



Brussels,  
Agri.ddg1.c.4(2020)6491670 JK

## MINUTES

### *21<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP*

*1 October 2020*

Chair: Ms Sophie Helaine

Delegations present: All Member States were present except Malta

Ms Helaine (Head of Unit, DG AGRI Unit C.4 Monitoring and Evaluation) welcomes the participants, announces that the meeting will be interpreted in French, English and German and explains the technical requirements of the meeting. She reads out an interpretation disclaimer stating, “Only the statements by speakers in the room and accompanying documents presented during the meeting are to be considered as original. Any broadcast video and audio other than the original (including any interpretation via an audio channel, a video conference or an interpretation platform) are intended to facilitate communication and do not constitute an authentic record of the proceedings”<sup>1</sup>.

#### **1. Approval of the agenda and of the minutes of previous meeting**

No modifications of the minutes of the previous Expert Group meeting are requested by the Member States’ representatives. The minutes are therefore approved.

Ms Helaine lists the points of the agenda. The point ‘Sectorial programmes indicators’ is moved up on the agenda. Ms Helaine asks if any Member State has a suggestion for AOB or comments on the agenda. No further modifications are requested by the Member States’ representatives and the agenda is therefore approved.

#### **2. Nature of the meeting**

The Expert Group meeting is open to appointed representatives of the Member States. The meeting documents and presentations are available on <https://circabc.europa.eu/ui/welcome>.

The meeting was held via videoconference.

---

<sup>1</sup> The complete disclaimer is available in CIRCA



### 3. List of points discussed

#### 3.1 Livestock indicators R.36 and R.38: calculation examples

Ms Sophie Helaine (Head of Unit, DG AGRI Unit C.4, Monitoring and Evaluation), Ms Christine Falter (Policy Officer, DG AGRI Unit F.1, Conception and Consistency of Rural Development), Mr Georgios Mathioudakis (Policy Officer, DG AGRI Unit F.1, Conception and Consistency of Rural Development) and Mr Benjamin Fairbrother (Policy Officer, DG AGRI Unit F.1, Conception and Consistency of Rural Development) give a presentation with the title ‘Result indicators linked to livestock R.36 (AMR) and R.38 (animal welfare).’

*After the presentation, the delegates from the Member States raised the following questions and remarks:*

Luxembourg asks at which point in time and how often livestock units should be counted in case of investment projects that run over several years. Luxembourg asks for additional explanations concerning the example of double counting shown on the last slides of the presentation and wonders if double counting would be authorised in case of two investments for two different livestock species on the same farm.

Lithuania would appreciate a clarification of the meaning of the sentence ‘Member States are not expected to identify the livestock unit supported but the beneficiaries’ which has been newly added to the indicator fiches of R.36 and R.38.

Poland asks which intervention should be paid and reported in case a beneficiary applies for two interventions for the same livestock unit.

The Netherlands wonder how the result indicators linked to livestock could be calculated for the purpose of planning, as the necessary information about farms undertaking the interventions is not available at the planning stage.

*The Commission clarifies that livestock units should be counted as of the year of the first payment and repeated in the following years, as the indicator is cumulative.*

*In cases where it is possible to distinguish that for the same beneficiary there are two different animal types concerned (without having to look at the animal identification number) it would indeed be appropriated to count both.*

*The Commission explains why Member States in the indicator fiches are not expected to identify the livestock unit supported but the beneficiaries: R.36 Limiting antibiotic use, and R.38 Improving animal welfare, both record livestock units which have benefited from support, either directly (support paid by livestock unit) or indirectly (support paid by hectare or by operation). However, for avoiding double counting there is no need to look at the animal ID, but to check if a farm beneficiary with a unique ID has already benefited from another intervention for the same livestock. The Commission exemplifies this with the situation of a farm that has received support for investments that is later followed with a commitment on animal welfare.*

*If a beneficiary is asking for support for two interventions and these are correct, then both should be paid. As long as the payment is not for the same thing, it is possible to*

*receive two payments for the same livestock unit, which however ideally is counted only once.*

*The calculation of result indicators in the planning stage is recognised as challenging and rather approximative. It should possibly be based on Member States' experiences from the previous programming periods.*

### **3.2 Sectoral programmes indicators**

Fabian Santini (Deputy Head of Unit, DG AGRI Unit G.1, Governance of the agri-food markets) gives a presentation with the title 'Indicators for sectoral interventions'.

#### *3.2.1 Planning for performance clearance*

Poland is worried about how unit amounts can be planned for a few years in advance, as support depends on the future turnover of Producer Organisations (PO). According to the EAGF rules, funds for sectoral interventions that are not spent in the year are lost. Fruit and vegetables (F&V) had a specific support scheme for producer groups on which sectoral interventions cannot be built on. As Poland has few POs in other sectors than F&V it faces a lack of experience in planning these interventions.

France enquires if the need to reassess the contribution of the POs to the result indicators by modifying the targets and milestones every year is compulsory or only a recommendation.

France welcomes the proposal to modify the indicators fiches in order to simplify also the performance clearance of F&V, wine and others. It wonders if the regulatory provisions for the performance clearance introduced by the Croatian presidency on Article 41c for F&V, would also be modified in the legal text for beekeeping, wine and other sectors as well.

*The Commission explains that producer organisation (PO) are structures that are constituted, controlled by producers, and that have an economic activity together, in particular joint sales. For planning, an intervention that is based on the value of marketed production (VMP), it is important to consider that the VMP is used to set the ceiling of the funding to be received by a PO. In addition, the VMP of a PO does not change much from one year to another, and the history of POs and operational funds in the FV sector can help identifying certain pathways. Because operational programmes are conceived and submitted to the Member State for 3-7 years, it is possible for MS to have in advance a strategic view of what the POs are aiming at. In any case, if the planning is not met because there were fluctuations in the VMP, that would be an excellent justification to provide to the Commission.*

*The Commission reminds that Pillar I funding is annual, being this a good reason to be prudent in their planning, in particular regarding sectoral interventions.*

*Regarding the Member States' lack of experience for planning the unit amounts of support linked to PO, the Commission refers to the 'Study of the best ways for producer*

*organisations to be formed, carry out their activities and be supported*<sup>2</sup>. The annex of this study contains Member States' fiches on the situation of recognised and non-recognised POs. Historically, the recognised POs in the F&V sector have benefitted of operational programmes and that was a major incentive for their recognition. However, there are structures in other sectors that have all the elements characterising a PO, but they are not recognised as they never sought recognition. So even if it was said that in one Member State there are no PO in other sectors than F&V, it is not the case when talking of non-recognised POs.

