and unit (1)	Target value (2)	Main value (3)	Secondary contribution (4)	LEADER/CLLD contribution (5)	Total RDP (6)=3+4+5	Comments (max 500 char)
R1 / T4: percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP support for investments in restructuring or modernisation (focus area 2A)	16.35	5.55	N/A	0.00	5.55	
R2: Change in Agricultural output on supported farms/AWU (Annual Work Unit) (focus area 2A)* (GROSS VALUE)	N/A					Data are not currently available for this Common Result Indicator.
R2: Change in Agricultural output on supported farms/AWU (Annual Work Unit) (focus area 2A)* (NET VALUE)	N/A					Data are not currently available for this Common Result Indicator.
R3 / T5: percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP supported business development plan/investments for young farmers (focus area 2B)	0.27	0.50	N/A	0.00	0.50	
R4 / T6: percentage of agricultural holdings receiving support for participating in quality schemes, local markets and short supply circuits, and producer groups/organisations (focus area 3A)	15.54	0.00	N/A	0.00	0.00	
R5 / T7: percentage of farms participating in risk management schemes (focus area 3B)		0.00	N/A	0.00	0.00	
R6 / T8: percentage of forest/other wooded area under management contracts supporting biodiversity (focus area 4A)	37.99	4.68	N/A	0.00	4.68	
R7 / T9: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts supporting biodiversity and/or landscapes (focus area 4A)	22.73	19.66	N/A	0.00	19.66	
R8 / T10: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts to improve water management (focus area 4B)	19.80	16.30	N/A	0.00	16.30	
R9 / T11: percentage of forestry land under management contracts to improve water management (focus area 4B)	37.99	4.68	N/A	0.00	4.68	
R10 / T12: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion (focus area 4C)	19.13	17.91	N/A	0.00	17.91	
R11 / T13: percentage of forestry land under management contracts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion (focus area 4C)	37.99	4.68	N/A	0.00	4.68	
R12 / T14: percentage of irrigated land switching to more efficient irrigation system (focus area 5A)		0.00	N/A	0.00	0.00	
R13: Increase in efficiency of water use in agriculture in RDP supported projects (focus area	N/A					No actions will be delivered against this Common Result Indicator under the SRDP 2014-2020.

5A)*							
R14: Increase in efficiency of energy use in agriculture and food-processing in RDP supported projects (focus area 5B)*	N/A						No actions will be delivered against this Common Result Indicator under the SRDP 2014-2020.
R15: Renewable energy produced from supported projects (focus area 5C)*	N/A						No actions will be delivered against this Common Result Indicator under the SRDP 2014-2020.
R16 / T17: percentage of LU concerned by investments in live-stock management in view of reducing GHG and/or ammonia emissions (focus area 5D)	1.32	0.01	N/A	0.00	0.01		
R17 / T18: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts targeting reduction of GHG and/or ammonia emissions (focus area 5D)	23.18	18.27	N/A	0.00	18.27		
R18: Reduced emissions of methane and nitrous oxide (focus area 5D)*	N/A						Data are not currently available for this Common Result Indicator.
R19: Reduced ammonia emissions (focus area 5D)*	N/A						Data are not currently available for this Common Result Indicator.
R20 / T19: percentage of agricultural and forest land under management contracts contributing to carbon sequestration and conservation (focus area 5E)	16.14	13.23	N/A	0.00	13.23		
R21 / T20: Jobs created in supported projects (focus area 6A)	N/A	17.00		N/A	17.00		The target value for this indicator is to create 17 jobs in supported projects. The target has been met.
R22 / T21: percentage of rural population covered by local development strategies (focus area 6B)	86.76	86.76	N/A		86.76		
R23 / T22: percentage of rural population benefiting from improved services/infrastructures (focus area 6B)	10.14	2.61	N/A	0.04	2.65		
R24 / T23: Jobs created in supported projects (Leader) (focus area 6B)	551.00	18.00	N/A		18.00		
R25 / T24: percentage of rural population benefiting from new or improved services/infrastructures (ICT) (focus area 6C)	0.88	0.00	N/A	0.00	0.00		

7.c) Table of additional and programme specific indicators used to support evaluation findings

