



# Assessing the added value of LEADER - Guidelines

Annex 1 Fiches for LEADER added value indicators

16 May 2024



Funded by  
the European Union

## Copyright notice

© European Union, 2024

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

## Recommended citation:

EUROPEAN COMMISSION – Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development – Unit A.3 (2024): Guidelines - Assessing the added value of LEADER. Annex 1 Fiches for LEADER added value indicators.

## 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.



The European Evaluation Helpdesk for the CAP is responsible for providing support for monitoring and evaluation activities at the EU and Member State level. It works under the guidance of DG AGRI's Unit A.3 (Policy Performance Unit) of the Commission. The European Evaluation Helpdesk for the CAP supports all evaluation stakeholders, in particular DG AGRI, national authorities, Managing Authorities and evaluators, through the development and dissemination of appropriate methodologies and tools; the collection and exchange of good practices; capacity building and communicating with network members on evaluation-related topics.

Additional information about the activities of the European Evaluation Helpdesk for the CAP is available on the Internet through the Europa server <https://eu-cap-network.ec.europa.eu/support/evaluation>



# Table of contents

<b>Improved social capital</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Indicator: LAV.O.01. Number of LAG members broken down by type of organisation: a) public administrations; b) private local economic interests; c) social local interests; d) other. ....	1
Indicator: LAV.R.01. Network Diversity Index of the LAG membership (as a proxy of structural social capital of the LAG)..	2
Indicator: LAV.I.01. LAG members that consider a quality cooperation culture has developed between LAG members. ....	4
Indicator: LAV.O.02. Number (or ratio) of operations (projects) jointly implemented by several types of promoters (specifying types) .....	6
Indicator: LAV.O.03. Number of participants in joint operations (projects). ....	7
Indicator: LAV.R.02. Evidence of participants in LEADER projects (operations) who improve their capacity to organise themselves in social groups and integrate into the community fabric. ....	8
Indicator: LAV.I.02. Perception of improved social interactions in the LAG area amongst participants in LEADER projects. ....	10
Indicator: LAV.O.04. Number of interregional cooperation operations (projects) implemented by the LAG. ....	12
Indicator: LAV.O.05. Number of transnational cooperation operations (projects) implemented by LAG. ....	13
Indicator: LAV.R.03. Evidence of the quality of interactions of the LAG members with other (external) actors. ....	14
Indicator: LAV.O.06. Evidence of trust in the LAG. ....	16
Indicator: LAV.R.04. Level of trust of the local community towards the LAG. ....	18
Indicator: LAV.I.03. Change in the trust of the local community towards the LAG. ....	19
Indicator: LAV.O.07. Evidence of shared social awareness in the LAG area. ....	20
Indicator: LAV.R.05. Evidence of shared values in cooperation and/or joint operations (projects), considering (a) capacity to keep agreements; (b) truthfulness in social and economic relationships; (c) responsiveness and respect for the rule of law; and (d) capacity to avoid opportunistic behaviours or free riding. ....	22
Indicator: LAV.I.04. Perception that LAG actions have had an impact on improving local identity and the image of the LAG area, its people, resources and products. ....	24
<b>Improved governance</b> .....	<b>25</b>
Indicator: LAV.O.08. Number of LAG members in the decision-making body by type of organisation they represent, and by gender and age: (a) public administrations; (b) private local economic interests; (c) local social interests; and (d) other (not covered by the previous categories). ....	25
Indicator: LAV.R.06. Evidence of LAG processes that facilitate inclusiveness in local governance. ....	27
Indicator: LAV.I.05. Perception of local community members that the LAG brings together organisations and people in an inclusive manner in decision-making. ....	29
Indicator: LAV.O.09. Number of training/capacity building activities that have helped improve the administrative and technical skills of LAGs by type of organiser (LAG, MA/PA, NN, other bodies). ....	30
Indicator: LAV.R.07. Evidence of improvement of administrative skills. ....	32
Indicator: LAV.R.08. Evidence of improvement of the technical skills of LAGs in the LDS and areas covered by it. ....	34



Indicator: LAV.O.10. Number of animation activities by target stakeholder group, organiser and type of activity.....	36
Indicator: LAV.R.09. Evidence of support (by type of support) provided to applicants and beneficiaries, and, particularly, to those that have not applied or been supported before, including hard-to-reach groups.....	38
Indicator: LAV.I.06. Number of new applicants as a result of animation and support activities.....	40
Indicator: LAV.O.11. Number of LAGs with relevant documents concerning their activities available on a website: a) statutes of the LAG; b) composition of the board; c) minutes of general meetings; d) financial statements (part of annual reports); e) LDS; f) published calls for projects; g) decisions on project selection and descriptions of funded projects; h) LAG evaluations; and i) newsletters.....	41
Indicator: LAV.O.12. Evidence of the LAG's communication activities and their reach e.g. a) existence of a LAG website; b) presence in social media; c) presence in other public common channels; d) meetings/events; and e) other.....	43
Indicator: LAV.R.10. Percentage of local community members who are aware of a) the LAG; b) its activities; and c) the LDS.....	44
Indicator: LAV.I.07. Evidence of local community members that think LEADER brings the EU closer to citizens.....	45
Indicator: LAV.I.08. Evidence of local community members with a perception that the LAG is a credible institution/central agent for local development.....	46
Indicator: LAV.O.13. Number and type of interactions between the MA/PA and LAGs or LAG representatives.....	47
Indicator: LAV.R.11. Evidence of improved quality of interactions between the MA/PA/NN and LAGs or LAG representatives.....	48
Indicator: LAV.I.09. Evidence of a positive perception of people in the MA/PA/NN and LAGs who consider that the links and coordination/communication between the MA/PA/NN and the LAGs have been strengthened.....	50
<b>Enhanced results and impacts</b> .....	<b>51</b>
Indicator: LAV.O.14. Ratio of EAFRD funding for LDS to other (non-EAFRD) funding spent on the LDS, of which a) by private sources, b) by public sources.....	51
Indicator: LAV.O.15. Evidence (number and expenditure) of projects to which the LAG applies outside the EAFRD (e.g. other EU or national funds).....	52
Indicator: LAV.R.12. Evidence of operations (projects) that include voluntary work.....	53
Indicator: LAV.O.16. Number of new project promoters supported by the LAG where financial support from the LEADER intervention was decisive.....	54
Indicator: LAV.R.13. Evidence of local community members in the LAG area with a positive perception of the LAG's capacity to identify and empower new project promoters.....	55
Indicator: LAV.O.17. Number and share of operations (projects) implemented by different types of promoters.....	56
Indicator: LAV.O.18. Number of operations (projects) that contribute to each typology of needs identified in the LDS, including green, digital or social transitions of rural areas.....	58
Indicator: LAV.R.14. Percentage of operations (projects) that valorise unique territorial assets (e.g. social, cultural, culinary, landscape, natural, environmental).....	59
Indicator: LAV.I.10. Evidence of operations (projects) that produce community benefits and reinforce community identity.....	61
Indicator: LAV.O.19. Number of operations (projects) which are innovative in the local context.....	62
Indicator: LAV.R.15. Percentage of expenditure in innovative operations (projects) to the total expenditure.....	63



Indicator: LAV.R.16. Evidence of innovations produced at the local level in response to a) digital; b) green; c) economic; and d) social challenges/transition. ....	64
Indicator: LAV.I.11. Percentage of LEADER stakeholders who consider that LEADER contributes to the generation of new ideas, products or processes in the LAG area that are innovative in the local context. ....	66
Indicator: LAV.O.20. Number of operations (projects) that contribute to a) economic; b) environmental; and c) social sustainability. ....	67
Indicator: LAV.R.17. Evidence of operations (projects) whose sustainability has been improved through consultation with the LAG. ....	68
Indicator: LAV.R.18. Evidence of operations (projects) which are sustainable due to knowledge of local conditions. ....	69
Indicator: LAV.O.21. Number of LEADER operations (projects) that work in synergy. ....	70
Indicator: LAV.R.19. Share of LEADER operations (projects) that have produced cooperation in the form of networks, partnerships, jointly implemented projects and other collaborations/synergies. ....	71
<b>Structural changes</b> .....	<b>72</b>
Indicator: LAV.I.12. Judgement expressed by LEADER stakeholders on the capacity of LEADER to produce structural changes in the dimensions on which the LDS intervenes. ....	72





## Improved social capital

**Indicator:** LAV.O.01. Number of LAG members broken down by type of organisation: a) public administrations; b) private local economic interests; c) social local interests; d) other.

**Added value element:** Networks.

**Related factor of success:** The size and diversity of the network and quality of interactions within the LAG are improving or remain at a high level.

**Definition and aim:** The indicator 'Number of LAG members broken down by type of organisation' is an output indicator that computes the relative composition of the variable 'type of organisation' in relation to LAG's members. The aim is to analyse if, during the programming period (2023-2027) the relative composition of the type of organisation changes and in which way.

**Unit of measurement:** Number of LAG members pertaining to the four categories identified by Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475.

**Data sources:** Data for Monitoring and Evaluation (DME). Variables L600 to L604.

Member States shall report by 30 April of year N these variables per LAG, for the LAGs selected by 31 December of year N-1 (Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475).

**Suggested time and frequency of data collection:** The data are collected as part of the DME at the moment of selecting the LAG. This represents the baseline value. The evaluator shall collect the data during implementation and at the end of the programming period as the final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** By comparing the values over time, the evaluator shall verify if the relative values of the type of organisation of LAG members change and in which direction.

Formula	Variable
Number of LAG members that represent public administrations	L601
Number of LAG members that are representatives of private local economic interests (e.g. economic organisations, local businesses)	L602
Number of LAG members that are representatives of social local interests (e.g. non-governmental organisations, local associations)	L603
Number of LAG members falling under other categories	L604

**Comments/caveats:** By comparing the relative compositions of the type of organisations of LAG's members at the beginning, during implementation and at the end of the programming period, the evaluator shall verify if a more equal representation of the different types of organisations occurs and how it evolves over time. This should attest to a better performance of the structural social capital of the LAG members.

If needed, the evaluator may also calculate the relative share of each type of member as a percentage of the total number of LAG members (L600).

When collecting the data at the end of the programming period, the evaluator should classify the LAG members according to the classification proposed in Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475.

This indicator can be aggregated at the CAP Strategic Plan (CSP) level as it is based on DME variables which are common to all LAGs.



**Indicator: LAV.R.01. Network Diversity Index of the LAG membership (as a proxy of structural social capital of the LAG).**

**Added value element:** Networks.

**Related factor of success:** The size and diversity of the network and quality of interactions within the LAG are improving or remain at a high level.

**Definition and aim:** The structural dimension of social capital of the LAG membership refers to the set of social structures allowing interaction among LAG members. According to the social capital theory, a wider variety within the LAG's membership could provide access to useful resources which are not otherwise available to a homogenous group of organisations. The 'network diversity (NTd) index of the LAG membership' aims at capturing the level of diversity of the type of organisations inside each LAG, that is, the heterogeneity of the categories to which the various members belong. The LAG members are clustered into types of organisations by means of the interests they represent.

The NTd index studies the distribution of the variable 'type of organisation' and measures the distance between each case and the maximum theoretical concentration level (each LAG member belongs to the same type of organisation).

**Unit of measurement:** Ordinal scale from 0 to 1, within four categories  $N = 4$ , if the type of organisations considered are the four types considered in Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475. These are:

- > LAG members that represent public administrations (L601);
- > LAG members that represent local economic interests (L602);
- > LAG members that represent social local interests (L603);
- > LAG members that are of another type (L604).

**Data sources:** Administrative records of the LAG or DME. Variables L600 to L604. (Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) No 2022/1475.)

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** The data are provided by the DME at the moment of selecting the LAG. This represents the baseline value. The evaluator collects the data at the end of the programming period as the final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall verify if the variable 'type of organisation' tends to concentrate (the NTd is close to 0) or to distribute (the NTd is close to 1) during the programming period. If the NTd tends to distribute, then the structural social capital of the LAG membership improves.

The index is calculated as:

$$NTd = 1 - \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{(N-1)} (p_i - q_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{(N-1)} p_i} \right)$$

where:

- > NTd stands for network diversity and the second member is a form of Gini's concentration index;
- > N represents the maximum number of types of organisations potentially present in a LAG;
- >  $p_i = i/N$  is the proportion of all the first i type of organisation;
- >  $q_i$  is the proportion of members belonging to the first i type of organisation.

**Comments/caveats:** The NTd varies in the range of 0 to 1 assuming the value 0 (no diversity) when there is only one type of organisation in the group and the value 1 (maximum diversity) when all the types of organisations are equally represented in the group.

**Important note:** The 'other' category (variable L604) should be interpreted with caution and even disaggregated into further categories. For example, a LAG with many organisations falling under 'other type' may be quite diverse but have a low NTd, while a LAG with less diversity may perform better in the NTd.



By comparing the NTd index's initial value with its final value, the evaluator can verify whether the NTd has improved, remained the same or decreased throughout the programming period.

A practical application of the NTd indexes of the LAG's membership is provided in the evaluation support study of the costs and benefits of the implementation of LEADER<sup>1</sup>. In the study, the index is computed for different case studies across Europe.

A practical application is proposed below by means of the variables (L600, L601, L602, L603, L604) utilised in Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475:

	LAG members that are of another type	LAG members that represent social local interests	LAG members that represent private local economic interests	LAG members that represent public administrators		
Type of organisation	1	2	3	4		
Cumulative distribution of type of organisation	1	3	6	10		
<b>(pi) computation</b>	0,1	0,3	0,6		The sum:	1

	LAG members that are of another type	LAG members that represent social local interests	LAG members that represent private local economic interests	LAG members that represent public administrators		
	L604	L603	L602	L601	L600	
Number of members per type of organisation	2	3	5	11	21	
Cumulative distribution of members per type of organisation	2	5	10	21		
<b>(qi) computation</b>	0,095238095	0,238095238	0,476190476		The sum:	0,80952381

<b>(pi - qi) computation</b>	0,004761905	0,061904762	0,123809524		The sum:	0,19047619
------------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	--	----------	------------

**Ntd.**

0,80952381

This indicator cannot be aggregated at CSP level, but comparisons between LAGs are possible.

<sup>1</sup> European Commission, Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development, *Evaluation support study of the costs and benefits of the implementation of LEADER – Final report*, Publications Office of the European Union, 2023, <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2762/995751>





**Indicator: LAV.I.01. LAG members that consider a quality cooperation culture has developed between LAG members.**

**Added value element:** Networks.

**Related factor of success:** The size and diversity of the network and quality of interactions within the LAG are improving or remain at a high level.

**Definition and aim:** The indicator 'LAG members that consider a quality cooperation culture has developed between LAG members' is an impact indicator of the structural social capital of LAG members. A quality cooperation culture among LAG members is needed to reach the final aims of the organisation and it is the effects of the network structure of relations among them. This is computed by means of different aspects operationalised through the following question: To what extent LAG members [...]:

- > [...] attend meetings organised by the LAG.
- > [...] exchange of information in meetings organised by the LAG.
- > [...] collaborate in activities organised by the LAG.
- > [...] develop good relationships among them.
- > [...] develop a quality cooperation culture among them.

**Unit of measurement:** The different aspects are measured on a Likert scale from 1 (the *minimum* value) to 5 (the *maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Surveys and focus groups to collect data on different aspects should be proposed to the LAG staff, LAG decision-making body and all the LAG members, or a representative sample of them.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect data at the beginning of the programming period as the baseline value, during implementation and at the end of the programming period as the final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall verify if a quality cooperation culture among LAG members, decision-making body, and staff tends to reach the maximum score or not based on the perceptions of respondents.

The indicator is calculated as the ratio of total scores assigned by respondents to each aspect observed and the maximum possible score:

$$LAV.I.01 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij}}{MaxP}$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $P_{ij}$  is the score attributed by respondent  $i$  on the aspect  $j$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

	Very low	Low	Neither low nor high	High	Very high
<b>Scores</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Aspects:</b>					
1. To what extent do members attend to meetings organised by the LAG?					
2. To what extent do members exchange information in meetings organised by the LAG?					



3. To what extent do members collaborate in activities organised by the LAG?					
4. To what extent have members developed good relationships among them?					
5. To what extent have members developed a quality cooperation culture among them?					

**Comments/caveats:** By measuring different aspects of the indicator, the evaluator shall verify if the value of the indicator is close to 5, which means that a very high-quality cooperation culture has been developed among LAG members. If the value is close to one, the opposite happens. Moreover, by comparing the evaluation results over time, the evaluator shall verify if the indicator has improved, remained the same or decreased during the programming period.

*This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level, provided the same questions are asked to all LAGs.*



**Indicator: LAV.O.02. Number (or ratio) of operations (projects) jointly implemented by several types of promoters (specifying types).**

**Added value element:** Networks.

**Related factor of success:** The social interactions in the LAG area (but outside the LAG itself) have improved or remain at a high level thanks to LEADER.

**Definition and aim:** The 'Number of operations (projects) jointly implemented by several types of promoters' is an output indicator that measures a concrete operationalisation of social capital in the local context, thanks to a LAG's activities. Operations jointly implemented by several types of promoters require the activation of connections and relations among actors, the identification of a shared vision operationalised through objectives, the definition of own resources to contribute to operations, and the voluntary work to contribute to the identification and formulation of the operations.

The higher the number of operations (projects) jointly implemented by several types of promoters, the better the capacity of the LAG and its members to activate social capital at the local level.

**Unit of measurement:** Number of operations (projects) jointly implemented (L706). Denominator for ratio: Total number of operations (projects) implemented by the LAG (L700).

**Data sources:** DME. Variables L700 and L706 (Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475). Member States shall report these variables per LAG in 2026 and 2030 from the moment of the first payment to a given operation (project). The report in year N relates to all operations paid until 15 October N-1.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect data in 2026 when Member States are reporting the list of variables for each LAG's activities. The evaluator shall collect the final value if the evaluation takes place before 2030.

These data are normally available in the LAG's administrative records, so the evaluator should also consider this specific data source, which provides detailed information for all years of the programming period.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** By comparing the baseline and final values, the evaluator shall verify if the relative values of the 'Number of operations jointly implemented' (L706) change. The evaluator may also calculate the share of the jointly implemented operations to the total number of operations (formula:  $L706/L700$ ).

**Comments/caveats:** Based on data collected and elaborated at different moments of the programming period, it will be possible to observe whether the percentage of operations jointly implemented by several promoters has increased, remained the same or decreased during the programming period.

This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level as it is based on DME variables that are common to all LAGs.



**Indicator: LAV.O.03. Number of participants in joint operations (projects).**

**Added value element:** Networks.

**Related factor of success:** The social interactions in the LAG area (but outside the LAG itself) have improved or remain at a high level thanks to LEADER.

**Definition and aim:** The 'Number of participants in joint operations (projects)' is an output indicator that measures a concrete operationalisation of social capital in the local context, thanks to a LAG's activities. Operations jointly implemented by several types of promoters require the activation of connections and relations among local community members/actors. By counting the number of participants in joint operations, the evaluator shall analyse the capacity of the LAG and its members to promote networking and novel relations that evolve into real operations where local community members are involved.

The higher the number of participants in joint operations (projects), the better the capacity of the LAG and its members to activate social capital at the local level.

**Unit of measurement:** Number of participants in joint operations.

**Data sources:** Project reports and surveys. The administrative records of the LAG can facilitate the data collection for this indicator.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** These data are normally available in LAGs' administrative records, so the evaluator should consider this specific data source, which provides detailed information for all years of the programming period.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** Based on the administrative records of the LAG, the evaluator can determine how many participants have been involved in joint operations as well as their types, for example, local actors representing social business interests, public administration, etc.

Based on data related to type of participants, it will be possible to compute the network diversity index for the joint operations. For the method, approach and formula see indicator LAV.R.01. Network Diversity Index of the LAG membership.

**Comments/caveats:** The higher the number of participants in joint operations implemented via LEADER and the higher the diversity of the type of partner(s), the better the social capital in the LAG area. However, there can be an upper limit as too many partners may be more difficult to coordinate.

*This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level if all LAGs collect this data.*



**Indicator: LAV.R.02. Evidence of participants in LEADER projects (operations) who improve their capacity to organise themselves in social groups and integrate into the community fabric.**

**Added value element:** Networks.

**Related factor of success:** The social interactions in the LAG area (but outside the LAG itself) have improved or remain at a high level thanks to LEADER.

**Definition and aim:** The indicator 'Evidence of participants in LEADER projects who improve their capacity to organise themselves in social groups and integrate into the community fabric' is a result indicator of social capital at the local level. The capacity of participants to organise themselves and integrate into the community fabric is computed based on scores attributed by respondents to different aspects operationalised through the following question: To what extent participants in LEADER projects are engaged in [...]:

- > [...] local associations/non-governmental organisations (NGOs).
- > [...] community groups.
- > [...] civil rights/advocacy groups.
- > [...] other interest groups.

**Unit of measurement:** The different aspects are measured on a Likert scale from 1 (the *minimum* value) to 5 (the *maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Focus groups and surveys to collect data on different aspects should be proposed to a representative sample of participants in LEADER projects.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Suggested frequency of data collection: Collect data at the beginning of the programming period as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall verify whether the indicator 'Evidence of participants in LEADER projects who improve their capacity to organise themselves in social groups and integrate into the community fabric' tends to reach the maximum score (or not), based on the perceptions of respondents.

The indicator is calculated as the ratio of total scores assigned by respondents to each aspect observed and the maximum possible score:

$$LAV.R.02 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij} / MaxP$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $P_{ij}$  is the score attributed by respondent  $i$  on the aspect  $j$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

It is not mandatory to have all four aspects in place. Only the relevant ones should be assessed from 1 to 5 and the other ones added if relevant.

	Very low	Low	Neither low nor high	High	Very high
<b>Scores</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Aspects:</b>					
1. To what extent are participants in LEADER projects engaged in local associations/NGOs?					



2. To what extent are participants in LEADER projects engaged in community groups?					
3. To what extent are participants in LEADER projects engaged in civil rights/advocacy groups?					
4. To what extent are participants in LEADER projects engaged in other interest groups?					

**Comments/caveats:** By measuring different aspects of the indicator, the evaluator shall depict if 'Evidence of participants in LEADER projects who improve their capacity to organise themselves in social groups and integrate into the community fabric' is close to 5, which means that participants in LEADER projects have very highly improved their capacity to organise themselves in social groups and integrate into the community fabric. If the value is close to one, the opposite happens. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated in different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall verify if the indicator has improved, remained the same or decreased during the programming period.

This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level, provided all LAGs are asked the same questions i.e. select the same aspects to assess.



**Indicator: LAV.I.02. Perception of improved social interactions in the LAG area amongst participants in LEADER projects.**

**Added value element:** Networks.

**Related factor of success:** The social interactions in the LAG area (but outside the LAG itself) have improved or remain at a high level thanks to LEADER.

**Definition and aim:** The 'Perception of improved social interactions in the LAG area amongst participants in LEADER projects' is an impact indicator of structural social capital at the local level. The indicator is computed based on scores attributed by respondents to different aspects operationalised through the following questions: To what extent do participants in LEADER projects perceive that they have [...]:

- > [...] been heard by others.
- > [...] reached a common understanding.
- > [...] been able to resolve conflicts.
- > [...] promoted useful exchanges.
- > [...] improved social interactions with other local community members who are part of their own social group or economic sector.
- > [...] improved social interactions with other local community members who are part of different social groups or economic sectors.

**Unit of measurement:** The different aspects are measured on a Likert scale from 1 (the *minimum* value) to 5 (the *maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Focus groups and surveys to collect data on different aspects should target a representative sample of participants in LEADER projects.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect data at the beginning of the programming period as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall verify if the indicator perception of improved social interactions in the LAG area tends to reach the maximum score (or not) based on the perceptions of respondents.

The indicator is calculated as the ratio of total scores assigned by respondents to each aspect observed and the maximum possible score:

$$LAV.I.02 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij}}{MaxP}$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $P_{ij}$  is the score attributed by respondent  $i$  on the aspect  $j$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

	Very low	Low	Neither low nor high	High	Very high
<b>Scores</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Aspects:</b>					
1. To what extent do participants in LEADER projects perceive that they have been heard by others?					
2. To what extent do participants in LEADER projects perceive that they have reached a common understanding?					



3. To what extent do participants in LEADER projects perceive that they have been able to resolve conflicts?					
4. To what extent do participants in LEADER projects perceive that they have promoted useful exchanges?					
5. To what extent do participants in LEADER projects perceive they have improved social interactions with other local community members who are part of their own social group or economic sector?					
6. To what extent do participants in LEADER projects perceive that they have improved social interactions with other local community members who are part of different social groups or economic sectors?					

**Comments/caveats:** By measuring different aspects of the indicator, the evaluator shall depict if the value of the indicator is close to 5, which means that the perception of an improvement in social interactions in the LAG area is very high. If the value is close to one, the opposite happens. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated in different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall verify if the indicator has improved, remained the same or decreased during the programming period.

*This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level, provided all LAGs are asked the same questions.*





**Indicator: LAV.O.04. Number of interregional cooperation operations (projects) implemented by the LAG.**

**Added value element:** Networks.

**Related factor of success:** The LAG has developed or maintained networking with relevant partners outside the LAG area.

**Definition and aim:** The 'Number of interregional cooperation operations (projects) implemented by the LAG' is an output indicator measuring how many interregional cooperation projects the LAG has promoted and developed during the programming period. These operations are powerful instruments to promote social capital by sharing information, knowledge, experiences, skills and good practices. They are real investments in bridging social capital. The aim is to analyse how many interregional cooperation operations (projects) the LAG has promoted. The higher the number, the better the capacity of the LAG to promote social capital in different LAG areas.

**Unit of measurement:** Number of interregional cooperation operations (projects) implemented by the LAG (L708).

**Data sources:** DME. Variables L708, L400, L600, L910 (Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475).

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** The DME foresees that Member States will collect data on the number of interregional cooperation projects implemented by the LAG in 2026 and 2030, related to all operations paid until 15 October 2025 and 15 October 2029.

These data are normally available in the LAGs' administrative records, so the evaluator should also consider this specific data source, which provides detailed information for all the years of the programming period.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall count the number of interregional cooperation operations (projects) implemented by the LAG in the programming period. The higher the number, the better.

For comparison purposes, it will be better to normalise values of the number of interregional cooperation projects to allow for a proper comparison among LAGs that eliminate the effects of gross influences that could be determined by:

- > Population covered by the Local Development Strategy (LDS) (L400).
- > Number of members of the LAG (L600).
- > Budget devoted to interregional cooperation projects (ICP) over the total budget devoted to cooperation projects (ICP budget/L910).

For example, normalising values for the population covered by the LDS means that the number of interregional cooperation projects of each LAG is divided by the population covered by the LDS. In this way, the numbers can be comparable or put in context across LAGs. It is useful if the evaluator wants to compare interregional cooperation projects implemented by different LAGs.

**Comments/caveats:** It is suggested to integrate the analysis with interviews with the managers of the operations (projects) to verify to what extent the cooperation has effectively produced real relations among different types of organisations. If the managers of the LAGs involved in the interregional cooperation project can specify the type of organisations involved in cooperation activities, then the evaluator can compute the network diversity index of the project(s) as a proxy of the structural social capital activated at that level.

This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level as it is based on DME variables that are common to all LAGs.



**Indicator: LAV.O.05. Number of transnational cooperation operations (projects) implemented by LAG.**

**Added value element:** Networks.

**Related factor of success:** The LAG has developed or maintained networking with relevant partners outside the LAG area.

**Definition and aim:** The indicator 'Number of transnational cooperation operations (projects) implemented by LAG' is an output indicator measuring how many transnational cooperation projects the LAG has promoted and developed during the programming period. These operations are powerful instruments to promote social capital by sharing information, knowledge, experiences, skills and good practices. They are real investments in bridging social capital. The higher the number of transnational cooperation projects, the better the capacity of the LAG to promote social capital in LAG areas in Member States.

**Unit of measurement:** Number of transnational cooperation operations (projects) implemented by the LAG (L709).

**Data sources:** DME. Variables L709, L400, L600, L910 (Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475).

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** The DME foresees that Member States will collect data on the number of transnational cooperation projects implemented by the LAG in 2026 and 2030, related to all operations paid until 15 October 2025 and 15 October 2029.

These data are normally available in the LAGs' administrative records, so the evaluator should also consider this specific data source, which provides detailed information for all the years of the programming period.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall count the number of transnational cooperation projects implemented by the LAG in the programming period. The higher the number, the better in terms of activation of social capital among Member States.

For comparison purposes, it will be better to normalise the value considering one of the following items:

- > Population covered by the LDS (L400).
- > Number of members of the LAG (L600).
- > Budget devoted to transnational cooperation projects over the total budget devoted to cooperation projects (TCP budget/L910).

For example, normalising the values for the population covered by the LDS means that the number of transnational cooperation projects of each LAG is divided by the population covered by the LDS. In this way, the numbers can be comparable or put in context across LAGs. It is useful if the evaluator wants to compare transnational cooperation projects implemented by different LAGs.

**Comments/caveats:** It is suggested that interviews with project managers are integrated into the analysis to verify what extent the cooperation has effectively produced real relations among types of organisations in different Member States.

If the managers of the LAGs involved in the transnational cooperation project can specify the type of organisations involved in cooperation activities, then it shall be possible for the evaluator to compute the Network Diversity Index of the project(s) as a proxy of the structural social capital activated at that level.

This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level as it is based on DME variables that are common to all LAGs.



**Indicator: LAV.R.03. Evidence of the quality of interactions of the LAG members with other (external) actors.**

**Added value element:** Networks.

**Related factor of success:** The LAG has developed or maintained networking with relevant partners outside the LAG area.

**Definition and aim:** The 'Evidence of the quality of interactions of the LAG members with other (external) actors' is a result indicator of social capital outside the LAG area. The capacity of the LAG members to establish and promote relations with external actors (e.g. organisations and institutions) represents the external social capital that the LAG and its members can build outside the LAG area.

The indicator is computed based on scores attributed by respondents to different aspects operationalised through the following question: To what extent have LAG members developed external relations with [...]:

- > [...] regional institutions
- > [...] national institutions
- > [...] transnational or European institutions
- > [...] other LAGs
- > [...] universities/research bodies
- > [...] entities representing social interests
- > [...] businesses/entities representing economic interests
- > [...] entities representing environmental interests
- > [...] national networks (including National CAP Network)
- > [...] international/EU-level networks (including EU CAP Network)

**Unit of measurement:** The different aspects are measured on a Likert scale from 1 (the *minimum* value) to 5 (the *maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Focus groups and surveys for data collection should target LAG staff, LAG decision-making body and a representative sample of LAG members.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect data at the beginning of the programming period as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall verify if the indicator 'Evidence of the quality of interactions of the LAG's members with external actors' tends to reach the maximum score (or not) based on the perceptions of respondents. The indicator is calculated as the ratio of total scores assigned by respondents to each aspect observed and the maximum possible score:

$$LAV.R.03 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij}}{MaxP}$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $P_{ij}$  is the score attributed by respondent  $i$  on the aspect  $j$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

	Very low	Low	Neither low nor high	High	Very high
<b>Scores</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Aspects:</b>					
1. To what extent have LAG members developed external relations with regional institutions?					

2. To what extent have LAG members developed external relations with national institutions?					
3. To what extent have LAG members developed external relations with transnational and European organisations?					
4. To what extent have LAG members developed external relations with other LAGs?					
5. To what extent have LAG members developed external relations with universities/research bodies?					
6. To what extent have LAG members developed external relations with entities representing social interests?					
7. To what extent have LAG members developed external relations with businesses/entities representing economic interests?					
8. To what extent have LAG members developed external relations with the entities representing environmental interests?					
9. To what extent have LAG members developed external relations with the national networks (including National CAP network)?					
10. To what extent have LAG members developed external relations with the international/EU level networks (including EU CAP Network)?					

**Comments/caveats:** By measuring different aspects of the indicator, the evaluator shall depict if the value of the indicator is close to 5, which means that the quality of interactions with external actors (outside the LAG area) has been highly developed. If the value is close to one, the opposite happens. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated in different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall verify if the quality of interactions outside the LAG area has improved, remained the same or decreased.

This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level, provided all LAGs are asked the same questions.



**Indicator: LAV.O.06. Evidence of trust in the LAG.**

**Added value element:** Mutual support and trust.

**Related factor of success:** The level of mutual support and trust within the LAG, and the local community in the LAG area has increased or remains at a high level.

**Definition and aim:** A normative view of social capital draws from informal norms such as trust, reciprocity and solidarity. Trust is “[...] an expectation born from experiences deemed positive by the individual, developed under conditions of uncertainty, whereby intense cognitive and emotional involvement may overcome the threshold of mere hope”<sup>2</sup>. It follows that trust strengthens expectations of an almost certain response from others. In the case of interpersonal trust, relational exchanges between LAG members may be rewarding when member A expects a positive response from member B, member B may then cooperate, purposefully deciding against betrayal of such expectation. When this relationship moves beyond relationships among individuals and becomes systemic, it may become a moral obligation.

The ‘Evidence of trust in the LAG’ is an output indicator of the different products determined by trust within the LAG. The indicator is computed based on scores attributed by respondents to different aspects operationalised through the following questions: To what extent:

- > [...] do LAG managers establish positive relationships with the staff, the LAG decision-making body and the LAG members?
- > [...] does the knowledge and expertise of the LAG staff make an essential contribution to achieving results?
- > [...] is the LAG staff willing to go above and beyond what needs to be done?
- > [...] does the collaboration between LAG members contribute to achieving results?

**Unit of measurement:** The different aspects are measured on a Likert scale from 1 (the *minimum* value) to 5 (the *maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Surveys for data collection should be sent to the LAG staff, decision-making bodies and a representative sample of LAG members (if it is not possible to survey all LAG members).

If all LAG members are interviewed (e.g. using a focus group approach), then the information to be elaborated by Social Network Analysis (SNA)<sup>3</sup> can be collected and network statistics computed.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect data at the beginning of the programming period as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall verify if the indicator ‘Evidence of trust in the LAG’ tends to reach the maximum score (or not) based on the perceptions of respondents. The indicator is calculated as the ratio of total scores assigned by respondents and the maximum possible score:

$$LAV.O.06 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij}}{MaxP}$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $P_{ij}$  is the score attributed by respondent  $i$  on the aspect  $j$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

2 Mutti, A., *Capitale sociale e sviluppo: la fiducia come risorsa*, Il Mulino, Bologna, 1998, pp.42.

3 Borgatti, S.P., M.G. Everett, and J.C. Johnson, *Analyzing Social Networks*, 2nd edition., SAGE, Los Angeles, 2018.



	Very low	Low	Neither low nor high	High	Very high
Scores	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Aspects:</b>					
1. To what extent do LAG managers establish positive relationships with the staff, LAG decision-making body and LAG members?					
2. To what extent does the knowledge and expertise of the LAG staff make an essential contribution to achieving results?					
3. To what extent is the LAG staff willing to go above and beyond what needs to be done?					
4. To what extent does the collaboration between LAG members contribute to achieving results?					

**Comments/caveats:** By measuring different aspects of the indicator, the evaluator shall depict if the value of the indicator is close to 5, which means that evidence of trust in the LAG attests to a very high level. If the value is close to one, the opposite happens. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated in different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall depict if the indicator has improved, remained the same or decreased during the programming period.

*Additional insights:*

The 'Evidence of trust in the LAG' indicator can also be complemented with an indicator of interpersonal trust among LAG members. This indicator can be measured in two ways:

1. Rapidly, by asking a representative sample of the LAG members: In case you could not participate in the assembly, how many members would you delegate your vote to?

*In this case, it will be possible to measure the extent of interpersonal trust in the LAG by averaging the respondents' responses and comparing them to the total number of members.*

2. In a detailed way, by asking all LAG members: If you could not participate in the assembly, could you specify to whom of the LAG members would you delegate your vote?

*In this case, it will be possible to create a square matrix of vote delegation, present it with SNA software and determine network statistics, such as degree, density and betweenness.*

This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level, provided all LAGs are asked the same questions.



**Indicator: LAV.R.04. Level of trust of the local community towards the LAG.**

**Added value element:** Mutual support and trust.

**Related factor of success:** The level of mutual support and trust within the LAG, and the local community in the LAG area has increased or remains at a high level.

**Definition and aim:** Trust is a complex concept which normally refers to different elements. The 'Trust of the local community towards the LAG' is a result indicator of normative social capital because it represents what the LAG has done during the programming period(s) and how its actions have been perceived by the local community.

This indicator aims to capture if there is a better assessment of trust towards the LAG compared to the general level of trust in the LAG area i.e. the result of what the LAG has done during the programming period and how its actions have been perceived by the local community.

**Unit of measurement:** The indicator is measured on a Likert scale from 1 (*minimum* value) to 5 (*maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Focus groups or surveys for data collection should be proposed to a representative sample of local community representatives. Case studies can be used to complement the survey findings with qualitative explanatory information on the level of trust.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect data at the beginning of the programming period (one year after the LAG is operational) as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value. In the comments, insights are provided on a possible counterfactual indicator.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The indicator is measured through the question: How do you grade on a scale from 1 to 5 (where 1 is the minimum and 5 is the maximum value) your level of trust in the LAG thanks to the activities performed by the LAG?

The final value of the indicator is based on the average of the answers provided by respondents.

$$LAV.R.04 = \sum_{i=1}^n P_i / MaxP$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $P_i$  is the point attributed by respondent  $i$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

**Comments/caveats:** The evaluator shall depict if the value of the indicator is close to 5. This means that trust attests to a very high level. If the value is close to one, the opposite happens. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated in different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall depict what has improved, remained the same or decreased.

This indicator can be compared to the indicator of the generalised level of trust. Generalised trust is the spontaneous sociability of people and corresponds to the trust that people have in other members of society in general without knowing them. The standard question used to measure it is the Rosenberg question (1956): "In general, would you say that most people can be trusted, or do you have to be cautious when dealing with people?"<sup>4</sup>. The final value of the indicator is the percentage of persons having answered 'most people can be trusted' compared to the total number of respondents.

This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level provided all LAGs are asked the same question.

<sup>4</sup> Rosenberg, M., 'Misanthropy and political ideology', *American Sociological Review*, 21(6), 1956, pp. 690-695.



**Indicator: LAV.I.03. Change in the trust of the local community towards the LAG.**

**Added value element:** Mutual support and trust.

**Related factor of success:** The level of mutual support and trust within the LAG, and the local community in the LAG area has increased or remains at a high level.

**Definition and aim:** The change in the trust of the local community towards the LAG is the impact indicator capturing the LEADER added value in terms of normative social capital. The normative social capital is the least tangible side of social capital, due to its reference to norms and values that circulate in networks and strengthen cooperation for common objectives. Two LAG networks characterised by the same structure, but a different set of values and norms, may lead to completely distinct outcomes: cooperation and coordination in one case, and competition and conflict in another. The analysis of specific social values or norms that 'codify' relationships among actors complements the analysis of network relationships. Values are dependent on context and local culture, but they are also recognised, interpreted, and eventually transformed through repeated interactions among LAG members. Values, and specifically trust, require time to change.

The change in trust is captured by asking directly representatives of the local community if their trust in the LAG has increased, decreased or remained the same during the programming period.

**Unit of measurement:** Percentage of respondents.

**Data sources:** Focus groups or surveys for data collection should be proposed to a representative sample of local community representatives. Case studies can be used to complement the survey findings with qualitative explanatory information on the level of trust.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** This question can be asked at the end of programming period.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The indicator 'Change in the trust towards the LAG' is measured through the question: To what extent has your trust in the LAG changed thanks to the activities performed by the LAG during the 2023-27 programming period?

The possible answers are:

- > My trust has worsened.
- > My trust has not changed.
- > My trust has improved.

The final value of the indicator is the percentage of respondents who declared to prefer a specific option over the total number of respondents (e.g., the percentage of persons answering 'my trust has improved' over the total number of respondents).

$$LAV.I.03 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^3 P_{ij}}{N}$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  are the respondents,  $P_{ij}$  is the number of respondents who have answered 'my trust has improved' and  $N$  is the total number of respondents.

**Comments/caveats:** The higher the percentage of respondents that attest their trust in the LAG has increased, the better the normative social capital promoted by the LAG as perceived by different local actors/community members.

*This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level provided all LAGs are asked the same question.*





**Indicator: LAV.0.07. Evidence of shared social awareness in the LAG area.**

**Added value element:** Shared mental models, values and beliefs.

**Related factor of success:** Shared vision for the LAG area, territorial identities, common objectives, values and/or beliefs are promoted by LEADER within the LAG and LAG area.

**Definition and aim:** The 'Evidence of shared social awareness in the LAG area', where 'social awareness' encompasses the ability to understand and empathise with others, recognising their emotions, perspectives and experiences is an output indicator for the cognitive dimension of social capital. The cognitive dimension arises from shared mental models and resulting ideas, reinforced by culture and ideology, specifically norms, values, attitudes, and beliefs that rationalise cooperative behaviour. Shared mental models are co-constructed when individuals with different experiences learn from each other, compensating the diverse knowledge and reaching a common understanding. When this happens, a shared mental model is defined<sup>5</sup>.

The indicator is computed based on scores attributed by respondents to different aspects that operationalise shared social awareness through the following questions: To what extent LAG members and LEADER stakeholders (i.e. LEADER project promoters/beneficiaries/participants) in the LAG area share:

- > [...] a sense of belonging to the local community.
- > [...] attitudes of solidarity.
- > [...] inclusiveness by welcoming disadvantaged groups, including women and youth.
- > [...] recognition of social problems.

**Unit of measurement:** The indicator is measured on a Likert scale from 1 (*minimum* value) to 5 (*maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Surveys and focus groups. Surveys for data collection should be proposed to a representative sample of LAG members and LEADER project promoters/beneficiaries/participants.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect data at the beginning (one year after the LAG is operational) of the programming period as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall verify if the indicator 'of shared social awareness in the LAG area' tends to reach the maximum score (or not) based on the perceptions of respondents.

The indicator is calculated as the ratio of total scores assigned by respondents and the maximum possible score:

$$LAV.0.07 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij} / MaxP$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $P_{ij}$  is the score attributed by respondent  $i$  on the aspect  $j$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

<sup>5</sup> Mathieu, J.E., Heffner T.S., Goodwin G.F., Salas E., and Cannon-Bowers J.A., 'The Influence of Shared Mental Models on Team Process and Performance', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 85, No. 2, 2000, pp. 273-283. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.2.273>



	Very low	Low	Neither low nor high	High	Very high
Scores	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Aspects:</b>					
1. To what extent do LAG members and LEADER stakeholders share a sense of belonging to the local community?					
2. To what extent do LAG members and LEADER stakeholders share attitudes of solidarity?					
3. To what extent do LAG members and LEADER stakeholders share inclusiveness by welcoming disadvantaged groups, including women and youth?					
4. To what extent do LAG members and LEADER stakeholders share recognition of social problems?					

**Comments/caveats:** By measuring different aspects of the indicator, the evaluator shall depict if the value of the indicator is close to 5, which means that evidence of shared social awareness in the LAG area attests to a very high level. If the value is close to one, the opposite happens. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated in different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall depict if the indicator has improved, remained the same or decreased during the programming period.

The results can also be disaggregated by type of respondent by calculating the indicator based on the answers of LAG members and the answers of LEADER stakeholders separately, and maybe compare the two.

*This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level provided all LAGs are asked the same question.*



**Indicator: LAV.R.05. Evidence of shared values in cooperation and/or joint operations (projects), considering (a) capacity to keep agreements; (b) truthfulness in social and economic relationships; (c) responsiveness and respect for the rule of law; and (d) capacity to avoid opportunistic behaviours or free riding.**

**Added value element:** Shared mental models, values and beliefs.

**Related factor of success:** Shared vision for the LAG area, territorial identities, common objectives, values and/or beliefs are promoted by LEADER within the LAG and LAG area.

**Definition and aim:** The 'Evidence of shared values in cooperation and/or joint operations (projects)' is a result indicator allowing observations in a real setting of cooperation and joint operations (projects) promoted by the LAG, how shared values have crystallised. The indicator is computed based on scores attributed by respondents to different aspects operationalised through the following question: To what extent do participants in LEADER cooperation and joint projects (operations) attest:

- > [...] capacity to keep agreements.
- > [...] truthfulness in social and economic relationships.
- > [...] responsiveness and respect for the rule of law.
- > [...] capacity to avoid opportunistic behaviours or free riding.

**Unit of measurement:** The different aspects are measured on a Likert scale from 1 (the *minimum* value) to 5 (the *maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Focus groups and surveys for data collection should target a representative sample of project promoters/beneficiaries/participants in LEADER cooperation and joint projects (operations). Additionally, interviews with LAG representatives (e.g. staff, decision-making bodies and members) can be used to complement the survey/focus group findings with qualitative explanatory information.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect the data one year after the LAG becomes operational as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall verify if the indicator 'of shared values in cooperation and/or joint operations' tends to reach the maximum score (or not) based on the perceptions of respondents.

The indicator is calculated as the ratio of total scores assigned by respondents and the maximum possible score:

$$LAV.R.05 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij}}{MaxP}$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $P_{ij}$  is the score attributed by respondent  $i$  on the aspect  $j$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

	Very low	Low	Neither low nor high	High	Very high
<b>Scores</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Aspects:</b>					
1. To what extent do participants in cooperation and/or joint projects (operations) attest capacity to keep agreements?					
2. To what extent do participants in cooperation and/or joint projects (operations) attest truthfulness in social and economic relationships?					

3. To what extent do participants in cooperation and/or joint projects (operations) attest responsiveness and respect for the rule of law?

4. To what extent do participants in cooperation and/or joint projects (operations) attest capacity to avoid opportunistic behaviours or free riding?

**Comments/caveats:** By measuring different aspects of the indicator, the evaluator shall depict if the value of the indicator is close to 5, which means that evidence of shared values in cooperation and/or joint projects (operations) attests to a very high level. If the value is close to one, the opposite happens. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated in different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall depict if the indicator has improved, remained the same or decreased during the programming period.

This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level, provided all LAGs are asked the same questions.



**Indicator: LAV.I.04. Perception that LAG actions have had an impact on improving local identity and the image of the LAG area, its people, resources and products.**

**Added value element:** Shared mental models, values and beliefs.

**Related factor of success:** Shared vision for the LAG area, territorial identities, common objectives, values and/or beliefs are promoted by LEADER within the LAG and LAG area.

**Definition and aim:** The 'Perception that LAG actions have had an impact on improving local identity and the image of the area, its people, resources and products' is an impact indicator for cognitive social capital. Shared mental models, values and beliefs, concretise into real projects, shall determine a novel shared vision for the territory and its identities and image.

The indicator is computed based on scores attributed by respondents to different aspects operationalised through the following questions: To what extent have the LAG's actions had an impact on:

- > [...] improving local identity.
- > [...] improving the image of the LAG area.
- > [...] improving the image of local people, resources, and products.

**Unit of measurement:** The indicator is measured on a Likert scale from 1 (the *minimum* value) to 5 (the *maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Focus groups and surveys for data collection should be proposed to a representative sample of LAG members (if it is not possible to survey all LAG members) and project promoters. Moreover, the local community members not included in the LAG membership should be surveyed.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** It is suggested to collect the data at the end of the programming period.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall verify if the indicator 'of perception that LAG actions have had an impact on improving local identity and the image' tends to reach the maximum score (or not) based on the perceptions of respondents. The indicator is calculated as the ratio of total scores assigned by respondents and the maximum possible score:

$$LAV.I.04 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij} / MaxP$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $P_{ij}$  is the score attributed by respondent  $i$  on the aspect  $j$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

	Very low	Low	Neither low nor high	High	Very high
<b>Scores</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Aspects:</b>					
1. To what extent have the LAG actions had an impact on improving local identity?					
2. To what extent have the LAG actions had an impact on improving the image of the LAG area?					
3. To what extent have the LAG actions had an impact on improving the image of local people, resources and products?					

**Comments/cautions:** By measuring different aspects of the indicator, the evaluator shall depict if the value of the indicator is close to 5, which means that the perception that LAG's actions have had an impact on improving local identity and the image attests to a very high level. If the value is close to one, the opposite happens.

This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level, provided all LAGs are asked the same questions.





## Improved governance

**Indicator:** LAV.O.08. Number of LAG members in the decision-making body by type of organisation they represent, and by gender and age: (a) public administrations; (b) private local economic interests; (c) local social interests; and (d) other (not covered by the previous categories).

**Added value element:** Local governance.

**Related factor of success:** Inclusiveness in decision-making: the LAG's capacity to bring together organisations and people in an inclusive manner in decision-making is improving or remains at a high level.

**Definition and aim:** This is an output indicator that computes the relative composition of the variable 'type of organisation' in relation to LAG's members in decision-making. The aim is to analyse if, during the programming period (2023-2027), the inclusiveness of the decision-making body changes and in which way. For this reason, it looks at inclusiveness from the point of view of types of organisations, gender and age.

**Unit of measurement:**

- › Number of members of the LAG's decision-making body pertaining to the four categories identified by Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475 (variables L611-L614).
- › Number of members of the LAG's decision-making body by gender (variables L615-L618).
- › Number of young persons in the LAG decision-making body (variable L619).

**Data sources:** DME. Variables L610 to L620.

Member States shall report by 30 April of year N these variables per LAG, for the LAGs selected by 31 December of year N-1 (Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475).

**Suggested time and frequency of data collection:** The data are collected as part of the DME at the moment of selecting the LAG. This represents the baseline value. The evaluator collects the data at the end of the programming period as the final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** By comparing the baseline and final values, the evaluator shall verify if the relative values of the type of organisation, gender and age, of the LAG's decision-making body change and in which direction.

Formula	Variable
Number of members in the LAG's decision-making body that represent public administrations	L611
Number of members in the LAG's decision-making body that are representatives of private local economic interests (e.g. economic organisations, local businesses)	L612
Number of members in the LAG's decision-making body that are representatives of social local interests (e.g. non-governmental organisations, local associations)	L613
Number of members in the LAG's decision-making body falling under other categories	L614
Number of female members in the LAG's decision-making body	L615
Number of young persons in the LAG's decision-making body	L619



**Comments/caveats:** Variable L619 'number of young persons in LAG's decision-making body' will take into account the age limit as defined by each Member State (variable L620). For instance, it can specify the 'number of persons below 40 years old'.

By comparing the relative compositions of the type of organisations, as well the relative compositions of gender, age in the LAG's decision-making body at the beginning and end of the programming period, the evaluator shall verify if a more equal representation of the different types of organisations, male/female members and young/older members occurs. This should attest to a better degree of inclusiveness in decision-making.

When collecting the data at the end of the programming period, the evaluator should classify the members of the LAG's decision-making body according to the classification proposed in Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475.

This indicator can be complemented with the ratio of LAG members in the decision-making body by dividing the above variables by the total number of LAG members in the decision-making body (L610).

This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level as it is based on common data (i.e. data required to be collected by all LAGs according to the Implementing Regulation (EU) 2022/1475).