*The Commission confirms that there is a possibility to modify targets and milestones according to indicators, if this is wished by the Member State, however it is not mandatory.*

*The Commission confirms that the modifications introduced by the Croatian presidency on Article 41(c) will only be related to the interventions in operational programmes set up by POs, hence for F&V and for any other sector, for which Member States may decide to have such sectoral interventions through POs.*

*The introduction of the Article 41(c) meant that also the indicator fiche for O.33 had to be modified to make the performance clearance based on the number of OPs.*

*For wine interventions, it is opportune to remove such interventions from the output indicators where they were listed, in order to avoid mixing rural development interventions. The Commission has chosen to amend the fiche so that all interventions in sectoral programmes for wine are grouped together into one single output indicator, following the model of beekeeping interventions. This means the reporting obligations for the sectoral programs have been simplified.*

### *3.2.2 Beekeeping – definitions and indicators*

Lithuania asks if, for the indicator O.3 Number of CAP support beneficiaries, only beekeepers need to be counted. The indicator fiche states that “Beekeepers are accounted as farmers”. However, the beneficiaries in National apiculture programmes can be beekeepers, beekeepers' organisations, laboratories or specialised bodies (scientists) for the implementation of research programmes.

Germany and Austria are concerned that if for the aggregates only the farmers are to be counted, this would, if interpreted in the narrow sense, lead for instance in Germany to the exclusion of 95 % of beneficiaries (e.g. institutes, research organisations) from reporting. Germany suggests that the fiches should be formulated in a way that when it comes to legal scrutiny it is clear that beekeepers could be included even if they are not farmers in the narrow sense.

Germany asks confirmation if for the denominator of R.9 the Commission really wants the number of beekeepers to be included. It points out that Germany does in fact have 269,800 farms and 150,000 beekeepers.

Germany considers that for indicator O.35 Number of actions for beekeeping preservation/improvement there is a lack of consistency as regards of what should be

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/2c31a562-eef5-11e9-a32c-01aa75ed71a1>

aggregated. It suggests to count just interventions for beekeepers, while currently there are 3 different identified indicators with three different values to be considered.

*The Commission clarifies that for the indicator O.3 Number of CAP support beneficiaries, only the number of beekeepers-farmers should be counted for the aggregates (focusing on farmers). By contrast, for the number of beneficiaries by interventions all beneficiaries are accounted (whether there are beekeepers-farmers or not).*

*The Commission explains that the Farm Structure Survey does not statistically classify beekeepers as farmers unless they have other production activities that would qualify them as such, thus the suggestion to add them to the denominator of result indicators 'number of farms'. However, in view of the numbers announced by Germany, it does not seem a good solution. Therefore, one suggestion would be to count only professional beekeepers or the beekeepers benefitting from CAP support. The Commission will further reflect on the described problem.*

*Regarding the aggregates in the indicator O.35 Number of actions for beekeeping preservation/improvement, the aim is to count the total number of beekeepers who received intervention paid by beekeepers, the total number of beehives receiving aid, CAP support per beehive and total number of operations for apiculture. The Commission clarifies that the total number of beehives was added because this it is a requirement for Member States according to Article 50 SPR.*

*The Commission will further reflect on how to consider a situation, like the one described by Germany, where the number of beekeepers corresponds to half the number of the holdings.*

### *3.2.3 Indicators R.10 Better supply chain organisation, and R.11 Concentration of supply*

Austria enquires if the calculation of the indicator R.11 Concentration of supply, is based on the value of marketed production, and not on the number of farmers.

France asks if the indicators R.10 Better supply chain organisation, and R.11 Concentration of supply, should only be connected to the CAP specific objective 3.

Belgium asks to clarify if for performance clearance, there is a need to plan the values for R.10 Better supply chain organisation, and R.11 Concentration of supply, but not of the other result indicators for which there is a contribution for sectoral interventions.

*The Commission clarifies that the calculation of the indicator R.11 Concentration of supply, is based on the value of marketed production.*

*The indicators R.10 and R.11 do not necessarily need to be linked only to the CAP specific objective 3, but can be linked also to other specific objectives.*

*The simplification of the performance clearance in Article 41(c) means that the planning of output indicators is only needed for operational programmes for F&V and the other sectors, and not like under the initial proposal for each intervention. However, when it comes to the results, the situation is different since these interventions may have significant and direct impact on several results indicators (e.g. risk management).*

### 3.2.4 Double counting in sectoral interventions

Belgium asks if it correctly understood that for sectoral interventions double counting could be done in certain circumstances (e.g. when unavoidable, or when too burdensome from an administrative point of view).

*The Commission confirms that when double counting cannot be avoided or when the administrative burden for sectoral interventions is too high (e.g. for areas), then it is acceptable not to check for double counting and simply add the hectares. Similarly, Member States can just count the number of members of the POs, even if the member of the PO is also beneficiary of the CAP for another intervention. Double counting is allowed because Member States would not record, when managing the operational fund, the ID beneficiaries of all the members of the POs.*

## 3.3 LEADER indicators

Karolina Jasinska-Muhleck (Policy Officer, DG AGRI Unit F.1, Conception and Consistency of Rural Developmen) gives a presentation with the title 'LEADER indicators: planning and reporting'.

*After the presentations, delegates from the Member States raised the following questions and comments:*

### 3.3.1 Calculation of unit amounts for LAGs and reporting

France asks whether, for Local Action Groups (LAG), there will be the requirement to provide average unit amounts per LAG or if there should be a uniform amount to avoid any risk that the clearance could be refused. In case average amounts are meant, this would be rather challenging for France as there are more than 340 LAGs in 18 regions, meaning that there should be 18 average amounts, one per region, in order to limit the risk that the clearance could be refused. Italy raises similar concerns as regards average unit amounts for LAGs.

Ireland asks for further explanations regarding the calculation of the average unit amount. It is not clear how the presented calculation relates to the performance clearance process.

Ireland and Latvia ask if the reporting is done by individual LAG, as shown in the presentation, or if it is done at the total number of contributions of the different LAGs.

Croatia asks if new data for output indicators needs to be collected each year, or if it is accumulated from the previous year.

*The Commission clarifies that, regarding unit amounts in the context of LAGs, average amounts are to be used in the programmes where each strategy has a different budget. Regionalised Member States may present as many average amounts as they have regions. However, they may alternatively present a single average amount, if explanations are given regarding the diversity of strategies' budgets between regions.*

*The average unit amount presented on the slides consisted in a mathematical exercise where the envelope available for the whole period is divided by the number of the outputs expected. This means that for the preparatory stage there would be the envelope foreseen for the preparatory support divided by the number of partnerships that are supposed to*

*receive support for this process, and then in the case of the second sub-set of the 0.27, the calculations would be the number of the financial envelope divided per number of strategies to be implemented.*

*What has been shown on the slides regarding the reporting on result indicators by individual LAGs should indicate how the information is collected. It is not expected that the Annual Performance Report reflects this level of detail. The Member States are expected to calculate the overall contribution of LEADER to the chosen result indicators. The reporting to the Commission should be done per result indicator based on a total contribution from all the interventions concerned. However, the exercise referred to in the presentation would be needed in order to obtain these result indicators values.*

*For the purpose of performance clearance reporting on output indicators is partial and done proportionally to the share of the total expenditure incurred. The output indicator value is to be calculated annually by multiplying the number of strategies, which received payment in a financial year per share of the total financial allocation they received in that year. When the total financial allocation is paid, all the partial outputs for LEADER reported throughout the period should sum up, up to the expected number of outputs (strategies prepared or implemented) in full. The output indicator for LEADER should be achieved only once 100 percent of the payments has been made.*

*For the purpose of monitoring, however, Member States should report annually the total number of strategies which got payment in the financial year.*

### *3.3.2 Planning of outputs*

Ireland argues that if the output was planned only once, it would be very confusing for stakeholders and others to understand why in financial year three to five there are no outputs planned for local development strategies. It would therefore be preferable if only the total output was planned so that there is no annual figure for the output of local development strategies (LDS). That would make more sense in the tables and it would not change anything in terms of the reporting or for the clearance process. Furthermore, it would be clearer for stakeholders.