Indicator type	Code	Indicator name	Focus Area	Unit	Indicator value	Comments (max 500 char)
Output	PST15B	Number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013	5B	Number	0.00	No expenditure has been made under Focus Area 5B by the Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund, which will deliver in Measure 1 in Scotland, since the start of the SRDP 2014-2020.
Output	PST12A	Number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013	2A	Number	14,431.00	
Output	PST13A	Percentage of total agri-food businesses supported under Article 17 of the Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013	3A	Percentage	12.57	

7.d) Table of CAP impact indicators

Name of common impact indicator	Unit	Updated indicator value	RDP contribution	Comments (max 500 char)
1. Agricultural Entrepreneurial Income / Standard of living of farmers	EUR/AWU			Data for this indicator are not currently available.
2. Agricultural factor income / total	EUR/AWU			Data for this indicator are not currently available.
3. Total factor productivity in agriculture / total (index)	Index 2005 = 100			Data for this indicator are not currently available.
7. GHG emissions from agriculture / total agriculture (CH4 and N2O and soil emissions/removals)	1000 t of CO2 equivalent	9,679.00		It is not currently possible to quantify the contribution of the SRDP 2014-2020 to this indicator. The data are for 2017.
7. GHG emissions from agriculture / share of total GHG Emissions	% of total net emissions	23.89		It is not currently possible to quantify the contribution of the SRDP 2014-2020 to this indicator. The data are for 2017.
7. GHG emissions from agriculture / ammonia emissions from agriculture	1000 t of NH3	30.50		It is not currently possible to quantify the contribution of the SRDP 2014-2020 to this indicator. The data are for 2016.
8. Farmland Birds index (FBI) / total (index)	Index 2000 = 100	103.00		It is not currently possible to quantify the contribution of the SRDP 2014-2020 to this indicator. The data are for 2017.
9. HNV Farming / total	% of total UAA	44.00		It is not currently possible to quantify the contribution of the SRDP 2014-2020 to this indicator. The data are for 2013. Updated data on HNV Farming will be available in the future.
10. Water Abstraction in Agriculture / total	1000 m3	12,281.00		It is not currently possible to quantify the contribution of the SRDP 2014-2020 to this indicator. The data are for 2018. The level of water abstraction in any given year is very depended on weather conditions.
11. Water Quality / Potential surplus of nitrogen on agricultural land	kg N/ha/year			Data for this indicator are not currently available.
11. Water Quality / Potential surplus of phosphorus on agricultural land	kg P/ha/year			Data for this indicator are not currently available.
11. Water Quality / Nitrates in freshwater - Surface water: High quality	% of monitoring sites	78.14		It is not currently possible to quantify the contribution of the SRDP 2014-2020 to this indicator. The data are for 2018.
11. Water Quality / Nitrates in freshwater - Surface water: Moderate quality	% of monitoring sites	12.02		It is not currently possible to quantify the contribution of the SRDP 2014-2020 to this indicator. The data are for 2018.
11. Water Quality / Nitrates in freshwater - Surface water: Poor quality	% of monitoring sites	9.84		It is not currently possible to quantify the contribution of the SRDP 2014-2020 to this indicator. The data are for 2018.
11. Water Quality / Nitrates in freshwater - Groundwater: High quality	% of monitoring sites	67.00		It is not currently possible to quantify the contribution of the SRDP 2014-2020 to this indicator. The data are for 2018.

