knowledge
intensive
business
services

Independent Evaluation Service for the 2014-2022 Rural Development Program of the Campania Region under the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD)

CIG: 7205166314 - CUP: B29G17000550009

2026 ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

Non-Technical Summary

Rome, May 2026

Unione Europea

Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo rurale: *l'Europa investe nelle zone rurali*

REGIONE CAMPANIA

PSR14-20 Campania

LATTANZIO KIBS

MONITORING & EVALUATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction

The **2026 Annual Evaluation Report** (AER) analyzes the use of resources, the status of implementation, and the assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of the Campania Region's 2014–2022 Rural Development Program as of December 31, 2025.

The document is structured as follows:

- ► Program objectives and implementation components (Chapter 1).
- ► Description of the methodological approach adopted for the evaluation activities, with details on the main sample surveys, the methods for determining the samples and defining the set of beneficiaries, as well as the information sources used and the criteria adopted to verify data quality and the reliability of the conclusions (Chapter 2).
- ► Presentation and analysis of the information collected (Chapter 3), including:
  - o an assessment of financial and procedural progress;
  - o an assessment of the trajectories of farms in Campania;
  - o RDP support for agricultural development in inland areas;
  - o analysis by FA and responses to the evaluation questions;
  - o the response to "horizontal" evaluation questions 19, 20, and 21.
- ► Analysis of organizational and management aspects, particularly regarding cases where interventions were terminated due to revocations or withdrawals (Chapter 4).
- ► Self-assessment process of the Campania LAGs 2014-2022 (Chapter 5).
- ► Description of activities carried out in collaboration with the independent evaluator of the ERDF, ESF, and EMFF, and with the Environmental Authority (Chapter 6).
- ► Conclusions, suggestions, recommendations, and proposals (Chapter 7).

2. Methodological Approach

This chapter outlines the fundamental elements of the evaluation approach adopted by the VI for the preparation of the 2026 RVA, with particular reference to the methodological criteria guiding its structure, the information sources utilized, and the techniques for collecting secondary and primary data.

The methodological approach adopted is a mixed-methods approach: it integrates quantitative and qualitative methods, selected based on the nature of the evaluation questions, the intervention context, and the specific research objectives. In line with the provisions of the Evaluation Design, the Evaluation Unit utilized both secondary data sources and primary data collection, employing the most appropriate tools in relation to the research objectives of each individual analysis.

The collection of primary data was organized along two distinct methodological lines: sample surveys, conducted among the beneficiaries of the RDP interventions, and participatory and qualitative techniques, based on the involvement of sector experts and key informants.

Specifically:

(i) In-depth analysis of program and implementation documentation and monitoring data from the regional monitoring system and AGEA (National OP), as well as discussions with regional representatives of the Managing Authority staff.

(ii) Direct survey targeting a sample of beneficiary farms to verify the results achieved and/or expected thanks to RDP resources, through the administration of a structured questionnaire using CAWI and CATI methods. The survey was conducted between April and May 2026. Unlike previous editions, the questionnaire does not include the section on the characteristics

of the beneficiary farm, which are obtained from AGEA's OPDB database, in order to reduce the information burden on the respondent. The sections of the questionnaire are therefore entirely dedicated to assessing the effects of the RDP on the objectives of the various Focus Areas. The survey results were aggregated with those from previous years (incremental sample 2020–2025) and analyzed to address the evaluation questions related to FA 2A, 3A, and 3B.

(iii) Analysis of the trajectories of Campania's agricultural enterprises, aimed at investigating both the effects of RDP interventions and the development trajectories of enterprises supported by the Program (see Section 3.3). In this context, the Delphi method was applied, which allowed for the involvement of a panel of sector experts to validate—or, if necessary, revise—the positioning of the clusters and trajectories identified by the quantitative analysis.

(iv) A direct survey targeting a sample of agricultural enterprises that received funding under measures 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 6.4.1 to collect data for the assessment of outcome indicator R2, based on the ratio of Gross Marketable Production (GMP) to Annual Labor Units (ALU) (see section 3.5).

(v) Analysis of cases where interventions were terminated due to revocation or withdrawal (see section 4.1), including a sample survey of entities that withdrew from the grant and two focus groups with officials from regional implementing bodies involved in the preliminary assessment and ongoing and final monitoring of funded operations, in order to gather information on the reasons underlying the revocation.

(vi) Other participatory and qualitative techniques:

a. Structured interview with the Measure 19 Manager, aimed at gathering an overall assessment of LEADER programming, with regard to financial progress, the LAGs' implementation capacity and territorial animation, and the quality of cooperation projects (see Chapter 3.5 — FA 6B).

b. Focus groups and interviews with experts and key informants to explore issues related to the implementation of the RDP, such as the effectiveness of technical assistance services (QVC 20) and relations with the National Rural Network (QVC 21).

3. Program Progress

The Campania Region's 2014–2022 RDP has reached a spending rate of 96%, driven by payments for so-called "area-based/headage-based measures," which have reached 99% of planned spending. The so-called "structural measures," on the other hand, have reached a spending rate of 95%.

Table 1 – Planned and actual spending as of 12/31/2025 for structural and area/head measures

	Planned Expenditure	Actual spending	of which from the 2014-2022 Programming Period	of which from carryovers	Spending capacity
	(€)	(€)	(€)	(€)	(%)
Structural measures	1,296,116,806	1,226,328,382	1,177,823,389	48,504,993	95
Measures by area/per head	1,083,314,975	1,068,938,020	1,032,138,747	36,799,273	99
Total	**2,379,431,781**	**2,295,266,402**	**2,209,962,136**	**85,304,266**	**96**

Source: for planned expenditure, the regional monitoring file "financial plan for version 17 of the RDP"; for actual expenditure, the regional monitoring file "decrees from 2016 to 2025"; for actual expenditure for M2 and M16, "AST2-04 for sub-measures"; for actual expenditure for M1, OPDB.

As for the individual Priorities, all have a spending capacity exceeding 85%; the lowest is P5, which reached 89% of actual spending relative to planned spending, although this represents an increase compared to the previous year, despite a decrease in the financial allocation and an increase in spending.

Table 2 - Planned resources and actual expenditure as of 12/31/2025 by Priority

P	Planned Expenditure	Actual Expenditure	Expenditure Capacity
	(€)	(€)	(%)
2	665,623,008	633,334,468	95
3	225,260,894	218,767,014	97
4	1,138,150,097	1,116,806,889	98
5	83,949,137	74,816,975	89
6	266,448,644	251,541,056	94
Total	**2,379,431,781**	**2,295,266,402**	**96**

Source: for planned expenditure, the regional monitoring file "financial plan for version 17 of the RDP"; for actual expenditure, the regional monitoring file "decrees from 2016 to 2025"; for actual expenditure for M2 and M16, "AST2-04 for sub-measures"; for actual expenditure for M1, OPDB. N.B. P1 resources are added to the other Priorities, as they are, by their nature, intended to support all the FA of the RDP.

The following table presents the planned and actual expenditure as of 12/31/2025 by individual FA or Priority in the case of Priority 4. Given the cross-cutting nature of the FAs under Priority 1, these are treated within the FAs to which they refer in financial terms.

FA 2A - Improving the economic performance of all agricultural holdings and encouraging the restructuring and modernization of agricultural holdings, in particular to increase market share and market orientation as well as the diversification of activities

Spending under FA 2A stands at 96% of the planned amount, an increase of 16 percentage points compared to last year, despite a decrease in the budget allocation (-3.2%) and an increase in actual spending (+15.8%). The FA's spending capacity is in line with the RDP average (96%). This progress is primarily driven by M21 and M22, which have a spending capacity of 100%. M16 also has a strong spending capacity (97%). The measure contributing the least is M2, where, in any case, the spending capacity is just over 90%. Carryovers account for 8% of actual spending. 98.5% of beneficiaries have already received the final payment for their projects.

Table 3 - Programmed resources and actual expenditure as of 12/31/2025 for FA 2A by M

M	Programmed Expenditure	Actual Expenditure	Spending capacity	of which from the 2014-2022 Program	of which from carryovers	of which from carryovers
	(€)	(€)	(%)	(€)	(€)	(%)
1	1,191,215	1,143,680	96	747,520	396,159	35
2	2,271,424	2,081,967	92	2,075,967	6,000	0
4	281,416,759	268,645,978	95	240,594,281	28,051,697	10
6	66,785,907	62,822,555	94	61,260,517	1,562,038	2
8	1,338,197	1,338,197	100	1,338,197	0	0
16	6,352,573	6,136,910	97	6,136,910	0	0
21	9,240,999	9,271,199	100	9,271,199	0	0
22	17,037,681	17,006,479	100	17,006,479	0	0
Total	**385,634,755**	**368,446,965**	**96**	**338,431,070**	**30,015,894**	**8**

Source: for planned expenditure, the regional monitoring file "financial plan for version 17 of the RDP"; for actual expenditure, the regional monitoring file "decrees from 2016 to 2025"; for actual expenditure under M2 and M16, "AST2-04 for sub-measures"; for actual expenditure under M1, OPDB.