Austria states that the estimation of the expenditure per year over the full period would be extremely challenging.

*The Commission explains that replacing the planning of output indicators for the year when the first expenditure is planned by the just stating the total value expected would not allow the Commission to monitor whether the implementation has started as planned. The Commission exemplifies this with a case in which two rounds of selection are planned and reflected in the CAP Strategic Plan: it would then be clear that the first strategies would get payment during the first year, and the second strategies would get payment in the following year. The requirement is to see the planned output at least once, the proposal being the year when the first payment for the LDS is made.*

*The Commission acknowledges that it is difficult to estimate the speed with which each LAG will implement the LDS and when the project beneficiaries will incur costs. Therefore, the financial yearly allocations to LEADER are to be seen as indicative and deviations between yearly execution and planned expenditure are not an issue for the performance clearance.,*



### 3.3.3 *Updating targets and milestones based on selected local development strategies*

France and Italy argue that it would be challenging to change the milestones after the selection of the LDS. The process of updating the milestones (in case LAGs change their LDS) along the programming period would be potentially administratively burdensome. France asks if, in case of a failure and suspension of the payment for the LAGs at the end of the period, there would be a need to split also the reduction among the LAGs.

Germany, France and Italy express concerns in particular during the stage two in the new planning process, when all the contributions to selected result indicators need to be collected from hundreds of LAGs. Germany asks for which result indicators it is expected that LAGs could contribute. Since LEADER is a bottom-up approach, based on a project-selection system and not on long-term project planning, it would not be enough to change the values of the result indicators in the CAP Strategic Plan only once at the time when the LDS have been selected, but several times throughout the programming period. LAGs do select projects once or twice a year, which leads to changes in the planned contributions. Germany suggests to reduce the result indicators to a minimum as to avoid too many changes. It also wonders how often the CAP Strategic Plan are expected to be revised.

Croatia expresses concerns on the expected CAP Strategic Plan amendments for additional result indicators. It would be challenging for the Managing Authority to collect all interventions or possible projects within the selection of LAGs. Croatia suggests that it would be simpler to have the interventions or projects of each LDS connected to one specific objective and result indicator of the CAP Strategic Plan. After the selection of LDS, some additional objectives and result indicators could also be connected. Croatia asks if it is mandatory to connect LEADER with these additional objectives or if it is possible to keep the one objective as it was initially in the CAP Strategic Plan.

Ireland asks if the second stage of the planning process would require a formal amendment or if it would constitute a category of a special type of amendment.

Slovakia asks which article in the SPR proposal requires the Member States to adjust the result indicators based on the selected LAG strategies. Article 97(1) (a) states that result forecasted values shall be justified in view of the assessment of needs.

*The Commission stresses that data collection on LEADER is currently not enough for evaluation. Asking for an extra effort in data collection on LEADER is justified since it is the only way of acknowledging the contribution of LEADER to the CAP objectives and evaluate the LEADER interventions, which corresponds at least to 5% of the rural development budget.*

*Targets and milestones do not need to be met exactly, so the revisions do not need to happen annually. It is actually expected that Member States do it only once, when the local development strategies have been selected to reflect their bottom planned contribution to the targets of chosen indicators.*

*The Commission clarifies that the specific approach to the planning and reporting of LEADER has been designed with a view not to jeopardize the bottom-up specificity of this instrument. The idea is not to use the plan to reflect the reality, but the plans included in the LDS. As it is known already from the current programming period, each LDS should include objectives and quantified targets. In this context, the Commission's*

*proposal is to present LAGs a very short list of result indicators which are particularly fit to reflect the expected contribution of the LEADER intervention in the CAP Strategic Plan, and which LAGs can pick up to define the targets that in any case LAGs need to define. Not each strategy would be expected to generate values for each of the chosen result indicators from the shortlist. However, if a strategy was targeted towards any of the result indicators and would be at the start already showing the potential to contribute to it, then the LAG would be expected to quantify those contributions. The short list of result indicators would cover the contribution of LEADER to the specific objective H. There is no need to link LEADER with other specific objectives unless the Member State has targeted LEADER towards very specific contributions under other specific objectives.*

*The Commission confirms that the amendment of the CAP Strategic Plan to reflect what is in the LDS should be made only once, precisely to reflect what is being planned and not what is about to happen. This amendment would be the information collected in the second stage of the planning process, when the LDS are already selected, and would undergo the same procedure as any other formal amendment.*

*There is no article that requests this revision of results indicators once the LDS have been selected. The default principle is that for each intervention planned in the CAP Strategic Plan, Member States would establish links with all results indicators where a substantial contribution is expected. The proposal of an alternative approach has been developed in recognition of the fact that it is difficult, in the case of LEADER, to plan all the contributions of LEADER interventions to all the different results indicators upfront.*

*The Commission reminds that Member States have anyway to report on the contributions of LEADER to the result indicators. In the current CMEF, jobs created via LEADER are to be reported annually, and the contribution of LEADER to other result indicators is to be reported twice during the programming period and in the ex post. Further efforts in better planning, recording and reporting on LEADER are therefore essential.*

### *3.3.4 Distinguishing LEADER preparatory support and implementation support: planning and reporting*

France raises concerns on the LEADER performance clearance: if there is only one output indicator for both the preparation of the strategy and the implementation of the strategy, the title given ('Number of supported local development strategies or preparatory actions') can be misleading. France asks if in this case there should be a separate output indicator dedicated to the support for the preparation of the strategy, and suggests that otherwise the final title could be 'including preparatory actions' instead.

Ireland enquires if the two interventions, one for the preparatory support and one for implementation, would both contribute to the indicator R.31a LEADER coverage.

Croatia asks if, in the case the preparation step for LEADER is carried out during the transition period and hence the implementation step starts directly in 2023, the CAP Strategic Plan for the next programming period should somehow also include the preparatory support that took place before the start of the period.