11. Water Quality / Nitrates in freshwater - Groundwater: Moderate quality	% of monitoring sites	23.91		It is not currently possible to quantify the contribution of the SRDP 2014-2020 to this indicator. The data are for 2018.
11. Water Quality / Nitrates in freshwater - Groundwater: Poor quality	% of monitoring sites	9.09		It is not currently possible to quantify the contribution of the SRDP 2014-2020 to this indicator. The data are for 2018.
12. Soil organic matter in arable land / Total estimates of organic carbon content	mega tons			Data for this indicator are not currently available.
12. Soil organic matter in arable land / Mean organic carbon content	g kg-1			Data for this indicator are not currently available.
13. Soil Erosion by water / rate of soil loss by water erosion	tonnes/ha/year			Data for this indicator are not currently available.
13. Soil Erosion by water / agricultural area affected	1000 ha			Data for this indicator are not currently available.
13. Soil Erosion by water / agricultural area affected	% of agricultural area			Data for this indicator are not currently available.
14. Employment Rate / * rural (thinly populated) (15-64 years)	%	77.00		It is not currently possible to quantify the contribution of the SRDP 2014-2020 to this indicator. The data are for 2018. Rural areas are defined using the 2 fold Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification. In Scotland the employment rate is based on the population aged 16 to 64.
14. Employment Rate / * rural (thinly populated) (20-64 years)	%	79.60		It is not currently possible to quantify the contribution of the SRDP 2014-2020 to this indicator. The data are for 2018. Rural areas are defined using the 2 fold Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification.
15. Poverty rate / total	% of total population	20.00		It is not currently possible to quantify the contribution of the SRDP 2014-2020 to this indicator. The data are for 2015-16- 2017-18.
15. Poverty rate / * rural (thinly populated)	% of total population	15.00		It is not currently possible to quantify the contribution of the SRDP 2014-2020 to this indicator. The data are for 2015-16- 2017-18.
16. GDP per capita / * rural	Index PPS (EU-27 = 100)			Data for this indicator are not currently available.

8. IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIONS TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE PRINCIPLES SET OUT IN ARTICLES 5, 7 AND 8 OF REGULATION (EU) No 1303/2013

8.a) Promotion of equality between men and women and non-discrimination (Article 7 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013)

It is the view of the Scottish Government that everyone deserves to be treated fairly, regardless of their age, disability, gender, gender identity/reassignment, race, religion or sexual orientation.

There is no place in Scotland for prejudice or discrimination and, among other actions, the Scottish Government is working to make sure women and men receive equal treatment and are not discriminated against because of their gender.

The schemes offered through the SRDP are assessed on the basis of each application meeting the scheme requirements and then, where required, achieving the appropriate threshold under the scoring and selection criteria, thus ensuring that gender discrimination is avoided. However, it was recognised that there was no factual baseline information available regarding the number of women involved in farming or the agricultural sector in Scotland. A ministerial commitment was made to commission research which could be used to properly inform decisions going forward. Early in the process it was found that this research would be of use to a number of other policy areas within the Scottish Government rather than just related to informing the SRDP.

The Women in Agriculture Taskforce aims to give women in farming access to the same development opportunities as men in this sector. The taskforce published a progress report in June 2018 (<https://www.gov.scot/publications/acknowledging-women-agriculture/>) and is set to publish a final report in autumn 2019.

The taskforce will be making specific recommendations on a number of areas including:

- making training and skills development more accessible for women;
- succession planning and inheritance for farming families;
- the development of an Equality Charter for all agricultural businesses to enable them to make the most of their people; and
- addressing issues of childcare in rural areas.

It is estimated that one in 10 people has a form of dyslexia and there is a belief that this might be higher in rural farming communities. The Scottish Government Agriculture and Rural Economy Directorate has worked towards improving accessibility standards by producing material for the CAP support that is an example of best practice. This has included:

- a redesign of the website to use colours that are easier for dyslexic users to view;
- a new style of hyperlinks that allow for colour and underlining;
- the addition of subtitles to guidance videos; and
- more descriptive 'alt-tags' (the little box of text that pops up when you hover over a hyperlink).

The Scottish Government have also worked with the National Farmers Union Scotland to support their Farming with Dyslexia campaign and, as part of this, have designed a range of accessible graphics and backdrops to use on our digital channels.

8.b) Sustainable development (Article 8 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013)

The SRDP has a number of objectives that contribute to sustainable development.

Under Measures 4, 10 and 11 the **Agri-Environment Climate Scheme** contributes to:

- the delivery of the 2020 Challenge for Scotland's Biodiversity by supporting appropriate management for vulnerable and iconic species and habitats, strengthening ecological networks, controlling invasive non-native species and enhancing the condition of protected nature sites;
- Scotland's world-leading climate change targets by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture and securing carbon stores in peatlands and other organic soils;
- meeting obligations to improve water quality under the EU Water Framework Directive by reducing diffuse pollution;
- the control of flooding through natural flood risk management; and
- supporting organic farming.