FA 2B - Promoting the entry of suitably qualified farmers into the agricultural sector and, in particular, generational renewal

Expenditure under FA 2B shows a 95% progress rate compared to the planned amount, a significant increase compared to last year (+20 percentage points), despite a slight decrease in the financial allocation (-1.6%) and a substantial increase in actual expenditure (+24%). The FA's spending capacity remains slightly lower (by -1 percentage point) than the RDP average (96%). Contributing to this progress are primarily Axis 4, with a spending capacity of 95%, and Axis 6, with a spending capacity of 94%. M2 remains below the FA's average spending capacity, although it remains relatively high (82%). Expenditure was incurred entirely using resources from the 2014–2022 Programming Period, and 76.6% of beneficiaries have already received the final payment for their projects.

Table 4 - Programmed resources and expenditure incurred as of 12/31/2025 for FA 2B by M *(Master 2026, Table 16)*

M	Programmed Expenditure	Actual Expenditure	Spending capacity	of which from the 2014-2022 Program	of which from carryovers	of which from carryovers
	(€)	(€)	(%)	(€)	(€)	(%)
1	3,501,135	3,234,550	92	3,234,550	0	0
2	1,343,598	1,095,963	82	1,095,963	0	0
4	167,413,901	158,991,000	95	158,991,000	0	0
6	107,729,618	101,565,990	94	101,565,990	0	0
Total	**279,988,252**	**264,887,503**	**95**	**264,887,503**		

Source: for planned expenditure, the regional monitoring file "financial plan for version 17 of the RDP"; for actual expenditure, the regional monitoring file "decrees from 2016 to 2025"; for actual expenditure under M2, "AST2-04 for sub-measures"; for actual expenditure under M1, OPDB."

FA 3A - Improving the competitiveness of primary producers by better integrating them into the agri-food supply chain through quality schemes, the creation of added value for agricultural products, the promotion of products in local markets, short supply chains, producer associations and organizations, and interprofessional organizations

Expenditure under FA 3A is 98% of the planned amount, an increase compared to last year (+15 percentage points), despite a decrease in the financial allocation (-3%) and an increase in actual expenditure (+15%). The FA's spending capacity is slightly higher (+2 percentage points) than the RDP average (96%). Contributing to this progress are primarily M9 and M14, which have maximum spending capacity, but also M3 at 96%, M2 at 93%, and M4 at 97%. M16 has a capacity of 87%, while M1 has reached 84%. Carryovers account for 0.2% of actual expenditure. 96.7% of beneficiaries have already received the final payment for their projects.

Table 5 – Programmed resources and expenditure incurred as of 12/31/2025 for FA 3A by M

M	Planned Expenditure	Actual Expenditure	Expenditure capacity	of which from the 2014–2022 Program	of which from carryovers	of which from carryovers
	(€)	(€)	(%)	(€)	(€)	(%)
1	492,010	412,159	84	412,159	0	0
2	1,649,152	1,535,558	93	1,535,558	0	0
3	4,691,000	4,494,022	96	4,494,022	0	0
4	96,444,373	93,798,424	97	93,798,424	0	0
9	299,586	299,586	100	299,586	0	0
14	90,624,947	90,810,145	100	90,454,296	355,849	
16	13,331,208	11,637,838	87	11,637,838	0	0
Total	**207,532,276**	**202,987,732**	**98**	**202,631,883**	**355,849**	

Source: for planned expenditure, the regional monitoring file "financial plan for version 17 of the RDP"; for actual expenditure, the regional monitoring file "decrees from 2016 to 2025"; for actual expenditure for M2 and M16, "AST2-04 for sub-measures"; for actual expenditure for M1, "OPDB".

FA 3B - Supporting the prevention and management of business risks

Expenditure under FA 3B, entirely programmed under M5, shows an 89% progress rate compared to the planned amount, a significant increase compared to last year (+37 percentage points), despite an unchanged budget allocation and a substantial increase in actual expenditure (+41.5%). The FA's spending capacity remains lower (by -7 percentage points) than the RDP average (96%). Carryovers account for 0.1% of actual expenditure. 93% of beneficiaries have already received the final payment for their projects.

Table 6 – Programmed resources and expenditure incurred as of 12/31/2025 for FA 3B in M *(Master 2026, Table 20)*

M	Planned Expenditure	Actual Expenditure	Spending capacity	of which from the 2014–2022 Program	of which from carryovers	of which from carryovers
	(€)	(€)	(%)	(€)	(€)	(%)
5	17,728,619	15,779,282	89	15,772,346	6,936	0
Total	**17,728,619**	**15,779,282**	**89**	**15,772,346**	**6,936**	**0**

Source: for planned expenditure, regional monitoring file "financial plan for version 17 of the RDP"; for actual expenditure, regional monitoring file "decrees from 2016 to 2025".

Priority 4 - Preserving, restoring, and enhancing ecosystems related to agriculture and forestry

FA P4 expenditure shows a progress rate of 98% compared to the planned amount, a moderate increase compared to last year (+9 percentage points), against a slight increase in the financial allocation (+2.6%) and actual expenditure (+12.5%). The FA's spending capacity is higher (+2 percentage points) than the RDP average (96%). Contributing to this progress are primarily M15, with a spending capacity exceeding 100%, and M10 and M11, which have reached maximum capacity. M4 (99%) and M7 (98%) also demonstrate excellent spending capacity. The measure with the lowest spending capacity is M2, at 83%. Carryovers account for 3% of actual expenditure. 99.6% of beneficiaries have already received the final payment for their projects.

Table 7 - Programmed resources and expenditure incurred as of 12/31/2025 for P4 by M *(Master 2026, Table 22)*

M	Planned Expenditure	Actual Expenditure	Spending capacity	of which from the 2014-2022 Program	of which from carryovers	of which from carryovers
	(€)	(€)	(%)	(€)	(€)	(%)
1	3,448,231	3,194,298	93	3,194,298	0	0
2	1,406,234	1,165,218	83	1,165,218	0	0
4	46,122,497	45,641,729	99	45,407,467	234,262	1
7	5,047,673	4,946,613	98	4,946,613	0	0
8	92,805,201	87,654,845	94	83,375,980	4,278,864	5
10	232,262,126	232,725,405	100	218,422,118	14,303,286	6
11	168,576,465	169,222,059	100	166,865,558	2,356,502	1
13	552,973,266	536,225,185	97	527,805,535	8,419,649	2
15	31,417,020	32,190,723	102	30,267,874	1,922,849	6
16	4,091,383	3,840,814	94	3,840,814	0	0
Total	**1,138,150,096**	**1,116,806,889**	**98**	**1,085,291,475**	**31,515,412**	**3**

Source: for planned expenditure, the regional monitoring file "financial plan for version 17 of the RDP"; for actual expenditure, the regional monitoring file "decrees from 2016 to 2025"; for actual expenditure for M2 and M16, "AST2-04 for sub-measures"; for actual expenditure for M1, "OPDB".

FA 5A - Improving water efficiency in agriculture

Expenditure under FA 5A shows an 85% progress rate compared to the planned amount, a sharp increase from last year (+55 percentage points), despite a decrease in the budget allocation (-2.3%) and a substantial increase in actual expenditure (nearly quadrupled, +272%). The expenditure rate for FA is lower (by -11 percentage points) than the RDP average (96%). This progress is primarily driven by M4, with an expenditure rate of 85%; M2 has reached 89% and M16 94%. Carryovers account for 8% of actual expenditure. 89.8% of beneficiaries have already received the final payment for their projects.

Table 8 – Programmed resources and expenditure incurred as of 12/31/2025 for FA 5A by M

M	Planned Expenditure	Actual expenditure	Spending capacity	of which from the 2014–2022 Program	of which from carryovers	of which from carryovers
	(€)	(€)	(%)	(€)	(€)	(%)
2	352,775	314,387	89	314,387	0	0
4	57,675,775	48,858,072	85	45,133,961	3,724,111	8
16	447,154	418,184	94	418,184	0	0
Total	**58,475,704**	**49,590,644**	**85**	**45,866,532**	**3,724,111**	**8**

Source: for planned expenditure, the regional monitoring file "financial plan for version 17 of the RDP"; for actual expenditure, the regional monitoring file "decrees from 2016 to 2025"; for actual expenditure under M2 and M16, "AST2-04 for sub-measures".

FA 5C - Promote the procurement and use of renewable energy sources, by-products, waste materials, residues, and other non-food raw materials for the purposes of the bioeconomy

Spending under FA 5C stands at 96% of the planned amount, an increase compared to last year (+13 percentage points), despite a slight decrease in the budget allocation (-2%) and a significant increase in actual spending (+24%). The FA's spending capacity is in line with the RDP average (96%). This progress is driven primarily by M7, with a spending capacity of 97%, but also by M16, at 87%. M2, at 57%, is slowing the FA's overall progress. Expenditures were made entirely using resources from the 2014–2022 Programming Period. 93.3% of beneficiaries have already received the final payment for their projects.