Belgium asks to clarify if the 'implementation of strategies' needs to be considered separately from 'support preparation' and if further explanation on the costs for coordination and cooperation in LEADER, which are currently two different sub-measures under measure 19 could be given.

*The Commission explains that the output indicator for LEADER indeed mentions in the title now 'preparatory actions and strategies' and encourages Member States to design two interventions, one for strategy and one for preparatory actions. This would be justified given that both types of support will typically have different eligibility conditions, types of beneficiaries and amounts of support involved. Since outputs need to be reported by intervention, Member States would therefore report two types of output values, one for preparatory actions and one for strategies. Both values would be distinct under that rubric of the LEADER output indicator. The split to two sub-sets of the LEADER indicator is explained in the fiche on O.27.*

*The Commission clarifies that both interventions, preparatory support and implementation, could contribute to the result indicator R.31a LEADER coverage. In any case, there is no expectation nor reason to plan for any result to be generated under the preparation.*

*In the case the whole preparatory support is paid in the transitional period under the current RDPs, there is no need to artificially plan for it under the future CAP Strategic Plans.*

*It is expected that cooperation and running costs of animation, which represent now two separate sub-measures of the measure 19, are reported under the implementation of strategies. The current sub-measures 19.2, 19.3 and 19.4 would be thus reported under 'implementation of the local development strategies', while the current sub-measure 19.1 would be reflected in the intervention 'preparation of strategies'.*

### 3.3.5 Justifying deviations

France asks what would be a feasible justification for deviations in the case, for example, the ratio is exceeded: would a justification based on the fact that the Member State paid for the biggest envelope before paying the smaller LAGs an acceptable one for the Commission?

Czech Republic enquires what will be the consequences of a failure to reach the result indicators at LAG level.

*The Commission states that any good explanation is a valid explanation to justify deviations, especially those explanations related to usual implementation issues.*

*The Commission clarifies the general view regarding potential consequences in the face of failure to reach a planned value for a result indicator at the LAG level: Member States are encouraged to have a dialogue with each LAG periodically in order to check what progress is being made and what are the reasons of potential deviations, rather than penalizing LAGs.*

### 3.3.6 Other remarks

Austria points out that the reference to Article 69(c) is missing in the new indicator fiche (types of operations) for the indicator O.23 Number of rural entrepreneurs receiving installation grants.

Italy raises concerns regarding the indicator R.31a LEADER coverage. Italy asks if the result indicator should be achieved at the moment of selection of the LDS.

Belgium asks if the moment of collection of the result indicators associated with LEADER follows the same rules as for other interventions: after the first payment for a LEADER project with a contribution to this indicator.

Lithuania asks if when the Smart Village strategy is implemented using LEADER as a platform as an integral part of the LDS, would this be in line with the description of the result indicator R.33 Digitising the rural economy.

Germany states that if the contribution of LAGs only needs to be integrated in the CAP Strategic Plans once, then Member States have only planned contributions, not realised figures. There is a concern on how to prove planned values by checking realised values regarding 'jobs created'. Germany asks for confirmation that this situation does not apply to LEADR contributions and hence only planned values are reported once after LAG selection

Lithuania asks for further explanations on the changes for the result indicator R.31 Growth and jobs in rural areas, specifically if the indicator is based on 'planned' values or on 'achieved' values, 'based on completed operations'.

*The Commission explains that the lack of reference to Article 69(c) in the fiche of the output indicator O.23 Number of rural entrepreneurs receiving installation grants, is due to the fact that the presentation was based on the presidency text (see the disclaimer) which has deleted the 'being part of local development strategies' from Article 69(c).*

*The indicator R.31a LEADER coverage is to be reported when the first payment is made. All result indicators and output indicator reporting refers to the first payment, except for the number of jobs, where it has been clearly stated that it is to be recorded at the completion of the project.*

*It is the choice of Member States to decide how the Smart Villages objective is implemented. If all LAGs support Smart Villages strategies<sup>3</sup>, then the covered rural population would be the same. There are, however, two different result indicators, R.31a LEADER coverage, and R.33 Digitising the rural economy, measuring the share of rural population and the number of Smart Villages strategies respectively.*

*The Commission reminds that the latest versions of result indicator fiches circulated do not include anymore the requirement to verify that the planned jobs correspond to the created jobs on a sample basis.*

### **3.4 IACS data sharing**

Mr Mohamed El Aydam (DG AGRI Unit D.3, Implementation support and IACS) gives a presentation with the title 'IACS data sharing'. The Commission informs that big efforts on the issue of IACS and data sharing are currently being undertaken and acknowledges that there is still work to be done.

---

<sup>3</sup> Smart Villages can be implemented via Leader, but Smart Villages Strategy are not limited to Leader interventions. In addition, Smart Village Strategies are not about repeating another participatory planning process already covered within LEADER LDS. See [https://enrd.ec.europa.eu/sites/enrd/files/enrd\\_publications/smart-villages\\_orientations\\_sv-strategies.pdf](https://enrd.ec.europa.eu/sites/enrd/files/enrd_publications/smart-villages_orientations_sv-strategies.pdf)

Germany asks what the strategy of the Commission is to set a legal basis in the Regulation for the data sharing of personalised spatial IACS data for evaluation purposes.

*The Commission invites Member States to write to the Presidency and promote changes regarding Article 99(2) of the Horizontal Regulation that would facilitate data sharing for the purpose of evaluation and research.*

### **3.5 Revised indicator fiches**

Ms Helaine gives a presentation with the title ‘MS questions on indicators: summary of the answers’ on indicators fiches and thanks Member States for their contribution. She opens the floor for questions. The discussions concerned the following indicators/topics:

#### *3.5.1 Questions sent to the Commission*

Hungary would like to receive written answers to the questions sent to the Commission on 29th August 2020 related to indicators and the monitoring system. Two questions are posed. First, if payment compensation should be suspended in case of multiple interventions contributing to one indicator. Second, if all the other measures will be suspended in case of the contribution of one intervention to more than one indicator. Hungary would like to know what the general rule in this case is.

*The Commission clarifies that these questions are not related to the fiches and will not be addressed in this meeting. The GeoHub and the colleagues specialised in sectoral interventions will be consulted on this matter and provide an answer.*

#### *3.5.2 R.12 Mitigation and adaptation to climate change: Share of Utilised Agricultural Area (UAA) and/or livestock units (LU) under support to reduce ammonia and GHG emissions, maintaining/enhancing carbon storage, including commitments to improve climate change adaptation (with breakdown by mitigation and adaptation)*

Ireland is concerned about the number of sub-indicators in Annex 1. For example, R.12 Mitigation and adaptation to climate change, has three sub-indicators, which is not a simplification.

France and Estonia agree with Ireland regarding R.12 and express their preference for not having sub-indicators.