Under Measures 4, 8, 15 and 16 the **Forestry Grant Scheme** will support the sustainable management of existing woodlands

Under Measures 1 and 16 the **Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Scheme** will:

- be aligned with the European Innovation Partnership for agricultural productivity and sustainability;
- help form partnerships between farmers, advisers and businesses working on the ground; and
- Form of operational groups who its expected will generate new insights and innovative ideas, as well as mobilising existing knowledge into practical solutions.

Under Measure 2 the **Farm Advisory Service** provides information and resources aimed at increasing the profitability and sustainability of farms and crofts which is designed to provide integrated advice for farmers and crofters across Scotland.

Under Measure 13 the **Less Favoured Area Support Scheme (LFASS)** is vital for Scotland's rural economy and remote communities throughout Scotland, providing support to around 11,300 farmers and crofters. Whilst no specific data are held on in case benefits to biodiversity, LFASS provides support that maintains livestock systems in remote and fragile areas where, without this support, it would be likely be uneconomical to operate these agriculture enterprises. Having a grazing pressure in sensitive and remote areas of Scotland can assist with maintaining habitat mosaics and reduce establishment of rank grasslands / monoculture species habitats.

Under Measure 19 **LEADER** supports multi-sectoral community-based development. It helps individuals, communities and businesses to come together to design and implement Local Development Strategies.

The LEADER approach is about developing links between local people and, in doing so, building social and economic capital.

Twenty-one Local Action Groups (LAGs) will be implementing Local Development Strategies across rural Scotland during the Programme period, with each LAG adopting their own approaches to supporting local development and social inclusion.

Under Measures 4 and 16, the **Food Processing Marketing and Co-operation Grant Scheme** supports the food and drink sector helping to make Scotland healthier, wealthier and smarter, with stronger communities and production that is socially and environmentally sustainable.

The scheme provide support to suppliers and producers to contribute to the Scottish Government's overall vision for food and drink in Scotland, which is to be a Good Food Nation, where it is second nature to produce, buy, serve and eat fresh, healthy food.

8.c) The role of the partners referred to in Article 5 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 in the implementation of the programme

Stakeholder engagement is a fundamental part of implementing the SRDP. During the development of the Programme a number of Stakeholder Working Groups were established to draw out key principles. This was followed by two public consultations. Subsequently a number of stakeholder organisations have involved in the Rural Development Operational Committee (the technical committee which informs the Joint Programme Monitoring Committee) to consider the progress of the Programme. Along with this a number of committees have been convened by the Scottish Government to consider wider policy issues are also free to consider and feedback views regarding the Programme. In addition the SRDP is also considered at an Agriculture and Rural Development Committee which involves stakeholders with interests across both CAP pillars. Key messages are relayed to stakeholders who have disseminated information to their members and the Scottish Government makes information publically available on the SRDP pages where appropriate.

Further to this, the Scottish Rural Network support partnership engagement and dissemination of information.

9. PROGRESS MADE IN ENSURING INTEGRATED APPROACH TO USE EAFRD AND OTHER UNION FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS

Prior to programme approval the Managing Authorities for each of the ESI Funds worked together to ensure complementarity in the design, scope and governance of the Funds. The 2014-20 EAFRD Programme coordinates with the other ESI funds, with governance through a Joint Programme Monitoring Committee.

10. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS (ARTICLE 46 OF REGULATION (EU) No 1303/2013)

30A. Has the ex-ante assessment been started ?	No
30B. Has the ex-ante assessment been completed ?	No
30. Date of completion of ex-ante assessment	-
31.1. Has selection or designation process already been launched ?	No
13A. Has the funding agreement been signed ?	No
13. Date of signature of the funding agreement with the body implementing the financial instrument	-

11. ENCODING TABLES FOR COMMON AND PROGRAMME-SPECIFIC INDICATORS AND QUANTIFIED TARGET VALUES

See Monitoring Annex

Annex II

Detailed table showing implementation level by Focus areas including output indicators

Focus Area 1A							
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
1A	T1: percentage of expenditure under Articles 14, 15 and 35 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 in relation to the total expenditure for the RDP (focus area 1A)	2014-2018			0.93	32.59	2.85
		2014-2017			0.53	18.57	
		2014-2016			0.19	6.66	
		2014-2015			0.13	4.56	