Table1 - Programmed resources and expenditure incurred as of 12/31/2025 for FA 5C by M

M	Programmed Expenditure	Actual Expenditure	Spending capacity	of which from the 2014-2022 Program	of which from carryovers	of which from carryovers
	(€)	(€)	(%)	(€)	(€)	(%)
2	141,823	81,359	57	81,359	0	0
7	6,465,233	6,285,323	97	6,285,323	0	0
16	477,951	414,955	87	414,955	0	0
Total	**7,085,007**	**6,781,637**	**96**	**6,781,637**	**0**	**0**

Source: for planned expenditure, the regional monitoring file "financial plan for version 17 of the RDP"; for actual expenditure, the regional monitoring file "decrees from 2016 to 2025"; for actual expenditure for M2 and M16, "AST2-04 for sub-measures".

FA 5D - Reduce greenhouse gas and ammonia emissions from agriculture

Expenditure under FA 5D is 99% of the planned amount, a slight increase compared to last year (+0.3 percentage points), despite a slight decrease in the budget allocation (-1%) and an increase in actual expenditure (+1.09%). The FA's spending capacity is higher (+3 percentage points) than the RDP average (96%). This progress is primarily driven by M16, which has maximum spending capacity, and M4, which has nearly maximum spending capacity at 99%. M2 has reached 50%, a significant improvement over the previous year. Expenditures were made entirely using resources from the 2014–2022 Programming Period. 90% of beneficiaries have already received the final payment for their projects.

Table 10 - Programmed resources and expenditure incurred as of 12/31/2025 for FA 5D by M

M	Programmed Expenditure	Expenditure incurred	Spending capacity	of which from the 2014-2022 Program	of which from carryovers	of which from carryovers
	(€)	(€)	(%)	(€)	(€)	(%)
2	77,174	38,723	50	38,723	0	0
4	6,752,784	6,709,577	99	6,709,577	0	0
16	38,530	38,530	100	38,530	0	0
Total	**6,868,487**	**6,786,830**	**99**	**6,786,830**	**0**	**0**

Source: for planned expenditure, the regional monitoring file "Financial Plan for Version 17 of the RDP"; for actual expenditure, the regional monitoring file "Decrees from 2016 to 2025"; for actual expenditure under M2 and M16, "AST2-04 for sub-measures".

FA 5E - Promoting carbon conservation and sequestration in the agricultural and forestry sectors

Expenditure under FA 5E shows a progress rate slightly above 100% compared to the planned amount, an increase of 9 percentage points compared to the previous year, despite a decrease in the financial allocation (-4.29%) and an increase in actual expenditure (+5.4%). The FA's spending capacity is higher than the RDP average (96%). M8 is the main contributor to this progress, with a spending capacity of 101%. M2 is slowing the FA's financial progress, with a spending capacity of 74%. M1 has a spending capacity of 80%. 81% of the expenditure was funded by carryovers from the previous programming period. Almost all beneficiaries, with the exception of one, have already received the final payment for their projects.

Table 11 - Programmed resources and expenditure incurred as of 12/31/2025 for FA 5E by M

M	Programmed Expenditure	Expenditure incurred	Spending capacity	of which from the 2014-2022 Program	of which from carryovers	of which from carryovers
	(€)	(€)	(%)	(€)	(€)	(%)
1	13,270	10,553	80	10,553	0	0
2	42,389	31,418	74	31,418	0	0
8	11,464,281	11,615,893	101	2,174,755	9,441,138	81
Total	**11,519,940**	**11,657,864**	**101**	**2,216,726**	**9,441,138**	**81**

Source: for planned expenditure, the regional monitoring file "financial plan for version 17 of the RDP"; for actual expenditure, the regional monitoring file "decrees from 2016 to 2025"; for actual expenditure under M2, "AST2-04 for sub-measures"; for actual expenditure under M1, OPDB.

FA 6A - Promoting the diversification, creation, and development of small businesses and employment

FA 6A shows 96% progress compared to the planned level, an increase from last year (+18 percentage points), despite a decrease in the financial allocation (-2.64%) and an increase in actual

expenditure (+20.3%). The FA's spending capacity is in line with the RDP average (96%). Contributing most to this progress is M6 with a spending capacity of 102%, but also M7 with a spending capacity of 98%. M2 reached 87%, M16 78%, and M1 62%. Carryovers account for 7% of actual expenditure. 91% of beneficiaries have already received the final payment for their projects.

Table 12 – Programmed resources and expenditure incurred as of 12/31/2025 for FA 6A by M

M	Programmed Expenditure	Actual Expenditure	Spending capacity	of which from the 2014–2022 Program	of which from carryovers	of which from carryovers
	(€)	(€)	(%)	(€)	(€)	(%)
1	32,408	20,100	62	20,100	0	0
2	887,398	772,212	87	772,212	0	0
6	21,426,672	21,785,656	102	21,785,656	0	0
7	83,205,888	81,602,270	98	73,879,473	7,722,797	9
16	13,746,948	10,679,963	78	10,679,963	0	0
Total	**119,299,315**	**114,860,201**	**96**	**107,137,404**	**7,722,797**	**7**

Source: for planned expenditure, the regional monitoring file "financial plan for version 17 of the RDP"; for actual expenditure, the regional monitoring file "decrees from 2016 to 2025"; for actual expenditure for M2 and M16, "AST2-04 for sub-measures"; for actual expenditure for M1, OPDB.

FA 6B - Stimulating local development in rural areas

FA 6B, entirely programmed under M19, shows a progress rate of 92% compared to the planned amount, an increase from last year (+27 percentage points), with no changes in actual expenditure. The expenditure capacity of FA is lower (by -4 percentage points) than the RDP average (96%). Carryovers account for 2% of actual expenditure. 92.4% of beneficiaries have already received the final payment for their projects.

Table 13 - Planned resources and actual expenditure as of 12/31/2025 for FA 6B in millions

M	Planned Expenditure	Actual expenditure	Spending capacity	of which from the 2014-2022 Program	of which from carryovers	of which from carryovers
	(€)	(€)	(%)	(€)	(€)	(%)
19	126,749,330	116,281,636	92	113,759,507	2,522,129	2
Total	**126,749,330**	**116,281,636**	**92**	**113,759,507**	**2,522,129**	**2**

Source: for planned expenditure, the regional monitoring file "financial plan for version 17 of the RDP"; for actual expenditure, the regional monitoring file "decrees from 2016 to 2025".

FA 6C - Promoting the accessibility, use, and quality of information and communication technologies (ICT) in rural areas

Expenditure under FA 6C, entirely programmed under Axis 7, shows a 100% progress rate compared to the planned amount, an increase from last year (+22 percentage points), despite an unchanged budget allocation and an increase in actual expenditure (+28%). The expenditure capacity of the FA is higher (+4 percentage points) than the RDP average (96%). Expenditure was incurred entirely from the 2014-2022 Programming period's resources. The 4 projects launched by the Ministry of Enterprise and Made in Italy (formerly the Ministry of Economic Development) have been completed.

Table 14 – Programmed resources and expenditure incurred as of 12/31/2025 for FA 6C (in millions of euros)

M	Programmed Expenditure	Expenditure incurred	Spending capacity	of which from the 2014–2022 Program	of which from carryovers	of which from carryovers
	(€)	(€)	(%)	(€)	(€)	(%)
7	20,400,000	20,399,219	100	20,399,219	0	0
Total	**20,400,000**	**20,399,219**	**100**	**20,399,219**	**0**	**0**

Source: for planned expenditure, the regional monitoring file "financial plan for version 17 of the RDP"; for actual expenditure, the regional monitoring file "decrees from 2016 to 2025".

Subject	Conclusions	Recommendations
Analysis of business trajectories	The analysis of investment trajectories reveals a highly heterogeneous landscape, with predominantly nonlinear paths and a lack of stable thematic specialization for most clusters. Three cross-cutting trends emerge, however: the discontinuous nature of the trajectories, with isolated peaks that are not consolidated over time; a reorientation in the most recent year toward the Environment and Climate dimension or a contraction in both main dimensions; and the growing role of the Territory component, which emerges as an active and structural dimension of investments across multiple clusters, signaling a gradual consolidation of a three-dimensional approach. Finally, the analysis by macro-area reveals an asymmetrical picture: while some clusters show a distribution largely in line with the overall average, a subset of clusters exhibits marked polarizations toward specific macro-areas of the RDP, revealing territorial specificities that complement and enrich the purely sectoral interpretation.	The presence of non-linear trajectories and frequent repositioning suggests the need for closer monitoring of cluster dynamics, in order to distinguish between physiological variability—attributable to the variety of approaches adopted by beneficiaries—and signs of discontinuity in access to planned measures. Furthermore, the strong polarization of certain clusters toward specific macro-areas of the RDP highlights the need for a targeted analysis of the underlying territorial dynamics, so as to move beyond a purely sectoral interpretation and fully capture the specific characteristics that define the implementation of the RDP across different regional contexts.
RDP Support for Inland Areas	Structural measures allocate €351,276,406 within the SNAI areas, accounting for nearly 28% of the total funding granted under these measures across the entire Campania region. In the four inland areas of the Campania region, the average contribution is €2,181.58 per hectare, slightly higher than that for the entire Campania region (€1,919.85/ha), and the average contribution is €1,549.38 per resident, significantly higher than the regional average (€217.16 per resident).	The high concentration of RDP resources in the SNAI areas and in Macro-areas C and D highlights the Campania RDP's ability to direct support toward the most fragile and rural territories. It is therefore recommended to consolidate, including in future programming, a strong territorial focus of interventions, maintaining preferential criteria for inland and mountainous areas, in line with the objectives of territorial rebalancing and socioeconomic cohesion.
	The distribution of funding from the RDP's structural measures across the Macro-areas shows that approximately 83% of the funding for structural measures is allocated to RDP Areas C and D, and of this, about 51% is allocated to Areas D and .	
	Area-based and per-head measures distribute €320,415,753 within SNAI Areas—over 30% of the total measures considered across the entire Campania region—and 43.8% relative to non-SNAI areas.	
	The contribution from the RDP's area-based measures in the internal areas is particularly significant, amounting to €1,413 per resident compared to €182 across the entire regional territory and €131 in the non-SNAI areas.	