*The Commission clarifies that R.12 Mitigation and adaptation to climate change, originally was three different indicators (R.12, R.13, R.14). The grouping in one indicator (while keeping breakdowns) was proposed by the Presidency, and the Commission made an attempt to draft a relevant fiche. Aggregating land and livestock would not be reasonable.*

*The Commission suggests to the Member States concerned to communicate their wish to split R.12 in three indicators to the Presidency.*

### 3.5.3 R.14 Carbon storage in soils and biomass

Belgium argues that it is difficult to merge into one indicator the concepts of reducing emissions from land and enhancing carbon storage in soils and biomass, which rely on two different kinds of actions/process.

*The Commission confirms that there are indeed more interventions that can contribute. Soil organic farming is rather not only about reducing emissions but also about contributing to carbon sequestration, so it will be accounted here. The maintenance of grassland as a result of the support to area facing natural constraints (ANC) will not automatically be accounted under R.14. There are grasslands that are emitting. It is not enough to be granted an ANC support on grassland, some practices should be added to ensure that it would contribute to carbon sequestration. As presented during last Expert Group meeting, the JRC is running a project to develop a methodology based on the layers of LPIS, and all these interventions would be in LPIS and in IACS, which will avoid double counting. The Commission reminds that volunteers for the pilot project are still needed.*

### 3.5.4 Double counting

France argues that on double counting it has noted differences between the various output indicators and proposes for simplification purposes a one-size-fits-all-approach for double counting applicable to all indicators. This should take account of the performance as a whole and ensure that once a farmer benefits from two different types of investments, this is noted in order to allow to measure the performance of certain CAP sectors. Exceptions are allowed for fruit and vegetables, as sectoral interventions for F&V are subject to derogation suggested by the Commission. France would like this derogation to be broadened to the wine sector for the restructuring of the sector because they are not currently included in IACS database in France. Regarding avoiding double counting between the beneficiaries of financial instruments and subsidies, banking organisations send lists of beneficiaries, but they are not detailed and they do not have the same type of numbering for recipients of subsidies. This is an impediment to avoid double counting.

Denmark notes that double counting is allowed widely and therefore wonders why it is not allowed in some indicators such as R.9 Farm modernisation, and O.3 Number of CAP support beneficiaries.

France asks if double counting could be authorised for the indicator R.23a Environment-/climate-related performance through investment in rural areas, in the case a beneficiary benefits of two investment operations during the programming period, counting this hence as two.

*The delivery of our policy will be less if interventions are concentrated on the same land/farms, this is why to the extent possible double counting should be avoided.. The same approach (no need to check for double counting) applies to all sectoral programmes and not only to fruits and vegetables.*

*The reason for allowing double counting in R.3 Digitising agriculture, and not in R.9 Farm modernisation, is that in R.9 double counting can be avoided because it relates to farmers which have a unique ID. For R.3 Digitising agriculture, that is not the case because interventions are mixed such as investments, knowledge and cooperation. In knowledge the unit of measurement is the number of persons who are benefiting from the training and not only farmers (as the distinction cannot be made). In addition, the unique ID of those farmers will not be available, not even any unique ID of the beneficiary of the training action. On this basis, double counting with the farmer who would for example have claimed investments in the field of digitalisation cannot be avoided.*

*The Commission acknowledges the proposal made by Belgium that adding two indicators, one based on investments and the other one based on knowledge and cooperation, would allow to have on one side one indicator on investment without double counting, and on the other side one on knowledge where double counting could potentially occur. The Commission invites Belgium to provide its suggestion to the Presidency.*

*A written answer will be provided to the question of double counting for the indicator R.23a Environment-/climate-related performance through investment in rural areas.*

#### *3.5.5 Impact indicators and Green deal targets.*

France wonders if impact indicators I.1 Sharing knowledge and innovation, and I.24 A fairer CAP, should be calculated each year by the Member State and included in the annual performance report, or if the Commission will do it.

France would be grateful for any explanation from the Commission as regards the targets under the Green Deal to allow Member States to plan well for these indicators. For example, regarding impact indicators to be used in the context of Green Deal – I.27 Sustainable use of pesticides, I.15 Improving water quality, I.26 Limiting antimicrobial use in farmed animals – it is unclear what would be the reference period or point of departure against which the targets should be set and what are the necessary collection methods and data. France suggests this as a topic for discussion in future meetings of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP.

*The Commission informs that it will calculate the indicators I.1 Sharing knowledge and innovation, and I.24 A fairer CAP, based on data provided by Member States.*

*With regard to the Green Deal, the Member States will have individual meetings with the Commission in October to discuss recommendations. The reference period for some of the Green Deal targets is already set, e.g. for GHG emissions the beginning of the reference period is the year 1990. For some indicators no reference period is needed (e.g. organic farming). For other indicators, the work is still ongoing. A point on the agenda of the next Expert Group meeting in November will be added.*

#### *3.5.6 R.26 Protecting forest ecosystems*

Spain requests the inclusion of Article 71 on cooperation amongst the interventions in the fiche of the indicator R.26 Protecting forest ecosystems.

*The Commission explains that in the case a cooperation action is aiming at doing commitments in forest land, the cooperation action would use the agro-environmental commitments to do this forest action. This is how the cooperation or LEADER action would finance this commitment. Hence it is enough to refer to the commitment and the cooperation action would be covered.*

#### *3.5.7 R.28 Supporting Natura 2000*

France supports Ireland's request to keep the indicators that were de-aggregated in R.28 Supporting Natura 2000, aggregated.

*The Commission clarifies that regarding R.28 Supporting Natura 2000, several Member States explicitly asked to draw a distinction between forestry land and agricultural land because in Natura 2000 they are dealt with very differently. Including forestry land and agricultural land together would result in very low values indicators while in many countries the support focuses mainly on agricultural land under Natura 2000.*

#### *3.5.8 R.29 Preserving landscape features*

Belgium states that the removal of R.29 Preserving landscape features, makes it difficult to report clearly on commitments related to landscape features. It asks if landscape features could be reported under R.27 Preserving habitats and species.

*The Commission agrees with the concern regarding the removal of R.29 Preserving landscape features, as this indicator constituted the most direct link to the Green Deal target on biodiversity-rich landscape features. Nevertheless, commitments for managing landscape features are included in R.27 preserving habitats and species (said differently R.29 is a subset of R.27). The Commission encourages Belgium to address his concern to the Presidency.*

#### *3.5.9 R.30 Generational renewal*

France argues that it has a real issue with R.30 Generational Renewal. For the time being under Pillar I for Article 27 Complementary income support for young farmers it is being checked whether or not the young farmer is working, but the number of young farmers working within a holding are not counted. This means that the information gathering system would have to be changed in order to satisfy the criteria for this aid. France asks for an exception in this case to the double counting rules for young farmers, to have the possibility of counting a beneficiary business or a legal entity as a young farmer without considering how many farmers conform this entity.