Focus Area 1B							
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
1B	T2: Total number of cooperation operations supported under the cooperation measure (Article 35 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013) (groups, networks/clusters, pilot projects...) (focus area 1B)	2014-2018			20.00	8.73	229.00
		2014-2017			13.00	5.68	
		2014-2016			4.00	1.75	
		2014-2015			1.00	0.44	

Focus Area 1C							
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
1C	T3: Total number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (focus area 1C)	2014-2018			14,683.00	138.30	10,617.00
		2014-2017			13,065.00	123.06	
		2014-2016			12,118.00	114.14	
		2014-2015			9,227.00	86.91	

Focus Area 2A								
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023	
2A	T4: percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP support for investments in restructuring or modernisation (focus area 2A)	2014-2018	5.55	33.95	5.55	33.95	16.35	
		2014-2017	4.21	25.75	4.21	25.75		
		2014-2016	3.09	18.90	3.09	18.90		
		2014-2015	2.39	14.62	2.39	14.62		
	Number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (Number of participants trained)	2014-2018				14,431.00	71.73	20,118.00
		2014-2017				13,065.00	64.94	
		2014-2016						
		2014-2015						
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023	
2A	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	206,073,982.76	64.61	193,659,599.69	60.72	318,933,889.00	
M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	2,656,545.70	64.37	2,407,124.33	58.33	4,127,034.00	
M01.1	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			2,407,124.33	58.33	4,127,034.00	
M01.1	O12 - Number of participants in trainings	2014-2018			14,431.00	71.73	20,118.00	
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	4,519,188.22	48.28	3,191,196.82	34.09	9,360,000.00	
M02.1	O13 - Number of beneficiaries advised	2014-2018			4,042.00	32.98	12,255.00	
M04	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	39,829,196.12	81.03	34,002,001.12	69.18	49,151,926.00	
M04	O2 - Total investment	2014-2018			49,669,689.21	81.05	61,283,926.00	
M04.1	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			32,481,846.71	71.50	45,431,926.00	
M04.1	O4 - Number of holdings/beneficiaries supported	2014-2018			2,905.00	59.43	4,888.00	
M04.3	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			1,520,154.41	40.86	3,720,000.00	
M06	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	1,032,074.00	86.01	593,717.66	49.48	1,200,000.00	
M06	O2 - Total investment	2014-2018					1,200,000.00	
M06.3	O4 - Number of holdings/beneficiaries supported	2014-2018			49.00	61.25	80.00	
M13	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	156,044,241.34	62.07	151,555,627.81	60.28	251,400,000.00	
M13.2	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2018			1,063,815.89	75.99	1,400,000.00	
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	1,992,737.38	53.93	1,909,931.95	51.69	3,694,929.00	

Focus Area 2B							
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
2B	T5: percentage of agricultural holdings with RDP supported business development plan/investments for young farmers (focus area 2B)	2014-2018	0.50	182.92	0.50	182.92	0.27
		2014-2017	0.39	142.67	0.39	142.67	
		2014-2016	0.31	113.41	0.31	113.41	
		2014-2015	0.11	40.24	0.11	40.24	
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
2B	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	15,145,536.40	79.11	14,564,654.23	76.08	19,145,101.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	1,129,798.05	48.28	797,016.69	34.06	2,340,000.00
M02.1	O13 - Number of beneficiaries advised	2014-2018			1,772.00	31.90	5,555.00
M06	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	14,015,738.35	83.40	13,767,637.54	81.93	16,805,101.00
M06	O2 - Total investment	2014-2018					16,805,101.00
M06.1	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			13,767,637.54	81.93	16,805,101.00
M06.1	O4 - Number of holdings/beneficiaries supported	2014-2018			263.00	92.93	283.00