**Indicator: LAV.R.06. Evidence of LAG processes that facilitate inclusiveness in local governance.**

**Added value element:** Local governance.

**Related factor of success:** Inclusiveness in decision-making: the LAG's capacity to bring together organisations and people in an inclusive manner in decision-making is improving or remains at a high level.

**Definition and aim:** The indicator 'Evidence of LAG processes that facilitate inclusiveness in local governance' is a result indicator of local governance. LAGs establish processes that can facilitate a more equal representation in decision-making. For this reason, the LAG processes that facilitate inclusiveness in local governance are computed based on scores attributed by respondents to different aspects operationalised through the following question: To what extent are processes facilitating inclusiveness in local governance developed by the LAG, in relation to [...]:

- > [...] rules and procedures (code of conduct) for decision-making that ensure clear roles for each member of the decision-making body.
- > [...] procedures for conflict resolution.
- > [...] rules governing representativeness in the decision-making body.
- > [...] rules and procedures ensuring balanced representation of interests.
- > [...] rules and procedures ensuring inclusion of interests of vulnerable groups in the decision making.
- > [...] procedures ensuring participation, transparency and accountability.

**Unit of measurement:** The different aspects are measured on a Likert scale from 1 (the *minimum* value) to 5 (the *maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Focus groups and surveys to collect data on different aspects should be proposed to LAG staff, the LAG decision-making body and a representative sample of LAG members (if it is not possible to survey all LAG members).

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect data at the beginning (one year after the LAG is operational) of the programming period as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall verify if the indicator 'evidence of LAG processes that facilitate inclusiveness in local governance' tends to reach the maximum score (or not) based on the perceptions of respondents. The indicator is calculated as the ratio of total scores assigned by respondents to each aspect observed and the maximum possible score:

$$LAV.R.06 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij} / MaxP$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $P_{ij}$  is the score attributed by respondent  $i$  on the aspect  $j$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

	Very low	Low	Neither low nor high	High	Very high
Scores	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Aspects:</b>					
1. To what extent are processes facilitating inclusiveness in local governance developed by the LAG in relation to rules and procedures (code of conduct) for decision-making that ensures clear roles for each member of the decision-making body?					
2. To what extent are local governance processes developed by the LAG in relation to procedures for conflict resolution?					





3. To what extent are local governance processes developed by the LAG, in relation to rules governing representativeness in the decision-making body?					
4. To what extent are local governance processes developed by the LAG in relation to rules and procedures ensuring a balanced representation of interests?					
5. To what extent are local governance processes developed by the LAG, in relation to rules and procedures ensuring the inclusion of interests of vulnerable groups in decision-making?					
6. To what extent are local governance processes developed by the LAG, in relation to procedures ensuring participation, transparency and accountability?					

**Comments/caveats:** By measuring different aspects of the indicator, the evaluator shall depict if 'evidence of LAG processes that facilitate inclusiveness in local governance' is close to 3, which means that LAGs have very well-developed local governance processes that facilitate inclusiveness in decision-making. If the value is close to one, the opposite happens. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated at different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall verify if the indicator has improved, remained the same or decreased during the programming period.

This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level if the questions asked to calculate the average score are the same in each LAG.



**Indicator: LAV.I.05. Perception of local community members that the LAG brings together organisations and people in an inclusive manner in decision-making.**

**Added value element:** Local governance.

**Related factor of success:** Inclusiveness in decision-making: the LAG's capacity to bring together organisations and people in an inclusive manner in decision-making is improving or remains at a high level.

**Definition and aim:** The indicator 'Perception of local community members that the LAG brings together organisations and people in an inclusive manner in decision making' is an impact indicator of local governance. Local community members/actors are best positioned to have an opinion on whether the LAG operates in an inclusive manner, bringing together a variety of organisations and people in decision-making. The perception is captured by asking directly the local community members whether they consider that the LAG brings together organisations and people in an inclusive manner in decision-making.

**Unit of measurement:** Percentage of local community members.

**Data sources:** Surveys and focus groups to collect data on different aspects targeted at a representative sample of the local community.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** It is suggested to collect the data at the beginning of the programming period as baseline value, and at the end of the programming period as final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The indicator 'Perception of local community members that the LAG brings together organisations and people in an inclusive manner in decision-making' is measured through the question: To what extent do you agree that the LAG brings together organisations and people in an inclusive manner in decision-making?

The possible answers are:

- > Strongly disagree.
- > Disagree.
- > Neither agree nor disagree.
- > Agree.
- > Strongly agree.

The final value of the indicator is the percentage of respondents who chose a specific option (e.g. the percentage of respondents answering 'strongly agree') over the total number of respondents.

$$LAV.I.05 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^m P_i}{N}$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  are the respondents,  $P_i$  is the number of respondents who have answered 'strongly agree' and  $N$  is the total number of respondents.

**Comments/caveats:** The higher the number of respondents who attest their strong agreement, the better the capacity of the LAG to bring together organisations and people in an inclusive manner in the decision-making, and therefore more inclusive the local governance.

This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level as it is based on a single question that does not depend on the content of the LDS, which is different in each LAG.



**Indicator: LAV.0.09. Number of training/capacity building activities that have helped improve the administrative and technical skills of LAGs by type of organiser (LAG, MA/PA, NN, other bodies).**

**Added value element:** Local governance.

**Related factor of success:** The administrative and technical skills of the LAG and its staff (in areas covered by the LDS) are improving or remain at a high level.

**Definition and aim:** This is an output indicator that measures the number of activities that have contributed to the improvement of skills of LAG, including both administrative and technical skills.

Administrative skills are a set of skills required to perform: (1) management of the LAG; (2) decision-making processes; (3) management of the design and implementation of the local development strategy; and (4) relationship building with LEADER stakeholders and the local community. Some examples of administrative skills include coordination, management, organizational/ planning, communication, problem solving, conflict resolution and teamwork.

Technical skills are a set of skills required to perform specific tasks, use particular tools, or work with various technologies and methodologies within a particular field. In the context of LEADER, these practical skills are related to the areas covered by the LDS (e.g. business, development, tourism, infrastructure, social care, environment). By acquiring these skills, the LAG has a better understanding of how the LDS can address local needs and improve its understanding of which operations should be supported to have more effective solutions in areas covered by the LDS. Some examples of technical skills include digital literacy, data collection, data analysis, quality assurance, local marketing, business development, management of hospitality services and other skills in fields related to the areas covered by LDS.

The aim of this output indicator is to compute if during the programming period (2023-2027) there have been training or capacity building activities organised by the LAG, the MA, the National CAP Network or other bodies.

This output indicator therefore sets the basis for capturing the activities that help LAG staff, the LAG decision-making body and LAG members acquire new skills.

**Unit of measurement:** Number of training/capacity building activities organised for the LAG staff, LAG decision-making body and LAG members, by type of organiser.

**Data sources:** LAG level monitoring databases, interviews with LAG staff, decision-making body and members.

**Suggested time and frequency of data collection:** Collect the data at the beginning (one year after the LAG is operational) of the programming period as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** By comparing the baseline and final values, the evaluator shall verify if the values of the number of training/capacity building activities by type of organiser, increase or remain the same.

Formula	Variable
Number of training/capacity building activities organised by the LAG for the LAG staff, decision-making body and members	
Number of training/capacity building activities organised by the MA	
Number of training/capacity building activities organised by the National CAP Network	
Number of training/capacity building activities organised by other bodies (specify or add rows)	



Total number of training/capacity building activities	Sum of previous rows
---	----------------------

The proportion of activities of each organiser can also be calculated by dividing the number of activities from each organiser by the total number of training/capacity building activities.

**Comments/caveats:** The higher the number of training/capacity building activities organised for LAG staff, decision-making bodies and LAG members, the higher the possibility that they increase their skills.

This indicator can also be complemented with the hours spent on training/capacity building activities by type of organiser. This can provide more accurate information on the scale of the training, as a training activity of two hours is not the same as an activity of eight hours.

This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level as it concerns the number of capacity building/training events.



**Indicator: LAV.R.07. Evidence of improvement of administrative skills.**

**Added value element:** Local governance.

**Related factor of success:** The administrative and technical skills of the LAG and its staff (in areas covered by the LDS) are improving or remain at a high level.

**Definition and aim:** The indicator 'Evidence of improvement of administrative skills' is a result indicator of local governance. This is one of two result indicators that aim to capture the extent to which participation in training/capacity building activities contributes to an improvement of administrative skills.

Administrative skills are a set of skills required to perform: (1) management of the LAG; (2) decision-making processes; (3) management of the design and implementation of the LDS; and (4) relationship building with LEADER stakeholders and the local community. Some examples of administrative skills include coordination, management, organizational/planning, communication, problem solving, conflict resolution and teamwork. If administrative skills improve, LAG staff, decision-making bodies and LAG members can better manage the design and implementation of LDS and the relationships between LEADER stakeholders, and therefore better perform their day-to-day work. The evidence for improved administrative skills can be gathered by asking the following question: To what extent have the LAG staff, decision-making body, LAG members (where applicable) improved their skills in relation to [...]:

- > [...] simplification of procedures for applicants/beneficiaries.
- > [...] decision-making.
- > [...] coordination/management, including financial management, reporting, preparation of documents for decision-making.
- > [...] performing key tasks in a timely manner.
- > [...] facilitation.
- > [...] network management.
- > [...] conflict resolution.
- > [...] cooperation and participation.
- > [...] communication (of the LDS, of LAG activities, etc.)
- > [...] other administrative skills (specify).

**Unit of measurement:** The different aspects are measured on a Likert scale from 1 (*minimum* value) to 5 (*maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Focus groups or surveys to collect the data on different aspects should be targeted at LAG staff, decision-making bodies and a representative sample of LAG members (if it is not possible to survey all LAG members).

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect data one year after the LAG is operational as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall verify if the indicator 'Evidence of improvement of administrative skills' of LAGs tends to reach the maximum score (or not) based on the perceptions of respondents.

The indicator is calculated as the ratio of total scores assigned by respondents to each aspect observed and the maximum possible score:

$$LAV.R.07 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij}}{MaxP}$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $P_{ij}$  is the score attributed by respondent  $i$  on the aspect  $j$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.



	Very low	Low	Neither low nor high	High	Very high
Scores	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Aspects:</b>					
1. To what extent has there been an improvement in skills introducing simplification of procedures for applicants/beneficiaries?					
2. To what extent has there been an improvement in decision-making skills?					
3. To what extent has there been an improvement in coordination/management skills?					
4. To what extent has there been an improvement in skills in relation to performing key tasks in a timely manner?					
5. To what extent has there been an improvement in facilitation skills?					
6. To what extent has there been an improvement in network management skills?					
7. To what extent has there been an improvement in conflict resolution skills?					
8. To what extent has there been an improvement in cooperation and participation skills?					
9. To what extent has there been an improvement in communication skills?					
10. To what extent has there been an improvement in other administrative skills? (specify)					

**Comments/caveats:** By measuring different aspects of the indicator, the evaluator shall depict if 'Evidence of improvement of administrative skills' of LAGs is close to 5, which means that LAG staff, decision-making body and LAG members have very well-developed administrative skills. If the value is close to one, the opposite happens. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated at different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall verify if the indicator has improved, remained the same or decreased during the programming period.

A focus group can also be organised before designing these questions in order to identify all the relevant administrative skills that LAG staff, decision-making bodies and LAG members are expected to have to better perform their tasks.

It must also be noted that if there is staff rotation, the level of skills may drop despite training activities.

This indicator can only be aggregated at CSP level if the types of administrative skills expected to improve are the same for each LAG i.e. if the questions asked are the same.



**Indicator: LAV.R.08. Evidence of improvement of the technical skills of LAGs in the LDS and areas covered by it.**

**Added value element:** Local governance.

**Related factor of success:** The administrative and technical skills of the LAG and its staff (in areas covered by the LDS) are improving or remain at a high level.

**Definition and aim:** The indicator 'Evidence of improvement of the technical skills of LAGs in the LDS and areas covered by it' is a result indicator of local governance. This is one of two result indicators that aim to capture the extent to which participation in training/capacity building activities contributes to an improvement of technical skills.

Technical skills are a set of skills required to perform specific tasks, use particular tools or work with various technologies and methodologies within a particular field. In the context of LEADER, these practical skills are related to the areas covered by the LDS (e.g. business, development, tourism, infrastructure, social care and environment). By acquiring these skills, the LAG has a better understanding of how it can address local needs and improve its understanding of which operations should be supported to have more effective solutions in areas covered by the LDS. Some examples of technical skills include digital literacy, data collection, data analysis, quality assurance, local marketing, business development, management of hospitality services and other skills in fields related to the areas covered by LDS.

By improving their technical skills in relation to the LEADER principles, partnership building and local strategy development, as well as in relation to the areas covered by the LDS, LAGs can better perform their day-to-day work.

The evidence for improved technical skills can be gathered by asking the following question: To what extent has there been an improvement of technical skills in the field of [...]:

- > [...] LEADER method principles for the design and implementation of LDS.
- > [...] partnership building and strategy development.
- > [...] data collection/data analysis.
- > [...] other other fields areas related to the LDS (e.g. add additional fields as necessary e.g. local marketing, business development, tourism, infrastructure improvements, etc.).

**Unit of measurement:** The different aspects are measured on a Likert scale from 1 (*minimum* value) to 5 (*maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Focus groups or surveys to collect data on different aspects should target LAG staff, the decision-making body and a representative sample of LAG members (if it is not possible to survey all LAG members).

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect data one year after the LAG is operational as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall verify if the indicator 'Evidence of improvement of the technical skills of LAGs in the LDS and areas covered by it' tends to reach the maximum score (or not) based on the perceptions of respondents. The indicator is calculated as the ratio of total scores assigned by respondents to each aspect observed and the maximum possible score:

$$LAV.R.08 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij} / MaxP$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $P_{ij}$  is the score attributed by respondent  $i$  on the aspect  $j$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.



	Very low	Low	Neither low nor high	High	Very high
Scores	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Aspects:</b>					
1. To what extent has there been an improvement in technical skills related to LEADER method principles for the design and implementation of LDS?					
2. To what extent has there been an improvement in technical skills in the field of partnership building and strategy development?					
3. To what extent has there been an improvement in data collection/analysis skills?					
4. To what extent has there been an improvement of technical skills in the field of ... [e.g. local marketing]?					
5. To what extent has there been an improvement in technical skills in the field of ... [e.g. business development]?					
6. To what extent has there been an improvement of technical skills in the field of ... [e.g. tourism]?					
...					
...					

Include as many rows as necessary based on the content/fields of the LDS.

**Comments/caveats:** By measuring different aspects of the indicator, the evaluator shall depict if 'Evidence of improvement of the technical skills of LAGs in the LDS and areas covered by it' is close to 5, which means that LAG staff, decision-making body and members have very well-developed technical skills in the relation to the LEADER method, strategy development and the areas covered by the LDS. If the value is close to one, the opposite happens. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated at different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall verify if the indicator has improved, remained the same or decreased during the programming period.

A focus group can also be organised before designing these questions to identify all the relevant areas of the LDS on which LAG staff, decision-making body and members are expected to acquire specific knowledge.

It must be kept in mind that if LAGs do not have these technical skills, they may choose experts. In such a case, the internal skills within the LAG may be low, but the perception of LAG members may be high.

This indicator cannot be aggregated at CSP level as there are different areas covered by each LDS. However, the first two questions on LEADER method principles, partnership building, and strategy development can be common to all LAGs and could be aggregated at CSP level.





**Indicator: LAV.O.10. Number of animation activities by target stakeholder group, organiser and type of activity.**

**Added value element:** Local governance.

**Related factor of success:** The LAG has improved animation and support to actual and potential beneficiaries.

**Definition and aim:** The number of animation activities is an output indicator that measures a concrete operationalisation of local governance, thanks to the LAG's animation activities. Animation activities are central to LEADER implementation and set the basis for improved local governance by motivating the local community to participate in the formation or continuation of the LAG and engaging them effectively in the co-development of the LDS and its effective implementation.

Animation activities can:

- > target different stakeholder groups (e.g. sector, territory, beneficiaries, potential beneficiaries).
- > be organised by different actors (e.g. LAG only or LAG in cooperation with other regional businesses, public authorities and social, cultural and environmental organisations).
- > be of multiple types (e.g. individual advice, workshops, study visits, communication campaigns).

**Unit of measurement:** Number of animation activities:

- > by target stakeholder group;
- > by organiser;
- > by type of animation activity.

**Data sources:** LAG yearly reports/LAG level monitoring data are expected to contain information on animation activities. Interviews with LAG representatives (e.g. its staff, decision-making body and members) can provide further information on the types of animation activities implemented.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect the data annually during implementation and at the end of the programming period.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** By comparing the different values over time, the evaluator shall verify if the values of the 'number of animation activities' change.

The number of animation activities can be listed by type of animation activity, targeted stakeholder group, targeted territory, type of beneficiary and organiser, each year. The table below offers an example of how the data can be categorised and collected.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year n
<b>Number of animation activities (total number of activities)</b>			
<b>Type of activity:</b>			
Activity type X (number) (e.g. individual one-on-one advice)			
Activity type Y (number) (e.g. study visits)			
Activity type Z (number) (e.g. meetings with potential beneficiaries)			
Etc.			



<b>Targeted stakeholder groups:</b>			
Sector X (number of activities related to this sector)			
Sector Y (number of activities)			
Etc.			
<b>Targeted territories:</b>			
Territory X (number of activities)			
Territory Y (number of activities)			
<b>Type of beneficiaries:</b>			
Actual/project promoter			
Potential			
<b>Organiser:</b>			
The LAG alone			
The LAG in cooperation with other actors (e.g. regional businesses, public authorities, and social, cultural and environmental organisations).			

**Comments/caveats:** The higher the number of animation activities, the more likely interest is generated in LEADER projects and potential beneficiaries are encouraged to apply.

Furthermore, by comparing the number of animation activities at different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall verify if more target/stakeholder groups have been reached by animation activities.

*This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level in terms of totals, i.e. total number of animation activities.*



**Indicator: LAV.R.09. Evidence of support (by type of support) provided to applicants and beneficiaries, and, particularly, to those that have not applied or been supported before, including hard-to-reach groups.**

**Added value element:** Local governance.

**Related factor of success:** The LAG has improved animation and support to actual and potential beneficiaries.

**Definition and aim:** The indicator 'Evidence of support (by type of support) provided to applicants and beneficiaries, and, particularly, to those that have not applied or been supported before, including hard-to-reach groups' is a result indicator of local governance. It aims to identify what support is provided to applicants and beneficiaries in order to motivate them to participate in the implementation of the local development strategy.

The evidence of support can be gathered by asking the following question: To what extent do you agree with the following statements in relation to the type of support provided by the LAG to applicants, new applicants and new beneficiaries?

- > The LAG staff is easily reachable (e.g. accessibility of office, working hours, contact information provided).
- > Advice provided by the LAG staff to improve the quality of project applications is useful.
- > Advice provided by LAG staff on formal requirements related to the implementation of LEADER projects (e.g. documentation required to justify activities) is sufficient.
- > Queries are dealt with on the spot.
- > The LAG has defined hard-to-reach groups, identified their needs and provided specific communication material and/or capacity building support addressed to these groups.
- > Other type of support available (specify).

**Unit of measurement:** The different aspects are measured on a Likert scale from 1 (*minimum* value) to 5 (*maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Surveys and/or focus groups to collect data on different aspects should be proposed to a representative sample of LEADER project promoters, beneficiaries and potentially applicants that have been rejected.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect data one year after the LAG is operational as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall verify if the indicator 'Evidence of support (by type of support) provided to applicants and beneficiaries, including hard-to-reach groups' tends to reach the maximum score (or not) based on the perceptions of respondents.

The indicator is calculated as the ratio of total scores assigned by respondents to each aspect observed and the maximum possible score:

$$LAV.R.09 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij}}{MaxP}$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $P_{ij}$  is the score attributed by respondent  $i$  on the aspect  $j$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

	Very low	Low	Neither low nor high	High	Very high
<b>Scores</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Aspects:</b>					
1. The LAG staff is easily reachable (e.g. accessibility of office, working hours, contact information provided).					



2. Advice provided by the LAG staff to improve the quality of project applications is useful.					
3. Advice provided by LAG staff on formal requirements related to the implementation of LEADER projects (e.g. documentation required to justify activities) is sufficient.					
4. Queries are dealt with on the spot.					
5. The LAG has defined hard-to-reach groups, identified their needs and provided specific communication material and/or capacity building support addressed to these groups.					
6. Other type of support available.					

Include as many rows as necessary based on the type of support you need to check.

**Comments/caveats:** By measuring different aspects of the indicator, the evaluator shall depict if 'Evidence of support (by type of support) provided to applicants and beneficiaries, including hard-to-reach groups' is close to 5, which means that the LAG offers sufficient support to applicants and beneficiaries. If the value is close to one, the opposite happens. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated at different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall verify if the indicator has improved, remained the same or decreased during the programming period.

This indicator can be aggregated at the CSP level provided the types of support are the same for each LAG.



**Indicator: LAV.I.06. Number of new applicants as a result of animation and support activities.**

**Added value element:** Local governance.

**Related factor of success:** The LAG has improved animation and support to actual and potential beneficiaries.

**Definition and aim:** The 'number of new applicants as a result of animation and support activities' is a result indicator that measures the extent to which animation and support offered by the LAG have resulted in more people applying for funding under LEADER, including hard-to-reach groups (the latter to be defined by each LAG).

**Unit of measurement:** Number of new applicants.

**Data sources:** LAG level monitoring database to identify new applicants, surveys and interviews with new applicants.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect data one year after the LAG is operational as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** By comparing the baseline and final values, the evaluator shall verify if the values of the 'number of applicants' change.

The number of new applicants can be taken directly from the LAG level monitoring database. New applicants are local community members/actors who apply for LEADER support for the first time. They also include hard-to-reach groups, as defined by the LAG.

Interviews or surveys of new applicants can be organised to identify if the project application was submitted to the LAG as a result of animation and support activities.

**Comments/caveats:** The higher the number of new applicants, the higher the success of animation and support activities in motivating new local community members/actors to apply to LEADER.

The applicants representing hard-to-reach groups can be identified as a separate sub-group of new applicants if needed.

Furthermore, by comparing the number of new applicants at the beginning and end of the programming period, the evaluator shall verify if more stakeholders have applied for LEADER for the first time.

*This indicator can be aggregated at the CSP level as it concerns a number of new applicants.*



**Indicator: LAV.O.11. Number of LAGs with relevant documents concerning their activities available on a website: a) statutes of the LAG; b) composition of the board; c) minutes of general meetings; d) financial statements (part of annual reports); e) LDS; f) published calls for projects; g) decisions on project selection and descriptions of funded projects; h) LAG evaluations; and i) newsletters.**

**Added value element:** Local governance.

**Related factor of success:** Communication within LAG, with prospective applicants and the local community is improving.

**Definition and aim:** This is an output indicator that aims to capture whether LAGs communicate their activities through a website. This contributes to improving local governance by increasing transparency of LAG operations and decisions. The documents that are expected to be available as a minimum on the LAG website include up-to-date versions of:

- > Statutes of the LAG.
- > Composition of the decision-making body.
- > Minutes of general meetings.
- > Annual reports (including financial statements).
- > LDS.
- > Project calls, including selection criteria.
- > Decisions on project selection and descriptions of funded projects.
- > LAG evaluations.
- > Newsletters or other publications.

**Unit of measurement:** Number of LAGs.

**Data sources:** LAG websites.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect the data at the beginning of the programming period as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** By comparing the baseline and final values, the evaluator shall verify if the values of the 'number of LAGs with relevant documents concerning their activities on their website' change and in which direction. It is expected that over time, LAGs will become more transparent by adding more documents related to their activities on their website or they will remain transparent if these are already on their websites. More categories may be added if relevant.

Type of document	Available on website	Not available on website	Available but not updated
1. Statutes of LAG			
2. Composition of the decision-making body			
3. Minutes of general meetings			
4. Annual reports (including financial statements)			



5. LDS			
6. Project selection criteria			
7. Descriptions of funded projects			
8. LAG evaluations			
9. Newsletters or other publications			
Other (specify)			

The indicator is calculated as the sum of LAGs that include items 1-9 on their websites. Other documents on the website can be captured and described by the 'other' item and described.

**Comments/caveats:** The presence of relevant documents on the LAG websites indicates the efforts undertaken by LAGs to communicate their activities transparently and, therefore, increase the EU's visibility to the local community.

Furthermore, by comparing the number of LAGs with relevant documents on their websites at the beginning and end of the programming period, the evaluator shall verify if more LAGs become transparent about their activities or if they remain transparent (e.g. LAGs that stop updating their website with information about their LDS or funded projects may be considered to have reduced their transparency).

This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level as it concerns number of LAGs with presence of relevant documents on their website, specifically the presence of items a-i. For 'other' documents, a description can be provided, without aggregation.



**Indicator: LAV.O.12. Evidence of the LAG's communication activities and their reach e.g. a) existence of a LAG website; b) presence in social media; c) presence in other public common channels; d) meetings/events; and e) other.**

**Added value element:** Local governance.

**Related factor of success:** Communication within LAG, with prospective applicants and the local community is improving.

**Definition and aim:** The 'evidence of communication activities of the LAGs' is an output indicator that measures the extent to which LAGs communicate their activities. Communication activities contribute to improved local governance by increasing transparency of LAG activities.

The indicator aims to identify the existence of communication activities of the LAG and their reach by asking the questions: What communication channels does the LAG have? How many people are reached through the LAG's [...]:

- > [...]website.
- > [...]social media channels.
- > [...] presence in other public channels.
- > [...] meetings/events.

**Unit of measurement:** Number of monthly visits or number of occurrences per month (or year).

**Data sources:** LAG website, interviews, focus groups and communication statistics.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect the data at different points in time during the programming period.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall first verify what communication activities of the LAG exist, by asking the question: 'What communication channels does the LAG have?' Then the evaluator can ask about how many people were reached through these channels. The answer would be the number of visits to the communication channels if they exist.

LAG's communication channels	Number of communication activities	Number of occurrences (e.g. monthly or annual visits, circulation if press, number of listeners if radio, participants, etc.) in Year n
A LAG website	X	
Social media*		
Presence in other public channels*		
Meetings/events		
Other (specify)		

\* All these channels can be disaggregated further, for example, social media can be disaggregated into Facebook, X and Instagram or other. Public channels can be disaggregated into local radio, press, etc.

**Comments/caveats:** By comparing the evaluation results between different times during the implementation period, the evaluator shall verify if the number of visits, hence the visibility of the LAG, has improved, remained the same or decreased.

This indicator can be aggregated at the CSP level concerning the number of visits to each communication channel.





**Indicator: LAV.R.10. Percentage of local community members who are aware of a) the LAG; b) its activities; and c) the LDS.**

**Added value element:** Local governance.

**Related factor of success:** Communication within LAG, with prospective applicants and the local community is improving.

**Definition and aim:** The 'Percentage of local community members who are aware of a) the LAG; b) its activities; and c) the LDS' is a result indicator that measures the extent to which the local community is aware of the LAG, its activities and the LDS. It is expected that the communication activities of the LAG (measured with output indicators) will result in a higher awareness amongst local community members/actors.

**Unit of measurement:** The different aspects are measured on a Likert scale from 1 (*minimum* value) to 5 (*maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Focus groups and surveys to collect the data should target a representative sample of the local community.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect the data at the beginning of the programming period as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall verify if the indicator 'Percentage of local community members who are aware of a) the LAG; b) its activities; and c) the LDS' tends to reach the maximum score (or not) based on the perceptions of respondents. The indicator is calculated as the ratio of total scores assigned by respondents to each aspect observed and the maximum possible score:

$$LAV.R.10 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij}}{MaxP}$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $P_{ij}$  is the score attributed by respondent  $i$  on the aspect  $j$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

	Very low	Low	Neither low nor high	High	Very high
<b>Scores</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Aspects:</b>					
1. To what extent are you aware there is a LAG in your territory?					
2. To what extent are you aware of the activities of the LAG?					
3. To what extent are you aware of the LDS in your territory?					

**Comments/cautions:** By measuring different aspects of the indicator, the evaluator shall depict if the value of the indicator is close to 5, which means that the awareness of the LAG, its activities and the LDS is highly developed. If the value is close to one, the opposite happens. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated at different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall verify if awareness has improved, remained the same or decreased.

This indicator can be aggregated at the CSP level provided the same questions are asked in every LAG.



**Indicator: LAV.I.07. Evidence of local community members that think LEADER brings the EU closer to citizens.**

**Added value element:** Local governance.

**Related factor of success:** Communication within LAG, with prospective applicants and the local community is improving.

**Definition and aim:** The 'Evidence of local community members that think LEADER brings the EU closer to citizens' is an impact indicator that measures the extent to which local community members think highly of the LAG and its capacity to bring the EU closer to local communities through LEADER. This would be the ultimate outcome (impact) of the communication activities of LAGs if they effectively advertise the achievements of the implementation of the LEADER method and the LDS.

**Unit of measurement:** The different aspects are measured on a Likert scale from 1 (*minimum* value) to 5 (*maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Focus groups and surveys to collect data should target a representative sample of the local community.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect data at the beginning of the programming period as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The indicator is measured through the question: How do you grade on a scale from 1 to 5 (where 1 is the minimum and 5 is the maximum value) your perception that LEADER brings the EU closer to citizens?

The final value of the indicator is based on the average of the answers provided by respondents.

$$LAV.I.07 = \sum_{i=1}^n P_i / MaxP$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $P_i$  is the point attributed by respondent  $i$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

**Comments/caveats:** The evaluator shall depict if the value of the indicator is close to 5. This means that the perception that LEADER brings the EU close to citizens attests to a very high level. If the value is close to one, the opposite happens. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated in different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall depict if the indicator value has improved, remained the same or decreased.

This indicator can be aggregated at the CSP level provided the same question is asked in every LAG



**Indicator: LAV.I.08. Evidence of local community members with a perception that the LAG is a credible institution/central agent for local development.**

**Added value element:** Local governance.

**Related factor of success:** Communication within LAG, with prospective applicants and the local community is improving.

**Definition and aim:** The 'Evidence of the local community members with a perception that the LAG is a credible institution/central agent for local development' is an impact indicator that measures the extent to which the local community consider the LAG a credible institution that plays a central role in local development. This would be the ultimate outcome (impact) of the communication activities of LAGs if they effectively advertise the achievements of the implementation of the LEADER method and the LDS. It is also an outcome of the results achieved at local level and the changes that take place as a result of the implementation of the LDS.

**Unit of measurement:** The different aspects are measured on a Likert scale from 1 (*minimum* value) to 5 (*maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Focus groups and surveys to collect the data should be proposed to a representative sample of the local community.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect data at the beginning of the programming period as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The indicator is measured through the question: How do you grade on a scale from 1 to 5 (where 1 is the minimum and 5 is the maximum value) your perception that the LAG is a credible institution and a central agent for local development?

The final value of the indicator is based on the average of the answers provided by respondents.

$$LAV.I.08 = \sum_{i=1}^n P_i / MaxP$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $P_i$  is the point attributed by respondent  $i$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

**Comments/caveats:** By measuring different aspects of the indicator, the evaluator shall depict if the value of the indicator is close to 5, which means that the local community thinks highly of the LAG as a central agent for local development. If the value is close to one, the opposite happens. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated at different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall verify if this perception has improved, remained the same or decreased.

This indicator can be aggregated at the CSP level provided the same question is asked in every LAG



**Indicator: LAV.O.13. Number and type of interactions between the MA/PA and LAGs or LAG representatives.**

**Added value element:** Multi-level governance.

**Related factor of success:** The coordination and communication between the LAG and other levels of governance is improving or remains at a high level.

**Definition and aim:** The 'Number and type of interactions between the MA/PA and LAGs or LAG representatives' is an output indicator that aims to capture the interactions between the MA/PA and the LAG or its representatives. Participation of the MA/PA in LAG meetings or LAG assemblies, as well as participation of the LAG in Monitoring Committee meetings or other MA/PA meetings are examples of interactions. These interactions shape the division of competencies among the MA/PA and the LAG levels and help improve the delivery mechanism of LEADER.

**Unit of measurement:** Number of interactions per year, by type of interactions.

**Data sources:** Records/monitoring data in the MA/PA and the LAG, and interviews with staff from the LAG, MA and PA.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect data once a year during the programming period.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** By comparing the values over time, the evaluator shall verify if the values of the 'Number and type of interactions between the MA/PA and LAGs or LAG representatives' change and in which direction.

The evaluator shall verify what types of interactions exist between the MA/PA and the LAG and/or its representatives by asking the question: What type of interactions exist between the MA/PA and the LAG and how many times per year do these occur?

The answer would be the number of interactions per year for each of the identified types of interactions.

Question: What type of interactions exist between the MA/PA and the LAG and how many times per year do they occur?	Number in year n
Participation of the MA/PA in LAG meetings	
Participation of the MA/PA in LAG Assemblies	
Participation of the LAG or LAG representatives in Monitoring Committee meetings	
Trainings provided by the MA/PA to the LAG	
Coordination meetings between MA/PA and LAGs	
Other types of interactions (specify and add rows as needed)	

**Comments/caveats:** The existence of various types of interactions is an indication of the efforts to build an effective multi-level governance. Furthermore, by comparing over time, the number and types of interactions between the MA/PA and the LAG, the evaluator shall verify if more types of interactions are developed over time as well as if their frequency (number of interactions per year) changes.

This indicator can only be aggregated at the CSP level for interactions that are the same for all LAGs dealing with the MA/PA.



**Indicator: LAV.R.11. Evidence of improved quality of interactions between the MA/PA/NN and LAGs or LAG representatives.**

**Added value element:** Multi-level governance.

**Related factor of success:** The coordination and communication between the LAG and other levels of governance is improving or remains at a high level.

**Definition and aim:** The ‘Evidence of improved quality of interactions between the MA/PA/NN and LAGs or LAG representatives’ is a result indicator that aims to capture the extent to which the coordination and communication between the LAG and the MA/PA/NN have improved. This can be assessed by looking at whether LAGs are consulted on the design of systems and procedures and their simplification, the intensity of cooperation between the LAG and the MA/PA or the activities undertaken by the LAG, and the MA/PA in order to improve coordination and simplify systems and procedures.

This indicator is computed based on scores attributed by respondents to different aspects operationalised through the following questions: To what extent:

- > [...] does the MA/PA consult the LAGs on the design of systems and procedures?
- > [...] does the MA/PA consult the LAGs on the simplification of systems and procedures?
- > [...] does the MA/PA/NN undertake activities to evaluate and improve systems, rules and procedures?
- > [...] does the MA/PA/NN undertake activities to simplify coordination with LAGs?
- > [...] does the MA/PA/NN undertake activities to improve communication with LAGs?
- > [...] does the LAG undertake activities to improve coordination and communication with the MA/PA/NN?
- > [...] do disputes and conflicts between MA/PA and LAGs get resolved?

**Unit of measurement:** The different aspects are measured on a Likert scale from 1 (*minimum* value) to 5 (*maximum* value).

**Data sources:** A survey for data collection should target staff of the LAG/PA/NN representatives, MA, PA and NN. Additionally, interviews with these LEADER stakeholders can collect more information on the types of activities undertaken.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect data one year after the LAG is operational as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall verify if the indicator ‘improved quality of interactions between the MA/PA/NN and LAGs or LAG representatives’ tends to reach the maximum score (or not) based on the perceptions of respondents.

The indicator is calculated as the ratio of total scores assigned by respondents and the maximum possible score:

$$LAV.R.11 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij}}{MaxP}$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $P_{ij}$  is the score attributed by respondent  $i$  on the aspect  $j$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

	Very low	Low	Neither low nor high	High	Very high
<b>Scores</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Aspects:</b>					
1. To what extent does the MA/PA consult the LAGs on the design of systems and procedures?					



2. To what extent does the MA/PA consult the LAGs on the simplification of systems and procedures?					
3. To what extent does the MA/PA/NN undertake activities to improve systems, rules and procedures?					
4. To what extent does the MA/PA/NN undertake activities to simplify coordination with LAGs?					
5. To what extent does the MA/PA/NN undertake activities to improve communication with LAGs?					
6. To what extent does the LAG undertake activities to improve coordination and communication with the MA/PA?					
7. To what extent do disputes and conflicts between MA/PA and LAGs get resolved?					

**Comments/caveats:** By measuring different aspects of the indicator, the evaluator shall depict if the value of the indicator is close to 5, which means that the quality of interactions has highly improved. If the value is close to one, the opposite happens. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated at different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall depict if the indicator value has improved, remained the same or decreased during the programming period.

This indicator targets the CSP level as it measures multi-level governance.



**Indicator: LAV.I.09. Evidence of a positive perception of people in the MA/PA/NN and LAGs who consider that the links and coordination/communication between the MA/PA/NN and the LAGs have been strengthened.**

**Added value element:** Multi-level governance.

**Related factor of success:** The coordination and communication between the LAG and other levels of governance is improving or remains at a high level.

**Definition and aim:** The 'Evidence of a positive perception of people in the MA/PA/NN and LAGs who consider that the links and coordination/communication between the MA/PA/NN and the LAGs have been strengthened' is an impact indicator that aims to reflect the changes in the attitudes between the levels of governance on the functioning of multi-level governance. This would be the ultimate outcome (impact) of the activities undertaken by the MA/PA/NN and/or LAGs to improve and/or simplify coordination systems, rules and procedures.

**Unit of measurement:** The different aspects are measured on a Likert scale from 1 (*minimum* value) to 5 (*maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Survey and focus groups targeted at the MA, PA, NN, LAG staff, LAG decision-making body and LAG representatives.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect the data one year after the LAG is operational as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall verify if the indicator 'Evidence of a positive perception of people in the MA/PA/NN and LAGs who consider that the links and coordination/communication between the MA/PA/NN and the LAGs have been strengthened' tends to reach the maximum score (or not) based on the perceptions of respondents.

The indicator is calculated as the ratio of total scores assigned by respondents to each aspect observed and the maximum possible score:

$$LAV.I.09 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij}}{MaxP}$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $P_{ij}$  is the score attributed by respondent  $i$  on the aspect  $j$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

	Very low	Low	Neither low nor high	High	Very high
<b>Scores</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Aspects:</b>					
1. To what extent do you think the links between the MA/PANN and LAGs have been strengthened?					
2. To what extent do you think coordination/communication between the MA/PA/NN and LAGs have been strengthened?					

**Comments/caveats:** By measuring different aspects of the indicator, the evaluator shall depict if the value of the indicator is close to 5, which means that stakeholders think highly of the links/communication between the different levels of governance (LAGs and MA/PA/NN). If the value is close to one, the opposite happens. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated in different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall verify if this perception has improved, remained the same or decreased.

This indicator targets the CSP level as it measures multi-level governance.





## Enhanced results and impacts

**Indicator: LAV.O.14. Ratio of EAFRD funding for LDS to other (non-EAFRD) funding spent on the LDS, of which a) by private sources, b) by public sources.**

**Added value element:** Increased leverage.

**Related factor of success:** The LDS stimulated further investment or activities in the LAG area to achieve the strategic objectives of the LDS not directly funded by LEADER.

**Definition and aim:** This is an output indicator that measures the additional financial resources mobilised by the LDS, distinguishing between private and public sources. The indicator aims to compute, for each euro spent by EAFRD in the LDS, how many more euros are paid by other (private or public) sources. It consists of two specific indicators:

- > Total amount paid by private sources/total amount from EAFRD paid for the implementation of projects (operations), including cooperation projects and their preparation, selected under the LDS.
- > Total amount paid by public sources/total amount from EAFRD paid for the implementation of projects (operations), including cooperation activities and their preparation, selected under the LDS.

**Unit of measurement:** % of non-EAFRD invested in the LDS.

**Data sources:** For the numerator of both specific indicators: LAG level monitoring database.

For the denominator of both specific indicators: DME. Variable L922 (Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475). Member States shall report on variable L922 per LDS in 2026 and 2030.

**Suggested time and frequency of data collection:** The data for the L922 variable is collected as part of the DME. The administrative/monitoring database of LAGs shall collect data for euros paid by private or public sources for the LDS implementation.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The ratio computed shall enable understanding of the leverage effect i.e. the capacity of the LDS to mobilise further financial resources compared to the total number of EAFRD resources paid for the LDS implementation.

Formula	Data, variable
Ratio a/b in % a) Euros paid by private sources b) Total amount from EAFRD paid for the implementation of projects (operations), including cooperation activities and their preparation, selected under the LDS	Euros spent by private sources for the LDS L922
Ratio a/b in % a) Euros paid by public sources b) Total amount from EAFRD paid for the implementation of projects (operations), including cooperation activities and their preparation, selected under the LDS	Euros spent by public sources for the LDS L922

**Comments/caveats:** Based on data collected, the higher the ratio, the higher the leverage effect of the LDS.

The evaluator needs to be cautious when interpreting the indicators. For example, if there is a small amount of EAFRD support and high private contribution in some projects, this might suggest that they could be implemented without public support (deadweight).

This indicator can be aggregated at the CSP level provided all LAGs collect data on euros spent by public or private sources for the LDS. Variable L922 is common for all LAGs and there will be no issue in obtaining it for all LAGs.





**Indicator: LAV.O.15. Evidence (number and expenditure) of projects to which the LAG applies outside the EAFRD (e.g. other EU or national funds).**

**Added value element:** Increased leverage.

**Related factor of success:** The LDS stimulated further investment or activities in the LAG area to achieve the strategic objectives of the LDS not directly funded by LEADER.

**Definition and aim:** The output indicator 'Evidence (number and expenditure) of projects to which the LAG applies outside the EAFRD (e.g. other EU funds or national funds)' aims to capture the leverage in the capacity of the LAG to benefit from funding opportunities and bring more investments in the LAG area. It consists of two specific indicators:

- › Number of projects to which the LAG applies outside the EAFRD.
- › Expenditure on projects to which the LAG applies outside the EAFRD.

**Unit of measurement:** Specific indicator 1: Number of projects; Specific indicator 2: EURO.

**Data sources:** For both specific indicators use LAG level administrative/monitoring databases and interviews with LAGs.

**Suggested time and frequency of data collection:** Collect the data at the beginning of the programming period as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** By comparing the baseline and final values, the evaluator shall verify if the LAGs have been able to apply to projects funded by other sources outside EAFRD, for instance other EU funds or national funds.

Formula	Data
Number of projects funded by non-EAFRD sources* that the LAG applies to.	Number of projects
Expenditure on projects funded by non-EAFRD sources * that the LAG applies to.	Euros spent

\*This can be further disaggregated by type of source, e.g. EU funds, national funding.

**Comments/caveats:** Based on data collected and elaborated in different moments of the programming period, it will be possible to observe if the number of or the expenditure on projects funded outside EAFRD i.e. from other EU funds or national funds, has increased or kept equal during the programming period. The higher the number of projects or the expenditure on projects funded by non-EAFRD sources, the higher the leverage effect of LEADER.

This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level provided all LAGs collect the same data.



**Indicator: LAV.R.12. Evidence of operations (projects) that include voluntary work.**

**Added value element:** Increased leverage.

**Related factor of success:** The LDS stimulated further investment or activities in the LAG area to achieve the strategic objectives of the LDS not directly funded by LEADER.

**Definition and aim:** The result indicator 'Evidence of operations (projects) that include voluntary work' measures the additional human resources, notably voluntary work, that are mobilised by the LDS. The indicator aims to assess the extent to which LEADER generates voluntary work. It consists of two specific indicators:

- > Number of operations (projects) that include voluntary work.
- > Full-time equivalent (FTE) spent by volunteers on LEADER projects.

The full-time equivalent is calculated as the proportion of the hours spent in voluntary work to the maximum hours spent by a full-time worker during a whole year (in most cases 1 720 hours).

**Unit of measurement:** Specific indicator 1: Number of operations (projects); Specific indicator 2: FTE of voluntary work.

**Data sources:** For both specific indicators, use LAG level administrative/monitoring databases and surveys of project promoters.

**Suggested time and frequency of data collection:** Collect data during implementation (depending on uptake) and at the end of the programming period.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** By comparing the different values over time, the evaluator shall verify how voluntary work was generated by LEADER. This shows the extent to which additional resources by means of volunteers have been mobilised for the implementation of the LDS.

Formula	Data
Sum of projects (operations) that include voluntary work	Number of projects
Sum of FTE spent by volunteers on LEADER projects (operations)	Hours (days) of volunteering work per year

**Comments/caveats:** Based on data collected and elaborated in different moments of the programming period, it will be possible to observe if the number of projects that include voluntary work or the time spent on volunteer work has increased or remained the same during the programming period. The higher the number of projects or the hours/days spent on volunteer work, the higher the leverage effect of LEADER.

This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level provided all LAGs collect the same data.



**Indicator: LAV.O.16. Number of new project promoters supported by the LAG where financial support from the LEADER intervention was decisive.**

**Added value element:** Increased leverage.

**Related factor of success:** LEADER interventions made it possible to identify and motivate new project promoters.

**Definition and aim:** The output indicator 'Number of new project promoters supported by the LAG where financial support from the LEADER intervention was decisive' aims to capture the efforts of LAGs to identify and motivate new project promoters by measuring their number. It aims to identify those promoters for whom the support was decisive, meaning that without LEADER support their project would not have been implemented because it would not have been funded by other measures or funds.

**Unit of measurement:** Number of new project promoters.

**Data sources:** LAG level monitoring database, and interviews and surveys of LAG staff. Additionally, interviews with selected new project promoters can collect more information on the types of LAG activities undertaken to motivate them to participate in LEADER.

**Suggested time and frequency of data collection:** Collect data one year after the LAG is operational (as there are no applications at the beginning of the programming period) as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** By comparing the baseline and final values, the evaluator shall verify if the LAGs have been able to motivate new promoters for whom LEADER support was decisive. This indicator is calculated by asking a simple question in interviews or surveys or by obtaining the number from the LAG level monitoring database if it is collected:

How many new project promoters have you supported whose projects (operations) would not have received funding from other sources and therefore would not have been implemented without this decisive support?

**Comments/caveats:** Based on data collected and elaborated at different moments of the programming period, it will be possible to observe if the number of new project promoters for whom the LEADER support was decisive has increased or remained the same. The higher the number of new promoters, the higher the capacity of LEADER to mobilise more people to apply for LEADER funding.

*This indicator can be aggregated at the CSP level provided all LAGs collect the same data or are asked the same question.*



**Indicator: LAV.R.13. Evidence of local community members in the LAG area with a positive perception of the LAG's capacity to identify and empower new project promoters.**

**Added value element:** Increased leverage.

**Related factor of success:** LEADER interventions made it possible to identify and motivate new project promoters.

**Definition and aim:** This result indicator aims to capture the local community's perceptions of the LAG's capacity to identify and empower new project promoters i.e. to motivate them to apply for LEADER funding.

**Unit of measurement:** The indicator is measured on a Likert scale from 1 (the *minimum* value) to 5 (the *maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Focus groups and surveys to collect the data should be proposed to a representative sample of the local community.

**Suggested time and frequency of data collection:** Collect the data at the beginning (one year after the LAG is operational) of the programming period as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The indicator is measured through the question: How do you grade on a scale from 1 to 5 (where 1 is the *minimum* and 5 is the *maximum* value) your opinion on the capacity of the LAG to identify and motivate new project promoters?

The final value of the indicator is based on the average of the answers provided by respondents.

$$LAV.R.13 = \sum_{i=1}^n P_i / MaxP$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $P_i$  is the point attributed by respondent  $i$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

**Comments/caveats:** The evaluator shall depict if the value of the indicator is close to 5. This means that stakeholders think very positively of the capacity of the LAG to identify new project promoters and encourage them to apply for LEADER funding. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated at different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall depict if the capacity of the LAG has improved, remained the same or decreased.

This indicator can be aggregated at the CSP level provided all LAGs ask the same question to stakeholders.



**Indicator: LAV.O.17. Number and share of operations (projects) implemented by different types of promoters.**

**Added value element:** Projects well-tailored to the needs of the LAG area.

**Related factor of success:** LEADER meets specific local needs and territorial objectives by enabling projects by a variety of promoter types that valorise specific territorial assets and identities.

**Definition and aim:** The 'Number and share of operations (projects) implemented by different types of promoters' (variables L700-707 (Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475)) is an output indicator that measures a concrete operationalisation of the variety of project promoters. The aim is to capture the variety of promoters, based on the assumption that the higher the variety of promoters the more likely it is for the needs of the territory to be addressed (different promoters represent different typologies of needs). For instance, businesses and NGOs representing social interests make different contributions to local needs, likewise, public administration and private individuals have different stakes and contribute in different ways to local needs. The indicator consists of two specific indicators:

- > Number of operations (projects) implemented by different types of promoters.
- > Share of operations by type of promoters.

Specific indicator 2 may allow the evaluator to understand the capacity of the LAG to facilitate operations by type of promoters compared to the total number of operations activated. In this way, the evaluator can verify there is no concentration of operations (projects) on certain types of promoters.

**Unit of measurement:** For specific indicator 1: Number of operations, total and by type of promoter (variables L700-L707); For specific indicator 2: % of operations.

**Data sources:** For both specific indicators: DME. Variables L700-707 (Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475).

**Suggested time and frequency of data collection:** Collect data in 2026 where Member States must report the list of variables on LAG's activities by LAG. The evaluator shall collect the final value if the evaluation takes place before 2030.

These data are normally available in the LAGs' administrative/monitoring records, so the evaluator should also consider this specific data source, which provides detailed information for all the years of the programming period.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** For the specific indicator 1, the variables 'number of operations implemented by different types of promoters' (variables L701-L707) can be used alone.

For specific indicator 2 the following formulas can be applied:

Formula	Variable
Ratio a/b in % a) Number of operations implemented by private individuals or businesses b) Total number of operations implemented by the LAG	L701 L700
Ratio a/b in % a) Number of operations implemented by public administrations b) Total number of operations implemented by the LAG	L702 L700



<p>Ratio a/b in %</p> <p>a) Number of operations implemented by representatives of private economic local interests (e.g. business associations, chamber of commerce)</p> <p>b) Total number of operations implemented by the LAG</p>	<p>L703</p> <p>L700</p>
<p>Ratio a/b in %</p> <p>a) Number of operations implemented by representatives of social local interests (e.g. non-governmental organisations, local associations)</p> <p>b) Total number of operations implemented by the LAG</p>	<p>L704</p> <p>L700</p>
<p>Ratio a/b in %</p> <p>a) Number of operations implemented by research organisations</p> <p>b) Total number of operations implemented by the LAG</p>	<p>L705</p> <p>L700</p>
<p>Ratio a/b in %</p> <p>a) Number of operations implemented by several types of promoters</p> <p>b) Total number of operations implemented by the LAG</p>	<p>L706</p> <p>L700</p>
<p>Ratio a/b in %</p> <p>a) Number of operations implemented by promoters that fall under other categories than those listed in the previous points</p> <p>b) Total number of operations implemented by the LAG</p>	<p>L707</p> <p>L700</p>

**Comments/caveats:** Based on data collected and elaborated in different moments of the programming period, it will be possible to observe if the share of operations implemented by different promoters has increased, kept equal or decreased during the programming period. It can also be assessed if the distribution has changed and if there is any concentration on a specific type of promoter.

This indicator can be aggregated at CSP level given that these DME variables are common i.e. they have to be collected by all LAGs.



**Indicator: LAV.O.18. Number of operations (projects) that contribute to each typology of needs identified in the LDS, including green, digital or social transitions of rural areas.**

**Added value element:** Projects well-tailored to the needs of the LAG area.

**Related factor of success:** LEADER meets specific local needs and territorial objectives by enabling projects by a variety of promoter types that valorise specific territorial assets and identities.

**Definition and aim:** The 'Number of operations that contribute to each typology of needs identified in the LDS, including green, digital or social transitions of rural areas' (variables L801-810 (Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475)) is an output indicator that measures a concrete operationalisation of the objectives/areas covered by each operation.

The aim is to assess if the operations supported cover the needs that are identified and addressed by the LDS, stressing needs related to the green, digital or social transition. For instance, if the LDS has a specific focus on social inclusion, it is expected that operations will also cover social inclusion (L809). If the LDS also has needs related to environment and climate, it is expected there will be operations in the areas of renewable energy (L803), environmental sustainability and climate change mitigation, and adaptation (L804) and local businesses in the field of bioeconomy (L806). Also, if the LDS identifies the need to improve local resilience through smart village approaches, then it is expected that there will be operations related to smart village strategies (L807).

**Unit of measurement:** Number of operations by objective/area (L801-L810).

**Data sources:** DME. Variables L801-L810 (Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475). Interviews with LAG staff and the decision-making body.

**Suggested time and frequency of data collection:** Collect data in 2026 where Member States must report the list of variables on LAG's activities by LAG. The evaluator shall collect the final value if the evaluation takes place before 2030. These data are normally available in the LAGs' administrative/monitoring records, so the evaluator should also consider this specific data source, which provides detailed information for all the years of the programming period.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The first step would be to review the LDS and interview LAG staff and the decision-making body to map all the needs identified in the LDS.

The second step would be to compute the numbers of operations by objective/area (variables L801-L810), focusing on areas related to the needs identified in the LDS. The higher the number of operations in areas that address needs covered by the LDS, the better the capacity of operations and their combination to address these needs. Note that each operation may address more than one need.

	L801	L802	Etc.
Need 1		X (Number)	
Need 2	X (Number)	X (Number)	
Etc.			

**Comments/caveats:** Based on data collected and elaborated at different moments of the programming period, it will be possible to observe if the operations implemented in the areas that address the LDS needs have increased, remained the same or decreased during the programming period.

If the expenditure per objective/area is available (i.e. expenditure for L801-L810), the indicator can be revised to 'expenditure of operations that contribute to each typology of needs identified in the LDS'. In this way, it may capture if there are any big strategic projects which may be more important than many small ones not linked to each other.

Although the variable L800 is collected by all LAGs, the indicator cannot be aggregated at the CSP level because needs are different in each LDS, unless there is a common typology of needs established.

**Indicator: LAV.R.14. Percentage of operations (projects) that valorise unique territorial assets (e.g. social, cultural, culinary, landscape, natural, environmental).**

**Added value element:** Projects well-tailored to the needs of the LAG area.

**Related factor of success:** LEADER meets specific local needs and territorial objectives by enabling projects by a variety of promoter types that valorise specific territorial assets and identities.

**Definition and aim:** The 'Percentage of operations (projects) that valorise unique territorial assets (e.g. social, cultural, culinary, landscape, natural, environmental)' is a result indicator that aims to assess how the diversity of project promoters and operations builds on the unique territorial assets and contributes to their valorisation. The indicator is based on the assumption that the implementation of projects by promoters who have better knowledge of how the local assets may be used to address the identified needs will lead to an increased share of projects that build on territorial assets.

**Unit of measurement:** % of operations (projects).

**Data sources:** For the numerator: Surveys and focus groups with LAG staff and the decision-making body to identify the operations (projects) that valorise unique territorial assets.

For the denominator: DME. Variable L700, total number of operations implemented by the LAG (Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475).

**Suggested time and frequency of data collection:** Collect data during implementation (depending on uptake) and at the end of the programming period.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The first step would be to carry out a survey or focus group to LAG staff and the decision-making body to identify the number of operations that valorise unique territorial assets based on the question: How many projects focus on one or more of the following fields...:

- > Cultural or natural heritage.
- > Upgrading and/or transformation of abandoned/unused buildings and/or land.
- > Revitalisation of landscapes.
- > The promotion of local craft or culinary products.
- > Other unique territorial assets (e.g. social, natural, environmental).

This number will then be compared to the total number of operations supported by the LAG. The percentage computed shall allow an understanding of the extent to which LEADER contributes to valorise territorial assets that have a unique value for the territory covered by the LDS.

Formula	Data, variable
Ratio a/b in % a) Number of operations that valorise cultural or natural heritage b) Total number of operations implemented by the LAG	No of operations L700
Ratio a/b in % a) Number of operations that focus on upgrading and/or transformation of abandoned/unused buildings and/or land b) Total number of operations implemented by the LAG	No of operations L700





<p>Ratio a/b in %</p> <p>a) Number of operations that focus on revitalising landscapes</p> <p>b) Total number of operations implemented by the LAG</p>	<p>No of operations</p> <p>L700</p>
<p>Ratio a/b in %</p> <p>a) Number of operations that focus on promoting local craft or culinary products</p> <p>b) Total number of operations implemented by the LAG</p>	<p>No of operations</p> <p>L700</p>
<p>Ratio a/b in %</p> <p>a) Number of operations that valorise other unique territorial assets</p> <p>b) Total number of operations implemented by the LAG</p>	<p>No of operations</p> <p>L700</p>

**Comments/caveats:** Based on data collected and elaborated in different moments of the programming period, it will be possible to observe if the operations that valorise unique territorial assets have increased, remained the same or decreased during the programming period.

This indicator can be aggregated at the CSP level provided all LAGs are asked about the number of operations that valorise unique territorial assets. The L700 variable is common and will be collected by all LAGs.



**Indicator: LAV.I.10. Evidence of operations (projects) that produce community benefits and reinforce community identity.**

**Added value element:** Projects well-tailored to the needs of the LAG area.

**Related factor of success:** LEADER meets specific local needs and territorial objectives by enabling projects by a variety of promoter types that valorise specific territorial assets and identities.

**Definition and aim:** LEADER projects focus on the local area and its needs, depicted in the LDS. This local focus makes LEADER different as it is expected to bring benefits to local communities and reinforce their identity. This impact indicator aims to capture if such community benefits have been produced, whether community identity has been reinforced and in which way.

**Unit of measurement:** The indicator is measured on a Likert scale from 1 (the *minimum* value) to 5 (the *maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Focus groups or surveys to collect the data and information on different aspects should be proposed to LEADER project promoters/beneficiaries/participants. Moreover, the LAG staff, the decision-making body and a representative sample of LAG members (if it is not possible to survey all LAG members) should also be surveyed.

**Suggested time and frequency of data collection:** Collect data during implementation (depending on uptake) and at the end of the programming period.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The indicator is measured through the question: How do you grade on a scale from 1 to 5 (where 1 is the *minimum* and 5 is the *maximum* value) the capacity of the LAG to produce community benefits and reinforce community identity?

The final value of the indicator is based on the average of the answers provided by respondents.

$$LAV.I.10 = \sum_{i=1}^n P_i / MaxP$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $P_i$  is the point attributed by respondent  $i$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

Additionally, respondents can be asked through focus groups to describe the community benefits and therefore provide more information to explain this indicator.

**Comments/caveats:** A survey is most pertinent for collecting the data measured on a Likert scale, while focus groups to a smaller sample can help contextualise the numerical answers by providing descriptions of the types of community benefits produced by LEADER.

The evaluator shall depict if the value of the indicator is close to 5. This means that the capacity of LEADER to bring benefits to local communities and reinforce community identity trust attests to a very high level. If the value is close to one, the opposite happens. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated at different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall depict if the indicator has improved, remained the same or decreased.

This indicator can be aggregated at the CSP level provided all LAGs are asked the same question.



**Indicator: LAV.O.19. Number of operations (projects) which are innovative in the local context.**

**Added value element:** Projects with innovative elements at a local level.

**Related factor of success:** LEADER fosters the introduction/diffusion of innovations in the local context.

**Definition and aim:** LAGs and local project promoters implement various types of innovation (e.g. product, process, service, organisational, technological, social, business model and other types). Innovation is defined locally each local context by national or regional authorities or the LAGs themselves. This output indicator aims to measure the operations that produce such types of innovation.

**Unit of measurement:** Number of operations (projects) which are innovative in the local context (variable L710).

**Data sources:** DME. Variable L710 (Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475). Member States shall report on variable L710 per LDS in 2026 and 2030, from the moment of the first payment to a given operation (project). The report in year N relates to all operations paid until 15 October N-1.

**Suggested time and frequency of data collection:** The data for variable L710 is collected as part of the DME in 2026, which can represent the baseline value. The evaluator shall collect the data at the end of the programming period as the final value if the evaluation takes place before 2030.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** By comparing the baseline and final values, the evaluator shall verify whether the number of innovative operations in the local context changes.

Formula	Variable
Number of operations which are innovative in the local context	L710

The evaluator may also calculate the share of the innovative operations (projects) to the total number of operations (formula: ratio L710/L700).

**Comments/caveats:** Based on data collected and elaborated at different moments of the programming period, it will be possible to observe if the number of innovative operations in the local context has changed. The higher the number, the higher the capacity of LEADER to produce innovation.

This indicator can be aggregated at the CSP level given that variable L710 is common to all LAGs and there will be no issue in obtaining it for all LAGs.



**Indicator: LAV.R.15. Percentage of expenditure in innovative operations (projects) to the total expenditure.**

**Added value element:** Projects with innovative elements at a local level.

**Related factor of success:** LEADER fosters the introduction/diffusion of innovations in the local context.

**Definition and aim:** LAGs and local project promoters implement various types of innovation (e.g. product, process, service, organisational, technological, social, business model and other types). Innovation is defined locally by national or regional authorities or the LAGs themselves. This result indicator aims to assess what proportion of the budget spent on operations (projects) concerns innovative projects.

**Unit of measurement:** % of expenditures for innovative operations (projects).

**Data sources:** Expenditures that correspond to operations (projects) from the LAG level monitoring database.

For the denominator: DME. Variable L922 (Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475).

**Suggested time and frequency of data collection:** The data for expenditure on innovative operations (projects) in the local context should be available in the LAG-level monitoring database. The data for variable L922 is collected as part of the DME in 2026, which can represent the baseline value. If the evaluation takes place before 2030, the evaluator shall collect the data at the end of the programming period as the final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The indicator is calculated by dividing the expenditure that corresponds to operations (projects) that are innovative at the local level by variable L922, which represents the total expenditure for operations under the LDS. Therefore, for the numerator, operations (projects) that are innovative at the local level (also reported for variable L710 in DMA) have to be identified and their budgets (EAFRD) have to be summed up. For the denominator, the value reported for L922 can be used.

By comparing the baseline and final values, the evaluator shall verify if the percentage of expenditure for operations which are innovative in the local context has increased or remained the same.

Formula	Data, Variable
Ratio a/b in % a) Sum of expenditure for operations which are innovative in the local context b) Total amount from EAFRD paid for the implementation of operations, including cooperation activities and their preparation, selected under the LDS	Expenditure for projects reported for L710 L922

**Comments/caveats:** Based on data collected and elaborated at different moments of the programming period, it will be possible to assess the extent to which the LDS funds innovative operations. The higher the percentage, the higher the capacity of LEADER to produce innovation. Comparing baseline and final values will show whether this capacity has increased or remained the same.

This indicator can be aggregated at the CSP level if expenditures for projects reported for variable L710 are available in the LAG monitoring databases and variable L922 is common for all LAGs.



**Indicator: LAV.R.16. Evidence of innovations produced at the local level in response to a) digital; b) green; c) economic; and d) social challenges/transition.**

**Added value element:** Projects with innovative elements at a local level.

**Related factor of success:** LEADER fosters introduction/diffusion of innovations in the local context

**Definition and aim:** LAGs and local project promoters implement different types of innovation, including product, process, service, organisational, technological, social, business model and other types of innovation. The definition of innovation in the local context is up to each Member State. It is defined in each local context by LAGs themselves or, where relevant, by national or regional authorities. These innovations are produced to respond to different challenges as identified in the LDS, including digital, green, economic and societal challenges.

Green challenges may include tackling climate change, protecting natural resources and enhancing biodiversity, etc. Digital challenges may include making production processes more efficient, reducing the impacts of adversities (e.g. pests, diseases), fostering learning processes and facilitating the integration of companies into the market, etc. Economic challenges include improving the economic conditions of farmers, addressing market fluctuations and addressing business uncertainties, etc. Societal challenges include addressing depopulation, reducing inequalities and promoting inclusion, and improving working conditions, etc.

This result indicator is computed based on scores attributed by respondents to different aspects operationalised through the following questions: To what extent do the projects (operations) implemented under the local development strategy produce innovation to address:

- > [...] digital challenges.
- > [...] environmental challenges.
- > [...] economic challenges.
- > [...] societal challenges.

**Unit of measurement:** The indicator is measured on a Likert scale from 1 (*minimum* value) to 5 (*maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Surveys for data collection should be proposed to LAG staff and the decision-making body, to a representative sample of LAG members (if it is not possible to survey all LAG members) and promoters of LEADER projects.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect data during implementation (depending on uptake) and at the end of the programming period.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall verify if the indicator 'Evidence of innovations produced at the local level in response to a) digital; b) green; c) economic; and d) social challenges/transition' tends to reach the maximum score (or not) based on the perceptions of respondents.

The indicator is calculated as the ratio of total scores assigned by respondents and the maximum possible score:

$$LAV.R.16 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij}}{MaxP}$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $P_{ij}$  is the score attributed by respondent  $i$  on the aspect  $j$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

	Very low	Low	Neither low nor high	High	Very high
<b>Scores</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Aspects:</b>					
1. To what extent do the projects (operations) implemented under the LDS produce innovation to address digital challenges?					



2. To what extent do the projects (operations) implemented under the LDS produce innovation to address environmental challenges?					
3. To what extent do the projects (operations) implemented under the LDS produce innovation to address economic challenges?					
4. To what extent do the projects (operations) implemented under the LDS produce innovation to address societal challenges?					

**Comments/caveats:** By measuring different aspects of the indicator, the evaluator shall depict if the value of the indicator is close to 5, which means that evidence of innovations produced at the local level in response to a) digital, b) green, c) economic and d) social challenges/transition attests to a very high level. If the value is close to one, the opposite happens. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated in different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall depict if the indicator has improved, remained the same or decreased during the programming period.

This indicator can be aggregated at the CSP level provided all LAGs are asked the same questions (assuming all LAG strategies aim to address the same challenges). It is also important that all LAGs use the same interpretation of digital, green, economic and societal challenges.



**Indicator: LAV.I.11. Percentage of LEADER stakeholders who consider that LEADER contributes to the generation of new ideas, products or processes in the LAG area that are innovative in the local context.**

**Added value element:** Projects with innovative elements at a local level.

**Related factor of success:** LEADER fosters the introduction/diffusion of innovations in the local context.

**Definition and aim:** The definition of innovation in the local context is included in the LDS and can be used as a criterion when selecting LEADER operations (projects). Innovations include product, and service innovation (creating a new, unprecedented product or service), process innovation (new, significantly different technological process or method of manufacturing or creating a service), resource innovations (operations fundamentally change the way resources are used) and social innovations (new forms of collaboration, approaches or solutions to an existing social challenge). This impact indicator aims to capture the extent to which LEADER stakeholders consider that LEADER contributes to the production of innovations in the local context. This can be done by asking directly this question to the following groups of LEADER stakeholders: project promoters/beneficiaries, LAG members, LAG decision-making body and staff.

**Unit of measurement:** The indicator is measured on a Likert scale from 1 (the *minimum* value) to 5 (the *maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Surveys for data collection should be proposed to LAG staff, decision-making body, to a representative sample of LAG members (if it is not possible to survey all LAG members) and promoters of LEADER projects.

**Suggested time and frequency of data collection:** Collect data one year after the LAG becomes operational as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The indicator is measured through the question: To what extent do you agree with the statement that LEADER contributes to the generation of new ideas, products or processes in the LAG area that are innovative in the local context?

The possible answers are:

- > Strongly agree.
- > Agree.
- > Neither agree nor disagree.
- > Disagree.
- > Strongly disagree.

The final value of the indicator is the percentage of respondents who have declared to prefer a specific option over the total number of respondents (e.g. the percentage of respondents answering 'strongly agree' over the total number of respondents).

$$LAV.I.11 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n P_i}{N}$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  are the respondents,  $P_i$  is the number of respondents who has answered, for instance, 'strongly agree' and  $N$  is the total number of respondents.

**Comments/caveats:** The higher the number of respondents who attest their agreement with the above statement, the higher the added value due to innovation promoted by LEADER as perceived by different stakeholders. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated at different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall depict if the indicator has improved, remained the same or decreased during the programming period.

This indicator can be aggregated at the CSP level provided all LAGs are asked the same question.



**Indicator: LAV.O.20. Number of operations (projects) that contribute to a) economic; b) environmental; and c) social sustainability.**

**Added value element:** Sustainable projects.

**Related factor of success:** LEADER projects produce sustainable results.

**Definition and aim:** This output indicator aims to measure the number of operations (projects) that contribute to sustainability. Working definitions are provided here, although LAGs may define themselves as economic, social and environmental sustainability at the local level.

- Economic sustainability refers to the capacity of LEADER projects to contribute to long-term local economic development and financial stability of local businesses, as well as projects in the social innovation field (social economy).
- Environmental sustainability refers to LEADER projects that contribute to the sustainable use of local natural resources while respecting the environment, reducing emissions, protecting biodiversity and the natural environment, and promoting a local circular economy.
- Social sustainability in the context of LEADER projects refers to fostering resilience of local communities through social inclusion, well-being, reduction of poverty, job creation, diversification and rural infrastructure development.

**Unit of measurement:** Number of operations (projects).

**Data sources:** LAG level monitoring database, CSP electronic information system and LAG yearly reports.

**Suggested time and frequency of data collection:** Collect the data during implementation (depending on uptake) and at the end of the programming period.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The first step would be to check the LDS to identify which type of sustainability it addresses in case it does not address all three (economic, environmental and social). Then, in order to identify the operations (projects) that contribute to sustainability, the working definitions provided above can be used to calculate the number of projects from the LAG level monitoring database or LAG yearly reports.

By comparing the different values over time, the evaluator shall verify if the number of projects that contribute to economic, environmental and social sustainability has increased or remained the same.

**Comments/caveats:** As the number of projects is not necessarily collected by LAGs in relation to economic, environmental and social sustainability, the evaluator will need to identify them based on the working definitions provided here. The outcome would be, for instance, that the higher the number of projects contributing to environmental sustainability, the higher the capacity of LEADER to contribute to environmental sustainability.

For a more comprehensive understanding, include information about the expenditure of projects that contribute to sustainability.

*This indicator can be difficult to aggregate at the CSP level unless the same definitions of sustainability are used in all cases.*





**Indicator: LAV.R.17. Evidence of operations (projects) whose sustainability has been improved through consultation with the LAG.**

**Added value element:** Sustainable projects.

**Related factor of success:** LEADER projects produce sustainable results.

**Definition and aim:** LAGs operate in their local contexts to activate the capacity of the local community to identify their project ideas and, consequently, propose more robust and sustainable project proposals. This result indicator aims to identify operations (projects) whose sustainability has improved because of consultation with the LAG.

**Unit of measurement:** The indicator is measured on a Likert scale from 1 (the *minimum* value) to 5 (the *maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Surveys to collect data and information should target LEADER project promoters. Moreover, the LAG staff and decision-making body should also be surveyed.

Focus groups with project promoters and LAG staff can provide more context on how consultation with the LAG has helped.

**Suggested time and frequency of data collection:** Collect the data one year after the LAG is operational as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The indicator is measured through the question: How do you grade on a scale from 1 to 5 (where 1 is the minimum and 5 is the maximum value) the extent to which consultation with the LAG has helped the development of more robust and sustainable project proposals?

The final value of the indicator is based on the average of the answers provided by respondents.

$$LAV.R.17 = \sum_{i=1}^n P_i / MaxP$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $P_i$  is the point attributed by respondent  $i$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

Additionally, respondents can be asked through focus groups to describe how the consultation with the LAG has contributed to improving the capacity of promoters to propose more robust and sustainable projects. This can provide more information to explain this indicator.

**Comments/caveats:** A survey is most pertinent for collecting the data measured on a Likert scale, while focus groups to a smaller sample can help contextualise the numerical answers by providing descriptions of how consultations have helped.

The evaluator shall depict if the value of the indicator is close to 5. This means that consultations with LAGs play an important role in producing more robust and sustainable project proposals. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated at different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall depict if the indicator has improved, remained the same or decreased.

This indicator can be aggregated at the CSP level provided all LAGs are asked the same question.



**Indicator: LAV.R.18. Evidence of operations (projects) which are sustainable due to knowledge of local conditions.**

**Added value element:** Sustainable projects.

**Related factor of success:** LEADER projects produce sustainable results.

**Definition and aim:** Operations (projects) financed by LAGs aim to achieve the objectives of the LDS. Project promoters have good knowledge of the local context and what they need to achieve in order to improve their economic, social or environmental situation. This knowledge of local conditions is expected to lead to the implementation of sustainable projects i.e. projects that last for more than five years after the funding has ended and foster local economic, social and environmental sustainability.

**Unit of measurement:** The indicator is measured on a Likert scale from 1 (the *minimum* value) to 5 (the *maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Surveys to collect data and information should target LEADER project promoters/beneficiaries. Moreover, the LAG staff and the decision-making body should also be surveyed.

Focus groups can provide more context on how the knowledge of local conditions contributes to sustainable projects and foster local sustainability.

**Suggested time and frequency of data collection:** Collect data during implementation (depending on uptake) and at the end of the programming period.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The indicator is measured through the question: How do you grade on a scale from 1 to 5 (where 1 is the minimum and 5 is the maximum value) the extent to which operations (projects) are sustainable due to knowledge of local conditions?

The final value of the indicator is based on the average of the answers provided by respondents.

$$LAV.R.18 = \sum_{i=1}^n P_i / MaxP$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $P_i$  is the point attributed by respondent  $i$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

Additionally, respondents can be asked through focus groups to describe how the knowledge of local conditions has contributed to more sustainable projects. This can provide more information to explain this indicator.



**Indicator: LAV.O.21. Number of LEADER operations (projects) that work in synergy.**

**Added value element:** Projects that promote links between local actors.

**Related factor of success:** Collaborative projects are established or sustained.

**Definition and aim:** One of the added value elements of LEADER is that it funds operations (projects) which can work in synergy to produce changes at the local level. This entails different projects covering different aspects of the local area (e.g. tourism, local food and the environment) or one project in a partnership covering different sectors. For instance, activities covering the wine sector and promoting local culture through crafts, or activities covering local food products promoted by tourism.

Such activities can be implemented in the context of different operations (projects), projects jointly implemented by several types of promoters, different projects implemented under a smart village strategy thus working in synergy to contribute to this strategy, integrated projects leading to collaboration and synergies in the LAG area, umbrella projects allowing to integrate various local initiatives and strategic projects. Such projects produce synergies that benefit local development and are also the result of collaboration between different local actors. Therefore, this output indicator aims to identify how many such operations (projects) have been funded by LEADER.

**Unit of measurement:** Number of projects.

**Data sources:** LAG level monitoring database and LAG yearly reports. Interviews with LAG staff, the decision-making body and LEADER project promoters.

**Suggested time and frequency of data collection:** Collect data one year after the LAG becomes operational as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall count the number of implemented LEADER operations (projects) that work in synergy, including:

- > Number of projects jointly implemented by several types of promoters (variable L706 of Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475);
- > Number of projects related to smart village strategies (variable L807 of Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475);
- > Number of integrated projects;
- > Number of umbrella projects;
- > Number of strategic projects;
- > Number of other projects that work in synergy.

The higher the number, the better.

For comparison purposes, the evaluator can normalise the values of the number of projects that work in synergy to allow for a proper comparison among LAGs, which could be determined by:

- > Population covered by the LDS (L400).
- > Number of members of the LAG (L600).
- > Budget devoted to these projects over the total amount paid by EAFRD for the implementation of operations (budget of projects that work in synergy/L922).

For example, normalising values by the population under the LDS means that the number of LEADER projects working in synergy is divided by the population under the LDS. In this way, the numbers can be comparable or put in context across LAGs. This is useful if the evaluator wants to compare projects that work in synergy implemented by different LAGs.

**Comments/cautions:** Data on operations (projects) that work in synergy may not be evident in the LAG level monitoring database. To identify these projects, it is suggested to integrate the analysis with interviews with LAG staff, decision-making bodies or project promoters. In addition, by measuring the normalised value of the number of projects that work in synergy, the evaluator shall identify differences among different LAG areas in the same Member State.

This indicator can be aggregated at the CSP level provided all projects are counted in the same way.

**Indicator: LAV.R.19. Share of LEADER operations (projects) that have produced cooperation in the form of networks, partnerships, jointly implemented projects and other collaborations/synergies.**

**Added value element:** Projects that promote links between local actors.

**Related factor of success:** Collaborative projects are established or sustained.

**Definition and aim:** The experience from consecutive programming periods of LEADER implementation demonstrates that cooperation is an effective mechanism for helping rural areas to jointly develop and share new solutions to common issues. It is through cooperation that the potential of local areas can improve. This result indicator aims at assessing the share of projects that produce cooperation. This can be in the form of networks, partnerships, jointly implemented projects or other collaborations at local, interregional and transnational levels.

**Unit of measurement:** % of operations (projects) that have produced cooperation.

**Data sources:** DME. Variables L706, L708, L709 and L700 (e.g. percentage of L706/L700, L708/L700, L709/L700) (Annex VII to the Regulation (EU) 2022/1475). Interviews with LAG staff and the decision-making board for identifying other collaborations/synergies.

**Suggested time and frequency of data collection:** The DME foresees that the data on projects implemented by the LAG will be collected in 2026 and in 2030 by Member States and related to all operations paid until 15 October 2025 and 15 October 2029. Normally, in the administrative records of the LAGs, these data are available, so the evaluator should also consider this specific data source, which provides detailed information for all the years of the programming period.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of operations (projects) that produce cooperation by the total number of operations (projects). By comparing the baseline and final values, the evaluator shall verify if the share of LEADER projects that produce cooperation has increased, declined or remained the same.

LAG staff and the decision-making board can provide information on other types of collaborations or operations (projects) that produce cooperation/synergies that may not be captured by variables L706, L708 and L709.

Formula	Variable
Ratio a/b in % a) Number of operations jointly implemented by several types of promoters b) Total number of operations implemented by the LAG	L706 L700
Ratio a/b in % a) Number of interregional cooperation projects implemented by the LAG b) Total number of operations implemented by the LAG	L708 L700
Ratio a/b in % a) Number of transnational cooperation projects implemented by the LAG b) Total number of operations implemented by the LAG	L709 L700
Ratio a/b in % a) Number of other collaborations/synergies created by the LAG b) Total number of operations implemented by the LAG	Other collaborations L700

**Comments/cautions:** Based on data collected and elaborated at different moments of the programming period, it will be possible to observe if the share of operations that produce cooperation has increased, remained the same or decreased during the programming period.

This indicator can be aggregated at the CSP level as the variables L706, L708, L709 and L700 are common and will be collected by all LAGs. For other collaborations, it is suggested to provide examples rather than aggregation.



# Structural changes

**Indicator: LAV.1.12. Judgement expressed by LEADER stakeholders on the capacity of LEADER to produce structural changes in the dimensions on which the LDS intervenes.**

**Added value element:** Combination of all three added value components.

**Related factor of success:** The implementation of the LDS with the application of the LEADER method produces structural changes in the dimensions covered by the LDS.

**Definition and aim:** The 'Judgement expressed by LEADER stakeholders on the capacity of LEADER to produce structural changes in the dimensions on which the LDS intervenes' is an impact indicator that aims to assess the extent to which LEADER produces structural changes in the area covered by the LDS.

It assumes that the three added value components of LEADER jointly contribute to structural change. The focus of this indicator is not on individual projects supported by the LAG, but on the overall impacts produced as a result of the combination of projects under the LDS.

The indicator is computed based on scores attributed by respondents to different aspects operationalised through questions tailored to the dimensions/areas covered by the LDS. For instance, the questions can be: To what extent do LEADER stakeholders perceive that the combined projects of the LAG have contributed to [...]:

**Environmental and spatial dimension:**

- > [...] fighting climate change and/or adapting the local territory.
- > [...] promoting the circular economy.
- > [...] valorising spaces that have been neglected or unused.
- > [...] other environmental and spatial dimension(s).

**Economic dimension:**

- > [...] creating additional sources of income for the local population.
- > [...] reducing unemployment and creating jobs.
- > [...] digitalisation in rural areas.
- > [...] finding new markets.
- > [...] strengthening value chains.
- > [...] opening up new types of economic activities/diversification.
- > [...] other economic dimension(s).

**Social dimension:**

- > [...] preventing depopulation through access to basic services.
- > [...] keeping young people in the area.
- > [...] reducing poverty and social exclusion.
- > [...] other social dimension(s).
- > [...] changes in mental and behavioural patterns (e.g. sense of identity, willingness to collaborate).

**Cross-cutting structural changes:**

- > [...] increased community resilience.
- > [...] other.

This indicator should focus on the dimensions/areas where the LDS intervenes and therefore a careful identification of these dimensions is a prerequisite for developing the specific questions to be asked. The above list of dimensions/areas serves as an example only and can also be further merged or disaggregated as relevant.



**Unit of measurement:** The different aspects are measured on a Likert scale from 1 (*minimum* value) to 5 (*maximum* value).

**Data sources:** Focus groups or surveys to collect the data on different aspects should be proposed to LEADER project promoters/beneficiaries/participants. Moreover, LAG staff, the decision-making body and a representative sample of LAG members (if it is not possible to survey all LAG members) should also be surveyed.

**Suggested frequency of data collection:** Collect data one year after the LAG is operational as a baseline value and at the end of the programming period as a final value.

**Methodology, approach or formula for calculation:** The evaluator shall verify if the indicator 'Judgement expressed by LEADER stakeholders on the capacity of LEADER to produce structural changes in the dimensions on which the LDS intervenes' tends to reach the maximum score (or not) based on the perceptions of respondents.

The first step would be to identify and list all the dimensions/areas in which the LDS intervenes and where it is expected to make a change according to the identified needs. The next step would be to calculate the indicator as the ratio of total scores assigned by respondents to each aspect observed and the maximum possible score:

$$LAV.1.12 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij}}{MaxP}$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $P_{ij}$  is the score attributed by respondent  $i$  on the aspect  $j$  and  $MaxP$  is the maximum possible score.

	Very low	Low	Neither low nor high	High	Very high
Scores	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Environmental/spatial dimension:</b>					
1. To what extent do you perceive that the combined projects of the LAG have contributed to fighting climate change and/or adapting the local territory?					
2. To what extent do you perceive that the combined projects of the LAG have contributed to promoting the circular economy?					
3. To what extent do you perceive that the combined projects of the LAG have contributed to valorising spaces that have been neglected or unused?					
4. To what extent do you perceive that the combined projects of the LAG have contributed to [...] <i>add other environmental or spatial dimensions/areas of possible structural changes as needed.</i>					
<b>Economic dimension:</b>					
5. To what extent do you perceive that the combined projects of the LAG have contributed to creating additional sources of income for the local population?					
6. To what extent do you perceive that the combined projects of the LAG have contributed to reducing unemployment and creating jobs?					



7. To what extent do you perceive that the combined projects of the LAG have contributed to digitalisation in rural areas?					
8. To what extent do you perceive that the combined projects of the LAG have contributed to finding new markets?					
9. To what extent do you perceive that the combined projects of the LAG have contributed to strengthening value chains?					
10. To what extent do you perceive that the combined projects of the LAG have contributed to opening up new types of economic activities /diversification?					
11. To what extent do you perceive that the combined projects of the LAG have contributed to [...] <i>add other economic dimensions/areas of possible structural changes as needed.</i>					
<b>Social dimension:</b>					
12. To what extent do you perceive that the combined projects of the LAG have contributed to preventing depopulation through access to basic services?					
13. To what extent do you perceive that the combined projects of the LAG have contributed to keeping young people in the area?					
14. To what extent do you perceive that the combined projects of the LAG have contributed to reducing poverty and social exclusion?					
15. To what extent do you perceive that the combined projects of the LAG have contributed to [...] <i>add other social dimensions/areas of possible structural changes as needed.</i>					
16. To what extent do you perceive that the combined projects of the LAG have contributed to changes in mental and behavioural patterns (e.g. sense of identity, willingness to collaborate)?					
<b>Cross-cutting areas:</b>					
17. To what extent do you perceive that the combined projects of the LAG have contributed to increased community resilience?					
18. To what extent do you perceive that the combined projects of the LAG have contributed to other cross-cutting structural changes?					



**Comments/caveats:** By measuring different aspects of the indicator, the evaluator shall depict if the value of the indicator is close to 5, which means that the perception of the capacity of LEADER to produce structural changes in the territory through the LDS is very high. If the value is close to one, the opposite happens. Moreover, by comparing data collected and elaborated on at different moments of the programming period, the evaluator shall verify if the indicator has improved, remained the same or decreased during the programming period.

This indicator, which is based on perceptions, could be complemented by actual results achieved in the LDS expressed through relevant PMEF result indicators (e.g. R.37 for employment, R.42 for social inclusion).

Furthermore, this indicator could be complemented with some descriptive statistics/analysis on data related to structural changes (if available at the local/regional level), such as population trends, employment/unemployment trends and poverty/social exclusion trends, etc. These statistics could serve to contextualise the analysis of this indicator as well as other PMEF indicators linked to SOs.

*This indicator can be aggregated at the CSP level only for the dimensions/areas common to all LAGs.*





European Evaluation Helpdesk for the CAP  
Rue Belliard 12, 1040  
Brussels, Belgium  
+32 2 808 10 24