*The Commission explains that as noted in the fiche, for income support under Pillar I an entity is the same as a beneficiary. The number of young farmers that are working as one entity is not requested. This information is however available for rural development. For simplification, it is proposed to count only the beneficiaries as one entity even if several people are working in the entity.*



3.5.10 R.31 Growth and jobs in rural areas, R.32 Developing the rural bioeconomy, R.34 Connecting rural Europe

France supports the amendments made to the fiche of R. 31 Growth and jobs in rural areas, but has a comment on the points of time for data provision: The data is provided when the file is closed for the final payment. This is different from R.32 Developing the rural bioeconomy, and R.34 Connecting rural Europe, for which data should be provided as of the first payment. France suggests that data should be provided in the final payment for all these indicators.

Estonia wonders how for R.31 it is possible to know if the complementary income support for young farmers has created new jobs. It suggests that the indicator fiche should have additional guidance about the moment of data collection for complementary income support for young farmers.

Slovenia enquires on the ‘Footnote’ in the fiche of R.31 stating that “This is because both types of support encourage generational renewal, Pillar II supports the setting-up of new farmers while Pillar I supports the economic viability of newly set-up farmers”. Slovenia asks further information on how Pillar I creates new jobs. In the chapter “Definition and aim” it is written: “To quantify the number of jobs created (not maintained) in supported projects”. Support for young farmers under Pillar I is not necessarily connected to job creation.

Slovakia asks how the indicator R.31 is different from R.30 from the point of view of the complementary income support for young farmers. The footnote says that pillar I payment has been added because it also contributes to generation renewal, however this indicator is aimed at measuring growth and jobs.

Sweden welcomes the change of the data collection moment for the indicator R.31 Growth and jobs in rural areas, from ‘first payment’ to ‘last payment’. However, the methodology still says ‘planned jobs’. To avoid confusion, Sweden suggests that the fiche should say ‘realised jobs’. The fiche also states that double counting should be avoided when counting new jobs. Sweden considers the administrative burden of this very heavy as personal identifiers need to be gathered for all jobs, including part-time jobs, for all relevant types of interventions. Hence, Sweden considers that double counting should be allowed in this case.

Slovenia explains that in its RDP, sub-measure M06.1 is divided into two distinct parts: one with employment and another one without it. Also, payment differs. Therefore, the number of young farmers with employment for the indicator R.31 Growth and jobs in rural areas, is exactly known.

Poland wonders if it is possible to include the small farms schemes under the indicator R.9 Farm modernisation. Currently, it is only linked to R.31 Growth and jobs in rural areas, which is intended for job creation. If there is a decision to implement this intervention, it should be rather linked to a specific objective related to competitiveness.

*The Commission explains that R.31 Growth and jobs in rural areas requires an observation of the number of jobs created, which is not directly linked to the intervention paid but rather more to its effective achievements. Looking at the situation at the time of last payment is thus relevant. But for R.32, beneficiaries are counted, which means SMEs*

*and POs receiving CAP support. The first payment therefore is relevant and will provide robust information, there is no need to wait to report the data.*

*For infrastructure/services (R.34) when a project is drawn up the rural population that will potentially benefit is already known. There might be a distinction between the point at which the project is designed (the target population) and the point at which the project is being finalised. This difference is however not significant enough to justify that the reporting of this information would be delayed until the project is completed.*

*The target of Pillar I and Pillar II to support young farmers is exactly the same. It does not always lead to a new job.*

*The difference between R.30 and R.31 is that in R.31 it is R.30 plus the other jobs created thanks to the CAP.*

*The Commission acknowledges the mistake in the fiche for R.31, which will be changed as so to mention 'realised jobs'. Avoiding double counting is possible in the context of the rural development support to set up of farms and the complementary income support to young farmers. For other aspects of the job creation, it is indeed much more difficult. The Commission will reconsider the wording in the fiche so that the distinction between the different types of interventions where it is possible to avoid double counting is clear.*

*The Commission reminds that the intervention on small farm development is not an investment support. The Commission acknowledges the reluctance from certain Member States to account for this under R.31. It has been proposed in the presentation (and also in the indicator fiche) that this intervention is accounted for in R.35 Promoting social inclusion. The Commission encourages Member States to let the Presidency know of all the indicators that Member States would like to see back in Annex I (such as R.35).*

### *3.5.11 Changes on output and result indicators*

Italy states that more understanding and clarifications are needed on the implications of the changes on output and result indicators, as well as on the link with the work done in the Council and the role of indicators in defining average and uniform unit amounts (i.e. use of units and use of aggregate output). Italy raises concerns about planning of this indicators and the implication in structuring interventions.

*The Commission reminds that aggregates of output indicators are not to be planned, only the ones by intervention/unit amount.*

### *3.5.12 O.3 Number of CAP support beneficiaries*

Denmark asks why in O.3 Number of CAP support beneficiaries, new aggregates have been added in relation to gender and legal entity and expresses disapproval for that decision.

Czech Republic, Poland, Estonia and Belgium also provide remarks concerning the comments in indicator O.3 and do not agree with the breaking down by gender of the

beneficiary and legal entity. This would be an administrative burden for Member States and Estonia mentions that this information is not always provided.

Czech Republic and Poland also do not agree with the provision of aggregates by type of intervention. It would reduce the readability of the indicator and does not bring any added value. Especially when the majority of beneficiaries apply for BISS and there cannot be double counting.

Belgium suggests that a distinction of gender for the indicator O.3 could be a requirement for those Member States, for which it is relevant. Most of the beneficiaries of the support in the case of Belgium is 'agricultural holding', which is a unit that has no gender.

*The Commission takes note of the reluctance of Member States to split O.3 by gender. However, O.3 is not used for performance clearance, so there is no need to plan. In addition, 'gender equality' was added by the Presidency to the Specific Objective 8, therefore data is required to assess the CAP impact. It is only a reporting tool of the number of beneficiaries of the CAP interventions. The Commission asks Estonia to explain in writing the reasons why this information would not be available. A possible solution would be to ask for that information in the applications, as it is already done in some Member States.*

*It was already foreseen that O.3 would record the number of beneficiaries by intervention. The type of interventions was added to make sure that some aggregates are not missed (e.g. for eco-schemes). With regard to the fact that it would be a double count or repetition of what is asked in the other indicators, the other indicator remaining that refers to beneficiary is O.5, which is necessary for the performance clearance of the lump-sum for small farmers. Therefore, in the proposal of the Presidency, it is made clear in the label that O.5 is only related to small farmers. There is no output indicator besides O.3 that would ask for the number of beneficiaries of interventions.*

### *3.5.13 O.9 Number of ha benefitting from coupled support*

Slovakia asks regarding direct payments if the oilseed crops should be reported under O.9 Number of ha benefitting from coupled support, within a sub-indicator.

Lithuania comments that according to the methodology of output indicator O.9, it can be assumed that hectares paid under each area-related Coupled Income Support can have several unit amounts defined (e.g. by farm size). However, output indicator O.10 Number of heads benefitting from coupled support, (concerning number of heads benefitting from coupled support) does not allow for a possibility to have several unit amounts defined for animal heads.