Focus Area 3A								
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023	
3A	T6: percentage of agricultural holdings receiving support for participating in quality schemes, local markets and short supply circuits, and producer groups/organisations (focus area 3A)	2014-2018	14.69	94.56			15.54	
		2014-2017	14.69	94.56				
		2014-2016	14.69	94.56				
		2014-2015	14.69	94.56				
	Percentage of total agri-food businesses supported under Article 17 of the Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (Percentage of total number of agri-food businesses)	2014-2018				12.57	96.69	13.00
		2014-2017				9.83	75.62	
		2014-2016				6.29	48.38	
		2014-2015						
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023	
3A	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	71,418,789.18	82.95	43,222,695.55	50.20	86,103,479.00	
M03	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	960,652.73	92.95	959,364.70	92.83	1,033,518.00	
M04	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	62,061,189.95	82.38	35,739,252.01	47.44	75,337,355.00	
M04	O2 - Total investment	2014-2018			129,662,828.49	34.46	376,297,355.00	
M04.1 M04.2	O3 - Number of actions/operations supported	2014-2018			110.00	90.16	122.00	
M14	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	5,514,031.74	95.52	5,501,385.17	95.30	5,772,606.00	
M14	O4 - Number of holdings/beneficiaries supported	2014-2018			21.00	1.56	1,342.00	
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	2,882,914.76	72.80	1,022,693.67	25.83	3,960,000.00	
M16.4	O9 - Number of holdings participating in supported schemes	2014-2018			2.00	50.00	4.00	

Focus Area 3B							
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
3B	Number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (Number of participants trained)	2014-2018					530.00
		2014-2017					
		2014-2016					
		2014-2015					
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
3B	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	564,898.53	48.28	400,073.36	34.19	1,170,000.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	564,898.53	48.28	400,073.36	34.19	1,170,000.00
M02.1	O13 - Number of beneficiaries advised	2014-2018			4,087.00	48.40	8,445.00

Priority P4							
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
P4	T13: percentage of forestry land under management contracts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion (focus area 4C)	2014-2018			4.68	12.32	37.99
		2014-2017			2.72	7.16	
		2014-2016			1.74	4.58	
		2014-2015			1.03	2.71	
	T11: percentage of forestry land under management contracts to improve water management (focus area 4B)	2014-2018			4.68	12.32	37.99
		2014-2017			2.72	7.16	
		2014-2016			1.74	4.58	
		2014-2015			1.03	2.71	
	T8: percentage of forest/other wooded area under management contracts supporting biodiversity (focus area 4A)	2014-2018			4.68	12.32	37.99
		2014-2017			2.72	7.16	
		2014-2016			1.74	4.58	
		2014-2015			1.03	2.71	
	T12: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts to improve soil management and/or prevent soil erosion (focus area 4C)	2014-2018			17.91	93.61	19.13
		2014-2017			13.70	71.60	
		2014-2016			11.78	61.57	
		2014-2015			11.78	61.57	
	T10: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts to improve water management (focus area 4B)	2014-2018			16.30	82.33	19.80
		2014-2017			12.58	63.54	
		2014-2016			10.88	54.95	
		2014-2015			10.88	54.95	
T9: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts supporting biodiversity and/or landscapes (focus area 4A)	2014-2018			19.66	86.48	22.73	
	2014-2017			14.76	64.93		
	2014-2016			12.63	55.56		
	2014-2015			12.63	55.56		
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
P4	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	474,805,783.33	67.35	389,671,868.60	55.27	704,974,000.00
M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	114,494.00	31.80	56,389.17	15.66	360,000.00
M01.1	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			56,389.17	15.66	360,000.00
M01.1	O12 - Number of participants in trainings	2014-2018			252.00	25.20	1,000.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	3,389,392.16	48.28	2,406,700.14	34.28	7,020,000.00
M02.1	O13 - Number of beneficiaries advised	2014-2018			3,896.00	42.49	9,170.00
M04	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	42,022,864.26	129.35	20,003,667.78	61.57	32,487,995.00
M04	O2 - Total investment	2014-2018			24,413,886.85	75.15	32,487,995.00
M04.4	O3 - Number of actions/operations supported	2014-2018			1,246.00	34.61	3,600.00
M08	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	109,595,249.04	102.71	78,383,182.54	73.46	106,701,263.00

M08.1	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			69,140,505.56	86.77	79,680,000.00
M08.2	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			0.00	0.00	360,000.00
M08.3	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			0.00	0.00	4,800,000.00
M08.3	O4 - Number of holdings/beneficiaries supported	2014-2018			0.00	0.00	800.00
M08.4	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			321,999.12	6.71	4,800,000.00
M08.5	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			8,920,677.86	52.29	17,061,263.00
M08.5	O3 - Number of actions/operations supported	2014-2018			329.00	51.09	644.00
M08.5	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2018			14,353.71	6.15	233,400.00
M10	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	134,764,888.46	50.50	113,305,427.05	42.46	266,870,570.00
M10.1	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2018			843,560.43	67.48	1,250,000.00
M11	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	14,969,756.49	136.28	10,838,826.09	98.67	10,984,635.00
M11.1	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2018			9,013.57	44.40	20,300.00
M11.2	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2018			49,923.44	79.50	62,800.00
M13	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	156,044,241.34	62.07	151,555,627.80	60.28	251,400,000.00
M13.2	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2018			1,063,815.89	75.99	1,400,000.00
M15	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	13,904,897.58	57.96	13,122,048.03	54.70	23,989,537.00
M15.1	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2018			9,410.00	4.06	232,000.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			0.00	0.00	5,160,000.00

Focus Area 5B							
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
5B	Number of participants trained under Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 (Number of participants trained)	2014-2018					1,000.00
		2014-2017					
		2014-2016					
		2014-2015					
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
5B	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	1,809,189.58	42.77	1,227,261.04	29.01	4,230,000.00
M01	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			0.00	0.00	360,000.00
M01.1	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			0.00	0.00	360,000.00
M01.1	O12 - Number of participants in trainings	2014-2018			0.00	0.00	1,000.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	1,694,695.58	48.28	1,206,480.20	34.37	3,510,000.00
M02.1	O13 - Number of beneficiaries advised	2014-2018			1,304.00	38.87	3,355.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	114,494.00	31.80	20,780.84	5.77	360,000.00

Focus Area 5D							
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
5D	T18: percentage of agricultural land under management contracts targeting reduction of GHG and/or ammonia emissions (focus area 5D)	2014-2018			18.27	78.81	23.18
		2014-2017			13.76	59.35	
		2014-2016			10.88	46.93	
		2014-2015			10.88	46.93	
	T17: percentage of LU concerned by investments in live-stock management in view of reducing GHG and/or ammonia emissions (focus area 5D)	2014-2018			0.01	0.76	1.32
		2014-2017					
		2014-2016					
		2014-2015					
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
5D	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	12,482,118.00	34.53	11,157,965.27	30.86	36,150,943.00
M02	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	561,746.00	40.49	730,913.79	52.69	1,387,200.00
M02.1	O13 - Number of beneficiaries advised	2014-2018			1,455.00	21.40	6,800.00
M04	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	139,261.00	2.46	73,486.91	1.30	5,670,943.00
M04	O2 - Total investment	2014-2018			73,486.91	1.30	5,670,943.00
M04.1 M04.3 M04.4	O3 - Number of actions/operations supported	2014-2018			2.00	2.56	78.00
M04.1 M04.3 M04.4	O8 - Number of Livestock Units supported (LU)	2014-2018			149.00	2.16	6,912.00
M10	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	11,781,111.00	40.49	10,353,564.57	35.59	29,092,800.00
M10.1	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2018			108,322.00	106.20	102,000.00

Focus Area 5E							
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
5E	T19: percentage of agricultural and forest land under management contracts contributing to carbon sequestration and conservation (focus area 5E)	2014-2018			13.23	81.99	16.14
		2014-2017			10.12	62.72	
		2014-2016			8.71	53.98	
		2014-2015			8.70	53.92	
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
5E	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	117,980,253.36	54.48	74,023,759.61	34.18	216,540,000.00
M08	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	117,295,007.36	54.39	73,941,645.13	34.29	215,640,000.00
M08.1	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			62,470,038.53	31.36	199,200,000.00
M08.1	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2018			12,300.29	33.42	36,800.00
M08.2	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			0.00	0.00	840,000.00
M08.2	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2018			0.00	0.00	200.00
M08.5	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			11,471,606.60	73.54	15,600,000.00
M08.5	O3 - Number of actions/operations supported	2014-2018			1,252.00	192.62	650.00
M16	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	685,246.00	76.14	82,114.48	9.12	900,000.00