Subject	Conclusions	Recommendations
	The distribution of the contribution from the RDP's area-based measures across the macro-areas shows that approximately 84.5% of the contribution from area-based measures is located in RDP Areas C and D, and of this, approximately 63% is in Area D,	
Analysis of FA 1A	Target T1, "percentage of expenditure in accordance with Articles 14, 15, and 35 of Regulation (EU) No. 1305/2013 relative to total RDP expenditure," set at 2.6% for 2025, has been achieved. From the implementation analysis of TI 2.1.1—number of consultations carried out and resources disbursed as of 12/31/2024—FA 2A and 3A are the ones recording the highest number of consulting activities: 27% and 24%, respectively, of the consultations provided, accounting for approximately 50% of total spending on the TI. According to the consultancy inventory, these services addressed the topic of environmentally friendly agriculture (with a focus on organic methods), livestock farming (with particular attention to improving management and performance), and agricultural production with a focus on technological optimization and the introduction of innovation in strategic sectors (olives, grapes, etc.).	It is recommended to continue with the rapid implementation of Measure 2 and, in particular, of TI 2.3.1. The VI views positively the launch of the process to activate intervention SRH01 "Provision of advisory services" In this context, the opportunity seized by RC to activate the new intervention SRH06 "Back-office services for AKIS" is viewed positively, precisely to strengthen the organization of the various actors, including consultants: they are, in fact, key figures for the production and dissemination of knowledge. We also view positively the intention to launch coordination interventions (including SRG09 "Cooperation for actions supporting innovation and services aimed at the agricultural, forestry, and agri-food sectors") among the first calls for proposals implementing the future AKIS system. The management of the AKIS system will likely enable an active response to the specific challenges of the new Strategic Objective 10 "Modernization of the sector, promoting and sharing knowledge, innovations, and digitization processes in agriculture and rural areas and encouraging their use" (in particular, "lack of methodological expertise among staff affiliated with AKIS entities regarding new bottom-up and participatory approaches" and "promotion of pre-established projects disconnected from the actual needs of the territory and businesses").
Analysis of FA 1B	The overall target indicator T2 "Total number of cooperation operations subsidized under the cooperation measure [Article 35 of Regulation (EU) No. 1305/2013] (groups, networks/clusters, pilot projects...) has been achieved by approximately 61% (87 cooperation operations out of 143 set for 2025). As previously noted, both the inherent consistency and the diversity of the partnerships involved in the various types of interventions are viewed positively (the latter, moreover, has grown over time to reach a total of 287 in the GO alone. This is a very positive figure for Campania compared to other regions in the South).	In general, M16 shows a rather low implementation rate, both physical and financial, with a spending level of 31%. To fully address the specific evaluation question of FA 1B, which also pertains to the sustainability of partnerships over time, it may be appropriate to conduct thematic evaluations capable of analytically assessing cooperation and/or innovation interventions. For example, the effectiveness of the GO instrument could be evaluated as a multi-stakeholder and multidisciplinary entity capable of adapting and/or identifying innovative solutions to specific problems identified by agricultural enterprises. A similar analysis applies to projects under TI

Subject	Conclusions	Recommendations
		16.9.1, which can help understand the level of interaction and effectiveness of mixed partnerships on inclusion-related issues. Here, we emphasize that the Campania Region's decision to reintroduce previously tested interventions (the PEI AGRI Operational Groups – Intervention SRG01, formerly 16.1 – and the advisory services – SRH01 and SRH02, formerly TI 2.1.1 and TI 2.3.1), which will benefit from the adjustments made during implementation. Furthermore, the Campania Region's decision to also activate intervention SRH06 "Back Office Services for AKIS"—a completely new initiative within the AKIS framework—at the start of the programming period is viewed positively, as it supports the creation of partnerships for innovation support actions, as well as intervention SRG09 "Cooperation for actions supporting innovation and services aimed at the agricultural, forestry, and agri-food sectors."
Analysis of FA 1C	Ultimately, the only type of initiative implemented under Measure 1 was TI 1.1.1, which accounted for 69% of the total expenditure. The target for the number of trainees was exceeded by approximately 18% compared to the goal set for 2025. In terms of the number of participants, the total was 13,806, compared to an estimated target of 11,107. The courses offered primarily covered aspects related to business management and development, with particular emphasis on initial establishment and obtaining the certificate of qualification for the purchase and use of plant protection products (PAN); thus, in the majority of cases (approximately 82%), these were mandatory courses, for which the current training offerings can be considered sufficient to meet the demand.	Regarding the significant imbalance between "mandatory" training hours and those focused on professional development, it is suggested that such activities be promoted as an opportunity to enhance personal and professional skills in order to make the company more competitive and sustainable. To better align training supply and demand, the Regional Council could consider: raising awareness of the importance of continuous training as an opportunity for professional growth through information campaigns, including in collaboration with trade associations; awarding higher scores in the selection criteria of calls for proposals under the various measures of the Campania RDP to those who have undertaken training courses on topics related to the subject matter of the calls.
Analysis of FA 2A	The Types of Intervention contributing to FA 2A achieved overall positive results. Financially, the spending rate stands at 95.5%, with 13,608 beneficiaries involved and a project completion rate of 98.5%. One area of concern is Intervention Type (IT) 4.3.1, which, despite a spending capacity close to the maximum, still has a limited percentage of completed projects, at 19.9%. TI 4.1.1 funded 1,239 projects, primarily reaching sole proprietorships (84%) located in mountainous or disadvantaged areas (51%), with a significant presence of young farmers under 40 (38%). Investments primarily focused on the purchase of machinery, general expenses, and renewable energy systems, yielding	It is recommended to maintain and strengthen support for farm investments under TI 4.1.1, promoting structural changes in production systems and mechanization levels, in order to increase labor productivity, including through a reduction in the number of labor units employed, similar to what has already been observed among beneficiaries of TI 4.1.2 and 6.4.1. At the same time, it is recommended to continue investing in support for generational turnover (TI 4.1.2) and in the diversification of non-agricultural activities (TI 6.4.1), which have shown the greatest increases

Subject	Conclusions	Recommendations
	documented positive outcomes: 66% of beneficiaries developed product processing and direct sales, 61% improved their economic performance, and 72% adopted innovative equipment with positive environmental impacts. TI 6.4.1 funded 430 projects, 81% of which were concentrated in rural macro-areas C and D, with a traditional production profile dominated by mixed farming (31%) and arable crops (16%). Direct surveys confirm that diversification activities, agritourism, social farming, and food education have proven to be effective tools for income supplementation and job protection in rural areas. Analysis of the change in labor productivity (R2 indicator) shows an average increase of 26,785 euros (+58%) between the pre- and post-investment situations, confirmed by the counterfactual analysis, which estimates a change of 17,682 euros (+57%), attributable to RDP investments net of contextual dynamics. The highest net increases are recorded in arable farms (+152%), fruit and citrus farms (+73%), and vineyards and olive groves (+40%), while vegetable and flower farms and mixed farms show more modest growth but still higher than their respective control farms. By type of intervention, the most marked net growth is observed in farms participating in TI 6.4.1 (+152%) and TI 4.1.2 — young farmers — (+135%), compared to a more modest increase in farms under TI 4.1.1 (+31%).	in net productivity and have proven to be the most effective levers for modernizing the regional agricultural sector. It is also suggested to investigate the causes of the more modest results recorded in horticultural and mixed-crop farms, in order to assess the possible need for more targeted support tools or dedicated technical assistance measures. Finally, it is recommended to investigate the causes of the low percentage of projects completed under TI 4.3.1 (19.9%), as this figure contrasts with the high spending capacity recorded and warrants a specific analysis in view of the Program's ex-post evaluation.
Analysis of FA 2B	FA 2B records an overall spending rate of 94.6%, an increase of +22.6 percentage points compared to 2024. TI 4.1.2 reaches 95% spending and TI 6.1.1 94.3%, while TI 2.1.1 stands at 81.6%, the lowest. In terms of physical progress, 76% of projects have been fully paid: TI 4.1.2 stands out with 91% of beneficiaries already paid, while TI 1.1.1 and TI 2.1.1 stand at 61% and 73%, respectively. The number of beneficiaries under TI 6.1.1 exceeded the target: 2,265 young farmers established, with grants disbursed totaling €101.6 million. The total investment volume under TI 4.1.2 also exceeded projections, with €216.9 million realized but with a number of beneficiaries below the target. Indicator T5 (% of farms with a youth plan) reached 1.6%, exceeding the 1.5% target. The profile of beneficiaries shows positive trends in terms of territorial coverage and sustainability: 86% of young farmers operating in disadvantaged areas (70% of whom are in mountainous areas), 55% in Area D, and 34% in Area C; approximately 66% practice organic farming. Women account for 37% of beneficiaries, and the average age is 35, with 16% of new entrants under 30. The Evaluator's survey finds that 58% of beneficiaries report that their farms are competitive and sustainable following the intervention.	It is recommended that the Administration monitor the completion of projects still awaiting final payment, with priority given to TI 1.1.1, TI 2.1.1, and TI 6.1.1, in order to achieve full financial closure of the 2014–2022 programming period. It is suggested that efforts be strengthened to reduce the gender gap in access to support, given that women account for only 37% of beneficiaries. Selection criteria that prioritize degrees in agricultural sciences may structurally disadvantage young women, even in the presence of priority mechanisms for equal scores; it is therefore advisable to consider updating the selection criteria in future calls for proposals to ensure more equitable access. It is also recommended to promote the "Youth Package" approach as an effective model to be consolidated in the new 2023–2027 RDP programming, in which generational renewal is a cross-cutting priority. In this context, it is important to strengthen integration with training and advisory measures (M01 and M02) to support the development of management and technical skills among young established farmers, given that only 10% of young farmers in Campania hold a degree in agricultural sciences.