*The Commission explains that regarding oilseeds, in O.9 the hectares are to be reported by intervention/unit amount. If there is a coupled payment intervention for oilseeds, this detail will be reported. Only the aggregate will provide the total number of hectares for coupled payments all together. In addition, there will be a placeholder in the annual performance report where all the support given to oil seeds should be recorded (to comply with Blair house obligations).*

*The Commission confirms that there might be different unit amounts for coupled support interventions designed by herd or livestock unit. In the fiches the text is slightly different*

*between O.9 and O.10 but meant to be the same, and the reporting will be done by unit amount as well. Text of fiches will be aligned.*

#### *3.5.14 O.11 Number of ha receiving ANC top up (3 categories)*

France comments that regarding O.11 Number of ha receiving ANC top up (3 categories), , it would be difficult for France to split O.11 into different types of zone due to the methodology used.

*There are three different interventions since payments are not the same for mountainous zones, non mountainous zones, other, and outputs are reported by intervention. . France is invited to explain its difficulty in distinguishing the zones.*

#### *3.5.15 Payments for area specific disadvantage*

Belgium reminds that Payments for area specific disadvantage is not always supplemented with other environmental commitments and hence asks if this intervention can only contribute to R.7 Enhancing support to farm in areas with specific needs.

*The Commission clarifies that income support in Natura 2000 (Article 67) is not to be recorded under R.28 Supporting Natura 2000. Under this indicator, it is only commitments that are recorded. However, it is to be linked to all indicators related to income support, hence R.6 Redistribution to smaller farms, and R.7 Enhancing support to farms in areas with specific needs.*

#### *3.5.16 O.13 Number of ha (excluding forestry) covered by environment/climate commitments going beyond mandatory requirements*

Estonia asks why the beehives are added in O.13 Number of ha (excluding forestry) covered by environment/climate commitments going beyond mandatory requirements. This indicator should only assess hectares as the name indicates.

*The Commission highlights that for O.13, the reason why beehives have been added is that there are commitments under rural development which are paid per beehives.*

#### *3.5.17 O.14a Number of forestry units other than ha covered by environment/climate commitments going beyond mandatory requirements*

Estonia and Spain point at the fact that in the fiche of O.14a Number of forestry units other than ha covered by environment/climate commitments going beyond mandatory requirements, the methodology and unit of measurement are wrong as the name indicates that unit is other than hectare but the fiche indicates that the unit is hectare at the moment.

*The Commission acknowledges the mistake and confirms that the correct unit of measurement is other than hectares.*

### *3.5.18 O.19 Number of supported local infrastructures*

France wonders why local services have been removed from O.19 Number of supported local infrastructures. In effect, these are two different tools. France would like to know if this means that local services are financed under O.20, so this is non-agricultural non-productive land.

*The Commission considers it as unnecessarily complex to mention in the label “services” in the title and the heading, since paying for a service means investing in an infrastructure to provide this service. Services are to be reported under O.19.*

### *3.5.19 O.29 Number of farmers trained/given advice*

Estonia asks what is the action under O.29 Number of farmers trained/given advice. For example, in the case of a support for local knowledge exchange programmes that consists of different outputs such as training, information days, publication or study days, would the whole block of activities be considered one action or is every activity a separate action. For the aggregated value of O.29 it is very complicated to separate farmers and non-farmers.

Spain proposes to remove O.29 a. Number of plans, studies or awareness actions supported by EAFRD, because it does not add any relevant information and it does not agree with the creation of new indicators.

*The Commission answers that, the title of indicator O.29 was changed. This indicator is not about farmers but about operations. Originally there was a mistake in the CAP proposal: the unit was the number of farmers trained. However, the fiche does not refer to farmers but to operations. The reason is that the payment is per operation.*

*Regarding O.29a, the Commission explains that it was added by the Presidency based on feedback received from some Member States (like Estonia today). Under the article 71 there can be some interventions which correspond to this number of plans, studies or awareness actions which might be difficult to merge with O.29.*

### *3.5.20 O.31 Number of ha under environmental practices (synthesis indicator on physical area covered by conditionality, ELS, AECM, forestry measures, organic farming) and O 32 Number of ha subject to conditionality (broken down by GAEC practice)*

Denmark expresses support for the O.31 and O.32. and comments that the CAP Strategic plan is the only instrument to implement Farm to Fork and Biodiversity Strategy.

*The Commission thanks Denmark for supporting to have back in the Annex I the indicator O.31 and O. 32, and invites Denmark to communicate this to the Presidency.*

*Due to poor sound quality, the Commission asks Denmark to send its further comments in writing.*

### *3.5.21 Context indicators*

Italy comments that context indicators must be simple, easy and as much as possible, provided by statistics already available, clear to explain to stakeholders. Italy notices that the framework is becoming more and more complicated. There are many examples in this sense. Italy highlights a problem of timing. Based on the common context indicators, in Italy there are already written policy briefs for all the specific objectives. From these policy briefs, the SWOTs are already determined. All this process has been shared with the Regions and other Ministries. Italy is currently concluding the Needs assessment and would like to know how they should proceed considering the revised fiche, and if they should update all the analyses made.

France asks what is preventing the update of the fiches for some context indicators, such as C.43 Greenhouse emissions from agriculture, and C.46 Ammonia emissions from agriculture, so that values are accounted in terms of volume and also referred to different units such as hectares.

*The Commission explains that the number of context indicators is now less than what was in the CMEF. The statistics are anyhow available and the changes introduced to the former version of the fiches are just a clarification of what was already there, regarding the number of sub-indicators covered. This was suggested by Sweden. The [publication online](#) of the context indicators in the current framework already shows the existing split for the majority of these indicators. The SWOT analysis does not need to be changed because the content was not changed, only the format was changed. The only exception is the addition of gender in some of the indicators, because the objective of gender equality was added by the Presidency to the specific objective 8 and it is possible to reflect the split by gender since the statics are already available.*

*The issues regarding reporting context indicators in absolute or relative terms have already been answered in writing. Overloading the fiches with different units risks of provoking complaints about the complexity of these indicators. The information of values referred to different units could be used though by Member States during the needs assessment and in the SWOT analysis. However, absolute values need to be included as well, as this allows looking at the evolution of a Member State over time, which is the objective of these indicators and it is what is reported to the UN. The Commission acknowledges that referring at the value per unit can be useful for comparing Member States.*

### *3.5.22 Article 67 Natura Support for forest*

Estonia points out that there is no suitable result indicator for article 67 Natura 2000 Support for forest. Article 67 is mentioned in the fiches of R.4 Linking income support to standards and good practices, and a R.7 Enhancing support to farms in areas with specific needs, but these indicators are for farmers and it is not suitable to add forestry under this indicator.

*The Commission will come back to Estonia on the reply to this question.*

### *3.5.23 Demarcation between climate related indicators*

Lithuania asks what are the differences or demarcations between R.23a Environment-/climate-related performance through investment in rural areas, and R.16a Investments related to climate, if they both cover climate investments.