Focus Area 6A							
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
6A	T20: Jobs created in supported projects (focus area 6A)	2014-2018			17.00	100.00	17.00
		2014-2017			17.00	100.00	
		2014-2016			17.00	100.00	
		2014-2015			17.00	100.00	
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
6A	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	2,227,342.70	72.83	2,459,355.03	80.42	3,058,230.00
M04	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			0.00	0.00	480,000.00
M04	O2 - Total investment	2014-2018			0.00	0.00	720,000.00
M04	O4 - Number of holdings/beneficiaries supported	2014-2018					25.00
M06	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	1,277,950.78	68.77	1,546,768.36	83.24	1,858,230.00
M06	O2 - Total investment	2014-2018			3,616,103.93	194.60	1,858,230.00
M06.2 M06.4	O4 - Number of holdings/beneficiaries supported	2014-2018			17.00	100.00	17.00
M08	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	949,391.92	131.86	912,586.67	126.75	720,000.00
M08	O5 - Total area (ha)	2014-2018					34.00
M08.6	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			912,586.67	126.75	720,000.00
M08.6	O2 - Total investment	2014-2018			2,281,466.66	126.75	1,800,000.00

Focus Area 6B								
FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023	
6B	T23: Jobs created in supported projects (Leader) (focus area 6B)	2014-2018			18.00	3.27	551.00	
		2014-2017						
		2014-2016						
		2014-2015						
	T22: percentage of rural population benefiting from improved services/infrastructures (focus area 6B)	2014-2018				2.61	25.75	10.14
		2014-2017				1.33	13.12	
		2014-2016						
		2014-2015						
	T21: percentage of rural population covered by local development strategies (focus area 6B)	2014-2018				86.76	100.01	86.76
		2014-2017				86.76	100.01	
		2014-2016				86.76	100.01	
		2014-2015				86.76	100.01	
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023	
6B	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	94,812,468.43	84.31	38,455,346.53	34.20	112,454,358.00	
M07	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	13,093,623.00	93.16	7,392,930.29	52.60	14,054,358.00	
M07.1 M07.2 M07.4 M07.5 M07.6 M07.7 M07.8	O15 - Population benefiting of improved services/infrastructures (IT or others)	2014-2018			63,100.00	29.29	215,452.00	
M07.4	O3 - Number of actions/operations supported	2014-2018			4.00	100.00	4.00	
M07.5	O3 - Number of actions/operations supported	2014-2018			161.00	60.98	264.00	
M07.6	O3 - Number of actions/operations supported	2014-2018			982.00	100.41	978.00	
M19	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018	81,718,845.43	83.05	31,062,416.24	31.57	98,400,000.00	
M19	O18 - Population covered by LAG	2014-2018			2,100,000.00	100.00	2,100,000.00	
M19	O19 - Number of LAGs selected	2014-2018			21.00	100.00	21.00	
M19.2	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			17,984,701.70	25.50	70,536,000.00	
M19.3	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			830,573.39	17.88	4,644,000.00	
M19.4	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			12,247,141.15	52.74	23,220,000.00	

Focus Area 6C

FA/M	Target indicator name	Period	Based on approved (when relevant)	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Target 2023
6C	T24: percentage of rural population benefiting from new or improved services/infrastructures (ICT) (focus area 6C)	2014-2018					0.88
		2014-2017					
		2014-2016					
		2014-2015					
FA/M	Output Indicator	Period	Committed	Uptake (%)	Realised	Uptake (%)	Planned 2023
6C	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			0.00	0.00	10,800,000.00
M07	O1 - Total public expenditure	2014-2018			0.00	0.00	10,800,000.00
M07.3	O15 - Population benefiting of improved services/infrastructures (IT or others)	2014-2018					21,240.00
M07.3	O3 - Number of actions/operations supported	2014-2018					13.00

Documents

Document title	Document type	Document date	Local reference	Commission reference	Checksum	Files	Sent date	Sent By
AIR Financial Annex 2014UK06RDRP003	Financial annex (System)	10-09-2019		Ares(2019)5746854	926739410	AIRfinancialAnnex2014UK06RDRP003_en.pdf	13-09-2019	nhederne
SRDP 2014-2020 - AIR 2018 - Summary for Citizens	Citizens' summary	13-09-2019	2014-2020 - AIR 4 - SforC	Ares(2019)5746854	3129417771	SRDP 2014-2020 - AIR 2018 - Summary for Citizens	13-09-2019	nhederne