Subject	Conclusions	Recommendations
Analysis of FA 3A	FA 3A of the Campania RDP 2014-2022 has achieved a very high level of financial implementation, with an overall spending rate of 98% and 1,362 completed projects out of a total of 1,408 beneficiaries (97%). The results achieved confirm the strategic relevance of the interventions in relation to the needs of the regional agri-food system. In terms of quality and supply chain integration (TI 3.1.1, 3.2.1, 16.4.1), the 18 interventions funded under TI 3.1.1 and the 15 under TI 3.2.1 primarily reached farms in the province of Salerno, confirming this area's productive vocation. Intervention 16.4.1 involved 28 agricultural enterprises through 4 Cooperation Groups, focused on developing short supply chains and local markets. Data from the VI's direct survey show that 59% of beneficiaries have established or plan to establish supply chain agreements with processing companies, and that 73% believe the RDP has improved their business competitiveness. Regarding the competitiveness and sustainability of agro-industrial enterprises (SM 4.2), the 156 beneficiaries absorbed approximately €93.8 million in public spending, with investments concentrated on the purchase of new facilities, machinery, and equipment (60% of the resources). 88% of respondents to the VI's direct survey state that the investments have improved their competitive positioning and market presence, while the effects on environmental and territorial dimensions were more limited. Regarding animal welfare (M 14), the target of 700 beneficiaries was significantly exceeded, with payments disbursed to 1,117 farms. Action C, focused on disease control in cattle and buffalo herds, recorded the highest participation (796 beneficiaries, 719,754 LU). Geographically, macro-area B ("Rural areas with intensive agriculture") saw the highest concentration (43%), followed by macro-area D ("Rural areas with development challenges") (37%). 89% of beneficiaries gave an overall positive assessment of their participation in the RDP, with particular appreciation for the contribution to improving product quality (75%) and increasing sales volumes (63%).	It is recommended that future programming for 2023–2027 consolidate support for supply aggregation instruments, particularly POs and IOs, in order to bridge the gaps relative to the national average in terms of average GVA per PO, with accompanying measures and technical assistance dedicated to provinces with lower participation rates, primarily Benevento and Avellino. Regarding animal welfare, it is recommended to maintain adequate funding for Measure 14, strengthening actions aimed at promoting animal welfare in the market—an element that, in the current programming period, has acted as a barrier to participation in Action A.
Analysis of FA 3B	Axis 3B of the 2014–2022 Campania Rural Development Program (RDP) recorded an 89% spending rate, with actual expenditures of approximately €15.8 million out of a planned €17.7 million, and 106 projects completed out of a total of 114 beneficiaries (93%). The budget was further bolstered by approximately €10 million in additional funding from the National Equalization Fund to support the prevention measures outlined in TI 5.1.1. Regarding risk prevention (TI 5.1.1), the five calls for proposals launched between 2017 and 2023 confirm continuity in the allocation of resources throughout the entire programming period. The 69 funded interventions primarily targeted the provinces of Benevento (38%) and Salerno (28%), with geogr l coverage extending across the entire regional territory. From the OTE's perspective, the	For future programming, it is recommended to provide for systematic monitoring of the TI related to the occurrence of natural and catastrophic events, the activation of which is by nature unpredictable and not always able to fully absorb the allocated resources. In particular, it is suggested that such monitoring be intensified in the final stages of the programming period, in order to allow for the timely reallocation of unused resources to other interventions that have higher needs among the regional agricultural population, thereby optimizing the overall efficiency of the Program.

Subject	Conclusions	Recommendations
	projects primarily involved mixed-crop farms (26%), farms specializing in fruit and citrus cultivation (23%), and specialized pig farms (17%), for a total expenditure of 10.9 million euros. Data from the VI's direct survey show that 63% of beneficiaries reported having implemented measures to prevent risks from natural disasters, and 55% reported having generally improved their prevention capacity. Regarding the restoration of production potential (TI 5.2.1), the 48 funded interventions, implemented in response to the October 2015 floods in the province of Benevento, entailed a total expenditure of 4.9 million euros. 78% of beneficiaries considered the RDP to be significant support for the restoration of damaged farm structures, confirming the consistency and relevance of the measure with respect to the objective of the evaluation criterion.	
Analysis of FA 4A	The agricultural area of the RDP that has a positive effect on biodiversity amounts to 258,877 hectares, representing 39.5% of the regional UAA. The area covered by payments contributes most significantly to this result. The distribution of the SOI shows a higher concentration of the SOI in protected areas and Natura 2000 sites compared to the regional average.	
	Based on the analysis, the RDP agricultural areas contributing to the maintenance of High and Very High Nature Value (HNV) areas total 70,454 hectares, or 37.5% of the UAA, which does not allow for a higher concentration in these areas	
	The forest area covered by Sub-measure 15.1 of the RDP totals 55,711 hectares: 93% of this area consists of protected areas, and 87% of Natura 2000 sites. The area covered by clearings contributes significantly to this result. The distribution shows high implementation rates of commitments in areas where the environmental impact is maximized, thereby strengthening both the biodiversity protection system and connectivity between habitats to the benefit of wildlife	
	The agricultural area of the RDP that has a positive effect on biodiversity amounts to 258,877 hectares, representing 39.5% of the regional UAA. The area covered by payments contributes most significantly to this result. The distribution of the SOI shows a higher concentration of the SOI in protected areas and Natura 2000 sites compared to the regional average.	
Analysis of FA 4B	The water quality in the region is suboptimal, particularly for surface and groundwater: it is hoped that the new delineation of the ZVN areas approved in 2017 (effective in 2019) will lead to an improvement in water quality.	

Subject	Conclusions	Recommendations
	The area of the RDP that has a positive effect on water quality is 152,039 hectares, equal to 23.2% of the regional agricultural area, higher than what was achieved in the previous programming period.	
	The territorial distribution of the intervention area does not appear optimal, as it does not achieve the desired “concentration” in priority areas, where environmental risks are greatest: in the ZVNs, the SOI/SA ratio is 18.2% of the total agricultural area, while the same index, calculated for the region as a whole, is 23.2%. Among the likely causes is the lower economic incentive for farmers in these areas (where the most intensive and productive agriculture is located) to participate in agri-environmental measures.	In the next programming period, strengthen incentives for farms with land located in ZVN areas in order to concentrate interventions in the areas of greatest need
	The effectiveness of the measures in reducing nitrogen surpluses in the SOI is high, at approximately 56%, while phosphorus is reduced by 15%; overall, across the regional UAA, reductions in the two macronutrients are 17% for nitrogen and 4.7% for phosphorus	
FA 4C Analysis	The area of the RDP that has a positive effect on soil quality is 181,506 hectares, or 27.7% of the regional Agricultural Area. The distribution of the SOI in areas at risk of intolerable erosion (>11.2 t/ha per year) shows a concentration of 29%, compared to the regional average of 27.7%, indicating moderate effectiveness of the measures in addressing erosion.	
	Based on the analyses conducted, it appears that the RDP commitments reduce erosion by 1,318,088 Mg/year, corresponding to 47.3% of the total erosion occurring in the 181,505 hectares involved. It is estimated that, taken together, the agro-climatic and environmental actions reduce the average erosion rate in the intervention areas from 15.3 to 8.1 Mg/ha/year, resulting in an erosion reduction of 7.2 Mg/ha/year (I13).	
	The RDP measures do not appear to have a significant impact on the increase in organic carbon in soils, as the increase attributable to these measures is only 0.066%. However, the analysis shows that the measure dedicated to increasing organic matter in soils (10.1.2) results in a 0.13% increase in SOC.	
Analysis of FA 5A	The Campania RDP 2014/2022 implements a wide range of interventions aimed at conserving water resources, ranging from “dedicated” measures (4.1.4, 4.3.2) to those subsidized under measures with different primary objectives (most notably, operation 4.1.1). On the other hand, the resources allocated to this	

Subject	Conclusions	Recommendations
	objective are limited overall (just over 2% of the total RDP) and have also remained partially unused.	
	The delays accumulated during the initial phase were gradually overcome for Operation 4.1.4, which essentially brought all eligible projects to completion, although without fully utilizing the public funds initially allocated to this intervention line. The other measure dedicated to water conservation, Operation 4.3.2, which funds significantly larger-scale interventions, recorded 4 projects completed by 2025, with another 6 projects initiated but not completed that will carry over into the next programming period.	
	The results of the various water-saving measures are generally satisfactory, at least in terms of impact at the farm level: under Operation 4.1.4, a fairly consistent set of interventions was completed aimed at introducing high-efficiency irrigation systems on farms to replace obsolete and inefficient systems. These have recently been supplemented by interventions for the construction and restoration of reservoirs and rainwater storage tanks, to be used for irrigation purposes	
	This structural adaptation of the farms benefiting from Operation 4.1.4, together with the infrastructure improvements of the Consortia ensured by the 4 projects under Operation 4.3.2 completed by December 31, 2025, has led to a significant reduction in water consumption for irrigation purposes, both in absolute terms (-24%) and relative to the value of production (-26%). However, this change has a fairly limited impact when considered at the regional level (result indicator R12: only 3% of the region's irrigated land has switched to more efficient irrigation systems), since water-saving interventions are numerically limited overall (97 interventions completed for sub-measures 4.1.1 and 4.1.4, plus 4 for sub-measure 4.3.2).	Looking ahead, in line with the goals and objectives of *the* so-called *New Green Deal*, it is hoped that the region will pay even greater attention to so-called Agriculture 4.0 and the tools it makes available to farmers, both at the planning level (e.g., ACA Measure 2 in the next programming period) and in terms of information, promotion, dissemination, and training.
Analysis of FA 5C	There are over 1,000 projects completed as of December 31, 2025, involving the construction of facilities for the production of energy from renewable sources, representing a total investment of over 45 million euros. These include both projects directly aimed at energy production under operations 7.2.2 and 4.3.2B dedicated to this purpose (primarily biomass thermal plants and floating photovoltaic systems, respectively), as well as those funded under operations targeting agricultural enterprises (4.1.1 and 4.1.2) and processing companies (4.2.1), aimed primarily at their economic consolidation (almost exclusively the installation of photovoltaic panels for electricity generation).	

Subject	Conclusions	Recommendations
	The energy that can be generated by these plants is significant in absolute terms and is projected to grow substantially by 2025, amounting to 1,689 tons of oil equivalent; however, it is relatively insignificant when considered in relative terms, both in relation to the total “green energy” produced in the region by the primary sector and to the burden-sharing objectives	It is hoped that future planning will promote initiatives targeting public beneficiaries (municipalities) that combine environmental considerations with economic and territorial stewardship aspects, which served as a model example of RDP implementation in the 2014–2022 programming period
Analysis of FA 5D	The area of the RDP that results in a reduction in GHG emissions is 181,506 hectares, equal to 28% of the regional agricultural area. The total reduction in GHG emissions amounts to 274,063 MgCO2eq per year; of this, 8,279 MgCO2eq is due to the reduction in mineral fertilizers, and 265,874 MgCO2eq is the amount achieved through carbon sink absorption in agricultural soils.	
	The RDP measures examined do not appear to have a significant impact on GHG reduction in the agricultural sector, accounting for only 0.51% of total agricultural emissions and 6.0% of the mineral fertilizer sector.	
	The effects of the interventions show a reduction of 343.1 t/year in ammonia emissions from mineral/synthetic fertilizers, accounting for 1.9%; however, if only the emissions accounted for in sector 100100—Crops with fertilizers (except animal manure)—are considered, this proportion rises to 20.3%.	
FA 5E Analysis	Overall, the forested areas eligible for subsidies that contribute to carbon sequestration or conservation represent 1.92% of the total regional forest area.	
	Considering the total areas subject to afforestation (2014–2022 programming period and those carried over from the previous programming period), it is estimated that they could collectively result in the sequestration of approximately 23,067 tCO2eq/year. It should be noted, however, that the majority of the carbon sink (93%) is attributable to commitments made in previous programming periods, and only 7% relates to commitments from the current programming period	
	Overall, the forested areas eligible for funding that contribute to carbon sequestration or conservation represent 1.92% of the total regional forest area.	
Analysis of FA6A	FA 6A has a total spending capacity of 96% (€114,860,201 out of €119,299,315 planned), an increase of +18 percentage points compared to RAV2025. Most of the TIs show high spending capacities, exceeding 90%. Intervention 16.7.1,	It is recommended that the Administration monitor the completion of projects still in progress, with particular attention to TI 16.7.1, TI 1.1.1, and TI 2.1.1 to ensure the full achievement of the SNAI’s programmatic objectives in the four Project Areas.

Subject	Conclusions	Recommendations
	relating to the National Strategy for Internal Areas (SNAI), shows the lowest level with 76% of spending realized (€9,721,996 out of €12,773,253). The R21/T20 indicator "Number of jobs created under funded projects" significantly exceeded the target: 269 jobs created (1.23 FTE on average per project) compared to the target of 160 (+68%). Operations for infrastructure and basic services (O3) also significantly outperformed: 320 subsidized operations vs. a target of 203 (+58%), with 103 interventions under 7.4.1, 73 under 7.5.1, and 144 under 7.6.1. The Collective Rural Development Project (TI 6.4.2 + TI 7.6.1.B) involved 27 municipalities in 4 provinces, with 80 collective projects approved for funding and 252 private beneficiaries, concentrating interventions in Area D regions at risk of depopulation. Among the beneficiaries of TI 6.2.1, there is a predominance of women and a strong concentration in marginal rural areas (81% in Areas C and D). The direct survey indicates a positive perception (77% of beneficiaries) regarding the contribution of the interventions to the objectives of the FA.	It is also recommended to highlight the employment results achieved (269 jobs created, +68% above the target) as examples of best practices that can be transferred to the new 2023-2027 CSR programming, in line with Specific Objective 8 "Promoting employment and local development in rural areas." The Administration is invited to strengthen post-investment support for businesses benefiting from TI 6.2.1 to address the limited development of social and personal services and the poor capacity for networking among local economic operators, a condition essential for ensuring their long-term competitiveness. Finally, it would be advisable to consolidate the integrated approach of the Collective Rural Development Project, which has proven effective in combining the revitalization of villages (7.6.1) and private entrepreneurial development (6.4.2), as a replicable model in the new programming to counter depopulation in the most marginal rural areas.
Analysis of FA 6B	There has been growing interest in evaluation activities as a tool to support the planning and implementation of the Local Strategic Plans (LSPs). The value-added analysis, conducted through interviews with directors and surveys of 127 members and 349 beneficiaries, has yielded significant evidence regarding the impact of the LEADER approach in the Campania region.	Continue self-evaluation activities and collegial meetings on a regular basis in the new programming period. Provide training dedicated to the launch of the new cycle to consolidate the culture of evaluation within the LAGs and promote a more informed use of the available evaluation tools.
	The LEADER program plays a crucial role in fostering the development of projects in rural areas, particularly in the most disadvantaged areas (196 municipalities in Area D vs. 163 in Area C). Only 11% of beneficiaries encountered obstacles in accessing the funds ; the main challenges relate to bureaucratic complexity and selection criteria. The contribution of the LAGs is considered decisive or useful by 98% of beneficiaries, confirming their enabling role in local development.	Simplify procedures for accessing funds and strengthen support for private entities. Maintain the concentration of resources in the most disadvantaged rural areas and enhance training for LAG staff to improve bureaucratic and technical management.
	The continuity of the LEADER program is strongly confirmed by the stated intention of 91% of beneficiaries to participate in calls for proposals under the new 2023–2027 programming period. This figure, combined with 84% positive ratings on the effectiveness of outreach activities, attests to the consolidation of LAGs' role as a reference point for territorial development in rural areas of Campania. However, 69% of beneficiaries call for more innovative and inclusive outreach, indicating significant room for improvement.	Capitalize on the strong consensus among beneficiaries by investing in more innovative and inclusive outreach in the new programming period. Enhance the visibility of the results achieved through more effective and structured communication, to strengthen the trust of local stakeholders and expand the pool of potential beneficiaries.

Subject	Conclusions	Recommendations
	The LAGs have expressed the need to refine the allocation of time among various activities, reducing the burden of administrative tasks in favor of outreach and planning. There is a need to strengthen staff competencies, with particular attention to planning, procedural, and interpersonal skills. The analysis highlighted significant differences in the allocation of outreach resources: the Partenio LAG dedicates 41% of its SM19.4 allocation to outreach, compared to 11% for Taburno, reflecting very different approaches to leveraging this tool.	Provide training and consulting activities for the LAGs, including within the AKIS framework, to strengthen staff's specific skills. Evaluate the simplification of administrative requirements to free up resources for activities with higher added value. Promote the exchange of best practices on facilitation among the LAGs, leveraging the experiences of the most active ones.
	The outreach activities carried out through SM19.4 are deemed effective by 84% of beneficiaries. Nearly all LAGs have utilized the 25% ceiling, demonstrating the importance attributed to outreach. However, the activities are predominantly standard, with little exploration of opportunities for innovation.	Make the possibility of raising the maximum spending limit for SM19.4 contingent upon the implementation of innovative animation activities, to incentivize more effective communication and animation solutions tailored to the needs of the local area.
	All LAG websites provide key information on governance and calls for proposals, but they lack descriptions of funded projects and, in many cases, the publication of SSLs. Only 5 out of 15 LAGs publish information on funded projects, and only Alto Tammaro provides complete details by sub-measure.	Better clarify the LAGs' responsibilities regarding communication and the promotion of results. Recommend that LAGs improve the management of their digital channels in terms of the completeness of information and the systematic dissemination of completed projects, using existing best practices as a reference.
Analysis of FA 6C	Expenditure progress for SM7.3 has reached 99.9% of the programmed resources, confirming excellent spending capacity and the full financial implementation of the intervention. The population reached that currently benefits from improved services is 117,825, which exceeds the target value - T24: "Percentage of the rural population benefiting from new or improved services/infrastructure (ICT) (specific aspect 6C)." All 76 FEASR projects were completed as of December 31, 2025, with 27,024 user interfaces (UIs) connected at speeds exceeding 100 Mbps. The number of UIs covered by FTTH fiber optics (100 Mbps) exceeded the planned target (50,582 vs. 47,662, +6.1%), while the households covered by wireless FWA (30 Mbps) fall short of projections (27,420 out of 38,731), for a total of 78,002 households covered out of 86,393 projected. The target value (6.06%) for R25/T24 "Percentage of the rural population benefiting from new or improved services/infrastructure (information and communication technologies – ICT)" was met and exceeded, with an actual value of 6.42%.	In light of the positive progress of the funded interventions, it is recommended that the Administration continue to closely monitor the interventions managed by the Ministry of Economic Development (MiSE) and implemented by Infratel Italia, with particular attention to the 207 FWA construction sites that have been started but not yet completed, so that they fully contribute to the objectives of the BUL Strategy, also in synergy with the PNRR. It is also recommended to ensure coverage of the households not yet reached, including scattered dwellings (10,637 households not covered at the end of the programming period), to further reduce the digital divide in the most remote rural areas and maximize the impact of public intervention in market failure zones.

Subject	Conclusions	Recommendations
QVC 19	The programmatic design based on the construction of an "intervention logic" and, but only to a limited extent, the resulting implementation rules (verification of Criterion 19.1) constituted the factors predisposing the integration between support measures functional to individual or collective projects, in particular aimed at the transfer of innovations. This was therefore largely the result of the capacity (or willingness/interest) of potential beneficiaries to "combine" the support opportunities offered by the RDP. The assessment of Criterion 19.2 allowed for an initial "ex-post" evaluation of the effectiveness of this potential by examining the actual level of complementarity (quantitative) and coherence (qualitative) between the training activities carried out and the various operations implemented under the other Measures/SMs of the RDP. Approximately 25% of RDP beneficiaries participated in at least one training course, with the highest numbers in SMs 6.1 and 4.1. 61% of training activities focus on environmental topics, among which mandatory courses for the purchase of plant protection products (PAN) predominate; other, less common, training activities on environmental topics are consistently found in structural or cooperation measures such as SM 4.4, 16.5, and 16.8. This complementarity is, however, absent in the major "area-based or headage-based" measures 10, 11, 13, and 14, where beneficiaries show a very low propensity (4%) to attend courses focused on agricultural sustainability practices related to the commitments undertaken. There is good consistency between the objectives of operations funded under SM 4.1 and 6.1 and the high participation in training activities aimed at generational renewal. The same applies to the themes of innovation and diversification for beneficiaries of the SMs aimed at the processing and marketing of agricultural products (SM 4.2) and the development of non-agricultural activities (SM 6.4), but not among the more numerous beneficiaries of SM 4.1. The specific survey on cooperation projects under TI 16.1.2 (Criterion 19.3) shows that the high level of participation by farms in cooperation projects stems primarily from proposals for innovations capable of addressing the need to improve the environmental sustainability of production processes and to enhance the quality and diversification of agricultural production. Furthermore, the partnership experience is judged to be positive overall, mainly because it has improved relations between research and the productive sector and, above all, because it has allowed for the adoption of working methods and approaches based on cooperation and interaction among multiple stakeholders, which can be replicated or leveraged for other projects as well. (The project's added value is identified	Adopting implementing regulations capable of further facilitating (or even incentivizing) the ability of beneficiaries, whether individual or in association, to submit business, territorial, or sectoral projects capable of "combining" multiple forms of support. This is achieved primarily through collective planning and the use of "bundled" individual projects. In this context, enhance the implementation conditions and incentives aimed at encouraging greater participation by RDP beneficiaries in training activities, especially when the topics addressed are consistent with the intervention areas and objectives of the operations carried out. This should be done with particular attention to agro-climatic-environmental measures and organic farming. Promote greater development of cooperation projects between the production and research sectors aimed at identifying and disseminating innovations on issues/objectives related to supply chain integration, the reduction of production process costs, as well as the diversification of income sources and employment opportunities beyond agriculture

Subject	Conclusions	Recommendations
	primarily in the creation of a more lasting "relational capital" among the stakeholders involved.	
QVC 20	In discussions with/among key informants regarding TA activities, an overall positive assessment emerged regarding their effectiveness in pursuing the Measure's objectives, namely the full and consistent implementation of the RDP, its efficient monitoring, and, above all, the growth and consolidation of enhanced regional capacity building. Nevertheless, the existence of influencing factors, such as: • the "variability" of the regional context in terms of management and organization; • the reduction in the total human resources employed in the Department of Agriculture, which occurred during the middle years of the RDP's implementation; • changes to the relevant programmatic and regulatory framework at the EU and national levels • the turnover among external providers of TA services This set of factors may have contributed to a partial *imbalance between the functions performed by the TA,* namely between, on the one hand, those activities that were predominant in terms of human resources deployed—namely, operational support to regional structures—and, on the other hand, AT activities of a more consultative nature, focused on analyzing systemic aspects, proposing innovative management approaches and tools, and defining more efficient procedures and information flows to be permanently introduced into the regional administration. For these latter activities, the Region's ability to define a consolidated and coherent "demand" for support from the AT was objectively hindered by the aforementioned factors of variability and the continuous evolution of internal factors and the reference context. Despite these limitations, the AT contributed to the launch of improvement processes and tools that were subsequently finalized and implemented, particularly in the 2023–27 Regional Development Plan (CSR). Specifically, these relate to: • *the analysis of the current situation regarding workloads* within and outside the RDP, the adequacy of the skills employed, and the structural causes of inefficiency—knowledge that formed the basis for the redefinition of organizational models • the contribution, starting in 2022, to the development of a *regional agricultural information system, the SIARC,* a tool used both for the closure of the 2014-	a) Ensure a better balance between the various functions assigned to the Technical Agency (AT), namely between activities and resources allocated to operational support for regional structures and those aimed at providing managerial (identification of processes and tools) and strategic consulting on program management; at the same time, seek to ensure that the Regional Administration itself has the capacity (and willingness) to request this level of support and to guide (as well as evaluate) its implementation. b) mitigate the critical issues in program management that arise primarily during the period between the conclusion of one TA service and the actual operational launch of the next; c) ensure clear identification (and implementation of mechanisms for the ongoing transfer of knowledge and expertise by the AT or other entities capable of enhancing the regional administration's diagnostic and management capabilities;

Subject	Conclusions	Recommendations
	2022 RDP and for the launch and management of the 2023-2027 programming period	
QVC 21	In general terms, the RRN's network contribution stands out, stemming from support for processes, coordination, shared tools, and capacity building. The link with the RDP is medium-high, with stronger evidence regarding evaluation, implementation quality, and thematic alignment, while other more widespread effects of networking and engagement remain less well-documented.	RC could continue to strengthen the "networking" aspect (Priority 2 of the RETE PAC Program), defined by the Program as the creation of stable networks, active stakeholder involvement, exchange of experiences, dissemination of knowledge, public information, dissemination of results, and promotion of innovation. In this regard, it could be equally useful to make the reporting of activities carried out and their outcomes more systematic and detailed, so as to ensure continuity in the connections already established and to make the Network's actual contribution to various regional themes and projects more transparent.
	The case of Campania confirms that the RRN's contribution is best understood as enabling support and an infrastructure for coordination, learning, and accompaniment, rather than as an intervention directly attributable to the Program's final outcomes.	In general, within RC activities (in communication efforts, evaluation reports, programmatic and implementation documents, etc.), it might be useful to more explicitly highlight, across the various areas of intervention, the link between the support provided by the Network and the operational or methodological impacts observable at the regional level. This would help make the Network's contribution more transparent, not only in terms of relationships but also in terms of the concrete changes supported in regional processes.
	Support for Evaluation is the area where the relationship with the RRN appears most continuous and clearly recognizable. The interview and the QVC reveal consistent participation in groups, workshops, and opportunities for methodological discussion, which have accompanied regional work on the evaluation front.	
	The RRN's contribution is also clearly visible at the implementation level, thanks to the use of tools, technical support, and operational solutions that have accompanied regional management. In this context, the link is not merely relational but takes on a concrete operational form.	
	The coordination promoted by the RRN regarding AKIS, GO, LEADER, and thematic groups emerges in a noticeable and consistent manner with the Campania profile. This is a significant contribution, even if less robust in terms of documentation compared to evaluation and implementation.	
	The involvement of regional actors is evident, but it appears more clearly traceable among technical-administrative units and thematic representatives than among a broader range of stakeholders. The network connection thus emerges primarily within already established working circuits.	

Subject	Conclusions	Recommendations
	Some networking and communication effects emerge from the interview as part of the RRN's added value, but are less easily reconstructed with the same degree of grounding as the other objectives. For this reason, they have a more limited impact on the overall assessment.	
Analysis of Revocations and Withdrawals	The quantitative analysis conducted in Phase I (Chapter 1) shows that the phenomenon of revocations and withdrawals exhibits a highly uneven distribution, statistically associated in a non-random manner with five factors: the type of beneficiary, the measure, the sub-measure of intervention, the size of the investment, and the macro-area. Regarding beneficiary type, agricultural product marketing and processing enterprises stand out as the only category with a significantly higher-than-average incidence (14.1%), identifying an area of priority interest. The analysis by intervention measure, on the other hand, reveals a statistically significant concentration of revocations and withdrawals in measures 4 (9% aggregate incidence) and 6 (7.1%), which stand out as the areas of greatest interest. Conversely, virtuous and inferentially robust implementation performance is observed for measures 22, 21, and 19, characterized by a significant underrepresentation of the phenomenon compared to the average of the other categories. At the sub-measure level, the disaggregated analysis identifies three areas—4/4.1, 6/6.1, and 6/6.4—that warrant specific examination: in particular, sub-measure 4/4.1 alone accounts for over 36% of all events despite representing 11.6% of operations, making it the primary area of interest. Conversely, submeasure 22/22.1, which accounts for over half of the total number of cases, has an incidence close to zero, contributing significantly to keeping the aggregate average value low. The most significant evidence for interpretation, however, concerns the size of the investment, for which a clear positive correlation emerges with the re l rate of revocations and withdrawals: the incidence rises from values close to zero in the low-value categories to a peak of 8.2% in the very high-value category. This gradient, which is robust from an inferential standpoint, suggests that the beneficiaries' financial fragility and difficulty in accessing credit are a central determinant of the phenomenon, particularly in the case of substantial investments. Finally, at the macro-regional level, there is a statistically significant concentration of revocations and waivers in Areas B (8.8% aggregate incidence), D (5.7%), and C (5.2%), which emerge as the regions of greatest interest. Area D, in particular, although accounting for only 22% of total transactions, accounts for nearly half of the recorded events on its own, making it an area of specific concern.	It seems useful to propose a unified framework for such potential mitigation measures, given that the causal factors they should address are common: • In order to reduce the majority of cases of revocation or withdrawal due to failure to conclude (or adequately complete) the operation within the deadlines set by the grant decision, it appears necessary to introduce greater flexibility in these deadlines, not only in response to the occurrence of exceptional events (as was the case with the COVID-19 pandemic)[1] but also in light of macroeconomic dynamics and, in particular, changes in the prices of materials and equipment related to the investments. • Better coordination is also desirable between the procedural timelines for the various obligations that beneficiaries are required to meet, such as those pertaining to both the investment and the training requirements in the case of interventions in favor of young farmers. • With regard to the grounds for revocation in *public procurement transactions*, specifically in the context of "focus groups," the discussion centered on the adequacy of the time allotted to the Beneficiary to complete the transactions. This timeframe, which begins upon the adoption of the DICA, therefore also encompasses the entire phase of conducting the bidding procedure, including any appeals and related issues or further . In this context, the need arose to potentially *structure the deadlines specified in the DICA* by distinguishing between the deadline for completing the award procedure and the one granted for concluding the operation. This need stems from the observation, made in practice, that difficulties in carrying out the projects are often attributable to the fact that the decision to contract is adopted even a year after the issuance of the DICA, with additional technical delays accumulating thereafter. However, it has become apparent that the specific nature of the

[1] Although the extensions granted in response to the pandemic have effectively lengthened the deadlines for completing the projects—by as much as 3 to 4 months in some cases—some beneficiaries were still unable to complete the work by the new deadlines.

Subject	Conclusions	Recommendations
	The results of the analyses conducted on the causes of revocation and reasons for withdrawal (Chapters 2 and 3) highlight that these stem, at least in part, from common critical issues that emerged during the lifecycle of the funded operations; when particularly severe and unmitigable, these issues led to the failure of implementation. In most cases, revocations or withdrawals represent the procedural consequence of the Beneficiary's "inability" to meet the start or completion deadlines for the operation set forth in the grant decision (even if extended), which in turn stems from common critical issues: technical and administrative difficulties in the "constructability" of the project (e.g., in obtaining building permits and environmental authorizations) and, above all, a lack of financial resources to cover the co-financing share, accompanied by difficulties in accessing credit. This is due to a likely initial underestimation by the Beneficiary (or the Technical Expert) of these issues, as well as an unfavorable macroeconomic environment in recent years, with a general increase in actual investment costs. Other causal factors, less common than the previous ones but equally significant, are also present, differing between revocations and withdrawals and depending on the type of operation. In the case of revoked private operations, the negative outcomes of anti-mafia checks or reports received from judicial authorities stand out, as well as failure to maintain eligibility requirements and failure to complete the investment in financial and/or functional terms. In the case of public transactions, as expected, non-compliance with public procurement regulations is added to the list. Among the reasons for withdrawal, it is worth noting the "loss of interest" in the proposed transaction on the part of the Beneficiary (especially when young), which is judged in hindsight to be less feasible and effective given the long wait for the outcome of the funding, as contextual conditions have changed. The other potential causes considered in the in-depth analyses, however, received a low or even zero level of "reporting" by focus group participants and the beneficiaries interviewed. Cases of revocation due to failure to comply with the stability requirements of the operations, failure to cooperate with the competent authorities in investigative and monitoring activities, or failure to maintain the minimum score required for the project's eligibility for funding were rare. Causes of withdrawal related to general critical issues within the company, changes in its ownership or management structure, or force majeure events affecting the Beneficiary were also residual. This set of causes, which are not widespread, appears to have a substantially "normal" incidence; they often stem from factors external to the operation and its implementation process, and are therefore essentially not amenable to specific improvement measures.	various types of projects does not always make it possible to set a definite deadline. For example, in the case of construction-related interventions, such as the construction of a building or a structure, it is indeed possible to identify a defined timeline, as it is essentially predictable; conversely, in the case of environmental measures, the timeline is not solely tied to the administrative decision but also to environmental constraints, such as seasonality (the inability to work during periods of rain, snow, or in arid areas), which can lead to a natural extension of the implementation timeline. • Among the improvements capable of reducing revocations—or even withdrawals—due to failure to submit the documentation required to initiate the project, the "focus groups" of experts proposed making it mandatory to submit *detailed, construction-ready plans* as early as the initial application stage; It is believed, in fact, that a return to this requirement would allow for the identification of any critical issues related to authorizations as early as the preliminary review stage, thereby enabling the funding of projects less likely to be revoked due to the inability to commence work within the assigned deadlines. It should be noted, however, that this solution also has limitations, as the preparation of a construction-ready project entails significantly higher costs for the beneficiary, with possible consequences of dissatisfaction if the project, despite being eligible, is not funded due to insufficient available resources in the ranking, or due to the prior exclusion of entities with lesser technical, administrative, and financial capacities (e.g., small municipalities in inland areas). • Among other proposals aimed at reducing the documentation burden for obtaining construction readiness, there is also the suggestion to *limit the types of projects to be funded*: it is noted that, within the framework of a call for proposals currently being prepared under the " " initiative dedicated to educational farms, the decision has been made to exclude all construction activities requiring a building permit, admitting only "free construction" projects, in order to prevent issues related to obtaining the necessary authorizations. • From the perspective of the functioning of the institutions and bodies at various levels involved in the pre- and post-intervention assessment and monitoring, organizational and procedural improvements appear necessary (e.g., expanding the use of "service conferences") aimed at *reducing the length and technical-administrative complexity of the processes* through which operations approved and funded under the RDP meet the requirements for construction readiness.

Subject	Conclusions	Recommendations
	Conversely, mitigation measures targeting the primary causes of the aforementioned withdrawals and withdrawals—particularly those linked to the financing, launch, and implementation phases of the operations—appear appropriate and feasible.	• With regard to specific cases of withdrawal due to subsequent "loss of interest" on the part of the beneficiary (especially when young) in the operation they themselves proposed, mitigating these cases is obviously achievable by reducing the time required for preliminary review and eventual funding, through organizational and procedural improvements within the regional structures responsible • Finally, significant effects in terms of a lower incidence of revocations and withdrawals could presumably be achieved by enhancing and valuing the role played by professional technicians who, at various levels, assist beneficiaries in the design, submission, and implementation of operations. In particular, they should help reduce cases of mismatch between the size and complexity of the submitted project and the actual technical, managerial, and financial capacity of the proposer/beneficiary. With this in mind, training initiatives aimed at improving the technical staff's skills and professional development—as well as raising awareness among the Proposers/Beneficiaries themselves—regarding both the opportunities and the commitments involved in the implementation and management of operations would be desirable.