Spain suggests merging the indicators R.18 Improving soils and R.20 Protecting water quality; as well as R.16a Investment related to climate, R.23 Environment-/climate-related performance through investments in rural areas and R.27a Investments related to biodiversity.

*The Commission explains that R.23a relates only to SMEs or non-farm investments, while R.16a refers to investments on farms.*

*Regarding merging of R.18, R.19 and R.20 the Commission is very satisfied that the German Presidency split them again. It is essential to follow very closely the action of the CAP on natural resources and is not enough to have an aggregated indicator, which would put together water quality, air and soil. Knowing all the more that now there is an initiative on soil and even an objective for soil management which is set at EU level. There are also obligations for Member States to reduce ammonia emissions and targets it is essential to follow this separately. For investments, the split between climate, natural resources and biodiversity was proposed by the Presidency and it is very welcome.*

### *3.5.24 R.39 Organic farming*

Finland asks for a clarification about the basic rules of this calculation, mainly on how to calculate the organic farming indicator based under Article 65, how to put this in the result indicators. Finland would like to know if the calculation includes the whole area under R.39 Organic farming, and the same area - or partly - under R.37 Sustainable pesticide use. Organic farming can also reduce pesticide use.

Spain asks if organic farming is only considered under the new indicator R.39 Organic farming, or if it can also be taken into account in other indicators such as R.18 Improving soils, R.19 Improving air quality, R.20 Protecting water quality, R.21 Sustainable nutrient management and/or R.37 Sustainable pesticide use.

*The Commission clarifies that R.39 is about the organic farming practice, i.e. the area under organic farming supported by the CAP, while R.37 is about the different practices supported by the CAP that are contributing to the reduction of pesticide use, and organic is one of these practices. The Commission wants to acknowledge the contribution of organic farming to the reduction of use of pesticides in Europe. Therefore, it should also be accounted under R 37.*

*The Commission explains that organic support is not only to be recorded under the indicator R.39. The contribution of organic farming to the different CAP objectives is to be acknowledged in all the various indicators where it is found most relevant (see the cover note).*

### 3.5.25 Knowledge and innovation

Spain states that for indicators R.1 Enhancing performance through knowledge and innovation, and R.24 Environmental/climate performance through knowledge, reference is made to the cross-cutting objective on knowledge and innovation in Article 5. Spain asks if this means that interventions under Articles 71 and 72 would be focused only on the cross-cutting objective.

Sweden suggests to report the indicator R.2 Linking advice and knowledge systems, in the same way as the indicator R.1 enhancing performance through knowledge and innovation, where only the number of people, and not personal data, is managed and reported. This should be enough since double counting is allowed, according to the fiche.

*The Commission clarifies that the indicators R.1 Enhancing performance through knowledge and innovation, and R.24 Environmental/climate performance through knowledge, are not necessarily only to be linked to the cross-cutting objective of knowledge. The indicator R.24 also involves knowledge in the field of natural resources and climate, so the link is direct and significant with the objective on natural resources, the objective on biodiversity and the objective of climate, depending on how interventions are defined.*

*The Commission confirms that the number of the identification of advisors is not needed to compute the indicator R.2 Linking advice and knowledge systems. The Commission clarifies that if Member States would like afterwards to involve advisors in AKIS, it could be a solution to manage advisors' personal data in order to contact them back.*

### 3.5.26 Status of indicator fiches

France would like to know what the status of the cover note and the indicator fiche is and whether they will be supported by implementing acts.

Austria and Germany welcome the indicator fiches update by the Commission and raise concerns, however, that the fiches do not sufficiently reflect the work done in the Council Working Groups. Some discussions on changes to the whole set/system of indicators are difficult to follow (e.g. the proposal to first merge and then divide again indicators R.12 Adaptation to climate change, and R.14 Carbon storage in soils and biomass).

*The Commission explains that calculation methods will be led down in an implementing act, but that is not applicable to the whole fiche.*

*The Commission encourages Member States to share better solutions on improving the clearness of draft indicator fiches. The Commission reminds that the current situation is complex, as there is a Commission proposal as well as a text from the Presidency, together with the work from the Parliament. The Commission cannot preempt the trilogues. However, to ease the work of the Presidency towards the General Approach, the Commission prepared fiches reflecting the CAP proposal and the changes introduced by the Presidency.*



#### **4. AOB**

Mr Hannes Wimmer (ENRD Evaluation Helpdesk, Team Leader) gives a presentation called ‘Outcomes of the Thematic Working Group and Draft Annual Work Programme 2021’.

*The Commission highlights the relevance of the presented topics of the Annual Work Programme and welcomes the fact that Member States wish to use FADN even more as a source for evaluation. While FADN is an excellent source of information, it is for the time being still rather restricted to accounting issues and structural issues of the farm. However, the Commissions is working to expand the database also to environmental data, with a view to better establish the link between the CAP interventions and its impact on the environment. The legal proposal for the expanded FADN will be proposed in 2022 and will be called ‘FSDN’ by including the term ‘sustainability’.*

#### **5. Conclusions and next steps**

*The Commission announces that the deadline to send written comments before the next Meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP is the 15 October 2020. The next Meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP will take place on the 25 November 2020, following the same web-based format as the present meeting (three languages available, including morning and afternoon sessions).*

*Ms Helaine asks the delegates if any further questions are open. As this is not the case, the meeting is closed.*

#### **6. Next meeting**

*The next Meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP will take place on the 25 November 2020,*

#### **7. List of participants**

In Annex.

(e-signed)

Tassos HANIOTIS

List of participants– Minutes

*Expert group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP*

*1 October 2020*

<b>MEMBER STATE</b>	<b>Ministry Or Organisation</b>	<b>NUMBER OF PERSONS</b>
<b>BELGIQUE/BELGIË (Belgium)</b>	Flanders MA	1
<b>БЪЛГАРИЯ (Bulgaria)</b>	Bulgarian Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry	4
<b>ČESKO (Czechia)</b>	Ministry of Agriculture	1
<b>DANMARK (Denmark)</b>	The Danish Agricultural Agency	2
<b>DEUTSCHLAND (Germany)</b>	Federal Ministry for Food and Agriculture	1
<b>DEUTSCHLAND (Germany)</b>	MEND	1
<b>DEUTSCHLAND (Germany)</b>	Thuenen-Institute	1
<b>EESTI (Estonia)</b>	Agricultural Registers and Information Board	1
<b>EESTI (Estonia)</b>	Ministry of Rural Affairs	1
<b>EIRE- IRELAND</b>	Department of Agriculture, Food and Marine	4
<b>ΕΛΛΑΔΑ (Greece)</b>	MANAGING AUTHORITY OF GREEK RDP, Evaluation Unit	1
<b>ΕΛΛΑΔΑ (Greece)</b>	Ministry of Rural Development and Food, