



FAME SUPPORT UNIT

CT03.1

EMFF EVALUATION TOOLBOX

FINAL
OCTOBER
2017

Copyright notice:

© European Union, 2017

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION – Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries

Disclaimer:

The information and views set out in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the Commission. The Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this report. Neither the Commission nor any person acting on the Commission's behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Recommended citation:

EUROPEAN COMMISSION - Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries

Unit D.3 2017: FAME SU EMFF Evaluation working paper, Brussels

Authors:

Christine Hamza, Isabel Naylon, Andreas Resch, Pavel Salz, Angelos Sanopoulos

Contact:

FAME Support Unit
Boulevard de la Woluwe 2
B-1150 Brussels
T: +32 2 775 84 44
FAME@fame-emff.eu

CONTENT

| | |
|--|-----------|
| ABOUT THE EMFF EVALUATION TOOLBOX | 5 |
| 1 PROCESS EVALUATION FICHES | 7 |
| 1.1 Partnership | 10 |
| 1.2 Implementation (management structure and processes) | 12 |
| 1.3 Communication | 18 |
| 2 EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION (SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE/ MEASURE LEVEL) – FICHES | 21 |
| 2.1 UP1 Promoting environmentally sustainable, resource-efficient, innovative, competitive and knowledge-based fisheries | 30 |
| 2.1.1 Specific Objective 1.1 Reduction of the impact of fisheries on the marine environment, including the avoidance and reduction, as far as possible, of unwanted catches | 30 |
| 2.1.2 Specific Objective 1.2 Protection and restoration of aquatic biodiversity and ecosystems | 35 |
| 2.1.3 Specific Objective 1.3 Ensuring a balance between fishing capacity and available fishing opportunities | 37 |
| 2.1.4 Specific Objective 1.4 Enhancement of competitiveness and viability of fisheries enterprises, including of small-scale coastal fleets and the improvement of safety and working conditions | 40 |
| 2.1.5 Specific Objective 1.5 Provision of support to strengthen technological development and innovation, including increasing energy efficiency and knowledge transfer | 48 |
| 2.1.6 Specific Objective 1.6 Development of professional training, new professional skills and lifelong learning | 52 |
| 2.2 UP2 – Promoting environmentally sustainable, resource-efficient, innovative, competitive and knowledge based aquaculture | 54 |
| 2.2.1 Specific Objective 2.1 Provision of support to strengthen technological development, innovation and knowledge transfer | 54 |
| 2.2.2 Specific Objective 2.2 Enhancement of the competitiveness and viability of aquaculture enterprises, including improvement of safety or working conditions, in particular of SMEs | 57 |
| 2.2.3 Specific Objective 2.3 Protection and restoration of aquatic biodiversity and enhancement of ecosystems related to aquaculture and promotion of resource- efficient aquaculture | 59 |
| 2.2.4 Specific Objective 2.4 Promotion off aquaculture having a high level of environmental protection, and the promotion of animal health and welfare and of public health and safety | 63 |
| 2.2.5 Specific Objective 2.5 Development of professional training, new professional skill and lifelong learning | 67 |
| 2.3 UP3 Fostering implementation of the CFP | 68 |
| 2.3.1 Specific Objective 3.1 Improvement and supply of scientific knowledge and collection and management of data | 68 |
| 2.3.2 Specific Objective 3.2 Provision of support to monitoring, control and enforcement, enhancing institutional capacity and the efficiency of public administrations without increasing the administrative burden | 70 |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| 2.4 | UP4 Increasing employment and territorial cohesion | 71 |
| 2.4.1 | Specific Objective 4.1 Promotion of economic growth, social inclusion and job creation, and providing support to employability and labour mobility in coastal and inland communities which depend on fishing and aquaculture, including the diversification of activities within fisheries and into other sectors of the maritime economy | 71 |
| 2.5 | UP5 Fostering marketing and processing | 74 |
| 2.5.1 | Specific Objective 5.1 Improvement of market organisation for fishery and aquaculture products | 74 |
| 2.5.2 | Specific Objective 5.2 Encouragement of investment in the processing and marketing sector | 78 |
| 2.6 | UP6 Fostering the implementation of the Integrated Maritime Policy | 79 |
| 2.6.1 | Specific Objective 6.1 Development and the implementation of the Integrated Maritime Policy | 79 |
| 3 | IMPACT EVALUATION (UP LEVEL) – FICHES | 81 |
| 3.1 | Impact evaluation fiche – UP1 | 85 |
| 3.2 | Impact evaluation fiche – UP2 | 87 |
| 3.3 | Impact evaluation fiche – UP3 | 88 |
| 3.4 | Impact evaluation – UP 4 | 89 |
| 3.5 | Impact evaluation fiche – UP5 | 89 |
| 3.6 | Impact evaluation fiche – UP6 | 90 |
| 4 | METHODOLOGY | 91 |
| 5 | RELEVANT REGULATIONS | 97 |
| 5.1 | General regulations relevant to all ESIF – CPR 1303/2013 | 99 |
| 5.2 | Supplementing regulations relevant to all ESIF – 480/2014 | 103 |
| 5.3 | EMFF Regulations | 103 |
| 6 | INTERVENTION LOGIC | 109 |

ABOUT THE EMFF EVALUATION TOOLBOX

The EMFF evaluation toolbox is a reference book that complements the EMFF evaluation working paper. The aim of the working paper and the toolbox together is to improve the consistency and rigour with which EMFF programmes are evaluated.

The toolbox includes a range of fiches related to the EMFF evaluation process, adapted to different types of Operational Programme (OP) and different types of evaluation. Each Managing Authority (MA) should decide which part of the toolbox best serves the task in hand, based on the checklist in section 2 of the EMFF evaluation working paper.

The toolbox has six sections, which are described briefly below.

Section 1: Fiches for process evaluation

Process evaluation should be done during the implementation phase of the EMFF programme. The evaluation serves to assess whether the programme is adequately managed, so that if necessary it can be improved while it is still running. Ideally, a process evaluation is carried out during the first half of the programme period, with a second evaluation later on to check that any improvements have brought the desired results.

The process evaluation section of this toolbox contains 12 fiches, each covering one evaluation question:

Partnership

- Are the right stakeholders/partners involved?
- How effectively have the stakeholders/partners been involved in implementing the OP?

Implementation

- How effective is the management structure?
- Are the administrative processes effective throughout the project life cycle?
- How effective is the progress towards milestones and targets?
- Have actions to promote gender equality and non-discrimination been implemented effectively?
- Have actions to promote sustainable development been implemented effectively?
- How effective is the monitoring system in collecting, analysing and monitoring the output, financial, procedural and result indicators?
- How efficient are the OP implementation activities in terms of cost and time?

Communication

- How effectively does the communication strategy reach, inform and support the target groups in the project application process?
- Does the communication strategy improve awareness of the achievements of the programme?
- Are the instruments of the communication strategy efficient in terms of costs and time?

Section 2: Fiches for effectiveness evaluation (Specific Objective/measure level)

The effectiveness evaluation at Specific Objective (SO)/measure level should be conducted during the implementation period of the OP. This evaluation focuses primarily on the effectiveness of the implementation. It should therefore be conducted only once a suitable number of operations have been implemented; if the evaluation is done too soon, the results will not be as valuable. The underlying evaluation question is: How effective have EMFF operations/measures been in achieving the SO and OP targets?

The toolbox provides 47 evaluation fiches for the respective EMFF (sub)-articles. Some of the articles span two or more fiches. The division of articles follows the EMFF intervention logic shown in Section 6 of the toolbox.

It is up to the MA to choose which of the measures are relevant to evaluation, and to use only those fiches.

Section 3: Fiches for impact evaluation (UP level)

The impact evaluation at UP level should be conducted at the end of the EMFF programme implementation. It should evaluate how the EMFF contributes to national policy objectives.

The toolbox provides six evaluation fiches: one for each of the six UPs. The impact evaluation should compare changes in the values of the context indicators with the values of the corresponding aggregated result indicators.

In MSs with small marine and fisheries sectors, the effect of the EMFF may be marginal. The evaluation should therefore take into account the size of the programme, both in absolute terms and as a proportion of the overall national budget.

Section 4: List of methodologies

The section on methodologies includes a pragmatic collection of tested specific evaluation methods. The section includes three tables showing respectively:

- basic evaluation methods
- in-depth qualitative methods
- in-depth quantitative methods.

Each of the tables shows:

- a list of methodologies,
- the type of evaluation for which each methodology is most suitable,
- the evaluation criteria that the methodology addresses,
- the categories for which the methodology is most suitable,
- the indicative number of person-days required in an EMFF context,
- an outline of what the methodology involves.

Section 5: Relevant regulations

This section provides an overview of the articles in the CPR and EMFF regulations that are most relevant to evaluation. For each article, short comments suggest the evaluation stage to which it applies.

Section 6: Intervention logic

The intervention logic of the EMFF follows EMFF regulation 508/2014. Section 6 shows the links between UPs, SOs, articles, and result indicators. This should help to structure evaluations so that they follow the intervention logic and address the level appropriate to each type of evaluations.

When evaluating effectiveness at SO/measure level, for example, the evaluation report should address how the OP has achieved the SOs through the measures linked to those SOs. For an impact evaluation at UP level, the evaluation report should compare the achievements at UP level with the national/sectoral achievements.

FAME SUPPORT UNIT

1. PROCESS EVALUATION

CONTENT

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | PROCESS EVALUATION FICHES | 10 |
| 1.1 | Partnership | 10 |
| 1.2 | Implementation (management structure and processes) | 12 |
| 1.3 | Communication | 18 |

FICHES

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|----|
| Process fiche 1: | Effectiveness – stakeholder/partner involvement | 10 |
| Process fiche 2: | Effectiveness – active stakeholder/partner participation | 11 |
| Process fiche 3: | Effectiveness – management structure | 12 |
| Process fiche 4: | Effectiveness – project cycle management | 13 |
| Process fiche 5: | Effectiveness – progress towards milestones and targets, and performance management | 14 |
| Process fiche 6: | Effectiveness – horizontal principles – equality between men and women and non-discrimination | 15 |
| Process fiche 7: | Effectiveness – horizontal principles – sustainable development | 16 |
| Process fiche 8: | Effectiveness – monitoring system | 17 |
| Process fiche 9: | Efficiency – OP implementation | 17 |
| Process fiche 10: | Effectiveness – reaching target groups | 18 |
| Process fiche 11: | Effectiveness – awareness of achievements | 19 |
| Process fiche 12: | Efficiency – communication | 20 |

ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|----------------|--|
| AIR | Annual Implementation Report |
| CFP | Common Fisheries Policy |
| CI | Context indicator |
| CISE | Common Information Sharing Environment |
| CLLD | Community-Led Local Development |
| COM | European Commission |
| CPR | Common Provision Regulation |
| DCF | Data Collection Framework |
| DG | Directorate General |
| EI | Evaluation Indicator |
| EMFF | European Maritime and Fisheries Funds |
| EP | Evaluation Plan |
| FAME SU | Fisheries and Aquaculture Monitoring and Evaluation Support Unit – under the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) |
| FLAG | Fisheries Local Action Group |
| GT | Gross tonnage |
| IB | Intermediate body |
| ICES | International Council for the Exploration of the Sea |
| IMP | Integrated Maritime Policy |
| IMS | Integrated Marine Systems |
| JRC | Joint Research Centre |
| KEQ | Key Evaluation Question |
| kW | Kilowatt |
| MA | Managing Authority |
| MC | Monitoring Committee |
| MPA | Marine Protected Area |
| MSFD | Marine Strategy Framework Directive |
| OI | Output Indicator |
| OP | Operational Programme |
| PO | Producer Organisation |
| RI | Result Indicator |
| SFC | Electronic exchange of information concerning shared Fund management between Member States and the European Commission |
| STECF | Scientific, Technical and economic Committee on Fisheries |
| SWOT | Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats. |
| ToR | Terms of Reference |
| UP | Union priority |

1. PROCESS EVALUATION FICHES

1.1 Partnership

The main aim of the partnership evaluation is to assess the effectiveness of consultation and the involvement of stakeholders and partners in the preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the OP.

Process fiche 1: Effectiveness – stakeholder/partner involvement

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Evaluation question | Are the right stakeholders/partners involved? ¹ |
| Judgment criteria | The most relevant social and economic partners ² have been identified and involved |
| Key points to consider | Types of stakeholders/partners involved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • regional, local, urban and other public authorities • economic and social partners • bodies representing civil society (including environmental partners, non-governmental organisations, and bodies responsible for promoting social inclusion, gender equality and non-discrimination) • representatives of the fisheries sector (especially small-scale fisheries), aquaculture, processing and marketing • representatives for the measures shifted from direct to shared management (data collection, control and enforcement) • representatives for IMP |
| Evaluation indicators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • numbers of stakeholders involved • types of stakeholders involved • gender of stakeholders involved |
| Evaluation methodology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of steering and monitoring committee meeting data (participants, minutes, etc.) |

¹ In accordance with Article 3 of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 240/2014 on the code of conduct

² The most representative and relevant partners should include institutions, organisations and groups that can influence the preparation or could be affected by the preparation and implementation of the programmes (Reg. (EU) No 1303/2013, Whereas n°11)

Process fiche 2: Effectiveness – active stakeholder/partner participation

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Evaluation question | How effectively have the stakeholders/partners been involved in the implementation of the OP? |
| Judgment criteria | <p>The stakeholders/partners referred to above have been involved in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preparing Progress Reports • preparing the Annual Implementation Report • preparing and implementing the OP, including through participation in the Monitoring Committee |
| Key points to consider | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • composition of the MC • role of stakeholders/partners in the decision-making process within the MC • input of stakeholders/partners in MC meetings and the decision-making process |
| Evaluation indicators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of meetings per year • Frequency of involvement of stakeholders/partners in MC meetings • Gender balance in MC meetings • Satisfaction of stakeholders/partners with the operation of the MC, the quality and effectiveness of MC decisions etc., and their involvement in the decision-making process |
| Evaluation methodology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of steering and monitoring committee meeting data (participants, minutes, etc.) • Interviews with implementing bodies and managers of EMFF interventions (MA, MC) • Interviews with stakeholders and partners |

1.2 Implementation (management structure and processes)

The main aims when evaluating the implementation process are to assess:

- the effectiveness of the implementation structures and processes;
- the effectiveness of the data collection and monitoring system;
- the extent to which the horizontal principles have been considered in preparing and implementing the OP;
- the administrative costs and efficiency of the implementation structures.

Process fiche 3: Effectiveness – management structure

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Evaluation question | How effective is the management structure? |
| Judgment criteria | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MA and IBs have appropriate structures and processes to manage the OP implementation • The MA has the necessary organisational capacity and resources (i.e. consistency in the allocation of budgetary resources to the objectives of the OP) to effectively manage the OP • The staff of the MA have the necessary skills, capacities and time resources to effectively manage the OP • The Certifying Authority has the appropriate capacity and know-how to certify expenditures, and to draw up and submit payment applications to the Commission • Ability to use Simplified Cost Options |
| Key points to consider | <p>Existence of management standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • quality control system, process mapping and workflows <p>Performance of management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • programme management system • decision-making mechanism • job descriptions and command chains <p>Capacity at personnel level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • availability of sufficient resources (staff, and financial resources for management) • availability of staff training for the management of the OP • availability of necessary skills to manage the OP |
| Evaluation indicators | <p>Existence of management standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accessibility of management standards • adequacy of management systems, roles, and decision-making processes <p>Performance of management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • employees' views of management capability • average duration of the decision-making process • transparency of the decision-making process • average duration of the payment process • transparency of job descriptions <p>Capacity at personnel level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • existence of ongoing training and development • incidence of training activities • financial and human resources available • number of staff trained • types of qualifications gained in relation to work requirements |
| Evaluation methodology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process mapping (e.g. analysis of management systems/workflows in the management of an intervention) • Interviews with implementing bodies and managers of EMFF interventions |

Process fiche 4: Effectiveness – project cycle management

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Evaluation question | Are the administrative processes from project application to project finalisation (the project cycle) effective? |
| Judgment criteria | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The programme produces outputs of the requested quality and in the requested time frame • The administrative burden is kept to a minimum |
| Key points to consider | <p>From application preparation to application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely information on project application procedures (through website and other channels) • Support for beneficiaries in developing their operations • User friendliness of the application forms • Usefulness of the guidelines (e.g. regarding the eligibility of costs etc.) • Clarity of the description of the application procedure • Availability of support and advice from the MA for applicants • Administrative obstacles for applicants • Bottlenecks in the application process • Solutions to administrative obstacles <p>From application assessment and selection to approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time required to assess fulfilment of the formal criteria • Effective procedure for collecting missing documents • Introduction of deadlines for selection procedure • Clear ranking of applications through a points system • Use of external experts for application evaluation • Transparency of procedure for submitting information on application selection to the monitoring committee • Transparency of criteria for the applicants • Clear reasoning in cases of refusal • Clarity of the contract between beneficiary and contracting authority • Time required between the submission deadline and the decision to approve or reject <p>Project monitoring to project closure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity of the certification procedure • Simplicity of the reporting • Quality of the reporting • Simplicity of the procedure for making changes to the operation • Arrangements for pre-financing • Simplified cost options and flat rates • Clarity of eligible and non-eligible costs • Clarity of handling of earnings • Length of time taken to make payments • Simplicity of the proof of spending • Communication (EMFF Art. 119) |
| Evaluation indicators | <p>From preparation to submission of application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gaps in the programme management procedures • Duration between different steps in the programme management cycle • Availability of guidelines (yes/no) • Duration of selection procedure • Number of contacts the programme managers (MA) make with potential applicants • Level of satisfaction with the application process • Perceived clarity and usefulness of information and application guidance • Perceived helpfulness of MA <p>From application assessment and selection to approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transparency of selection procedure • Use of external experts • % of projects approved compared to the number of applications • Perceived transparency of selection process and selection criteria <p>Operation monitoring to operation closure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceived workload for reporting • Perceived simplicity of the procedures for making changes to the operation • Satisfaction with pre-financing options • Perceived simplicity of using simplified cost options and flat rates • Perceived clarity of technical issues (eligible and non-eligible costs, earnings, proof of spending) • Satisfaction with length of time needed to process payment claims |

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Evaluation methodology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconstruction and verification of the intervention logic of the OP/interventions by various qualitative and quantitative methods • Process mapping (e.g. analysis of management systems/workflows in managing an intervention) • Analysis of project documentation for EMFF operations (e.g. application forms, progress reports, final reports) • Interviews with implementing bodies/managers of EMFF interventions • Interviews with selected beneficiaries • Interviews with stakeholders and partners • Interviews with selected experts • Case studies (ideally based on stratified samples) • Structured focus groups involving beneficiaries or experts • Surveys of selected beneficiaries |
|-------------------------------|---|

Process fiche 5: Effectiveness – progress towards milestones and targets, and performance management

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Evaluation question | How effective is the progress towards milestones and targets? |
|----------------------------|--|

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Judgment criteria | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress towards milestones and targets is in line with the OP • The MA is able to implement effective corrections if the achievement of target values or milestones is low • The programme meets the performance framework milestones for all UPs |
|--------------------------|--|

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Key points to consider | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress of financial and output indicators in relation to targets • Realistic targets • Realistic milestones • Remedial actions • Early warning mechanism (e.g. contacts with the representatives of the main groups of beneficiaries) |
|-------------------------------|---|

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Evaluation indicators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance target ratio (share of target value of output and financial indicators achieved) in relation to the 2018 milestones for OI and FI and in relation to the 2023 targets for OI and FI • Change of performance target • Number and type of OP modifications • Rate of implementation progress (current performance compared to Performance Framework milestone/target), both incremental and cumulative • Rate of expenditure declared and certified (current performance compared to Performance Framework milestone/target), both incremental and cumulative • Number of operations with Infosys field 9 value 1 (interrupted) or 2 (abandoned) and related fund commitment and de-commitment; • Average time of operations moving from Infosys field 9 value 4 (under implementation) to 5 (fully implemented) • Number and amount of de-commitments (N+3), payment interruptions, financial corrections • Closeness of the relationship between DG MARE Geographical Policy Officers and MA |
|------------------------------|--|

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Evaluation methodology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of financial, procedural and indicator-related data collected in the electronic monitoring system (Infosys data Art. 97.1) • Interviews with implementing bodies/managers of EMFF interventions • Interviews with DG MARE Geographical Policy Officers |
|-------------------------------|---|

Process fiche 6: Effectiveness – horizontal principles – equality between men and women and non-discrimination

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Evaluation question | <p>Have actions to mainstream and promote the horizontal principles of equality between men and women and non-discrimination been implemented effectively?</p> |
| Judgment criteria | <p>The principles of equal opportunities for all, and non-discrimination (including accessibility for people with disabilities), according to the Common Provisions Regulation No 1303/2013 Article 7 are respected in all phases of the implementation of the OP (project selection, project implementation, monitoring, reporting and evaluation).³</p> |
| Key points to consider | <p>Project selection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether equal opportunities and non-discrimination are taken into account in formulating the selection criteria for projects • Whether projects have to demonstrate their equal opportunities and non-discrimination procedures • Whether projects are subject to an assessment of compliance with equal opportunities and non-discrimination principles and criteria as defined in EU and national legislation <p>Project implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether project promoters are aware of equal opportunities and non-discrimination issues • Whether stakeholders are involved in the implementing process • Whether people with disabilities have access to the projects • The significance given to gender perspective in implementing projects • Whether equal opportunities training has been considered • Whether childcare is available to ensure that women and men can participate in activities equally • Whether the activities are accessible to all in terms of location (e.g. accessible by public transport) <p>Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Composition of MC and MA in terms of gender <p>Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the Evaluation Plan takes into account equal opportunities and non-discrimination • The specific contribution of the programme to promote gender equality and non-discrimination • Difficulties experienced in implementing equal opportunity and non-discrimination actions and principles |
| Evaluation indicators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of women and men in MC • Number of women and men in MA (working on EMFF) • Number of women and men participating in operations (Infosys if applicable) • Number of women and men benefiting from improved services • Number of women and men benefiting from training events • Perception of beneficiaries and/or stakeholders of gender equality and non-discrimination • Perception of beneficiaries and/or stakeholders on the level of adequate actions related to gender equality and non-discrimination |
| Evaluation methodology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of project documentation for EMFF operations (e.g. application forms, progress reports, final reports) • Analysis of steering and monitoring committee meeting data (participants, minutes, etc.) • Analysis of financial, procedural and indicator-related data collected in the electronic monitoring system (Infosys data Art. 97.1) • Interviews with implementing bodies/managers of EMFF interventions • Interviews with stakeholders and partners • Interviews with selected beneficiaries |

³ E.g. involving stakeholders in the programme implementation process; applying specific selection criteria; incorporating accessibility to disabled people; implementing data in the monitoring database that allows the assessment of the promotion of gender equality/non-discrimination/sustainable development; arrangements for training of relevant administrative staff on the subject.

Process fiche 7: Effectiveness – horizontal principles – sustainable development

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Evaluation question | Have actions to mainstream and promote the horizontal principle of sustainable development, i.e. to preserve, protect and improve the quality of the environment, been implemented effectively? |
| Judgment criteria | The principles of sustainable development according to the Common Provisions Regulation No 1303/2013 Article 8 are respected in all phases of the implementation of the OP (project selection, implementation, monitoring, reporting and evaluation) ⁴ |
| Key points to consider | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the principles of sustainable development (environmental protection requirements, resource efficiency, climate change mitigation and adaptation, biodiversity, disaster resilience, risk prevention and management) are taken into account in the project selection (e.g. selection criteria), implementation, monitoring (e.g. relevant data in database) and evaluation • Whether the stakeholders have been involved in the programme implementation process • Whether training has been organised for relevant staff • Difficulties encountered in implementing relevant operations • Whether measures concerning landing obligation, biodiversity protection, marine litter and Natura 2000, selectivity and fuel efficiency were implemented |
| Evaluation indicators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of stakeholders in MC • Number of actions promoting sustainable development • Perception of beneficiaries and stakeholders on adequate implementation of sustainable development in EMFF |
| Evaluation methodology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of project documentation for EMFF operations (e.g. application forms, progress reports, final reports) • Analysis of steering and monitoring committee meeting data (participants, minutes, etc.) • Analysis of financial, procedural and indicator related data collected in the electronic monitoring system (Infosys data Art. 97.1) • Interviews with implementing bodies/managers of EMFF interventions • Interviews with stakeholders and partners • Interviews with selected beneficiaries • Consultation with selected experts (e.g. Delphi method) • Structured focus groups involving beneficiaries or experts |

⁴ E.g. involving stakeholders in the programme implementation process, applying specific selection criteria, incorporating accessibility to disabled persons, implementing data in the monitoring database that allows the assessment of the promotion of equality between men and women/non-discrimination/sustainable development, arrangements for training of relevant administrative staff on the subject.

Process fiche 8: Effectiveness – monitoring system

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Evaluation question | How effective is the monitoring system in collecting analysing and monitoring the output, financial, procedural and result indicators as defined by the programme? |
| Judgment criteria | The monitoring system is able to collect, analyse and monitor the required indicators as defined by the programme The official reports (progress reports and AIRs) are on time and fulfil the reporting requirements of the Commission (Art. 52 of the CPR) |
| Key points to consider | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infosys is set up and operational • No FAME Art. 97.1 error reports • Clarity of the definition of the rights of access to the database of the relevant bodies • Data collection • Compatibility of the national systems with the EMFF system • Compatibility of the AIR with SFC2014 • Timeliness of the approbation by the MC and the submission of the AIRs to the Commission • Comprehensiveness and clarity of the reports for the monitoring committee |
| Evaluation indicators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duration between submission and admission of AIR • Art. 97.1 number of errors • Accessibility of database • Available and complete data collection • Quality of the data collected • Number and type of differences between EMFF system and national monitoring system • Number and type of differences between AIR and SFC2014 • Duration of approbation and submission of reports • Perceived clarity of the reports for MC members |
| Evaluation methodology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data analysis and plausibility assessment • Interviews with MA • Interviews with experts • Interviews with MC members |

Process fiche 9: Efficiency – OP implementation

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Evaluation question | How cost- and time-efficient are the OP implementation activities? |
| Judgment criteria | Applications are processed and funds provided to beneficiaries in a timely manner The measures/schemes have been implemented at reasonable cost to the administration The administrative costs of the measures/schemes are different from those of comparable activities in the previous period |
| Key points to consider | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost per operation • Whether costs are higher or lower compared to the previous programming period • Whether costs are higher or lower compared to similar interventions funded by other national or regional programmes |
| Evaluation indicators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost (i.e. expenditure for OP management, not for the operation) per application compared to similar actions in the previous programming period or compared to other ESIF funds in the programming period 2014–2020 • Average time from application to decision • Average time from application to funds being provided for approved projects |
| Evaluation methodology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process mapping (e.g. analysis of management systems/workflows in the management of an intervention) • Cost analysis (e.g. Cost-Effectiveness Analysis, Cost-Benefit Analysis) |

1.3 Communication

The main aims of the evaluation of the communication strategy are to assess:

- The effectiveness of activities to inform the general public and potential applicants and beneficiaries about EMFF funding and the results achieved
- The efficiency of the communication strategy and instruments

Process fiche 10: Effectiveness – reaching target groups

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Evaluation question | How effective is the communication strategy in terms of reaching, informing and supporting the identified target group in the project application process? |
| Judgment criteria | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Range of target groups have been identified and described • Range of different communication channels used • The identified target groups, sectoral stakeholders and multipliers have been reached and appropriately informed • The target groups are aware of the support available and how to apply • The capacity of the potential project applicants has been raised • The horizontal principles are communicated |
| Key points to consider | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The degree to which the identified target groups have been reached and informed • The perception of the target groups • The number of actions • The number of applications • The degree to which the horizontal principles have been communicated |
| Evaluation indicators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of contacts of target groups with the MA • Number of communication and publicity actions • Type of communication and publicity actions • Number of applications • Ratio of number of applications to number of projects selected • Perceived level of information by target group • Perceived level of information by MC |
| Evaluation methodology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of project documentation for EMFF operations (e.g. application forms, progress reports, final reports) • Media and communication analysis (techniques to assess the effects of information and communication activities (e.g. Google Analytics, keyword tracking, media breakdown) • Interviews with implementing bodies/managers of EMFF interventions • Interviews with selected beneficiaries • Interviews with stakeholders and partners • Survey of selected beneficiaries |

Process fiche 11: Effectiveness – awareness of achievements

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Evaluation question | Does the communication strategy contribute to improving the awareness of the achievements of the programme? |
| Judgment criteria | The public and sectoral stakeholders are aware of the achievements of the programme |
| Key points to consider | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which the achievements of the programme have been communicated via the press, the website, specialist publications etc. • Extent to which operations have been transformed into stories for the public • Awareness among target groups of the programme's achievements • Awareness of the contribution of the EU |
| Evaluation indicators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of awareness among target groups • Number of articles and stories in specialized public media • Number of stories selected by FAME and published on europa.eu • Number of events • Perceived effect of communication channels |
| Evaluation methodology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stocktaking and analysis of literature (e.g. review of existing research and evaluation findings, web publications) • Media and communication analysis (techniques to assess the effects of information and communication activities) • Interviews with implementing bodies/managers of EMFF interventions • Interviews with selected beneficiaries • Survey of selected beneficiaries • Survey of the whole population of beneficiaries |

Process fiche 12: Efficiency – communication

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Evaluation question | Are the instruments of the communication strategy efficient (in terms of costs per output and timing)? |
| Judgment criteria | The costs of the communication strategy are in line with similar costs of other communication strategies or with the communication strategy of the previous programming period |
| Key points to consider | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs of different communication actions and the perceived effect on target groups • Costs of communication actions compared to the previous programming period |
| Evaluation indicators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceived effect of communication channels • Costs of the communication actions • Costs and reach of different communication channels (internet, press, events, etc.) • Ratio between perceived effect and costs |
| Evaluation methodology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder survey • Cost analysis (e.g. cost-effectiveness analysis, cost-benefit analysis) |

FAME SUPPORT UNIT

2. EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION AT SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE/ MEASURE LEVEL

CONTENT

TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Fiche key | 25 |
| Table 2: 508/2014 articles/measures allocated to the six categories | 26 |

FICHES

| | |
|--|----|
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 1: Art. 37 – Support for the design and implementation of conservation measures and regional cooperation | 30 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 2: Art. 38 – Limitation of the impact of fishing on the marine environment and adaptation of fishing to the protection of species (including 44.1.c. Inland fishing) | 31 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 3: Art. 39 – Innovation linked to the conservation of marine biological resources | 32 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 4: Art. 40.1.a – Protection and restoration of marine biodiversity and ecosystems and compensation regimes in the framework of sustainable fishing activities | 33 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 5: Art. 43.2 – Fishing ports, landing sites, auction halls and shelters | 34 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 6: Art. 40.1.b-g – Protection and restoration of marine biodiversity and ecosystems and compensation regimes in the framework of sustainable fishing activities (including Art. 44.6 Inland fishing) | 35 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 7: Art. 34 – Permanent cessation of fishing activities | 37 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 8: Art. 36 Support for the systems of allocation of fishing opportunities | 38 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 9: Art. 27 Advisory services | 39 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 10: Art. 30 Diversification and new forms of income (including Art. 44.4 Inland fishing) | 40 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 11: Art. 31 Start-up support for young fishermen (including Art 44.2 Inland fishing) | 41 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 12: Art. 32 Health and safety (including Art 44.1.b Inland fishing) | 42 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 13: Art. 33 Temporary cessation of fishing activities | 43 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 14: Art. 35 Mutual funds for adverse climatic events and environmental incidents | 44 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 15: Art. 40.1.h Protection and restoration of marine biodiversity and ecosystems and compensation regimes in the framework of sustainable fishing activities | 45 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 16: Art. 42 Added value, product quality and use of unwanted catches (including Art. 44.1.c. Inland fishing) | 46 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 17: Art. 43.1+3 – Fishing ports, landing sites, auction halls and shelters (including Art. 44.1.f Inland fishing) | 47 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 18: Art. 26 Innovation (including Art 44.3 Inland fishing) | 48 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 19: Art. 28 Partnerships between scientists and fishermen (including Art 44.3 Inland fishing) | 49 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 20: Art. 41.1.a,b,c Energy efficiency and mitigation of climate change (including Art. 44.1.d Inland fishing) | 50 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 21: Art. 41.2 Energy efficiency and mitigation of climate change (including Art. 44.1.d Inland fishing) | 51 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 22: Art. 29.1.a, b Promotion of human capital, job creation and social dialogue (including Art. 44.1.a Inland fisheries) | 52 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 23: Art. 29.1.c Promotion of human capital, job creation and social dialogue (including Art. 44.1.a Inland fisheries) | 53 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 24: Art. 47 Innovation | 54 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 25: Art. 49 Management, relief and advisory services for aquaculture farms | 56 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 26: Art. 48.1. a-d, f-h Productive investments in aquaculture | 57 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 27: Art. 52 Encouraging new aquaculture farmers practising sustainable aquaculture | 58 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 28: Article 48.1.k Productive investments in aquaculture – increasing energy efficiency, renewable energy | 59 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 29: Art. 48.1.e,ij, Productive investments in aquaculture – protection of environment and resource efficiency | 60 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 30: Art. 51 Increasing the potential of aquaculture sites | 61 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 31: Art. 53 Conversion to eco-management and audit schemes and organic aquaculture | 62 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 32: Art. 54 Aquaculture providing environmental services | 63 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 33: Art. 55 Public health measures | 64 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 34: Art. 56 Animal health and welfare measures | 65 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 35: Art. 57 Aquaculture stock insurance | 66 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 36: Art. 50 Promotion of human capital and networking | 67 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 37: Art. 77 Data collection | 69 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 38: Art. 76 Control and enforcement | 70 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 39: Art. 62.1.a Support from the EMFF for community-led local development | 71 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 40: Art. 63 Implementation of community-led local development strategies | 72 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 41: Art. 64 Cooperation activities | 73 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 42: Art. 66 Production and marketing plans | 74 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 43: Art. 67 Storage aid | 75 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 44: Art. 68 Marketing measures | 76 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 45: Art. 70 Compensation regime | 77 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 46: Art. 69 Processing of fishery and aquaculture products | 78 |
| Effectiveness evaluation fiche 47: Art. 80 Eligible operations | 79 |

ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|----------------|--|
| AIR | Annual Implementation Report |
| CFP | Common Fisheries Policy |
| CI | Context indicator |
| CISE | Common Information Sharing Environment |
| CLLD | Community-Led Local Development |
| COM | European Commission |
| CPR | Common Provision Regulation |
| DCF | Data Collection Framework |
| DG | Directorate General |
| EI | Evaluation Indicator |
| EMFF | European Maritime and Fisheries Funds |
| EP | Evaluation Plan |
| FAME SU | Fisheries and Aquaculture Monitoring and Evaluation Support Unit – under the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) |
| FLAG | Fisheries Local Action Group |
| GT | Gross tonnage |
| IB | Intermediate body |
| ICES | International Council for the Exploration of the Sea |
| IMP | Integrated Maritime Policy |
| IMS | Integrated Marine Systems |
| JRC | Joint Research Centre |
| KEQ | Key Evaluation Question |
| kW | Kilowatt |
| MA | Managing Authority |
| MC | Monitoring Committee |
| MPA | Marine Protected Area |
| MSFD | Marine Strategy Framework Directive |
| OI | Output Indicator |
| OP | Operational Programme |
| PO | Producer Organisation |
| RI | Result Indicator |
| SFC | Electronic exchange of information concerning shared Fund management between Member States and the European Commission |
| STECF | Scientific, Technical and economic Committee on Fisheries |
| SWOT | Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats. |
| ToR | Terms of Reference |
| UP | Union priority |

2. EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION (SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE/ MEASURE LEVEL) – FICHES







This section on evaluation at SO/measure level focuses on evaluating how effectively measures have been implemented to achieve the EMFF specific objectives (SOs).

The underlying key evaluation question (KEQ) at SO/measure level is: ***How effective were EMFF operations/measures in achieving the OP objectives?***

The section contains

1. An overview of evaluation questions, judgment criteria and evaluation indicators for each SO
2. An evaluation fiche for each of the articles (see Table 1).

Table 1: Fiche key

| | |
|---|---|
| Category | <p>For each SO, all the relevant articles are listed, with an evaluation fiche attached for each. The articles require different kinds of interventions, which can be categorised into six categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">  business development  environment  human capital  institutional capacity building  innovation  CLLD |
| Judgement criteria | Judgment criteria are used to specify the KEQs. A judgment criterion describes where the merit of the intervention lies. It makes the implicit assumptions of the objectives explicit and helps to identify the required indicators. |
| Key points to consider | Key points to consider are defined on the basis of the corresponding articles in Regulation 508/2014 |
| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
| The set of evaluation indicators should help to focus on the key points. We propose a range of different types of evaluation indicators (see table 7 in the EMFF working paper above). If specific indicators are available at national level, however, it is recommended to use these wherever possible. | Sources of evaluation indicators include Infosys, AIR, result indicators, beneficiaries (beyond Infosys), stakeholders, experts, scientists, MAs, and national statistics. Keep in mind that Infosys and AIR do not provide real-time data. If more up-to-date data is available at national level this should be used instead. |

The toolbox section on effectiveness evaluation is structured according to the UPs and SOs. For each SO, all the relevant articles are listed, with an evaluation fiche attached for each. The articles fall into six different categories:







1. business development
2. environment
3. human capital
4. institutional capacity building
5. innovation
6. CLLD

Table 2: 508/2014 articles/measures allocated to the six categories

| SO | Evaluation questions “To what extent has EMFF contributed to:...” | Measures | Infosys measure code |
|-----|---|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 1.1 | “Reduction of the impact of fisheries on the marine environment, including the avoidance and reduction, as far as possible, of unwanted catches”? | Article 37 | I.14 |
| | | Article 38 1.a,b | I.15 |
| | | Article 38 1.c, d | I.15 |
| | | Article 39 | I.16 |
| | | Article 40.1.a | I.17 |
| 1.2 | “Protection and restoration of aquatic biodiversity and ecosystems”? | Article 43.2 | I.24 |
| | | Article 40.1.b-g, i | I.18 |
| 1.3 | “Ensuring a balance between fishing capacity and available fishing opportunities”? | Article 34 | I.10 |
| | | Article 36 | I.13 |
| 1.4 | “Enhancement of competitiveness and viability of fisheries enterprises, including of small-scale coastal fleets, and the improvement of safety and working conditions”? | Article 27 | I.2 |
| | | Article 30 | I.6 |
| | | Article 31 | I.7 |
| | | Article 32 | I.8 |
| | | Article 33 | I.9 |
| | | Article 35 | I.11, I.12 |
| | | Article 40.1.h | I.19 |
| | | Article 42 | I.22 |
| 1.5 | “Strengthening technological development and innovation, including increasing energy efficiency and knowledge transfer”? | Article 43.1 + 3 | I.23 |
| | | Article 26 | I.1 |
| | | Article 28 | I.3 |
| 1.6 | “Development of professional training, new professional skills and lifelong learning”? | Article 41.1.a, b, c | I.20 |
| | | Article 41.2 | I.21 |
| 2.1 | “Strengthening technological development, innovation and knowledge transfer” in the aquaculture sector? | Article 29.1 + 29.2 | I.4 |
| | | Article 29.3 | I.5 |
| 2.2 | “Enhancement of the competitiveness and viability of aquaculture enterprises, including improvement of safety or working conditions, in particular of SMEs”? | Article 47 | II.1 |
| | | Article 49 | II.5 |
| 2.2 | “Enhancement of the competitiveness and viability of aquaculture enterprises, including improvement of safety or working conditions, in particular of SMEs”? | Article 48.1.a-d, f-h | II.2 |
| | | Article 52 | II.8 |

This categorisation allows measures to be aggregated and a qualitative summary to be prepared showing how the EMFF contributes to these categories. The qualitative summary should feed into the impact assessment at UP level.

Table 2 shows how the 51 (sub)-articles are allocated to the six categories.







| Categories | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
|  Business development |  Environment |  Human capital Knowledge |  Institutional capacity building |  Innovation |  CLLD |
| | 1 | | 2 | | |
| | 1 | | | | |
| | 1 | | | | |
| | 2 | | | 1 | |
| | 1 | | | | |
| 2 | 1 | | | | |
| | 1 | | 2 | | |
| 2 | 1 | | | | |
| | 2 | | 1 | | |
| 2 | | 1 | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| | | 1 | | | |
| 1 | 2 | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | | | | |
| 1 | | | | 2 | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | 1 | |
| | | | | 1 | |
| | 1 | | | | |
| | 1 | | | | |
| | | 1 | | | |
| | | 1 | | | |
| | | | | 1 | |
| 1 | 2 | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | | | | |

| 50 | Evaluation questions “To what extent has EMFF contributed to...” | Measures | Infosys measure code |
|-----|--|----------------------|----------------------------|
| 2.3 | “Protection and restoration of aquatic biodiversity and enhancement of ecosystems related to aquaculture and promotion of resource-efficient aquaculture”? | Article 48.1.k | II.4 |
| | | Article 48.1.e, i, j | II.3 |
| | | Article 51 | II.7 |
| | | Article 53 | II.9 |
| 2.4 | “Aquaculture having a high level of environmental protection, and the promotion of animal health and welfare and of public health and safety”? | Article 54 | II.10 |
| | | Article 55 | II.11 |
| | | Article 56 | II.12 |
| | | Article 57 | II.13 |
| 2.5 | “Development of professional training, new professional skill and lifelong learning” in the aquaculture sector? | Article 50 | II.6 |
| 3.1 | “Improvement and supply of scientific knowledge and collection and management of data”? | Article 77 | VI.2 |
| 3.2 | Better “control and enforcement”? | Article 76 | VI.1 |
| 4.1 | “Economic growth, social inclusion and job creation, and providing support to employability and labour mobility in coastal and inland communities which depend on fishing and aquaculture, including the Diversification of activities within fisheries and into other sectors of maritime economy”? | Article 62.1.a | III.1 |
| | | Article 63 | III.2, III.3 |
| | | Article 64 | III.4 |
| | | Article 66 | IV.1 |
| 5.1 | “Improvement of market organisation for fishery and aquaculture products”? | Article 67 | IV.2 |
| | | Article 68 | IV.3 |
| | | Article 70 | V.1 |
| 5.2 | “Encouragement of investment in the processing and marketing sector”? | Article 69 | IV.4 |
| 6.1 | Fostering the “Integrated Maritime Policy”? | Article 80.1.a | VIII.1 |
| | | Article 80.1.b | VIII.2 |
| | | Article 80.1.c | VIII.3 |

Key:

1: main category

2: additional category

| Categories | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Business development | Environment | Human capital Knowledge | Institutional capacity building | Innovation | CLLD |
| 2 | 1 | | | | |
| | 1 | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | | | | |
| 2 | 1 | | | | |
| 2 | 1 | | | | |
| | | 1 | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| | | 1 | | | |
| | 2 | | 1 | | |
| | 2 | | 1 | | |
| | | | | | 1 |
| | | | | | 1 |
| | | | | | 1 |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 1 | | | 2 | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| | 2 | | 1 | | |
| | 1 | | | | |
| | 2 | | 1 | | |

2.1. UP1 Promoting environmentally sustainable, resource-efficient, innovative, competitive and knowledge-based fisheries


2.1.1 Specific Objective 1.1 Reduction of the impact of fisheries on the marine environment, including the avoidance and reduction, as far as possible, of unwanted catches

KEY EVALUATION QUESTION 1.1: To what extent has EMFF contributed to “reduction of the impact of fisheries on the marine environment, including the avoidance and reduction, as far as possible, of unwanted catches”?

Specific Objective 1.1


| | |
|------------------|--|
| Related Articles | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design and implementation of conservation measures (Art. 37) 2. Limiting impact of fishing and protection of species (Art. 38) 3. Innovation linked to conservation (Art. 39) 4. Protection of biodiversity – collection of gear and litter (Art. 40) 5. Shore infrastructure to facilitate landings obligation (Art. 43) |
| RIs | <p>RI 1.4.a Change in unwanted catches (tonnes)</p> <p>RI 1.4.b Change in unwanted catches (%)</p> <p>RI 1.5 Change in fuel efficiency of fish capture</p> |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 1: Art. 37 – Support for the design and implementation of conservation measures and regional cooperation


| | |
|--|--|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to the effective design and implementation of conservation measures at national or regional level |
| Key points to consider | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For efficient design and implementation measures: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. design, development and monitoring of technical and administrative means necessary for the development and implementation of conservation measures and regionalisation b. stakeholder participation in designing and implementing conservation measures and regionalisation 2. cooperation between MSs in designing and implementing conservation measures and regionalisation <p><i>EMFF may support direct restocking only when it is provided for as a conservation measure in a Union legal act</i></p> |
| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
| A. Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations by type | Infosys code of measure I.14.1: Type of activity: a. design; b. development and monitoring; c. stakeholder participation; d. direct restocking |
| E. Type of conservation measures | MA, beneficiaries |
| F. Type of fishery | MA, beneficiaries |
| G. Number and type of stakeholders participating in designing and implementing conservation measures and regionalisation | MA |

| | |
|--|---|
| H. Numbers of stocks concerned, if relevant | Infosys code of measure I.14.2: Numbers of stocks concerned |
| I. Achieved results of the operations, in particular in relation to reduction of unwanted catches and improvement of fuel efficiency | Beneficiaries, experts |


Effectiveness evaluation fiche 2: Art. 38 – Limitation of the impact of fishing on the marine environment and adaptation of fishing to the protection of species (including 44.1.c. Inland fishing)

| | |
|--|--|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to the reduction of unwanted catches, reduction of impact on environment and protection from birds and mammals |
| Key points to consider | Investments in <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. equipment to improve size selectivity or species selectivity of fishing gear b. equipment that eliminates discards by avoiding and reducing unwanted catches of commercial stocks, or that deals with unwanted catches to be landed in accordance with Article 15 of Regulation (EU) No 1380/2013 c. equipment that limits and, where possible, eliminates the physical and biological impacts of fishing on the ecosystem or the sea bed d. equipment that protects gear and catches from mammals and birds <i>shall not be granted more than once during the programming period</i> |
| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
| A. Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations by type | Infosys code of measure I.15.1: Whether the operation relates to sea or inland fishing or both Infosys code of measure I.15.2: Type of investment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. selectivity of gear b. reduce discards or deal with unwanted catches c. eliminating impacts on ecosystem and sea bed d. protecting gears and catches from mammals and birds e. fish aggregating devices in outermost regions |
| E. Number and type of vessels | Infosys Annex II field 4 Community Fleet Register |
| F. Number of fishermen benefiting; | Infosys code of measure I.15.3: Number of fishermen benefiting from the operation |
| G. Change (reduction) in unwanted catches. | RI 1.4.a Change in unwanted catches (tonnes) RI 1.4.b Change in unwanted catches (%) |
| H. Type of environmental protection (e.g. species selectivity, size selectivity, reduction of impact on seabed, reduction of bycatches, protection of catches from birds and mammals etc.) | MA, beneficiaries |
| I. Type of fishery (e.g. type of gear used, type of vessel, location of fishing grounds, target species etc.) | MA, beneficiaries |


Effectiveness evaluation fiche 3: Art. 39 – Innovation linked to the conservation of marine biological resources

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Category |  | |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to increased innovation and cooperation between fishermen and scientists | |
| Key points to consider | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developing or introducing new technical or organisational knowledge that reduces the impact of fishing activities on the environment, including improved fishing techniques and gear selectivity, or achieves a more sustainable use of marine biological resources and coexistence with protected predators 2. Collaboration with a scientific or technical body recognised by the MS which shall validate the results of such operations 3. Adequate publication of results of operations <p><i>Fishing vessels involved in projects financed under this Article shall not exceed 5% of the national fleet in terms of either number of vessels or gross tonnage.</i></p> | |
| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source | |
| A. Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex 1 field 10 | |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget | |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value | |
| D. Number of operations of each type | Infosys code of measure I.16: Whether the operation relates to sea or inland fishing or both Infosys code of measure I.16: Type of operation: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. developing new technical or organisational knowledge: reducing impacts b. introducing new technical or organisational knowledge: reducing impacts c. developing new technical or organisational knowledge: achieving sustainable use d. introducing new technical or organisational knowledge: achieving sustainable use | |
| E. Scientific institutes involved and their input | MA, scientists | |
| F. Number of fishermen benefiting from the operation | Infosys code of measure I.16 | |
| G. Type of impact reduction | MA, beneficiaries | |
| H. Type of fishery | MA, beneficiaries | |
| I. Type of vessels involved in trials and duration of missions (sea-days) | Infosys Annex II field 4 CFR | |
| J. Quality of the knowledge developed | MA, beneficiaries, experts | |
| K. Utilisation of knowledge gained | MA, beneficiaries, experts | |
| L. Impact on fuel efficiency | RI 1.5 Change in fuel efficiency of fish capture | |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 4: Art. 40.1.a – Protection and restoration of marine biodiversity and ecosystems and compensation regimes in the framework of sustainable fishing activities

| Category |  |
|--|--|
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to the increase of waste collection by fishermen |
| Key points to consider | Investment in collection of waste by fishermen from the sea such as the removal of lost fishing gear and marine litter |
| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
| A. Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex 1 field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number by type of operation (awareness, innovation, equipment on board, equipment in port, incentives for the fishermen, incentives for the port, local community actions, other) | MA, beneficiaries |
| E. Number of fishermen benefiting | Infosys code of measure I.17. Number of fishermen benefiting from the operation |
| F. Amount of marine litter collected (tonnes) | MA, beneficiaries |
| G. Type of litter collected (nets, other fishing gear, other fishing-related items, other (e.g. household waste)) | MA, beneficiaries |
| H. Amount of fishing gear collected (tonnes, number of nets) | MA, beneficiaries, experts |
| I. Extent of roll-out of the actions beyond beneficiaries (how much and how quickly/when) | MA, beneficiaries, experts |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 5: Art. 43.2 – Fishing ports, landing sites, auction halls and shelters

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Category |  | |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to increased compliance with the landing obligation | |
| Key points to consider | Investments in fishing ports, auction halls, landing sites and shelters to facilitate compliance with the obligation to land all catches. ¹ | |
| | Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
| | A. Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 |
| | B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| | C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| | D. Number of operations by type | Infosys code of measure I.24.1: Category of investment: fishing ports; landing sites; auction halls; shelters |
| | E. Number of fishermen benefiting from the operation | Infosys code of measure I.24.2: Number of fishermen benefiting from the operation |
| | F. Total catches landed (share of unwanted catches for utilisation) | MA, beneficiaries, experts |
| | G. Share of utilisation of unwanted catches | MA, beneficiaries, experts |


2.1.2 Specific Objective 1.2 Protection and restoration of aquatic biodiversity and ecosystems

KEY EVALUATION QUESTION 1.2: To what extent has EMFF contributed to “protection and restoration of aquatic biodiversity and ecosystems”?

Specific Objective 1.2

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Related Articles | Contribution of EMFF to promotion of management of Natura 2000 and marine protected areas. (Art. 40 b-g) |
| RIs | RI 1.5 Change in fuel efficiency of fish capture RI 1.10.a Change in the coverage of Natura 2000 areas designated under the Birds and Habitats directives RI 1.10.b Change in the coverage of other spatial protection measures under Art. 13.4 of the Directive 2008/56/EC |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 6: Art. 40.1.b-g – Protection and restoration of marine biodiversity and ecosystems and compensation regimes in the framework of sustainable fishing activities (including Art. 44.6 Inland fishing)

| | |
|---|---|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to increased protection of Natura 2000 and marine protected areas |
| Key points to consider | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Actions related to the construction, installation or modernisation of static or movable facilities intended to protect and enhance marine fauna and flora, including their scientific preparation and evaluation 2. Actions contributing to a better management or conservation of marine biological resources 3. Actions related to the preparation, including studies, drawing-up, monitoring and updating of protection and management plans for fishery-related activities relating to Natura 2000 sites and spatial protected areas referred to in Directive 2008/56/EC and relating to other special habitats 4. Actions related the management, restoration and monitoring of Natura 2000 sites in accordance with Directives 92/43/EEC and 2009/147/EC, in accordance with prioritised action frameworks established pursuant to Directive 92/43/EEC 5. Actions related the management, restoration and monitoring of marine protected areas with a view to the implementation of the spatial protection measures referred to in Article 13(4) of Directive 2008/56/EC 6. Actions to increase environmental awareness, involving fishermen, with regard to protecting and restoring marine biodiversity |
| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
| A. Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Type of constructed facilities (static/movable, exact purpose) | Infosys code of measure I.18.2: Type of operation: investment in facilities |
| E. Number and nature of operations funded in inland fishing | Infosys code of measure I.18.1: Whether the operation relates to sea or inland fishing or both |
| F. Contribution to management of Natura 2000 areas | Infosys code of measure I.18.3: Total area covered by Natura 2000 (in km ²) |
| G. Contribution to management of marine protected areas | Infosys code of measure I.18.4: Total area covered by MPA (in km ²) |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| H. | Coverage of Natura 2000 areas (km ²), and share of total | Infosys code of measure I.18.3: Total area covered by Natura 2000 (in km ²) <i>Calculated with additional data on total surface of Natura 2000 and MPAs</i> |
| I. | Coverage of marine protected areas (km ²) and share of total | Infosys code of measure I.18.4: Total area covered by MPA (in km ²) <i>Calculated with additional data on total surface of Natura 2000 and MPAs</i> |
| J. | Coverage of other spatial measures (km ²) | Infosys code of measure I.18.4: Total area covered by other spatial measures (in km ²) <i>Calculated with additional data on total surface of Natura 2000 and MPAs</i> |
| K. | Quality and impact of actions related to management improvement | MA, beneficiaries, experts |
| L. | Quality and impact of fishery-related activities relating to Natura 2000 sites and spatial protected areas ² and relating to other special habitats | MA, beneficiaries, experts |
| M. | Quality and impact of actions related to management, restoration and monitoring of Natura 2000 sites ³ | MA, beneficiaries, experts |
| N. | Quality and impact of actions promoting environmental awareness (e.g. media used, duration in months, number of people reached) | MA, beneficiaries, experts |


2.1.3. Specific Objective 1.3 Ensuring a balance between fishing capacity and available fishing opportunities

KEY EVALUATION QUESTION 1.3: To what extent has EMFF contributed to “ensuring a balance between fishing capacity and available fishing opportunities”?



Specific Objective 1.3

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Related Articles | 1. Permanent cessation of fishing activities; (Art. 34) 2. Systems for allocation of fishing opportunities (Art. 36) |
| RIs | RI 1.3 Change in net profits RI 1.6 Change in the % of unbalanced fleet |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 7: Art. 34 – Permanent cessation of fishing activities

| | |
|---|---|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to improved balance of fishing capacity through fleet balance |
| Key points to consider | 1. Permanent cessation of fishing activities for fishermen and vessel owners who have worked at sea for at least 90 days per year during the last two calendar years, achieved through the scrapping of fishing vessels 2. permanent cessation is foreseen as a tool of an action plan 3. equivalent capacity has been permanently removed from the Union fishing fleet register and after the fishing licences and authorisations have also been permanently withdrawn 4. - permanent cessation with preserving maritime heritage |
| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
| A. Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 2 |
| E. Number of fishermen concerned. | Infosys code of measure I.10 |
| F. Number and type of vessels scrapped | MA, beneficiaries |
| G. Number of vessels by type | Infosys code of measure Annex II field 4 CFR |
| H. Change in the % of unbalanced fleet | RI 1.6 Change in the % of unbalanced fleet |
| I. Share of actual permanent cessations in relation to foreseen cessation in the action plan | MA |
| J. Preserved maritime heritage with permanent cessation (e.g. number of vessels turned into tourist attractions; maybe should be specified as such) | MA, experts |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 8: Art. 36 Support for the systems of allocation of fishing opportunities

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Category |   |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to improved allocation of fishing opportunities |
| Key points to consider | Support the design, development, monitoring, evaluation and management of the systems for allocating fishing opportunities |

| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|---|--|
| A. Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations by type of activity | Infosys code of measure I.13.1: Type of activity: design; development; monitoring; evaluation; management |
| E. Type and number of beneficiaries | Infosys code of measure I.13.2: Type of beneficiary |
| F. Number of fishermen expected to use the system | MA, beneficiaries, stakeholders |
| G. Quality of system improvement | MA, beneficiaries, stakeholders |
| H. Increase of income | RI 1.3 Change in net profits |


2.1.4 Specific Objective 1.4 Enhancement of competitiveness and viability of fisheries enterprises, including of small-scale coastal fleets and the improvement of safety and working conditions

KEY EVALUATION QUESTION 1.4: To what extent has EMFF contributed to “enhancement of competitiveness and viability of fisheries enterprises, including of small-scale coastal fleet and the improvement of safety and working conditions”?

Specific Objective 1.4

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Related Articles | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Advisory services (Art. 27) 2. Diversification and new forms of income (Art. 30) 3. Start-up support for young fishermen (Art. 31) 4. Health and safety (Art. 32) 5. Temporary cessation of fishing activities (Art. 33) 6. Mutual funds for adverse climatic events and environmental incidents (Art. 35) 7. Compensation for damage to catches caused by mammals and birds (Art. 40.1.h) 8. Added value, product quality and use of unwanted catches (Art. 42) 9. Fishing ports, landing sites, auction halls and shelters (Art. 43.1+3) |
| RIs | <p>RI 1.1 Change in the value of production</p> <p>RI 1.2 Change in the volume of production</p> <p>RI 1.3 Change in net profits</p> <p>RI 1.5 Change in fuel efficiency of fish capture</p> <p>RI 1.7 Employment created (FTE) in the fisheries sector or complementary activities</p> <p>RI 1.8 Employment maintained (FTE) in the fisheries sector or complementary activities</p> <p>RI 1.9.a Change in the number of work-related injuries and accidents</p> <p>RI 1.9.b Change in the % of work-related injuries and accidents in relation to the total number of fishermen</p> |


Effectiveness evaluation fiche 9: Art. 27 Advisory services

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to improved competitiveness of fishermen |
| Key points to consider | <p>Improve the overall performance and competitiveness of operators and to promote sustainable fisheries through:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. feasibility studies on viability of projects b. advice on environmental sustainability c. business and marketing strategies |


| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|---|--|
| A. Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex 1 field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of advisory organizations involved under this article | MA, beneficiaries, stakeholders |
| E. Number of fishermen to whom the services were provided | MA, beneficiaries |

| | |
|--|---|
| F. Number and nature of operations funded in inland fishing. | Infosys code of measure I.2.1: Whether the operation relates to sea or inland fishing or both |
| G. Quality of advice on environmental sustainability, business and marketing strategies, end user services | MA, beneficiaries, stakeholders |
| H. Utilisation of advice on environmental sustainability, business and marketing strategies, end user services | MA, beneficiaries, stakeholders |
| I. Utilisation of feasibility studies | MA, beneficiaries, |
| J. Increase of income | RI 1.3 Change in net profits |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 10: Art. 30 Diversification and new forms of income (including Art. 44.4 Inland fishing)


| | |
|---|---|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to increase of diversification and new forms of income |
| Key points to consider | Diversification operations by type: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. investments on board b. angling tourism c. restaurants d. environmental services related to fishing e. educational activities concerning fishing f. other |
| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
| A. Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex 1 field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/ total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of diversification operations by type | Infosys code of measure I.6.1: Type of diversification: investments on board; angling tourism; restaurants; environmental services; educational activities |
| E. Operations funded in inland fishing | Infosys code of measure I.6.1: Whether the operation relates to sea or inland fishing or both |
| F. Number by type of vessels concerned | Infosys code of measure Annex II field 4 CFR |
| G. Number of fishermen concerned | Infosys code of measure I.6.1: Number of fishermen concerned |
| H. Increase of income | RI 1.3 Change in net profits |
| I. Employment created | RI 1.7 Employment created (FTE) in the fisheries sector or complementary activities |
| J. Employment maintained | RI 1.8 Employment maintained (FTE) in the fisheries sector or complementary activities |
| K. Perceived improvement for beneficiaries | Beneficiaries |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 11: Art. 31 Start-up support for young fishermen (including Art 44.2 Inland fishing)

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to increase viability of small-scale coastal fleets |
| Key points to consider | <p>First acquisition of a fishing vessel that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. has an overall length of less than 24 metres b. is equipped for sea fishing c. is between 5 and 30 years old d. belongs to a fleet segment for which the report on fishing capacity has shown a balance with the fishing opportunities available to that segment |


| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|---|--|
| A. Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations | Infosys Annex I field 2 |
| E. Operations funded in inland fishing | Infosys code of measure 1.7.1: Whether the operation relates to sea or inland fishing or both |
| F. Number and type of vessels purchased | Infosys code of measure Annex II field 4 CFR |
| G. Number of beneficiaries | Infosys code of measure 1.7.2: Age of the young fishermen benefiting from the operation – number of entries |
| H. Average age of beneficiaries | Infosys code of measure 1.7.2: Age of the young fishermen benefiting from the operation |
| I. Employment created | RI 1.7 Employment created (FTE) in the fisheries sector or complementary activities |
| J. Employment maintained | RI 1.8 Employment maintained (FTE) in the fisheries sector or complementary activities |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 12: Art. 32 Health and safety (including Art 44.1.b Inland fishing)

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to the improvement of health and safety conditions for fishermen |
| Key points to consider | Improve hygiene, health, safety and working conditions for fishermen through investments on board or in individual equipment, provided that those investments go beyond the requirements under Union or national law |


| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|--|--|
| A. Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations by type: a. health, b. hygiene, c. safety, d. working conditions | Infosys code of measure I.8.2: Type of equipment: investment on board; individual equipment |
| E. Operations funded in inland fishing | Infosys code of measure I.8.1: Whether the operation relates to sea or inland fishing or both |
| F. Number of fishermen concerned by the operation | Infosys code of measure I.8.3: Number of fishermen concerned by the operation |
| G. Type of vessel where changes have been introduced | Infosys code of measure Annex II field 4 CFR |
| H. Change in working conditions | RI 1.9.a Change in the number of work-related injuries and accidents RI 1.9.b Change in the % of work-related injuries and accidents in relation to total number of fishermen |
| I. Perceived quality of improved working conditions | MA, beneficiaries, stakeholders |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 13: Art. 33 Temporary cessation of fishing activities

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to the improved balance of fishing capacity through fleet balance |
| Key points to consider | EMFF contributed to the improved balance between fishing capacity and seasonal fishing opportunities |


| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|---|--|
| A. Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 2 |
| E. Number of fishermen who received support | Infosys code of measure I.9.1: Number of fishermen concerned |
| F. Number of fleets by type | Infosys code of measure Annex II field 4 CFR |
| G. Average annual duration of support per vessel | Infosys code of measure I.9.2: Number of days covered |
| H. Increase of stock protected | MA, experts |
| I. Level of impact on emergency measures | MA, beneficiaries, stakeholders |
| J. Change in net profits | RI 1.3 Change in net profits |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 14: Art. 35 Mutual funds for adverse climatic events and environmental incidents


| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to the preservation of competitiveness and viability of fishermen |
| Key points to consider | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contribute to mutual funds which pay financial compensation to fishermen for economic losses caused by adverse climatic events or environmental incidents, or for the rescue costs for fishermen or fishing vessels in the case of accidents at sea during their fishing activities 2. To be eligible for support under this Article, the mutual fund concerned shall: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. be accredited by the competent authority of the Member State, in accordance with national law b. have a transparent policy on payments into and withdrawals from the fund c. have clear rules attributing responsibility for any debts incurred |

| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|---|--|
| A. Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of fishermen benefiting | Infosys code of measure I.12.2: Number of crew members concerned |
| E. Number of mutual funds created | Infosys code of measure I.1.1: Name of mutual fund |
| F. Objectives of mutual funds supported | MA, mutual funds manager |
| G. Level of utilisation of the funds | Budget of each fund Infosys code of measure I.12.1: Compensation paid for: adverse climatic events; environmental incidents; rescue costs |
| H. Employment maintained | RI 1.8 Employment maintained (FTE) in the fisheries sector or complementary activities |
| I. Extent of roll-out of funds | MA, mutual funds manager |


Effectiveness evaluation fiche 15: Art. 40.1.h Protection and restoration of marine biodiversity and ecosystems and compensation regimes in the framework of sustainable fishing activities

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Category |  | |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to the protection and restoration of marine biodiversity and ecosystems and compensation regimes | |
| Key points to consider | Schemes for compensation for damage to catches caused by mammals and birds protected by Directives 92/43/EEC and 2009/147/EC | |
| Evaluation indicators (EI) | | |
| | EI | Source |
| A. Total investment | | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of fishermen receiving compensation | | Infosys code of measure I.19: Number of fishermen benefiting from the operation |
| E. Number and type of vessels supported | | Infosys code of measure Annex II field 4 CFR |
| F. Types and timing of damage (birds, mammals, seasons) | | MA, beneficiaries |
| G. Employment maintained | | RI 1.8 Employment maintained (FTE) in the fisheries sector or complementary activities |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 16: Art. 42 Added value, product quality and use of unwanted catches (including Art. 44.1.c. Inland fishing)

| | |
|---|--|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to improve competitiveness of fishermen |
| Key points to consider | <p>Improve the added value or quality of the fish caught with:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> investments that add value to fishery products, in particular by allowing fishermen to carry out the processing, marketing and direct sale of their own catches innovative investments on board that improve the quality of the fishery products |
| Evaluation indicators (EI) | |
| Source | |
| A. Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations by type | Infosys code of measure I.22.2: Type of operation: investments that add value to products; investments on board that improve the quality of the fishery products |
| E. Number and nature of operations funded in inland fishing | Infosys code of measure I.22.1: Whether the operation relates to sea or inland fishing or both |
| F. Number of fishermen benefiting | Infosys code of measure I.22.3: Number of fishermen benefiting from the operation |
| G. Number and type of vessels supported | Infosys code of measure Annex II field 4 CFR |
| H. Quality of improvements of fishery products | Beneficiaries, MA, stakeholders |
| I. Extent of broader roll-out of the innovative results | Beneficiaries, MA, stakeholders |
| J. Change on production | RI 1.1 Change in the value of production RI 1.2 Change in the volume of production |
| K. Increase of income | RI 1.3 Change in net profits |
| L. Employment created | RI 1.7 Employment created (FTE) in the fisheries sector or complementary activities |
| M. Employment maintained | RI 1.8 Employment maintained (FTE) in the fisheries sector or complementary activities |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 17: Art. 43.1+3 – Fishing ports, landing sites, auction halls and shelters (including Art. 44.1.f Inland fishing)

| Category |  |
|--|--|
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to the improvement of fishing ports, landing sites, auction halls and shelters |
| Key points to consider | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For the purpose of increasing the quality, control and traceability of the products landed, increasing energy efficiency, contributing to environmental protection and improving safety and working conditions, the EMFF may support investments improving the infrastructure of fishing ports, auctions halls, landing sites and shelters, including investments in facilities for waste and marine litter collection 2. To improve the safety of fishermen, the EMFF may support investments in the construction or modernisation of shelters. <i>Support shall not cover the construction of new ports, new landing sites or new auction halls.</i> |
| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
| A. Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations by type | Infosys code of measure I.23.2: Category of investment: Fishing ports; landing sites; auction halls; shelters Infosys code of measure I.23.2: Type of investment: quality; control and traceability; energy efficiency; environmental protection; safety and working conditions |
| E. Number and nature of operations funded in inland fishing | Infosys code of measure I.23.1: Whether the operation relates to sea or inland fishing or both |
| F. Number of fishermen benefiting | Infosys code of measure I.23.3: Number of fishermen benefiting from the operation |
| G. Number of other port users or other workers benefiting from the operation | Infosys code of measure I.23.4: Number of other port users or other workers benefiting from the operation |
| H. Level of improvements of port infrastructure supported | MA, beneficiaries, stakeholders |
| I. Level of improvements of safety and working conditions | MA, beneficiaries, stakeholders |
| J. Level of improvement of control and traceability of products landed | MA, beneficiaries, stakeholders |
| K. Increasing energy efficiency | RI 1.5 Change in fuel efficiency of fish capture |
| L. Increase of income | RI 1.3 Change in net profits |


2.1.5 Specific Objective 1.5 Provision of support to strengthen technological development and innovation, including increasing energy efficiency and knowledge transfer

KEY EVALUATION QUESTION 1.5: To what extent has EMFF contributed to “strengthening technological development and innovation, including increasing energy efficiency and knowledge transfer”?

Specific Objective 1.5

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Related Articles | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Innovation (Art. 26) 2. Partnerships between scientists and fishermen (Art. 28) 3. Energy efficiency and mitigation of climate change (Art. 41) |
| RIs | <p>RI 1.1 Change in the value of production</p> <p>RI 1.2 Change in the volume of production</p> <p>RI 1.3 Change in net profits</p> <p>RI 1.5 Change in fuel efficiency of fish capture</p> |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 18: Art. 26 Innovation (including Art 44.3 Inland fishing)

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to innovative technology in the fishery sector |
| Key points to consider | <p>Projects aimed at:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. developing or introducing new or substantially improved products and equipment b. improved products or techniques c. new or improved management and organisation systems including at the level of processing and marketing d. collaboration with a scientific or technical body e. publications |


Evaluation indicators (EI)

Source


| | |
|---|--|
| A. Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations by type | Infosys code of measure I.1.2: Type of innovation: products and equipment; process and techniques; management and organisation system |
| E. Number and nature of operations funded in inland fishing | Infosys code of measure I.1.1: Whether the operation relates to sea or inland fishing or both |
| F. People benefiting from operations | Infosys code of measure I.1.3: Number of people benefiting from the operation directly in companies supported |
| G. Number of innovations in use after the completion of the operation | MA, beneficiaries |
| H. Level of improvement achieved by innovation in management | MA, beneficiaries, experts |

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| I. Level of improvement achieved by innovation in products | MA, beneficiaries, experts |
| J. Perceived benefit from collaboration with scientific and technical bodies | MA, beneficiaries, experts |
| K. Extent of the roll-out of the innovations. | MA, beneficiaries, experts |
| L. Increase of income | RI 1.3 Change in net profits |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 19: Art. 28 Partnerships between scientists and fishermen (including Art 44.3 Inland fishing)


| | |
|--|---|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to improved partnership between science and fishery |
| Key points to consider | Transfer of knowledge between scientists and fishermen: a. creation of networks, partnership agreements or associations between one or more independent scientific bodies and fishermen b. activities carried out in the framework of the networks, partnership agreements, or associations c. activities such as data collection and management activities, studies, pilot projects, dissemination of knowledge and research results, seminars and best practices |
| Evaluation indicators (EI) | |
| Source | |
| Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 |
| Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| Number of operations by type | Infosys code of measure 1.3.2: Type of activities: networks; partnership agreement or association; data collection and management; studies; pilot projects; dissemination; seminars; best practices |
| Number and nature of operations funded in inland fishing | Infosys code of measure 1.3.1: Whether the operation relates to sea or inland fishing or both |
| Number of scientists involved in partnership | Infosys code of measure 1.3.3: Number of scientists involved in partnership |
| Number of fishermen involved in partnership | Infosys code of measure 1.3.4: Number of fishermen involved in partnership 4 Numerical |
| Number of other bodies benefiting from the operation | Infosys code of measure 1.3.5: Number of other bodies benefiting from the operation |
| List of created network, partnerships and association agreements by type | MA |
| Perceived benefit from knowledge exchange and partnership with scientific and technical bodies | Beneficiaries |
| Extent of the roll-out of the innovations. | MA, beneficiaries, experts |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 20: Art. 41.1.a,b,c Energy efficiency and mitigation of climate change (including Art. 44.1.d Inland fishing)

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to energy efficiency and the mitigation of the effects of climate change |
| Key points to consider | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. investments in equipment or on board aimed at reducing the emission of pollutants or greenhouse gases and increasing the energy efficiency of fishing vessels; investments in fishing gear are also eligible provided that they do not undermine the selectivity of that fishing gear 2. energy efficiency audits and schemes 3. studies to assess the contribution of alternative propulsion systems and hull designs to the energy efficiency of fishing vessels |

| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|---|--|
| A. Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations by type | Infosys code of measure I.20.2: Type of operation: equipment on board; fishing gear; energy efficiency audits and schemes; studies |
| E. Number and nature of operations funded in inland fishing | Infosys code of measure I.20.1: Whether the operation relates to sea or inland fishing or both |
| F. Type of vessel supported | Infosys code of measure Annex II field 4 CFR National statistics |
| G. % decrease in fuel consumption | Infosys code of measure I.20.4: % decrease in fuel consumption |
| H. % decrease in CO ₂ emissions | Infosys code of measure I.20.5: % decrease in CO ₂ emissions |
| I. Extent of actual reduction of emissions | RI 1.5 Change in fuel efficiency of fish capture |
| J. Outlook for roll-out | MA, beneficiaries |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 21: Art. 41.2 Energy efficiency and mitigation of climate change (including Art. 44.1.d Inland fishing)

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to modernisation of main engines or ancillary engines |
| Key points to consider | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Replacement or modernisation of main or ancillary engines: 2. for vessels up to 12 metres in overall length, provided that the new or modernised engine does not have more power in kW than the current engine 3. for vessels between 12 and 18 metres in overall length, provided that the power in kW of the new or modernised engine is at least 20% lower than that of the current engine 4. for vessels between 18 and 24 metres in overall length, provided that the power in kW of the new or modernised engine is at least 30% lower than that of the current engine |

| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|--|---|
| A. Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations by type | Infosys code of measure I.21.2: Type of operation: replacement of engine; modernisation |
| E. Number and nature of operations funded in inland fishing | Infosys code of measure I.21.1: Whether the operation relates to sea or inland fishing or both |
| F. Type of vessel supported | Infosys code of measure Annex II field 4 CFR National statistics |
| G. Total engine power (kW) before and after operation by type: a/ replacement and b/ modernization | Infosys code of measure I.21.3: kW before intervention (certified or physically inspected) Infosys code of measure I.21.4: kW after intervention (certified or physically inspected) |
| H. % decrease in fuel consumption | Infosys code of measure I.21.5: % decrease in fuel consumption |
| I. % decrease in CO ₂ emissions | Infosys code of measure I.21.6: % decrease in CO ₂ emissions |
| J. Extent of actual reduction of emissions | RI 1.5 Change in fuel efficiency of fish capture |

2.1.6 Development of professional training, new professional skills and lifelong learning

KEY EVALUATION QUESTION 1.6: To what extent has EMFF contributed to “development of professional training, new professional skills and lifelong learning”?

Specific Objective 1.6

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Related Articles | 1. Professional training, lifelong learning, joint projects, the dissemination of knowledge (Art. 29.1) 2. Networking (Art. 29.2) 3. Social dialogue (Art. 29.3) |
| RIs | RI 1.7 Employment created (FTE) in the fisheries sector or complementary activities RI 1.8 Employment maintained (FTE) in the fisheries sector or complementary activities RI 1.9.a Change in the number of work-related injuries and accidents RI 1.9.b Change in the % of work-related injuries and accidents in relation to total number of fishermen |


Effectiveness evaluation fiche 22: Art. 29.1.a, b Promotion of human capital, job creation and social dialogue (including Art. 44.1.a Inland fisheries)

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to the development of human capital in the fishery sector EMFF contributed to the improvement of working conditions in the fishery sector |
| Key points to consider | Promote human capital, job creation and social dialogue through: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> professional training, lifelong learning, joint projects, dissemination of knowledge of an economic, technical, regulatory or scientific nature and of innovative practices, and acquisition of new professional skills, in particular linked to the sustainable management of marine ecosystems, hygiene, health, safety, activities in the maritime sector, innovation and entrepreneurship networking and exchange of experiences and best practices between stakeholders, including among organisations promoting equal opportunities between men and women, promoting the role of women in fishing communities, and promoting under-represented groups involved in small-scale coastal fishing or in on-foot fishing |

| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|---|---|
| A. Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations related to training by type | Infosys code of measure I.4.2: Type of activities: training and learning; networking; social dialogue |
| E. Number and nature of operations funded in inland fishing | Infosys code of measure I.4.1: Whether the operation relates to sea or inland fishing or both |
| F. Number of partners benefiting | Infosys code of measure I.4.3: Number of spouses and partners benefiting from the operation |
| G. Number of people and organisations benefiting | Infosys code of measure I.4.4: Number of people or organisations benefiting from the operation (participants in training, members of networks, organisations involved in social dialogue actions) |
| H. Number of women participating in training | Infosys Annex I field 7 |

| | |
|---|--|
| I. Quality of the training | Beneficiaries, stakeholder |
| J. Utilisation of training | Beneficiaries, stakeholder |
| K. Employment maintained | RI 1.8 Employment maintained (FTE) in the fisheries sector or complementary activities |
| L. Impact of training on working conditions | Beneficiaries, stakeholder RI 1.9.a Change in the number of work-related injuries and accidents RI 1.9.b Change in the % of work-related injuries and accidents in relation to total number of fishermen |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 23: Art. 29.1.c Promotion of human capital, job creation and social dialogue (including Art. 44.1.a Inland fisheries)

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to the development the social dialogue in the fishery sector |
| Key points to consider | Promote human capital, job creation and social dialogue with a. social dialogue at Union, national, regional or local level involving fishermen, social partners and other stakeholders |

| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|---|--|
| A. Total investment | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of training sessions | Infosys code of measure 1.5.2: Type of activities: training and learning |
| E. Number and nature of operations funded in inland fishing | Infosys code of measure 1.5.1: Whether the operation relates to sea or inland fishing or both |
| F. Number of trainees who received funding | Infosys code of measure 1.5.3: Number of trainees benefiting from the operation |
| G. Number of women participating in training | Infosys Annex I field 7 |
| H. Quality of the training | Beneficiaries, stakeholder |
| I. Utilisation of training | Beneficiaries, stakeholder |
| J. Employment maintained | RI 1.8 Employment maintained (FTE) in the fisheries sector or complementary activities |

2.2 UP2 – Promoting environmentally sustainable, resource-efficient, innovative, competitive and knowledge based aquaculture


2.2.1 Specific Objective 2.1 Provision of support to strengthen technological development, innovation and knowledge transfer

KEY EVALUATION QUESTION 2.1: To what extent has EMFF contributed to “strengthen technological development, innovation and knowledge transfer in aquaculture”?

Specific Objective 2.1

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Related Articles | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Innovation (Art. 47) 2. Management, relief and advisory services for aquaculture farms (Art. 49) |
| RIs | <p>RI 2.1 Change in volume of aquaculture production</p> <p>RI 2.2 Change in value of aquaculture production</p> <p>RI 2.3 Change in net profit</p> |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 24: Art. 47 Innovation

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to increased innovative technological development in aquaculture |
| Key points to consider | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Operations with the aim of: 2. developing technical, scientific or organisational knowledge in aquaculture farms, which, in particular, reduces the impact on the environment, reduces dependence on fish meal and oil, fosters a sustainable use of resources in aquaculture, improves animal welfare or facilitates new sustainable production methods 3. developing or introducing on the market new aquaculture species with good market potential, new or substantially improved products, new or improved processes, or new or improved management and organisation systems 4. exploring the technical or economic feasibility of innovative products or processes |

| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|---|--|
| A. Total investment in innovation | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations by type | Infosys code of measure II.1.1: Type of innovation: knowledge development; introduction of new species; feasibility studies |

| | |
|---|--|
| E. Number of employees benefiting | Infosys code of measure II.1.3: Number of employees benefiting from the operation directly linked in the enterprises supported |
| F. Number and list of scientific/technical bodies supporting innovation | Infosys code of measure II.1.2: Type of research body involved |
| G. Sources providing access to technical details of the innovations (to allow others to adopt them) | MA, websites |
| H. Level of reduction of impact on environment with reducing dependency on fish meal and oil, sustainable use of resources in aquaculture and facilitating new sustainable products | MA, beneficiaries, scientists, experts |
| I. Quality of the new introductions to the market | MA, beneficiaries, scientists, experts |
| J. Perceived benefit from know-how development | MA, beneficiaries |
| K. Number of innovations in use after completion of the operation | MA, beneficiaries |
| L. Extent of the roll-out of the innovations beyond the funded operations | MA, beneficiaries |
| M. Change in production | RI 2.1 Change in volume of aquaculture production RI 2.2 Change in value of aquaculture production |
| N. Increase in income | RI 2.3 Change in net profit |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 25: Art. 49 Management, relief and advisory services for aquaculture farms

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to increased innovation in technological development in aquaculture |
| Key points to consider | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To improve the overall performance and competitiveness of aquaculture farms, and to reduce the negative environmental impact of their operations: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. setting-up of management, relief and advisory services for aquaculture farms b. purchase of farm advisory services of a technical, scientific, legal, environmental or economic nature 2. Advisory service should cover: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. needs for aquaculture farms to comply with EU and national legislation in terms of environmental legislation, as well as with maritime spatial planning requirements b. environmental impact assessment, aquatic animal health and welfare or public health c. management needs to enable aquaculture farms to comply with Union and national standards for aquatic animal health and human health and safety d. marketing and business strategies |

Evaluation indicators (EI)

Source

| | |
|---|--|
| A. Total investment | Infosys Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number and type of operations | Infosys code of measure II.5.1: Type of operation: setting up management; purchase of farm advisory services; relief and advisory services (focus on compliance with environmental legislation); relief and advisory services (focus on environmental impact assessment); relief and advisory services (focus on compliance with animal welfare, health and safety, and public health legislations); relief and advisory services (focus on marketing and business strategies) |
| E. Number and type of advisory service | Infosys code of measure II.5.2: Number of employees benefiting from the operation |
| F. Number of fishermen benefiting from the service | Infosys code of measure II.5.2: Number of employees benefiting from the operation compared to total number of fishermen |
| G. Improved health and safety standards | MA, beneficiaries, experts |
| H. Quality of advisory service | MA, beneficiaries, experts |
| I. Extent of continuation of the services beyond EMFF funding | MA, beneficiaries, experts |
| J. Utilisation of advices | MA, beneficiaries, experts |
| K. Improvement of working conditions | MA, beneficiaries, experts |


2.2.2 Specific Objective 2.2 Enhancement of the competitiveness and viability of aquaculture

KEY EVALUATION QUESTION 2.2: To what extent has EMFF contributed to “enhancement of the competitiveness and viability of aquaculture enterprises, including improvement of safety or working conditions, in particular of SMEs”?

Specific Objective 2.2

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Related Articles | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Productive investments in aquaculture (Art. 48.1.a-d,f-h) 2. Encouraging new aquaculture farmers practising sustainable aquaculture (Art. 52) |
| RIs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RI 2.1 Change in volume of aquaculture production RI 2.2 Change in value of aquaculture production RI 2.3 Change in net profit RI 2.8 Employment created RI 2.9 Employment maintained |


Effectiveness evaluation fiche 26: Art. 48.1. a-d, f-h Productive investments in aquaculture

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to enhanced productive investments in aquaculture |
| Key points to consider | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Productive investments in aquaculture 2. Diversification of aquaculture production and species cultured 3. Modernisation of aquaculture units, including improving the working and safety conditions of aquaculture workers 4. Improvements and modernisation related to animal health and welfare, including the purchase of equipment to protect farms from wild predators 5. Investments in enhancing the quality of, or in adding value to, aquaculture products 6. Restoration of existing aquaculture ponds or lagoons through the removal of silt, or investments aimed at preventing silt deposits 7. Diversification of the income of aquaculture enterprises through the development of complementary activities |

| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|---|---|
| A. Total investment | Infosys Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations by type | Infosys code of measure II.2.1: Type of investment: productive; diversification; modernisation; animal health; quality of products; restoration; complementary activities Infosys code of measure II.3.1: Type of investment: environmental and resources; water usage and quality; closed systems |
| E. Number of employees benefiting | Infosys code of measure II.2.2: Number of employees benefiting from the operation |
| F. Improved working conditions | MA, beneficiaries, experts |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| G. Increase in production in tonnes | RI 2.1 Change in volume of aquaculture production |
| H. Increase in economic value | RI 2.2 Change in value of aquaculture production |
| I. Increase in economic viability | RI 2.3 Change in net profit |
| J. New job creation | RI 2.8 Employment created |
| K. Jobs maintained | RI 2.9 Employment maintained |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 27: Art. 52 Encouraging new aquaculture farmers practising sustainable aquaculture

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to encouraging new aquaculture farmers practising sustainable aquaculture |
| Key points to consider | Setting up of sustainable aquaculture enterprises by new aquaculture farmers, who must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. possess adequate skills and competences b. be setting up an aquaculture micro- or small enterprise for the first time c. submit suitable business plans |

| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|--|--|
| A. Total investment | Infosys Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of supported new farmers | Infosys code of measure II.8.2: Number of employees benefiting from the operation |
| E. Increase of sustainable aquaculture | Infosys code of measure II.8.1: Total area concerned (in km ²) |
| F. Main types of enterprise (combinations of species and technologies) | MA, beneficiaries, stakeholder |
| G. Realized production by the end of the operation and expected production in 5 year | RI 2.1 Change in volume of aquaculture production RI 2.2 Change in value of aquaculture production |
| H. Increase in economic viability | RI 2.3 Change in net profit |
| I. Employment created | RI 2.8 Employment created |
| J. Employment maintained | RI 2.9 Employment maintained |
| K. Type of new competences and skills used | MA, beneficiaries, experts |
| L. Number of SME created | MA, beneficiaries |


2.2.3 Specific Objective 2.3 Protection and restoration of aquatic biodiversity and enhancement of ecosystems related to aquaculture and promotion of resource-efficient aquaculture

KEY EVALUATION QUESTION 2.3: To what extent has EMFF contributed to “protection and restoration of aquatic biodiversity and enhancement of ecosystems related to aquaculture and promotion of resource-efficient aquaculture”?

Specific Objective 2.3


| | |
|------------------|--|
| Related Articles | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduction of environmental impact of aquaculture (Art. 48.1.e, i-k) 2. Increasing potential of aquaculture sites (Art. 51) 3. Conversion to eco-management, audit schemes and organic aquaculture (Art. 53) |
| RIs | <p>RI 2.4 Change in the volume of production organic aquaculture</p> <p>RI 2.5 Change in the volume of production recirculation system</p> <p>RI 2.6 Change in the volume of aquaculture production certified under voluntary sustainability schemes</p> <p>RI 2.7 Aquaculture farms providing environmental services</p> <p>RI 2.8 Employment created</p> <p>RI 2.9 Employment maintained</p> |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 28: Article 48.1.k Productive investments in aquaculture – increasing energy efficiency, renewable energy

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to the increase of productive investments in aquaculture aimed at protection of environment and resource efficiency |
| Key points to consider | Investments increasing energy efficiency and promoting the conversion of aquaculture enterprises to renewable sources of energy |


| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|---|--|
| A. Total investment | Infosys Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations by type | Infosys code of measure II.4.: Type of investment: energy efficiency; renewable energy |
| E. % reduction of energy use | MA, beneficiaries |
| F. Increase of renewable energy use | Stakeholders, experts, beneficiaries |
| G. Types of renewal energy used: solar, wind, water, geothermal | Stakeholders, experts, beneficiaries |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 29: Art. 48.1.e,i,j, Productive investments in aquaculture – protection of environment and resource efficiency


| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to the increase of productive investments in aquaculture aimed at protection of environment and resource efficiency |
| Key points to consider | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. investments reducing the negative impact or enhancing the positive effects on the environment and increasing resource efficiency 2. diversification of aquaculture production and species cultured 3. investments resulting in a substantial reduction in the impact of aquaculture enterprises on water usage and quality, in particular through reducing the amount of water or chemicals, antibiotics and other medicines used, or through improving the output water quality, including through the deployment of multi-trophic aquaculture systems 4. promotion of closed aquaculture systems where aquaculture products are farmed in closed recirculation systems, thereby minimising water use |

| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|--|--|
| A. Total investment | Infosys Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations by type | Infosys code of measure II.3: Type of investment: environmental and resources; water usage and quality; closed systems |
| E. Reduction on water usage | Beneficiaries |
| F. Increase of production organic aquaculture | RI 2.4 Change in the volume of production organic aquaculture |
| G. Increase of recirculation aquaculture systems | RI 2.5 Change in the volume of production recirculation system |
| H. Change in the volume of aquaculture production certified under voluntary sustainability schemes | RI 2.6 Change in the volume of aquaculture production certified under voluntary sustainability schemes |
| I. Employment created | RI 2.8 Employment created |
| J. Employment maintained | RI 2.9 Employment maintained |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 30: Art. 51 Increasing the potential of aquaculture sites

| | |
|--|---|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to increasing the potential of aquaculture sites. |
| Key points to consider | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. identification and mapping of the most suitable areas for developing aquaculture, taking into account, where applicable, spatial planning processes, and identifying and mapping areas where aquaculture should be excluded in order to maintain the role of such areas in the functioning of the ecosystem 2. to improvement and development of support facilities and infrastructures required to increase the potential of aquaculture sites and reduce the negative environmental impact of aquaculture, including investments in land consolidation, energy supply or water management 3. actions with the aim of preventing serious damage to aquaculture (according to Article 9(1) of Directive 2009/147/EC or Article 16(1) of Directive 92/43/EEC) 4. action taken by competent authorities following the detection of increased mortality or disease as provided for in Article 10 of Council Directive 2006/88/EC |
| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
| A. Total investment | Infosys Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations by type | Infosys code of measure II.7.1: Type of operation: identification of areas; improvement of support facilities and infrastructures; preventing serious damage; actions following the detection of increased mortalities or diseases |
| E. Number of suitable areas identified and mapped for aquaculture | MA, beneficiaries |
| F. Number of areas where aquaculture should be excluded | MA, beneficiaries |
| G. Total area concerned (in km ²) | MA, national statistics or similar |
| H. Improved facilities and infrastructures | MA, beneficiaries |
| I. Extent of identified and mapped most suitable areas for developing aquaculture. | MA, beneficiaries |
| J. Change in production organic aquaculture | RI 2.4 Change in the volume of production organic aquaculture RI 2.5 Change in the volume of production recirculation system |
| K. Perceived improvement in preventing serious damage to aquaculture | MA, beneficiaries |
| L. Number and type of supported animal health surveillance scheme | MA, national food safety authorities |
| M. Number of action related to Article 10 of Council Directive 2006/88/EC | MA, national food safety authorities |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 31: Art. 53 Conversion to eco-management and audit schemes and organic aquaculture

| | |
|---|--|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to conversion to eco-management and audit schemes and organic aquaculture |
| Key points to consider | To promote the development of organic or energy-efficient aquaculture through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. conversion of conventional aquaculture into organic aquaculture within the meaning of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 (1) and in accordance with Commission Regulation (EC) No 710/2009 b. participation in the Union eco-management and audit schemes (EMAS) |
| Evaluation indicators (EI) | |
| A. Total investment | Infosys Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations by type | Infosys code of measure II.9.1: Type of operation: conversion to organic aquaculture; participation in EMAS |
| E. Number of employees benefiting | Infosys code of measure II.9.2 |
| F. Total area concerned | Infosys code of measure II.9.3 |
| G. Production (tonnes) of beneficiaries supported | RI 2.6 Change in the volume of aquaculture production certified under voluntary sustainability schemes |
| H. Aquaculture farms providing environmental services (improving the quality of land, water or air) | RI 2.7 Aquaculture farms providing environmental services |
| I. Number of beneficiaries participating in EMAS | Infosys code of measure II.9.1 |
| J. Average amount of compensation | Infosys code of measure II.9.1 |
| K. Share of average amount of compensation related to total turnover of the beneficiaries | MA, beneficiaries |


2.2.4 Specific Objective 2.4 Promotion off aquaculture having a high level of environmental protection, and the promotion of animal health and welfare and of public health and safety

KEY EVALUATION QUESTION 2.4: To what extent has EMFF contributed to “aquaculture having a high level of environmental protection, and the promotion of animal health and welfare and of public health and safety”?

Specific Objective 2.4

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Related Articles | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aquaculture providing environmental services (Art. 54) 2. Public health measures (Art. 55) 3. Animal health and welfare measures (Art. 56) 4. Aquaculture stock insurance (Art. 57) |
| RIs | <p>RI 2.1 Change in volume of aquaculture production</p> <p>RI 2.2 Change in value of aquaculture production</p> <p>RI 2.4 Change in the volume of production organic aquaculture</p> <p>RI 2.5 Change in the volume of production recirculation system</p> <p>RI 2.6 Change in the volume of aquaculture production certified under voluntary sustainability schemes</p> <p>RI 2.7 Aquaculture farms providing environmental services</p> |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 32: Art. 54 Aquaculture providing environmental services

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to aquaculture farms which provide environmental services |
| Key points to consider | <p>To foster the development of aquaculture providing environmental services:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. aquaculture methods compatible with specific environmental needs and subject to specific management requirements resulting from the designation of Natura 2000 areas in accordance with Directives 92/43/EEC and 2009/147/EC b. participation, in terms of costs directly related thereto, in ex-situ conservation and reproduction of aquatic animals, within the framework of conservation and biodiversity restoration programmes developed by public authorities, or under their supervision c. aquaculture operations that include conservation and improvement of the environment and of biodiversity, and management of the landscape and traditional features of aquaculture zones |


| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|---|--|
| A. Total investment | Infosys Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations by type | Infosys code of measure II.10.1: Type of operation: aquaculture in Natura 2000 areas; ex situ conservation and reproduction; aquaculture operations including conservation and improvement of environment and biodiversity |
| E. Type of aquaculture methods supported | MA, beneficiaries |
| F. Number of farms providing environmental services | RI 2.6 Aquaculture farms providing environmental services |
| G. Total area concerned with ex-situ conservation and reproduction of aquatic animals | MA, beneficiaries |

| | |
|---|---|
| H. Area of operations concerned by Natura 2000 (in km ²) | Infosys code of measure II.10.3: Total area concerned by Natura 2000 (in km ²) |
| I. Non Natura 2000 area of operations | Infosys code of measure II.10.4: Total area concerned outside Natura 2000 (in km ²) |
| J. Number of beneficiaries with commitment to aqua-environmental requirements for a minimum period of five years, which goes beyond that required by Union and national law | MA, beneficiaries |
| K. Change in production by type | RI 2.4 Change in the volume of production: organic aquaculture RI 2.5 Change in the volume of production: recirculation system RI 2.6 Change in the volume of aquaculture production certified under voluntary sustainability schemes |
| L. Increase in economic value | RI 2.2 Change in value of aquaculture production |


Effectiveness evaluation fiche 33: Art. 55 Public health measures

| | |
|---|--|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to the promotion of animal health and welfare |
| Key points to consider | Compensation to mollusc farmers for the temporary suspension of harvesting, when this is exclusively to protect public health |
| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
| A. Total investment | Infosys Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations by type | MA, beneficiaries |
| E. Number of beneficiaries benefiting | Infosys code of measure II.1.1: Number of employees benefiting from the operation |
| F. Average support per beneficiary | Infosys Annex I field 14 Infosys code of measure II.12 |
| G. Perception of impact of compensation | MA, beneficiaries |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 34: Art. 56 Animal health and welfare measures

| | |
|---|--|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to enhanced animal health and welfare in aquaculture enterprises |
| Key points to consider | <p>Foster animal health and welfare in aquaculture enterprises, inter alia, in terms of prevention and biosecurity:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. costs of controlling and eradicating diseases in aquaculture b. developing general and species-specific best practices or codes of conduct on biosecurity, animal health and animal welfare needs in aquaculture c. reducing dependence of aquaculture on veterinary medicine d. veterinary or pharmaceutical studies and dissemination and exchange of information of best practices e. establishment and operation of health protection groups f. compensation to mollusc farmers for temporary suspension of harvesting |
| Evaluation indicators (EI) | |
| Source | |
| A. Total investment | Infosys Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations by type | Infosys code of measure II.12.1: Type of operation: control and eradication of diseases; best practices and codes of conduct; reduction of dependence on veterinary medicines; veterinary or pharmaceutical studies and good practices; health protection groups; compensation to mollusc farmers |
| E. Number of employees benefiting from the operation | Infosys code of measure II.12.2: |
| F. Number of beneficiaries | MA, beneficiaries |
| G. Quality of control of diseases | MA, scientists, national food protection/public health agencies, to make it more specific |
| H. Quality of eradication of diseases | MA, scientists, experts |
| I. Change of dependence of aquaculture on veterinary medicine | Infosys code of measure II.12.1: reduction of dependence on veterinary medicines Scientists, experts |
| J. Number of animal health issues which have been resolved | MA, scientists, experts |
| K. Level and quality of implementation of veterinary or pharmaceutical studies | MA, scientists, experts |
| L. Quality and utilisation of dissemination and exchange of information of best practices | MA, beneficiaries, scientists, experts |
| M. Utilisation of health protection groups | Beneficiaries |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 35: Art. 57 Aquaculture stock insurance

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to aquaculture stock insurance |
| Key points to consider | Contribute to aquaculture stock insurance to cover economic losses from: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. natural disasters b. adverse climatic events c. sudden water quality and quantity changes for which the operator is not responsible d. diseases in aquaculture, failure or destruction of production facilities for which the operator is not responsible |

Evaluation indicators (EI)

Source

| | |
|---|--|
| A. Total investment | Infosys Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations | Infosys Annex I field 3 |
| E. Number of beneficiaries benefiting | Infosys code of measure II.1.3: Number of employees benefiting from the operation |
| F. Reasons for economic losses | MA, beneficiaries |
| G. Impact on production | RI 2.1 Change in volume of aquaculture production |
| H. Impact on economic value | RI 2.2 Change in value of aquaculture production |


2.2.5 Specific Objective 2.5 Development of professional training, new professional skill and lifelong learning

KEY EVALUATION QUESTION 2.5: To what extent has EMFF contributed to “development of professional training, new professional skill and lifelong learning”

Specific Objective 2.5

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Related Articles | Human capital and networking. (Art. 50) |
| RIs | RI 2.8 Employment created RI 2.9 Employment maintained |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 36: Art. 50 Promotion of human capital and networking

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | FF contributed to improved human capital and networking |
| Key points to consider | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. professional training, lifelong learning, the dissemination of scientific and technical knowledge and innovative practices, the acquisition of new professional skills in aquaculture and with regard to the reduction of the environmental impact of aquaculture operations 2. improving working conditions and promoting occupational safety 3. networking and exchanging experiences and best practices among aquaculture enterprises or professional organisations and other stakeholders, including scientific and technical bodies or those promoting equal opportunities between men and women |

| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|--|---|
| A. Total investment | Infosys Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations by type | Infosys code of measure II.6.1: Type of activity: professional training; lifelong learning; dissemination; new professional skills; improvement of working conditions and promotion of occupational safety; networking and exchange of experience |
| E. Number of employees benefiting from the operation | Infosys code of measure II.6.2: Number of employees benefiting from the operation |
| F. Number of spouses and life-partners benefiting from the operation | Infosys code of measure II.6.3: Number of spouses and life-partners benefiting from the operation |
| G. Number of women participating in the operations | MA, beneficiaries |
| H. Perceived improvement of working conditions | Participants |
| I. Perceived benefit of networking and exchange of experience | Participants |
| J. Quality of the training | Participants |

| | |
|--|------------------|
| K. Implementation of training input, technical knowledge gained | Participants |
| L. Improved working conditions | MA, participants |
| M. Roll-out of results gained by networking and exchange of experience | MA, participants |
| N. Employment maintained | RI 2.9 |

2.3 UP3 Fostering implementation of the CFP

Measures based on articles 76 and 77 are different from the others, since they are “hybrids” between direct and shared management.

Data collection (and to a lesser extent control) is undertaken within the framework of a multi-annual programme, which is considered as one operation. However, the evaluation has to look into the detailed operations.

The evaluation approach might need to rely much more on qualitative data collection, since there will not be much information in Infosys.


2.3.1 Specific Objective 3.1 Improvement and supply of scientific knowledge and collection and management of data

KEY EVALUATION QUESTION 3.1: To what extent has EMFF contributed to “improvement and supply of scientific knowledge and collection and management of data”?

Specific Objective 3.1

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Related Articles | Improvement and supply of scientific knowledge and collection and management of data. |
| RIs | RI 3.B.1 Improvement of % of fulfilment of data calls |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 37: Art. 77 Data collection

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to the improvement of data collection system |
| Key points to consider | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. collection, management and use of data for scientific analysis and implementation of the CFP 2. national, transnational and subnational multiannual sampling programmes, provided that they relate to stocks covered by the CFP 3. at-sea monitoring of commercial and recreational fisheries, including monitoring of by-catch of marine organisms such as marine mammals and birds 4. research surveys at sea 5. participation of representatives of MSs and regional authorities in regional coordination meetings, meetings of regional fisheries management organisations of which the Union is a contracting party or an observer, or meetings of international bodies responsible for providing scientific advice 6. improvement of data collection and data management systems, and implementation of pilot studies to improve existing data collection and data management systems |

| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|---|--|
| A. Budget allocated to operation specified by type | Infosys Annex 1 field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Type of beneficiary | Infosys code of measure IV.2 |
| E. Improvement of data collection system | RI 3.B.1: Improvement of % of fulfilment of data calls |
| F. Performance improvement in area | Conclusions of evaluations done by Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) Scientists |


2.3.2 Specific Objective 3.2 Provision of support to monitoring, control and enforcement, enhancing institutional capacity and the efficiency of public administrations without increasing the administrative burden

KEY EVALUATION QUESTION 3.2: To what extent has EMFF contributed to better “control and enforcement”?

Specific Objective 3.2

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Related Articles | Control and enforcement (Art. 76). |
| RIs | RI 3.A.1 Numbers of serious infringements detected RI 3.A.2 Landings that have been the subject to physical control |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 38: Art. 76 Control and enforcement

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to an improved control and enforcement |
| Key points to consider | Funding to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. purchase, install and develop technology b. purchase, install and develop components for data transmission c. purchase, install and develop components needed to ensure traceability d. implement programmes to exchange and analyse data e. modernise or purchase patrol vessels and aircraft f. purchase other means of control g. develop innovative control and monitoring systems and pilot projects h. provide training and exchange programmes i. carry out cost/benefit analyses and assessments of audits j. run seminars and media tools k. cover operational costs l. implement action plans |

| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|--|--|
| A. Budget allocated to operations specified by type | Infosys Annex 1 field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations by type | Infosys code of measure IV.1.1: Type of operation |
| E. Results achieved by type of operation specified. | Beneficiaries |
| F. Capacity improvement related to Equipment and training, | Beneficiaries |
| G. Performance improvement in area covered | Beneficiaries |
| H. Numbers of serious infringements detected | RI 3.A.1 |
| I. Landings that have been subject to physical control | RI 3.A.2 |

2.4 UP4 Increasing employment and territorial cohesion

2.4.1 Specific Objective 4.1 Promotion of economic growth, social inclusion and job creation, and providing support to employability and labour mobility in coastal and inland communities which depend on fishing and aquaculture, including the diversification of activities within fisheries and into other sectors of the maritime economy

KEY EVALUATION QUESTION 4.1: To what extent has EMFF contributed to “economic growth, social inclusion and job creation, and providing support to employability and labour mobility in coastal and inland communities which depend on fishing and aquaculture, including the diversification of activities within fisheries and into other sectors of the maritime economy”?

Specific Objective 4.1


| | |
|------------------|--|
| Related Articles | 1. Preparatory actions (Art. 62.1.a) 2. Implementation of community-led local development strategies (Art. 63) 3. Cooperation activities (Art. 64) |
| RIs | RI 4.1 Employment created (FTE) RI 4.2 Employment maintained (FTE) RI 4.3 Businesses created |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 39: Art. 62.1.a Support from the EMFF for community-led local development

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to community-led local development |
| Key points to consider | Actions related to preparatory support |


| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|--|--|
| A. Total investment | Infosys Annex 1 field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of beneficiaries receiving support for preparatory actions by type | Infosys code of measure III.1: Type of beneficiary |
| E. Number of preparatory actions | Number of operations in Infosys |
| F. Contribution to better CLLD Strategies | MA |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 40: Art. 63 Implementation of community-led local development strategies

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | EMFF contributed to implementation of community-led local development strategies |
| Key points to consider | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adding value, creating jobs, attracting young people and promoting innovation at all stages of the supply chain of fishery and aquaculture products 2. Supporting diversification inside or outside commercial fisheries, lifelong learning and job creation in fisheries and aquaculture areas 3. Enhancing and capitalising on the environmental assets of the fisheries and aquaculture areas, including operations to mitigate climate change 4. Promoting social well-being and cultural heritage in fisheries and aquaculture areas, including fisheries, aquaculture and maritime cultural heritage 5. Strengthening the role of fisheries communities in local development and the governance of local fisheries resources and maritime activities |

| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|---|---|
| A. Total investment | Infosys Annex 1 field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Type of operations | Infosys code of measure III.3: Type of operation: adding value; diversification; environment; socio-cultural; governance; running costs and animation |
| E. Number of partners by type | Infosys code of measure III.2.2: Number of public partners in FLAGs Infosys code of measure III.2.3: Number of private partners in FLAGs Infosys code of measure III.2.4: Number of civil society partners in FLAGs |
| F. Number of employees in the FLAG | Infosys code of measure III.2.5: Number of FTE employed by FLAG for administration Infosys code of measure III.2.6: Number of FTE employed by FLAG for animation |
| G. Population benefiting | Infosys code of measure III.2.1: Total population covered by FLAG |
| H. Employment created (FTE) | RI 4.1 Employment created (FTE) |
| I. Employment maintained (FTE) | RI 4.2 Employment maintained (FTE) |
| J. Number of business created | RI 4.3 Businesses created |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 41: Art. 64 Cooperation activities

| | |
|---|--|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | Contribution of EMFF to better cooperation supporting the implementation of the Local Development Strategy |
| Key points to consider | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for inter-territorial and transnational cooperation projects 2. Preparatory technical support for inter-territorial and transnational cooperation projects |
| Evaluation indicators (EI) | |
| A. Total investment | Infosys Annex 1 field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Type of cooperation | Infosys code of measure III.4: Type of operation: preparatory support; projects within the same MS; projects with other MS; projects with partners outside the EU |
| E. Number of operations by type | Infosys code of measure III.4.1: Type of operation: adding value; diversification; environment; socio-cultural; governance; running costs and animation |
| F. Number of partners | Infosys code of measure III.4.2: Number of partners |
| G. Quality and intensity of cooperation | MA |

2.5 UP5 Fostering marketing and processing


2.5.1 Specific Objective 5.1 Improvement of market organisation for fishery and aquaculture products

KEY EVALUATION QUESTION 5.1: To what extent has EMFF contributed to “improvement of market organisation for fishery and aquaculture products”?

Specific Objective 5.1


| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Related Articles | 1. Production and marketing plans (Art. 66) 2. Storage aid (Art. 67) 3. Marketing measures (Art. 68) 4. Compensation regime (Art. 70) |
| RIs | RI 5.1.a Change in value of first sales in POs RI 5.1.b Change in volume of first sales in POs RI 5.1.c Change in value of first sales in non- POs RI 5.1.d Change in volume of first sales in non- POs |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 42: Art. 66 Production and marketing plans

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | Contribution of EMFF to improve preparation and implementation of production and marketing plans |
| Key points to consider | Actions related to preparation and implementation of production and marketing plans referred to in Article 28 of Regulation (EU) No 1379/2013 |

| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|---|--|
| A. Total investment | Infosys Annex 1 field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of production/marketing plans (operations) supported | Infosys Annex I field 3 |
| E. Number of members of producers organisations involved | Infosys code of measure IV.1.: Number of members of producers' organisations involved |
| F. Average support per beneficiary | Infosys Annex I field 10 |
| G. Scope of the prepared production plans (e.g. species, volume of sales, marketing channels, scale in relation to total PO activities, etc.) | MA, beneficiaries, stakeholders |
| H. Number of production/marketing plans implemented | MA, beneficiaries, stakeholders |
| I. Quality of the marketing plans | MA, beneficiaries, stakeholders |
| J. Increased volume and value of products sold by POs | RI 5.1.a Change in value of first sales in POs RI 5.1.b Change in volume of first sales in POs |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 43: Art. 67 Storage aid

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | Contribution of EMFF to storage aid |
| Key points to consider | Compensation to recognised producer organisations and associations of producers organisations that store fishery products |

| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|---|--|
| A. Total investment | Infosys Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of Producers Organizations members benefiting from the operation; | Infosys code of measure IV.2.: Number of producers' organisations members benefiting from the operation |
| E. Occasions when storage aid was provided; | MA |
| F. Volume and value of stored products reintroduced to the market | MA |
| G. Volume of species for which storage aid was granted; | MA, experts |
| H. Value of species for which storage aid was granted, after it was sold | MA, experts |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 44: Art. 68 Marketing measures

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | Contribution of EMFF to marketing measures |
| Key points to consider | <p>Marketing measures to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. create producer organisations, associations of producer organisations or inter-branch organisations⁸ b. find new markets and improve conditions for marketing fishery and aquaculture products: (i) species with marketing potential; (ii) unwanted catches landed from commercial stocks⁹; (iii) fishery and aquaculture products obtained using methods with low impact on the environment, or organic aquaculture products¹⁰ c. promote quality and value added by facilitating: (i) the application for registration of a given product and the adaptation of operators to the relevant compliance and certification requirements¹¹; (ii) the certification and promotion of sustainable fishery and aquaculture products, including products from small-scale coastal fishing, and of environmentally-friendly processing methods; (iii) direct marketing of fishery products by small-scale coastal fishermen or by on-foot fishermen; (iv) presentation and packaging of products d. contribute to the transparency of production and markets, and conduct market surveys and studies on the Union's dependence on imports e. contribute to the traceability of fishery or aquaculture products, including development of a Union-wide ecolabel for fishery and aquaculture products as referred to in Regulation (EU) No 1379/2013 f. Drawing up standard contracts for SMEs that are compatible with Union law g. Conducting regional, national or transnational communication and promotional campaigns to raise public awareness of sustainable fishery and aquaculture products |

Evaluation indicators (EI)

Source

| | |
|---|---|
| A. Number of operations by type | <p>Infosys code of measure IV.3.1: Type of operation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. create producers' organisations, association or inter-branch organisations b. find new markets and improve marketing conditions (focus on species with marketing potential) c. find new markets and improve marketing conditions (focus on unwanted catches) d. find new markets and improve marketing conditions (focus on products with low impact or organic products) e. promoting quality and value-added (focus on certification and promotion sustainable products) f. promoting quality and value-added (focus on quality schemes) g. promoting quality and value-added (focus on direct marketing) h. promoting quality and value-added (focus on packaging) i. transparency of production j. traceability and eco-labels k. standard contracts l. communication and promotional campaigns |
| B. Absorption rate | <p>Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget</p> |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | <p>AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value</p> |
| D. Number of firms benefiting from the operation | <p>Infosys code of measure IV.3.2: Number of firms benefiting from the operation</p> |

⁸ In accordance with Section II of Chapter II of Regulation (EU) No 1379/2013;


⁹ In accordance with technical measures, Article 15 of Regulation (EU) No 1380/2013 and Article 8(2)(b) of Regulation (EU) No 1379/2013

¹⁰ within the meaning of Regulation (EC) No 834/2007; EN L 149/40 Official Journal of the European Union 20.5.2014

¹¹ in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 1151/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council (1)

| | |
|---|--|
| E. Number of producers' organisations members benefiting from the operation | Infosys code of measure IV.3.3: Number of producers' organisations members benefiting from the operation |
| F. Extent of direct marketing by EU small-scale and coastal fisheries (SSCF) | MA, beneficiaries |
| G. Number/type of products which were certified or registered and its effect on price (value added) | MA, beneficiaries |
| H. Review of action related to traceability | MA, beneficiaries |
| I. Standard contracts which were developed and the extent of their use | MA, beneficiaries |
| J. Intensity of entering new markets | MA, beneficiaries, experts |
| K. Improved conditions for the placing on the market of fishery and aquaculture products | MA, beneficiaries, experts |
| L. Number of promotional campaigns to increase awareness | MA, beneficiaries, experts Results of market surveys conducted |
| M. Increased volume and value of products made available on the market (upon processing, in case of processors) | RI 5.1.a Change in value of first sales in POs RI 5.1.b Change in volume of first sales in POs RI 5.1.c Change in value of first sales in non-POs RI 5.1.d Change in volume of first sales in non-POs |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 45: Art. 70 Compensation regime

| | |
|---|---|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | Contribution of EMFF to successful implementation of compensation regime to overcome disadvantages of outermost regions referred to in Article 349 TFEU |
| Key points to consider | Compensation of additional costs incurred by operators in the fishing, farming, processing and marketing of certain fishery and aquaculture products from the outermost regions referred to in Article 349 TFEU |
| Evaluation indicators (EI) | |
| Source | |
| A. Total investment | Infosys Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of firms benefiting from the operation | Infosys code of measure V.1.2.: Number of firms benefiting from the operation |
| E. Location of beneficiaries | MA, beneficiaries |
| F. Volume of fishery or aquaculture product for which compensation was paid | Beneficiaries, experts |
| G. Impact of compensation measures on economic situation of beneficiaries | Beneficiaries, experts |


2.5.2 Specific Objective 5.2 Encouragement of investment in the processing and marketing sector

KEY EVALUATION QUESTION 5.2: To what extent has EMFF contributed to “encouragement of investment in the processing and marketing sector”?

Specific Objective 5.2

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Related Articles | Promotion of investment in the processing and marketing sector. (Art. 69) |
| RIs | RI 5.1.a Change in value of first sales in POs RI 5.1.b Change in volume of first sales in POs RI 5.1.c Change in value of first sales in non-POs RI 5.1.d Change in volume of first sales in non-POs |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 46: Art. 69 Processing of fishery and aquaculture products

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | Contribution of EMFF to the improvement of processing of fishery and aquaculture products |
| Key points to consider | <p>Actions that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> contribute to energy saving or reducing the impact on the environment, including waste treatment improve safety, hygiene, health and working conditions support the processing of catches of commercial fish that cannot be destined for human consumption relate to the processing of by-products resulting from main processing activities relate to the processing of organic aquaculture products pursuant to Articles 6 and 7 of Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 lead to new or improved products, new or improved processes, or new or improved management and organisation systems |

| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|--|--|
| A. Total investment | Infosys Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of operations by type | Infosys code of measure IV.4.1.: Type of investment: |
| E. Number of firms supported | Infosys code of measure IV.4.2.: Number of firms supported |
| F. Reduction of environmental impact in different steps of processing activities | Beneficiaries, experts |
| G. Perceived improvement of safety, hygiene, health and working conditions in different steps of processing activities | Beneficiaries, experts |
| H. Improved products, new or improved processes, or new or improved management and organisation systems | Beneficiaries, experts |
| I. Change in value of first sales in non-POs | RI 5.1.c |
| J. Change in volume of first sales in non-POs | RI 5.1.d |

2.6 UP6 Fostering the implementation of the Integrated Maritime Policy


2.6.1 Specific Objective 6.1 Development and the implementation of the Integrated Maritime Policy

KEY EVALUATION QUESTION 6.1: To what extent has EMFF contributed to the “Integrated Maritime Policy”?

Specific Objective 6.1

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Related Articles | Extent to which EMFF operations supported IMP (Art. 80) |
| RI 6.1 | Increase in the Common Information Sharing Environment (CISE) for the surveillance of the EU maritime domain. |
| RI 6.2.a | Change in the coverage of Natura 2000 areas designated under the Birds and Habitats directives. |
| RI 6.2.b | Change in the coverage of other spatial protection measures under Art. 13.4 of the Directive 2008/56/EC. |

Effectiveness evaluation fiche 47: Art. 80 Eligible operations

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Category |  |
| Judgement criteria | Contribution of EMFF to IMP objectives Reg. 1255/2011 |
| Key points to consider | <p>Actions to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> contribute to achieving the objectives of the Integrated Maritime Surveillance (IMS) and, in particular, those of the CISE protect the marine environment, in particular its biodiversity and marine protected areas such as Natura 2000 sites, in accordance with the obligations established in Directives 92/43/EEC and 2009/147/EC improve knowledge of the state of the marine environment, with a view to establishing the monitoring programmes and the programmes of measures provided for in Directive 2008/56/EC |

| Evaluation indicators (EI) | Source |
|---|---|
| A. Total investment | Infosys Annex I field 10 |
| B. Absorption rate | Infosys code of measure Annex I field 10 AIR table 4 Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the MA/total budget |
| C. Progress in reaching the target of output indicators | AIR Table 2 milestones and/or target value compared to cumulative value Number of operations/milestone value Number of operations/target value |
| D. Number of actions by type <ul style="list-style-type: none"> contributing to Integrated Marine System (IMS) contributing to Common Information Sharing Environment (CISE) Marine protected area (MPA) Natura 2000 Establishment of monitoring programme Establishment of measures for a Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) | Infosys code of measure VIII.1.1: Type of operation Infosys code of measure VIII.2.1: Type of operation Infosys code of measure VIII.3.1: Type of operation |

| | |
|---|--|
| E. Coherence between actions and IMP objectives Reg. 1255/2011 | Experts, MA, EC |
| F. Type of beneficiaries | Infosys code of measure VIII.1.: Type of beneficiaries – integrated maritime surveillance Infosys code of measure VIII.2.: Type of beneficiaries – Protection of marine environment, and the sustainable use of marine and coastal resources Infosys code of measure VIII.3.: Type of beneficiaries – Improving the knowledge on the state of the marine environment |
| G. New or enlarged or better-managed Natura 2000 and other protected areas | Infosys code of measure VIII.2.: Surface of MPA covered Surface of Natura 2000 covered (km ²) |
| H. Improved knowledge on the state of the marine environment | Experts, MA, EC |
| I. Improved monitoring | Experts, MA, EC |
| J. Increase in the Common Information Sharing Environment (CISE) for the surveillance of the EU maritime domain | RI 6.1 |
| K. Change in the coverage of Natura 2000 areas designated under the Birds and Habitats directives | RI 6.2.a |
| L. Change in the coverage of other spatial protection measures under Art. 13.4 of the Directive 2008/56/EC | RI 6.2.b |

FAME SUPPORT UNIT

3. IMPACT EVALUATION UP LEVEL

CONTENT

TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 3: Architecture of the evaluation framework for impact assessment at UP level | 84 |
|--|----|

FICHES

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| Impact evaluation fiche 1: UP1 | 85 |
| Impact evaluation fiche 2: UP2 | 87 |
| Impact evaluation fiche 3: UP3 | 88 |
| Impact evaluation fiche 4: UP5 | 89 |
| Impact evaluation fiche 5: UP6 | 90 |

ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|----------------|--|
| AIR | Annual Implementation Report |
| CFP | Common Fisheries Policy |
| CI | Context indicator |
| CISE | Common Information Sharing Environment |
| CLLD | Community-Led Local Development |
| COM | European Commission |
| CPR | Common Provision Regulation |
| DCF | Data Collection Framework |
| DG | Directorate General |
| EI | Evaluation Indicator |
| EMFF | European Maritime and Fisheries Funds |
| EP | Evaluation Plan |
| FAME SU | Fisheries and Aquaculture Monitoring and Evaluation Support Unit – under the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) |
| FLAG | Fisheries Local Action Group |
| GT | Gross tonnage |
| IB | Intermediate body |
| ICES | International Council for the Exploration of the Sea |
| IMP | Integrated Maritime Policy |
| IMS | Integrated Marine Systems |
| JRC | Joint Research Centre |
| KEQ | Key Evaluation Question |
| kW | Kilowatt |
| MA | Managing Authority |
| MC | Monitoring Committee |
| MPA | Marine Protected Area |
| MSFD | Marine Strategy Framework Directive |
| OI | Output Indicator |
| OP | Operational Programme |
| PO | Producer Organisation |
| RI | Result Indicator |
| SFC | Electronic exchange of information concerning shared Fund management between Member States and the European Commission |
| STECF | Scientific, Technical and economic Committee on Fisheries |
| SWOT | Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats. |
| ToR | Terms of Reference |
| UP | Union priority |

3. IMPACT EVALUATION (UP LEVEL) – FICHES

The impact evaluation is conducted at two different levels. Impact should be evaluated at UP level with a long-term view, while effectiveness needs to be evaluated at SO/measure level:

- the impact evaluation takes into account changes in the policy context and the effects that can be attributed to the EMFF programme (toolbox section 0);
- the effectiveness evaluation addresses the achievements of operations funded under the EMFF OP (toolbox section 2). The results of the effectiveness evaluation feed into the overall fiche on impact evaluation.

Table 3 Reference source not found. below shows the structure of the impact evaluation.

Table 3: Architecture of the evaluation framework for impact assessment at UP level

| Key evaluation question (KEQ) reflecting the UP objective(s) | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| Judgment criteria (JC) related to the KEQ | Key points to be considered related to the JC | Impact assessment | |
| | | Change in the context/policy field/sector | Contribution of operations funded under the EMFF OP to the observed change |
| UP objective formulated as a long-term impact | Specific aspect under a UP objective which can be assessed by common result indicators | Change in the sector/policy field is caused by external factors and EMFF contribution. It is assessed through a list of appropriate context indicators. | Achievements of the EMFF OP reported via common result indicators: the sum of indicators for each UP, and qualitative conclusions for the effectiveness evaluation |

Comparisons between context and result indicators are not always possible, and at this level a purely quantitative evaluation is certainly not possible. Instead, the system should provide a basis for answering the evaluation question qualitatively, based on the judgment criteria.

3.1 Impact evaluation fiche – UP1

Evaluation question (EQ UP1): What impact has the EMFF OP had in promoting environmentally sustainable, resource-efficient, innovative, competitive and knowledge-based fisheries?

Impact evaluation fiche 1: UP1

| Judgment criteria | Key points to consider | Impact assessment | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | | Change in the context/policy field/sector | Contribution of operations funded under the EMFF OP to the observed change |
| Environmental sustainability has improved | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limitation of the impact of fishing on the marine environment Reduction of unwanted catch in fisheries Better balance between fishing capacity and available fishing opportunities Increase in marine protected areas | <p>Change in context against the baseline situation observed through the following context indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CI_1.1 Fishing fleet CI_1.5 Indicators of biological sustainability CI_1.7 Ecosystem indicators as defined for the implementation of Directive 2008/56/EC CI_1.10 Coverage of marine protected areas | <p>Achievements of the EMFF measures (e.g. Art. 37, 38, 39, 40.1.a, 43.2) which effect the observed change in the context, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total investment (EMFF, national, beneficiary), number of operations by type, and achieved results of operations related to the key points Quantification of the result indicators at operations level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RI_1.6 Change in the % of unbalanced fleets RI_1.4 Change in unwanted catches (in tonnes and %) RI_1.10 Change in the coverage of marine protected areas relevant to UP 1 |
| Resource efficiency has improved | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased fuel efficiency in fisheries Contribution to climate change mitigation | <p>Change in context against the baseline situation observed through the following context indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CI_1.1 Fishing fleet (kW) CI_1.6 Fuel efficiency of fish capture | <p>Achievements of the EMFF measures (e.g. Art. 26, 28, 37, 38, 39, 40.1a, 41.1 a, b, c, 41.2, 43.2) which effect the observed change in the context, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total investment (EMFF, national, beneficiary), number of operations by type, and achieved results of operations related to the key points Quantification of the indicator at operations level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RI_1.5 Change in fuel efficiency of fish capture (in litres per tonne landed catch) OI 1.7 “Energy efficiency and mitigation of climate change Number of operations Art.41.1.a,b,c (+44.1.d)” and respective operation implementation data OI 1.8 “Replacement or modernisation of engines Number of operations” and respective operation implementation data |
| Competitiveness has improved | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased labour productivity (incl. SSCF) Increased net profits (difference between revenue and overall costs) (incl. SSCF) Increased return on investment (incl. SSCF) | <p>Change in context against the baseline situation observed through the following context indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CI_1.2 Gross value added per FTE employee (thousand EUR per FTE employee) CI_1.3 Net profit (thousand EUR) CI_1.4 Return on investment of fixed tangible assets (in %) | <p>Achievements of the EMFF measures (Art. 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 40.1.h, 41.1.a, b, c, 41.2, 42, 43.1+3) which effect the observed change in the context, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total investment (EMFF, national, beneficiary), number of operations by type and achieved results of operations related to the key points Quantification of the result indicators at operations level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RI_1.3 Change in net profits (thousand EUR) RI_1.1 Change in the value of production RI_1.2 Change in the volume of production Calculation/isolation of the above indicators for SSCF based on Infosys, Annex I, field 7 (beneficiary natural person or not), field 8 (size of enterprises and Annex II, CFR type of vessel). |

| Judgment criteria | Key points to consider | Impact assessment | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | Change in the context/policy field/sector | Contribution of operations funded under the EMFF OP to the observed change |
| Economic viability has improved | <p>Improved employment opportunities in aquaculture sector in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created new jobs (permanent or recurring) Safeguarded jobs (permanent or recurring) Improved qualitative factors for employment <p>Safety of work in fisheries has improved in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced injuries in fishery workplaces | <p>Change in context against the baseline situation observed through the following context indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CI_1.8 Number of employed persons (FTE in the fisheries or maritime sector) CI_1.9 Incidence of work-related injuries and accidents (total number, and % in relation to total number of fishermen) | <p>Achievements of the EMFF measures (e.g. Art. 29.1+2, 29.3, 30, 31, 42, 43.1+3) which effect the observed change in the context, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total investment (EMFF, national, beneficiary), number of operations by type, and achieved results of operations related to the key points Quantification of the result indicators at operations level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RI_1.7 Employment created in the fisheries sector or complementary activities (FTE) RI_1.8 Employment maintained in the fisheries sector or complementary activities (FTE) RI_1.9 Change in the work-related injuries and accidents (total number, and % in relation to total number of fishermen) |
| Innovation | <p>Incremental innovation in fisheries Innovative infrastructure in fisheries</p> | <p>General level of innovation (incremental, process, technology) in the fishery sector</p> | <p>Aggregation of evaluation result of the evaluation at SO/measure level of those measures in the innovation category</p> |
| Human capital Knowledge | <p>Knowledge increase in fisheries Type of knowledge developed in fisheries</p> | <p>General knowledge gains in the fishery sector</p> | <p>Aggregation of evaluation result of the evaluation at SO/measure level of those measures in the human capital and knowledge category.</p> |

3.2 Impact evaluation fiche – UP2

Evaluation question (EQ UP2): What is the impact of the EMFF programme in promoting environmentally sustainable, resource-efficient, innovative, competitive and knowledge-based aquaculture?

Impact evaluation fiche 2: UP2

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| Environmental sustainability has improved | Promotion of environmentally sustainable aquaculture | Change in context against the baseline situation observed through the following context indicator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CI_2.4 Volume of production organic aquaculture | Achievements of the EMFF measures (e.g. Art. 48, 53, 54) which effect the observed change in the context, e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total investment (EMFF, national, beneficiary),, number of operations by type, and achieved results of operations related to the key points Quantification of the result indicators at operations level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RI_2.4 Change in the volume of production organic aquaculture (tonnes) RI_2.6 Change in the volume of aquaculture production certified under voluntary sustainability schemes (tonnes) RI_2.7 Aquaculture farms providing environmental services (number) |
| Resource efficiency has improved | Improved efficiency of water usage in aquaculture | Change in context against the baseline situation observed through the following context indicator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CI_2.5 Volume of production recirculation system (tonnes) | Achievements of the EMFF measures (e.g. Art. 48) which effect the observed change in the context, e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total investment (EMFF, national, beneficiary), number of operations by type, and achieved results of operations related to the key points Quantification of the result indicators at operations level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RI_2.5 Change in the volume of production recirculation system (tonnes) |
| Competitiveness has improved | Improved economic performance of aquaculture enterprises in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in processed products from own primary production Increased revenues and cost-efficiency leading to increased net profits | Change in context against the baseline situation observed through the following context indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CI_2.1 Volume of aquaculture production CI_2.2 Value of aquaculture production (thousand EUR) CI_2.3 Net profit (thousand EUR) | Achievements of the EMFF measures (e.g. Art. 47, 48.1.a-d, f-h, 49, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57) which effect the observed change in the context, e.g. Total investment (EMFF, national, beneficiary), number of operations by type and achieved results of operations related to the key points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantification of the result indicators at operations level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RI_2.1 Change in volume of aquaculture production (tonnes) RI_2.2 Change in value of aquaculture production (thousand EUR) RI_2.3 Change in net profit (thousand EUR) |
| Economic viability has improved | Improved employment opportunities in aquaculture sector in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created new jobs (permanent or recurring) Safeguarded jobs (permanent or recurring) Improved qualitative factors of employment | Change in context against the baseline situation observed through the following context indicator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CI_2.6 Number of employed (FTE in the aquaculture sector) | Achievements of the EMFF measures (e.g. Art. 48.1.a-d, f-h, 52, 50) which effect the observed change in the context, e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total investment (EMFF, national, beneficiary), number of operations by type and achieved results of operations related to the key points Quantification of the result indicators at operations level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RI_2.8 Employment created (FTE in the aquaculture sector) RI_2.9 Employment maintained (FTE in the aquaculture sector) |
| Innovation | Incremental innovation in aquaculture Innovative infrastructure in aquaculture | General level of innovation (incremental, process, technology) in aquaculture | Aggregation of evaluation result of the evaluation at SO/measure level of those measures in the innovation category |

| Judgment criteria | Key points to consider | Impact assessment | |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | Change in the context/policy field/sector | Contribution of operations funded under the EMFF OP to the observed change |
| Human capital Knowledge | Knowledge increase in aquaculture Type of knowledge developed | General knowledge gain in the aquaculture sector | Aggregation of evaluation result of the evaluation at SO/measure level of those measures in the human capital and knowledge category |

3.3 Impact evaluation fiche – UP3

Evaluation question (EQ UP3): What is the impact of the EMFF programme in supporting data collection, control and enforcement?

Impact evaluation fiche 3: UP3

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Data collection has improved | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved availability and quality of data provision to JRC and ICES Increased capacity of the MS and EMFF programmes (e.g. DFC correspondent) to respond satisfactorily to data calls by JRC and ICES | Change in context against the baseline situation observed through the following context indicator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CI_3.B Fulfilment of data calls under DCF (%) | Achievements of the EMFF measures (e.g. Art. 77) which effect the observed change in the context, e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total investment (EMFF, national, beneficiary) and achieved results of operations related to the key points Quantification of the result indicators at operations level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RI_3.B Increase in the % of fulfilment of data calls (%) |
| Control and enforcement has improved | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased capacity of the control and enforcement authorities Increased resources and technologies available for control leading to fewer serious infringements and higher volumes of landings controlled by fisheries inspectors | Change in context against the baseline situation observed through the following context indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CI_3.A1 Serious infringements in the MS (total number in the last 7 years) CI_3.A2 Landings that are subject to physical control (%) CI_3.A3 Existing resources available for control (4 sub-indicators) | Achievements of the EMFF measures (e.g. Art. 76) which effect the observed change in the context, e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total investment (EMFF, national, beneficiary) and achieved results of operations related to the key points Quantification of the result indicators at operations level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RI_3.A1 Amount of serious infringements detected (number) RI_3.A2 Landings that have been the subject to physical control (%) |

3.4 Impact evaluation – UP 4

For UP 4 “Increasing employment and territorial cohesion” we distinguish between two levels of impact, since the implementation of this UP devolves to local groups in the framework of a local development strategy. Actions supported under CLLD should therefore contribute to both levels:

- the level of the OP and
- the local level.

a) The OP level

The level of the OP is the responsibility of the MA, and the impact should be evaluated in terms of the objectives set at the level of the OP. In particular, FLAGs should report to the MA on the UP4 common result indicators applicable to the OP:

- RI 4.1 Employment created (FTE),
- RI 4.2 Employment maintained (FTE),
- RI 4.3 Businesses created.

The MA might want to complement these common result indicators with specific result indicators set at national level, reflecting the role that CLLD should play in the OP strategy. Some MSs might for example want to use the network of FLAGs to support innovative actions in relation to Blue Growth. In that case, they might want to be able to identify the financial support allocated to this type of project and use specific indicators to assess the impact of the projects.

Another point of interest for the MA is to assess which type of local strategy is most suitable to deliver on their national objectives. This can be assessed by looking at the balance of projects across the five types of projects that FLAGs can support.

b) The local level

FLAGs are requested to evaluate their local development strategies (see CPR articles 32, 33 and 34). This is a different exercise from the assessment of local strategy at OP level, since each LDS is different and has its own specific objectives. Indicators and targets should therefore be set at the local level, and evaluation undertaken at that level too, without interference from the MA level.

This type of evaluation is outside the scope of this document. FAME and FARNET will develop a working paper specifically to help local groups with this type of evaluation in 2018.

3.5 Impact evaluation fiche – UP5

Evaluation question (EQ UP5): What is the impact of the EMFF programme on marketing and processing for fishery and aquaculture products?

Impact evaluation fiche 4: UP5

| Judgment criteria | Key points to consider | Impact assessment | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | Change in the context/policy field/sector | Contribution of operations funded under the EMFF OP to the observed change |
| Marketing of fishery and aquaculture products has improved | Improved marketing organisation and measures to increase the volume and value of marketed production | Change in context against the baseline situation observed through the following context indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CI_5.1 Producer organisations associations of POs, interbranch organisations (9 sub-indicators) • CI_5.2 Annual value of turnover of EU marketed production (7 sub-indicators) | Achievements of the EMFF measures (e.g. Art. 66, 67, 68, 69, 70) which effect the observed change in the context, e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total investment (EMFF, national, beneficiary), number of operations by type, and achieved results of operations related to the key points • Quantification of the result indicators at operations level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RI_5.1 Change in EU production, distinguishing between POs and non-POs (4 sub-indicators) |

3.6 Impact evaluation fiche – UP6

Evaluation question (EQ UP6): What is the impact of the EMFF programme on improving knowledge on the state of the marine environment and protecting its biodiversity and marine protected areas?

Impact evaluation fiche 5: UP6

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| <p>Knowledge on the state of the marine environment has improved</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved level of coverage of the surveillance system Increased capacity of the MS and EMFF programmes to contribute to a more complete surveillance system Introduction and adoption of organisational and technical know-how leading to an improved surveillance system | <p>Change in context against the baseline situation observed through the following context indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CI_6.1 Common Information Sharing Environment for the surveillance of the EU maritime domain (%) | <p>Achievements of the EMFF measures (e.g. Art. 80.1.a, 80.1.b, 80.1.c) which effect the observed change in the context, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total investment (EMFF, national, beneficiary), number of operations by type, and achieved results of operations related to the key points Quantification of the result indicators at operations level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RI_6.1 Increase in the Common Information Sharing Environment) for the surveillance of the EU maritime domain (%) |
| <p>The marine environment and its biodiversity and marine protected areas have been supported</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spatial extension of marine protected areas (MPAs) Improved knowledge on marine protected areas Improved management of marine protected areas | <p>Change in context against the baseline situation observed through the following context indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CI_6.2 Coverage of marine protected areas (2 sub-indicators) | <p>Achievements of the EMFF measures (e.g. Art. 80.1.a, 80.1.b, 80.1.c) which effect the observed change in the context, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total investment (EMFF, national, beneficiary), number of operations by type, and achieved results of operations related to the key points Quantification of the result indicators at operations level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RI_6.2 Change in the coverage of marine protected areas relevant to UP 6 (2 sub-indicators) |

FAME SUPPORT UNIT

4. METHODOLOGY

ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|----------------|--|
| AIR | Annual Implementation Report |
| CFP | Common Fisheries Policy |
| CI | Context indicator |
| CISE | Common Information Sharing Environment |
| CLLD | Community-Led Local Development |
| COM | European Commission |
| CPR | Common Provision Regulation |
| DCF | Data Collection Framework |
| DG | Directorate General |
| EI | Evaluation Indicator |
| EMFF | European Maritime and Fisheries Funds |
| EP | Evaluation Plan |
| FAME SU | Fisheries and Aquaculture Monitoring and Evaluation Support Unit – under the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) |
| FLAG | Fisheries Local Action Group |
| GT | Gross tonnage |
| IB | Intermediate body |
| ICES | International Council for the Exploration of the Sea |
| IMP | Integrated Maritime Policy |
| IMS | Integrated Marine Systems |
| JRC | Joint Research Centre |
| KEQ | Key Evaluation Question |
| kW | Kilowatt |
| MA | Managing Authority |
| MC | Monitoring Committee |
| MPA | Marine Protected Area |
| MSFD | Marine Strategy Framework Directive |
| OI | Output Indicator |
| OP | Operational Programme |
| PO | Producer Organisation |
| RI | Result Indicator |
| SFC | Electronic exchange of information concerning shared Fund management between Member States and the European Commission |
| STECF | Scientific, Technical and economic Committee on Fisheries |
| SWOT | Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats. |
| ToR | Terms of Reference |
| UP | Union priority |

4. METHODOLOGY

The following section includes a pragmatic list of specific and tested evaluation methods.

The methodologies fall into three types:

- basic evaluation methods based on information provided by Infosys and programme management – Methodology Table 1;
- in-depth qualitative methods based on interviews, surveys, etc. – Methodology Table 2;
- quantitative methods: counterfactual methods – Methodology Table 3.

For EMFF evaluations, basic evaluation methods and in-depth qualitative methods are generally the most suitable.

For each type of evaluation, the evaluator should link the evaluation fiche with the most suitable methodologies. For this purpose, the methodology tables 1–3 contain appropriate information in the following columns:

- Specific evaluation methods: title of the methodology;
- Type of evaluation: indicates whether it is for process, effectiveness, or impact;
- Categories: this column indicates for which category the methodology is most suitable. For process and effectiveness evaluations, specific categories have been defined:
 - Process evaluation: partnership, implementation, communication;
 - Effectiveness evaluation: Business development, Environment, Human capital, Institutional capacity building, Innovation, CLLD (see Error! Reference source not found.in the section on effectiveness evaluation);
- Indicative number of person-days (min–max) needed for each methodology in an EMFF context:
- Approach: explains the type of methodology.

This categorisation is supplemented by references to the general approach taken by each methodology (the right-most column of methodology Tables 1–3). The general approach is covered further in Methodology Table 4, which lists information sources for further reading.

Methodology Table 1: Basic methods

| No. | Specific evaluation methods | Type of evaluation (Process/ Impact) | Categories | Indicative no of person-days in EMFF context (min – max) | Approach |
|-----|--|---|-------------|--|--|
| SM1 | Reconstruction of the intervention logic (conceptual model) of the OP/interventions and referencing the assessment to this model (“Meta-method” in EU programmes). The verification of the intervention logic is done by various qualitative and quantitative methods which are outlined below | Process, Effectiveness Impact | All | 5–20 (for the conceptual component only, not including the application of various methods used to verify the intervention logic) | Theory-based evaluation approach (e.g. logical frameworks, programme theory, logic models, theory of change) |
| SM2 | Analysis of financial, procedural and indicator related data collected in the electronic monitoring system (Infosys data Art. 97.1) | Process Efficiency | All | 2–5 (depends on the complexity of data) | Descriptive statistics |
| SM3 | Analysis of project documentation for EMFF operations (e.g. application forms, progress reports, final reports) | Process Effectiveness Efficiency Impact | All | 2–10 (depends on the complexity of data) | Desk research on secondary data without fieldwork |
| SM4 | Analysis of steering and monitoring committee meeting data (participants, minutes, etc.) | Process | Partnership | 1–5 (depends on the complexity of data) | Desk research on secondary data without fieldwork |
| SM5 | Analysis of statistical data in a policy field or sector (e.g. context indicators) | Effectiveness Impact | All | 1–5 (depends on the complexity of data) | Descriptive statistics |

| No. | Specific evaluation methods | Type of evaluation (Process/ Impact) | Categories | Indicative no of person-days in EMFF context (min – max) | Approach |
|-----|--|--|------------|--|---|
| SM6 | Overview and analysis of literature (e.g. review of existing research and evaluation findings such as ex-post evaluations, web publications) | Process Effectiveness Efficiency Impact | All | 1–5 (depends on the complexity of the thematic topic) | Desk research on secondary data without fieldwork |
| SM7 | Management of the evaluation process, reporting and communication of evaluation findings | Process Effectiveness Efficiency Impact | All | 10–30 (depends on the complexity of the evaluation task) | Management, reporting and communication |

Methodology Table 2: In-depth qualitative analysis

| No. | Specific evaluation methods | Type of evaluation (Process/ Impact) | Categories | Indicative no of person-days in EMFF context (min – max) | Approach |
|------------|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|
| ID Qual 1 | Interviews with implementing bodies/managers of EMFF interventions | Process Effectiveness | All | 1–5 (depends on the no of relevant bodies) | Interviews |
| ID Qual 2 | Interviews with selected beneficiaries | Process Effectiveness | All | 1–5 (depends on the size of the sample) | Interviews |
| ID Qual 3 | Interviews with stakeholders and partners | Process Effectiveness | Partnership Implementation | 1–5 (depends on the no of relevant bodies) | Interviews |
| ID Qual 4 | Interviews with selected experts (e.g. Delphi method) | Process Effectiveness Impact | All | 1–5 (depends on the size of panels) | Delphi survey Expert panel |
| ID Qual 5 | Case studies (ideally based on stratified samples) | Process Effectiveness Impact | All | 2–10 (depends on the complexity of the thematic topic) | Case studies |
| ID Qual 6 | Structured focus groups with beneficiaries or experts | Process Effectiveness | All | 3–5 (depends on the no and size of groups) | Focus groups |
| ID Qual 7 | Survey of selected beneficiaries (e.g. by questionnaire) | Process Effectiveness | All | 1–10 (depends on the size of the sample) | Beneficiary surveys |
| ID Qual 8 | Survey of the whole population of beneficiaries (e.g. by online survey) | Process Effectiveness | All | 5–15 (depends on the complexity of the thematic topic) | Beneficiary surveys |
| ID Qual 9 | Qualitative counterfactual evaluation (with adequate control group of non-beneficiaries) (qualitative and participatory method) | Impact | All | 1–5 (depends on the complexity of the thematic topic) | Focus groups with beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries MAPP method with control group |
| ID Qual 10 | Process mapping (e.g. analysis of management systems/workflows in the management of an intervention) | Process | Implementation | 5–10 (depends on the complexity of the thematic topic) | Process maps Workflow diagram Flowcharts |
| ID Qual 11 | Media and communication analysis (techniques to assess the effects of information and communication activities) | Process | Communication | 5–10 (depends on the complexity of the thematic topic) | Media analysis |

Methodology Table 3: In-depth quantitative analysis

| No. | Specific evaluation methods | Type of evaluation (Process/ Impact) | Categories | Indicative no of person-days in EMFF context (min – max) | Approach |
|-------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| ID Quant 1 | Naïve comparison of achievements of programme beneficiaries at the micro-level with a population's average at the macro-level (e.g. development trend in a policy field/sector compared to the development trend at the business level) | Effectiveness Impact | Business development Environment Innovation | 1–5 (depends on the complexity of the thematic topic) | Descriptive statistics |
| ID Quant 2 | Survey of non-beneficiaries/non-protected marine area (in order to establish control groups) | Effectiveness Impact | All | 5–20 (depends on the data collection method) | Econometric counterfactual design |
| ID Quant 3 | Quantitative counterfactual evaluation (e.g. with appropriate matching techniques such as propensity score matching, difference-in-differences method, regression discontinuity) | Effectiveness Impact | Business development Capacity building | 5–10 (data processing only, not including data collection) | Econometric counterfactual design |
| ID Quant 5 | Survey of biogeographical and/or fish biology data (in the framework of applied evaluation case studies, not for research) | Effectiveness Impact | Environment | 5–50 (depends on the data collection method) | Assessment of environmental effects |
| ID Quant 6 | Survey of environmental indicators (e.g. size of fish stock in relation to maximum sustainable yield, age and size balance) (in the framework of applied evaluation case studies, not for research) | Effectiveness Impact | Environment | 5–50 (depends on the data collection method) | Assessment of environmental effects |
| ID Quant 7 | Environmental modelling (simulation of complex environmental systems) (in the framework of applied evaluation case studies, not for research) | Effectiveness Impact | Environment | 5–20 (for use of existing models, not including model development) | Statistical models Simulation models |
| ID Quant 8 | Spatial analysis with geographic information systems, mapping | Effectiveness Impact | Business development Environment Innovation CLLD | 2–10 (data processing only, not including data collection) | Geographic Information Systems Spatial Analytics |
| ID Quant 9 | Cost analysis (e.g. cost-effectiveness analysis, cost-benefit analysis) | Efficiency | All | 5–10 (depends on the complexity of the thematic topic) | Cost analysis |
| ID Quant 10 | Assessment of environmental impact (e.g. life cycle assessment) | Impact | Environment | 10–50 (depends on the complexity of the thematic topic) | Environmental impact assessment (EIA) |

Methodology Table 4: Information sources for overarching methods

| No. | Approaches | Information sources |
|---------------|--|---|
| SM1 | Theory-based evaluation approach (e.g. logical frameworks, programme theory, logic models, theory of change) | Funnell, S., and Rogers, P. (2011). Purposeful program theory: Effective use of theories of change and logic models. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons. EC, Evalsed Sourcebook (2013) Theory-based Impact Evaluation http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/guide/evaluation_sourcebook.pdf Interact Programme, Simon Pringle (2016) Theory Based Impact Evaluation Methods http://www.interact-eu.net/library?field_fields_of_expertise_tid=16#763-presentation-theory-based-impact-evaluation-methods-simon-pringle-0 Metis, WIFO, AEIDL (2014) Investment Support under Rural Development Policy: Programme-theory-based evaluation (TBE) https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/rural-development-reports/investment-support-rdp-2014_en Canadian Government, Centre of Excellence for Evaluation/ CEE (2012) Theory-Based Approaches to Evaluation: Concepts and Practices https://www.canada.ca/en/treasury-board-secretariat/services/audit-evaluation/centre-excellence-evaluation/theory-based-approaches-evaluation-concepts-practices.html |
| ID Qual 1 - 8 | Interviews, Case studies, Delphi surveys, Expert panels, Beneficiary surveys | EC, Evalsed Sourcebook (2013) various chapters http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/guide/evaluation_sourcebook.pdf |
| ID Qual 9 | Qualitative counterfactual evaluation | Metis, WIFO, AEIDL (2014) Investment Support under Rural Development Policy: MAPP method https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/rural-development-reports/investment-support-rdp-2014_en |
| ID Qual 11 | Media analysis | EC/DG for Communication (2015) Toolkit for the evaluation of the communication activities, Version: July 2015 https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/communication-evaluation-toolkit_en.pdf |
| ID Quant 3 | Econometric counterfactual design | Metis, WIFO, AEIDL (2014) Investment Support under Rural Development Policy: Econometric counterfactual design https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/rural-development-reports/investment-support-rdp-2014_en EC, Evalsed Sourcebook (2013) Counterfactual Impact Evaluation, Regression Analysis http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/guide/evaluation_sourcebook.pdf Joint Research Centre/JRC (2015) Synthesis report on the 'Pilot projects to carry out ESF related counterfactual impact evaluations' http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=88&langId=en&eventsId=1086&moreDocuments=yes&tableName=events The World Bank (2010) Handbook on Impact Evaluation Quantitative Methods and Practices https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/2693/520990PUBOEP111010official0Use00only1.pdf |
| ID Quant 4 | Input-output analysis | Metis, WIFO, AEIDL (2014) Investment Support under Rural Development Policy: Input-Output Analysis https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/rural-development-reports/investment-support-rdp-2014_en |
| ID Quant 7 | Statistical models Simulation models | Ferrara A, O. Ivanova O, Kancs d'A (2010) Modelling the Policy Instruments of the EU Cohesion Policy http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/information/publications/working-papers/2010/modelling-the-policy-instruments-of-the-eu-cohesion-policy EC, Evalsed Sourcebook (2013) Models http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/guide/evaluation_sourcebook.pdf |
| ID Quant 9 | Cost analysis | EC, Evalsed Sourcebook (2013) Cost Benefit Analysis, Cost Effectiveness Analysis http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/guide/evaluation_sourcebook.pdf |
| ID Quant 10 | Environmental impact assessment (EIA) | Reference and guidance documents by DG Environment http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eia/eia-support.htm Joint Research Centre (JRC): European Platform on Life Cycle Assessment http://eplca.jrc.ec.europa.eu/?page_id=43 |

FAME SUPPORT UNIT

5. REGULATIONS RELEVANT TO EVALUATION

ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|----------------|--|
| AIR | Annual Implementation Report |
| CFP | Common Fisheries Policy |
| CI | Context indicator |
| CISE | Common Information Sharing Environment |
| CLLD | Community-Led Local Development |
| COM | European Commission |
| CPR | Common Provision Regulation |
| DCF | Data Collection Framework |
| DG | Directorate General |
| EI | Evaluation Indicator |
| EMFF | European Maritime and Fisheries Funds |
| EP | Evaluation Plan |
| FAME SU | Fisheries and Aquaculture Monitoring and Evaluation Support Unit – under the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) |
| FLAG | Fisheries Local Action Group |
| GT | Gross tonnage |
| IB | Intermediate body |
| ICES | International Council for the Exploration of the Sea |
| IMP | Integrated Maritime Policy |
| IMS | Integrated Marine Systems |
| JRC | Joint Research Centre |
| KEQ | Key Evaluation Question |
| kW | Kilowatt |
| MA | Managing Authority |
| MC | Monitoring Committee |
| MPA | Marine Protected Area |
| MSFD | Marine Strategy Framework Directive |
| OI | Output Indicator |
| OP | Operational Programme |
| PO | Producer Organisation |
| RI | Result Indicator |
| SFC | Electronic exchange of information concerning shared Fund management between Member States and the European Commission |
| STECF | Scientific, Technical and economic Committee on Fisheries |
| SWOT | Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats. |
| ToR | Terms of Reference |
| UP | Union priority |

5. RELEVANT REGULATIONS

5.1 General regulations relevant to all ESIF – CPR 1303/2013

| Content of the article | FAME SU comment | Element of the evaluation | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | Preparation of the EMFF evaluation ¹³ | Content of the EMFF evaluation ¹⁴ | Evaluation process and management ¹⁵ |
| <p>Art. 33.1 Community-led local development strategies</p> <p>1. A community-led local development strategy shall contain at least the following elements:</p> <p>(f) a description of the management and monitoring arrangements of the strategy, demonstrating the capacity of the local action group to implement the strategy and a description of specific arrangements for evaluation</p> | <p>Related only to CLLD:</p> <p>CLLD strategy shall contain a description on how to evaluate the activities related to CLLD</p> | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ capacity |
| <p>Art. 34.3 Local action groups</p> <p>3. The tasks of local action groups shall include the following:</p> <p>(g) monitoring the implementation of the community-led local development strategy and the operations supported and carrying out specific evaluation activities linked to that strategy</p> | <p>Related only to CLLD:</p> <p>Local action groups shall carry out specific evaluations linked to the CLLD strategy</p> | | ✓ | |
| <p>Art. 35.1 Support from the ESI Funds for community-led local development</p> <p>1. Support from the ESI Funds concerned for community-led local development shall cover:</p> <p>(d) running costs linked to the management of the implementation of the community-led local development strategy consisting of operating costs, personnel costs, training cost, costs linked to public relations, financial costs as well as the costs linked to monitoring and evaluation of that strategy as referred to in point (g) of Article 34(3)</p> | <p>Related only to CLLD:</p> <p>CLLD evaluations are eligible for EMFF financing</p> | | | ✓ costs |
| <p>Art. 49.4 Functions of the monitoring committee</p> <p>The monitoring committee may make observations to the managing authority regarding implementation and evaluation of the programme including actions related to the reduction of the administrative burden on beneficiaries. The monitoring committee shall monitor actions taken as a result of its observations.</p> | <p>Related only to CLLD:</p> <p>Only indirectly relevant. The MC has an observing role in the evaluation at OP level but not at the level of the local strategies</p> | | | ✓ capacity |

¹³ Related to the time before the actual evaluation starts (mainly evaluation plan, operational programme preparation, data collection)

¹⁴ Relevant to the actual EMFF evaluation content (e.g. what has to be evaluated, what has to be considered)

¹⁵ Relevant to the EMFF evaluation management (e.g. capacity development of MA and evaluators, financial allocation to evaluation, tendering, control and observation, reporting of results in the AIR, monitoring of the EP)

| Content of the article | FAME SU comment | Element of the evaluation | | |
|---|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | | Preparation of the EMFF evaluation | Content of the EMFF evaluation | Evaluation process and management |
| <p>Art. 50.2 and 4</p> <p>Implementation reports</p> <p>2. Annual implementation reports shall set out key information on implementation of the programme and its priorities by reference to the financial data, common and programme-specific indicators and quantified target values, including changes in the value of result indicators where appropriate, and, beginning from the annual implementation report to be submitted in 2017, the milestones defined in the performance framework. The data transmitted shall relate to values for indicators for fully implemented operations and also, where possible, having regard to the stage of implementation, for selected operations. They shall also set out a synthesis of the findings of all evaluations of the programme that have become available during the previous financial year, any issues which affect the performance of the programme, and the measures taken. The annual implementation report to be submitted in 2016 may also set out, where relevant, actions taken to fulfil ex ante conditionalities.</p> <p>4. The annual implementation report to be submitted in 2017 shall set out and assess the information referred to in paragraph 2 and progress made towards achieving the objectives of the programme, including the contribution of the ESI Funds to changes in the value of result indicators, when evidence is available from relevant evaluations. That annual implementation report shall set out the actions taken to fulfil the ex-ante conditionalities not fulfilled at the time of adoption of the programmes. It shall also assess the implementation of actions to take into account the principles set out in Articles 7 and 8, the role of the partners referred to in Article 5 in the implementation of the programme and report on support used for climate change objectives.</p> | <p>Related to all ESIF:</p> <p>The results of the EMFF evaluation shall be summarised in the specific sections of the AIR (AIR section 8)</p> | | | <p>✓ AIR reporting</p> |

| Content of the article | FAME SU comment | Element of the evaluation | | |
|---|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | | Preparation of the EMFF evaluation | Content of the EMFF evaluation | Evaluation process and management |
| <p>Art. 54 General Provisions on Evaluation §1. Evaluations shall be carried out to improve the quality of the design and implementation of programmes, as well as to assess their effectiveness, efficiency and impact. The impact of programmes shall be evaluated, in the light of the mission of each ESI Fund, in relation to the targets under the Union strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth and, having regard to the size of the programme, in relation to GDP and unemployment in the programme area concerned, where appropriate.</p> <p>§2. Member States shall provide the resources necessary for carrying out evaluations, and shall ensure that procedures are in place to produce and collect the data necessary for evaluations, including data related to common and where appropriate programme-specific indicators.</p> <p>§3. Evaluations shall be carried out by internal or external experts that are functionally independent of the authorities responsible for programme implementation. The Commission shall provide guidance on how to carry out evaluations, immediately following the entry into force of this Regulation.</p> <p>§4. All evaluations shall be made available to the public.</p> | <p>Related to all ESIF: Art. 54 of 1303/2013 is the most important article related to evaluation. It describes the main content and procedure of evaluations. The evaluation content includes the following main aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness • Efficiency • Impact | | ✓ | |
| | <p>Related to all ESIF: Paragraphs 2–4 are process-related elements in the EMFF evaluation</p> | ✓ OP Section 10 and 11 | | ✓ capacity |
| <p>Art. 55 Ex ante evaluation</p> | <p>Related to all ESIF: Indirectly relevant. Conclusions and recommendations of the ex-ante evaluation need to be considered in the EMFF evaluation.</p> | ✓ | ✓ | |

| Content of the article | FAME SU comment | Element of the evaluation | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|---|
| | | Preparation of the EMFF evaluation | Content of the EMFF evaluation | Evaluation process and management | | |
| <p>Art. 56 Evaluation during the programming period</p> <p>§1. An evaluation plan shall be drawn up by the managing authority or Member State and may cover more than one programme. It shall be submitted in accordance with the Fund-specific rules.</p> <p>§2. Member States shall ensure that appropriate evaluation capacity is available.</p> <p>§3. During the programming period, the managing authority shall ensure that evaluations, including evaluations to assess effectiveness, efficiency and impact, are carried out for each programme on the basis of the evaluation plan and that each evaluation is subject to appropriate follow-up in accordance with the Fund-specific rules. At least once during the programming period, an evaluation shall assess how support from the ESI Funds has contributed to the objectives for each priority. All evaluations shall be examined by the monitoring committee and sent to the Commission.</p> <p>§4. The Commission may carry out, at its own initiative, evaluations of programmes. It shall inform the managing authority and the results shall be sent to the managing authority and provided to the monitoring committee concerned.</p> | <p>Related to all ESIF:</p> <p>This article refers mainly to the evaluation plan (EP). The EP might need some further development in terms of methodology and content of the evaluation.</p> <p>In many cases the EP as described in the OP is very short and mainly repeats the requirements of the regulation.</p> <p>As already outlined in Art. 54, the evaluation shall address effectiveness, efficiency and impacts.</p> <p>The articles imply that for each programme, more than one evaluation has to take place, assessing how the OP contributes to the UPs (in the case of EMFF).</p> | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| | | | | | ✓ capacity | |
| | | | | | ✓ | |
| | | | | | | ✓ |
| <p>Art. 57 Ex post evaluation</p> | <p>Related to all ESIF:</p> <p>Indirectly relevant. The EMFF evaluations are a source for the ex-post evaluation that will be undertaken by the Commission.</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| <p>Art. 125.2 Functions of the managing authority</p> <p>(d) establish a system to record and store in computerised form data on each operation necessary for monitoring, evaluation, financial management, verification and audit, including data on individual participants in operations, where applicable;</p> | <p>Related to all ESIF:</p> <p>The article refers to the need of MAs to store data adequately and provide the necessary data to evaluators in a suitable format</p> | ✓ | | | | |

5.2 Supplementing regulations relevant to all ESIF – 480/2014

| Content of the article | FAME SU comment | Element of the evaluation | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | | Preparation of the EMFF evaluation | Content of the EMFF evaluation | Evaluation process and management |
| Annex III List of data to be recorded and stored in computerised form in the monitoring system (referred to in Article 24) | Annex III lists all data that should be kept by the MAs for each operation supported. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

5.3 EMFF Regulations

| EC 508/2014 | Content of the article | FAME SU comment | Element of the evaluation | | |
|-------------|---|---|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | | | Preparation of the EMFF evaluation | Content of the EMFF evaluation | Evaluation process and management |
| Art. 107 | Monitoring and evaluation system §1. A common monitoring and evaluation system for EMFF operations under shared management shall be established with a view to measuring the performance of the EMFF. In order to ensure an effective performance measurement, the Commission shall be empowered to adopt delegated acts, in accordance with Article 126, defining the content and construction of that system. | Related to EMFF: Art. 107 § 1 refers to the role and importance of the common monitoring and evaluation system, which is the starting point for evaluation | | | ✓ M&E system |
| | §2. The general impact of the EMFF shall be considered in relation to the Union priorities set out in Article 6. | Related to EMFF: § 2 refers to impact evaluation. Impact evaluation of the OP should assess the contribution of the OP to the Union priorities, with regards to the size of the programme (see also CPR 1303/2013 Art. 54). | | ✓ | |
| Art. 108 | Objectives The objectives of the common monitoring and evaluation system shall be: (a) to demonstrate the progress and achievements of the CFP and the IMP, to consider the general impact and to assess the effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of EMFF operations; (b) to contribute to better targeted support for the CFP and the IMP; (c) to support a common learning process related to monitoring and evaluation; (d) to provide robust, evidenced based evaluations of the EMFF operations that feed into the decision-making process. | Related to EMFF: The evaluation shall consider the evaluation of the OP contribution to the objectives in Art. 108 | | ✓ | |

| EC 508/ 2014 | Content of the article | FAME SU comment | Element of the evaluation | | |
|--------------------|--|---|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| | | | Preparation of the EMFF evaluation | Content of the EMFF evaluation | Evaluation process and management |
| Art. 109 | <p>Common indicators</p> <p>1. A list of common indicators relating to the initial situation as well as to the financial execution, outputs and results of the operational programme and applicable to each operational programme shall be specified in the monitoring and evaluation system provided for in Article 107 to allow for aggregation of data at Union level.</p> <p>2. The common indicators shall be linked to the milestones and targets established in the operational programmes in accordance with the Union priorities set out in Article 6. Those common indicators shall be used for the performance review referred to in Article 21(1) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013, and shall allow assessment of the progress, efficiency and effectiveness of policy implementation against objectives and targets at Union and programme level.</p> | <p>Related to EMFF:</p> <p>Reference to the common indicators and reference to 1303/2013</p> | ✓ | | |
| Art. 111 | <p>Provision of information</p> <p>Beneficiaries of support under EMFF, including FLAGs, shall undertake to provide to the managing authority and/or to appointed evaluators or other bodies to which the performance of functions on its behalf is delegated, all the data and information necessary to permit monitoring and evaluation of the operational programme, in particular in relation to meeting specific objectives and priorities.</p> | <p>Related to EMFF:</p> <p>Beneficiaries are obliged to provide data and information in order to feed the monitoring system with required data and to enable the evaluation of the OP contribution to specific objectives and priorities</p> | ✓ | | |
| Art. 113 | <p>Functions of the monitoring committee</p> <p>(b) examine the activities and outputs related to the evaluation plan of the programme;</p> | <p>Related to EMFF:</p> <p>MC has the task to follow the activities related to the EP</p> | | | ✓ |

| EC 508/ 2014 | Content of the article | FAME SU comment | Element of the evaluation | | |
|--------------------|---|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| | | | Preparation of the EMFF evaluation | Content of the EMFF evaluation | Evaluation process and management |
| Art. 115 | General Provisions on Evaluation § 1. The Commission shall adopt implementing acts laying down the elements to be contained in ex ante evaluation reports referred to in Article 55 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 and establishing the minimum requirements for the evaluation plan referred to in Article 56 of that Regulation. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 127(3) of this Regulation. | Related to EMFF: Relevant in terms of the content of the EP. Art. 115 refers to the CIR. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| | § 2. Member States shall ensure that the evaluations conform to the common monitoring and evaluation system agreed in accordance with Article 107, shall organise the production and gathering of the necessary data, and shall supply the various pieces of information provided by the monitoring system to the evaluators. | Related to EMFF: § 2 refers to the relevance of the monitoring and evaluation system for all evaluations conducted. The information collected in the monitoring system needs to be available to evaluators. It is important to close all existing gaps in the monitoring system before the start of the evaluation in order to provide the best use of evaluators. | ✓ | | |
| | § 3. The evaluation reports shall be made available by Member States on the internet and by the Commission on the Union website. | Related to EMFF: The MS shall publish the full evaluation reports on the internet and on the commission website | | | ✓ publica- tion |
| Art. 116 | Ex ante evaluation | Related to EMFF ex-ante evaluations: Indirectly relevant. The EMFF evaluation should build a strong reference to the ex-ante evaluation of the OP. (see also CPR 1303/2013 Art. 55) | | ✓ | ✓ |

| EC 508/ 2014 | Content of the article | FAME SU comment | Element of the evaluation | | |
|---------------------------|--|---|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| | | | Preparation of the EMFF evaluation | Content of the EMFF evaluation | Evaluation process and management |
| Art. 117 | Ex post evaluation | Related to EMFF ex-post evaluations: The Commission will prepare the ex-post evaluation in close cooperation with the MS. The EMFF evaluation are a source for the ex-post evaluation. (see also CPR 1303/2013 Art. 57). The MS have to provide the necessary information for the ex-post evaluation. | | ✓ | ✓ |
| EMFF CIR 1362/2014 | | | | | |
| Annex Part A | Section 8: Activities in relation to the evaluation plan A summary should be provided on activities undertaken in relation to the implementation of the evaluation plan , including follow-up given to the findings of evaluations. A synthesis of the findings should be provided of all evaluations of the programme that have become available during the previous financial year , with reference of name and reference period of the evaluation reports used. Additionally, the access to evaluations that were made publicly available pursuant to Article 54(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 should be communicated here. | Related to EMFF: The article refers to the implementation of the EP and the reporting requirements in the AIR Part B and C | | | ✓ reporting |
| Annex Part B | Part B — Reporting submitted in 2017, 2019 and by the deadline referred to in Article 138(1) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 (in Addition to Part A) | Related to EMFF: Reporting requirements in the AIR related to EMFF evaluation | | | ✓ reporting |
| Annex Part C | Part C — Reporting Submitted in 2019 and by the Deadline referred to in Article 138(1) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 (in addition to Parts A + B) | | | | |

| EC 508/ 2014 | Content of the article | FAME SU comment | Element of the evaluation | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| | | | Preparation of the EMFF evaluation | Content of the EMFF evaluation | Evaluation process and management |
| EMFF CIR 1014/2014 | | | | | |
| Art. 1 | <p>Content and construction of the monitoring and evaluation system</p> <p>1.The common monitoring and evaluation system referred to in Article 107 of Regulation (EU) No 508/2014 shall be constituted of the following elements:</p> <p>(a) an intervention logic showing the interactions between priorities, focus areas and measures as provided for in Article 18(1)(a) and Article 116 of Regulation (EU) No 508/2014;</p> <p>(b) the set of common indicators referred to in Article 109 of Regulation (EU) No 508/2014;</p> <p>(c) the relevant cumulative data on operations selected for funding, as provided for in Article 97(1)(a) of Regulation (EU) No 508/2014;</p> <p>(d) the annual report on the implementation of the operational programme, as provided for in Article 114 of Regulation (EU) No 508/2014 in conjunction with Article 50 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013;</p> <p>(e) the evaluation plan as provided for in Article 115 of Regulation (EU) No 508/2014 in conjunction with Article 56 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013;</p> <p>(f) the ex-ante and ex post evaluations and all other evaluation activities linked to the EMFF programme, as provided for in Articles 115, 116 and 117 of Regulation (EU) No 508/2014 in conjunction with Article 55, 56 and 57 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013;</p> <p>(g) the performance review as provided for in Article 21(1) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013.</p> <p>2.When applying Articles 97(1)(a) and Articles 114 to 117 of Regulation (EU) No 508/2014, in conjunction with Articles 21(1), 50, 55, 56, 57 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013, the managing authority shall use the list of common indicators referred to in Article 109 of Regulation (EU) No 508/2014 throughout the different elements of the common monitoring and evaluation system.</p> | <p>Related to EMFF:</p> <p>The common monitoring and evaluation system is the basis for evaluation and should contain the aspects listed in Art. 1 of this regulation</p> | ✓ | | ✓ |

| EC 508/ 2014 | Content of the article | FAME SU comment | Element of the evaluation | | |
|--------------------|---|---|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| | | | Preparation of the EMFF evaluation | Content of the EMFF evaluation | Evaluation process and management |
| Annex | Common indicators to be used in the common monitoring and evaluation system: I Context indicators II Output indicators III Result indicators | Related to EMFF: The evaluation should refer to the common indicators in the regulation | ✓ | | |
| EMFF CIR 1242/2014 | | | | | |
| Annexes I-V | | Related to EMFF: Data information listed in the CIR specifies what data the Commission requires | ✓ | | |
| EMFF CIR 1243/2014 | | | | | |
| Annex | Data structure | Related to EMFF: The data structure gives an idea of what data is available for evaluation | ✓ | | |

FAME SUPPORT UNIT

6. EMFF INTERVENTION LOGIC

6. EMFF INTERVENTION LOGIC

UP

Measures

Article 37 Support for the design and implementation of conservation measures and regional cooperation

Article 38 Limiting the impact of fishing on the marine environment and adapting fishing to the protection of species (+ art. 44.1.c Inland fishing)

Article 39 Innovation linked to the conservation of marine biological resources (+ art. 44.1.c Inland fishing)

Article 40.1.a Protection and restoration of marine biodiversity – collection of lost fishing gear and marine litter

Article 43.2 Fishing ports, landing sites, auction halls and shelters – investments to facilitate compliance with the obligation to land all catches

Article 40.1.b-g, i Protection and restoration of marine biodiversity – contribution to a better management or conservation, construction, installation or modernisation of static or movable facilities, preparation of protection and management plans related to NATURA2000 sites and spatial protected areas, management, restoration and monitoring marine protected areas, including NATURA 2000 sites, environmental awareness, participation in other actions aimed at maintaining and enhancing biodiversity and ecosystem services (+ art. 44.6 Inland fishing)

Article 34 Permanent cessation of fishing activities

Article 36 Support to systems of allocation of fishing opportunities

Article 27 Advisory services (+ art. 44.3 Inland fishing)

Article 30 Diversification and new forms of income (+ art. 44.4 Inland fishing)

Article 31 Start-up support for young fishermen (+ art. 44.2 Inland fishing)

Article 32 Health and safety (+ art. 44.1.b Inland fishing)

Article 33 Temporary cessation of fishing activities

Article 35 Mutual funds for adverse climatic events and environmental incidents

Article 40.1.h Protection and restoration of marine biodiversity – schemes for the compensation of damage to catches caused by mammals and birds

Article 42 Added value, product quality and use of unwanted catches (+ art. 44.1.e Inland fishing)

Article 43.1 + 3 Fishing ports, landing sites, auction halls and shelters - investments improving fishing port and auctions halls infrastructure or landing sites and shelters; construction of shelters to improve safety of fishermen (+ art. 44.1.f Inland fishing)

1

| Specific objectives | Code | Result Indicator | Measurement Unit |
|---|--------|---|----------------------------------|
| 1. Reduction of the impact of fisheries on the marine environment, including the avoidance and reduction, as far as possible, of unwanted catches; | 1.4.a | Change in unwanted catches (tonnes) | tonnes |
| | 1.4.b | Change in unwanted catches (%) | % |
| | 1.5 | Change in fuel efficiency of fish capture | litres fuel/ tonnes landed catch |
| 2. Protection and restoration of aquatic biodiversity and ecosystems | 1.5 | Change in fuel efficiency of fish capture | litres fuel/ tonnes landed catch |
| | 1.10.a | Change in the coverage of Natura 2000 areas designated under the Birds and Habitats directives | Km ² |
| | 1.10.b | Change in the coverage of other spatial protection measures under Art. 13.4 of the Directive 2008/56/EC | Km ² |
| 3. Ensuring a balance between fishing capacity and available fishing opportunities | 1.3 | Change in net profits | thousand Euros |
| | 1.6 | Change in the % of unbalanced fleets | % |
| 4. Enhancement of the competitiveness and viability of fisheries enterprises, including of small scale coastal fleet, and the improvement of safety or working conditions | 1.1 | Change in the value of production | thousand Euros |
| | 1.2 | Change in the volume of production | tonnes |
| | 1.3 | Change in net profits | thousand Euros |
| | 1.5 | Change in fuel efficiency of fish capture | litres fuel/ tonnes landed catch |
| | 1.7 | Employment created (FTE) in the fisheries sector or complementary activities | FTE |
| | 1.8 | Employment maintained (FTE) in the fisheries sector or complementary activities | FTE |
| | 1.9.a | Change in the number of work-related injuries and accidents | number |
| | 1.9.b | Change in the % of work-related injuries and accidents in relation to total fishers | % |

UP

Measures

1

Article 26 Innovation (+ art. 44.3 Inland fishing)

Article 28 Partnerships between fishermen and scientists (+ art. 44.3 Inland fishing)

Article 41.1.a, b, c Energy efficiency and mitigation of climate change – on board investments; energy efficiency audits and schemes; studies to assess the contribution of alternative propulsion systems and hull designs (+ art. 44.1.d Inland fishing)

Article 41.2 Energy efficiency and mitigation of climate change - Replacement or modernisation of main or ancillary engines (+ art. 44.1.d Inland fishing)

Article 29.1 + 29.2 Promoting human capital and social dialogue - training, networking, social dialogue; support to spouses and life partners (+ art. 44.1.a Inland fishing)

Article 29.3 Promoting human capital and social dialogue – trainees on board of SSCF vessels / social dialogue (+ art. 44.1.a Inland fishing)

2

Article 47 Innovation

Article 49 Management, relief and advisory services for aquaculture farms

Article 48.1.a-d, f-h Productive investments in aquaculture

Article 52 Encouraging new sustainable aquaculture farmers practising sustainable aquaculture

| Specific objectives | Code | Result Indicator | Measurement Unit |
|--|-------|---|----------------------------------|
| 5. Provision of support to strengthen technological development and innovation, including increasing energy efficiency, and knowledge transfer | 1.1 | Change in the value of production | thousand Euros |
| | 1.2 | Change in the volume of production | tonnes |
| | 1.3 | Change in net profits | thousand Euros |
| | 1.5 | Change in fuel efficiency of fish capture | litres fuel/ tonnes landed catch |
| 6. Development of professional training, new professional skills and lifelong learning | 1.7 | Employment created (FTE) in the fisheries sector or complementary activities | FTE |
| | 1.8 | Employment maintained (FTE) in the fisheries sector or complementary activities | FTE |
| | 1.9.a | Change in the number of work-related injuries and accidents | number |
| | 1.9.b | Change in the % of work-related injuries and accidents in relation to total fishers | % |
| 1. Provision of support to strengthen technological development, innovation and knowledge transfer | 2.1 | Change in volume of aquaculture production | tonnes |
| | 2.2 | Change in value of aquaculture production | thousand Euros |
| | 2.3 | Change in net profit | thousand Euros |
| 2. Enhancement of the competitiveness and viability of aquaculture enterprises, including improvement of safety or working conditions, in particular of SMEs | 2.1 | Change in volume of aquaculture production | tonnes |
| | 2.2 | Change in value of aquaculture production | thousand Euros |
| | 2.3 | Change in net profit | thousand Euros |
| | 2.8 | Employment created | FTE |
| | 2.9 | Employment maintained | FTE |

UP

Measures

Article 48.1.k Productive investments in aquaculture - increasing energy efficiency, renewable energy

Article 48.1.e, i, j Productive investments in aquaculture - resource efficiency, reducing usage of water and chemicals, recirculation systems minimising water use

Article 51 Increasing the potential of aquaculture sites

Article 53 Conversion to eco-management and audit schemes and organic aquaculture

2

Article 54 Aquaculture providing environmental services

Article 55 Public health measures

Article 56 Animal health and welfare measures

Article 57 Aquaculture stock insurance

Article 50 Promoting human capital and networking

| Specific objectives | Code | Result Indicator | Measurement Unit |
|---|------|---|------------------|
| 3. Protection and restoration of aquatic biodiversity and enhancement of ecosystems related to aquaculture and promotion of resource-efficient aquaculture | 2.4 | Change in the volume of production organic aquaculture | tonnes |
| | 2.5 | Change in the volume of production recirculation system | tonnes |
| | 2.6 | Change in the volume of aquaculture production certified under voluntary sustainability schemes | tonnes |
| | 2.7 | Aquaculture farms providing environmental services | number |
| | 2.8 | Employment created | FTE |
| | 2.9 | Employment maintained | FTE |
| 4. Promotion of aquaculture having a high level of environmental protection, and the promotion of animal health and welfare and of public health and safety | 2.1 | Change in volume of aquaculture production | tonnes |
| | 2.2 | Change in value of aquaculture production | thousand Euros |
| | 2.4 | Change in the volume of production organic aquaculture | tonnes |
| | 2.5 | Change in the volume of production recirculation system | tonnes |
| | 2.6 | Change in the volume of aquaculture production certified under voluntary sustainability schemes | tonnes |
| | 2.7 | Aquaculture farms providing environmental services | number |
| 5. Development of professional training, new professional skills and lifelong learning | 2.8 | Employment created | FTE |
| | 2.9 | Employment maintained | FTE |

UP

Measures

3

Article 77 Data collection

Article 76 Control and enforcement

4

Article 62.1.a Preparatory support

Article 63 Implementation of local development strategies (incl. running costs and animation)

Article 64 Cooperation activities

| Specific objectives | Code | Result Indicator | Measurement Unit |
|---------------------|------|------------------|------------------|
|---------------------|------|------------------|------------------|

1. Improvement and supply of scientific knowledge and collection and management of data

3.B.1

Increase in the percentage of fulfilment of data calls

%

2. Provision of support to monitoring, control and enforcement, enhancing institutional capacity and the efficiency of public administration, without increasing the administrative burden

3.A.1

Number of serious infringements detected

number

3.A.2

Landings that have been the subject to physical control

%

Promotion of economic growth, social inclusion and job creation, and providing support to employability and labour mobility in coastal and inland communities which depend on fishing and aquaculture, including the diversification of activities within fisheries and into other sectors of maritime economy

4.1

Employment created (FTE)

FTE

4.2

Employment maintained (FTE)

FTE

4.3

Businesses created

number

UP

Measures

5

Article 66 Production and marketing plans

Article 67 Storage aid

Article 68 Marketing measures

Article 70 Compensation regime

Article 69 Processing of fisheries and aquaculture products

6

Article 80.1.a Integrating Maritime Surveillance

Article 80.1.b Promotion of the protection of marine environment, and the sustainable use of marine and coastal resources

Article 80.1.c Improving the knowledge on the state of the marine environment

TA

Article 78 Technical assistance at the initiative of the Member States

| Specific objectives | Code | Result Indicator | Measurement Unit |
|--|-------|--|------------------|
| 1. Improvement of market organisation for fishery and aquaculture products | 5.1.a | Change in value of first sales in POs | thousand Euros |
| | 5.1.b | Change in volume of first sales in POs | tonnes |
| | 5.1.c | Change in value of first sales in non-POs | thousand Euros |
| | 5.1.d | Change in volume of first sales in non-POs | tonnes |
| 2. Encouragement of investment in the processing and marketing sectors | 5.1.a | Change in value of first sales in POs | thousand Euros |
| | 5.1.b | Change in volume of first sales in POs | tonnes |
| | 5.1.c | Change in value of first sales in non-POs | thousand Euros |
| | 5.1.d | Change in volume of first sales in non-POs | tonnes |
| Development and implementation of the Integrated Maritime Policy | 6.1 | Increase in the Common Information Sharing Environment (CISE) for the surveillance of the EU maritime domain | % |
| | 6.2.a | Change in the coverage of Natura 2000 areas designated under the Birds and Habitats directives | Km ² |
| | 6.2.b | Change in the coverage of other spatial protection measures under Art. 13.4 of the Directive 2008/56/EC | Km ² |
| - | - | - | - |



■ Contact:

FAME Support Unit
Boulevard de la Woluwe 2
B-1150 Brussels
T: +32 2 775 84 44
FAME@fame-emff.eu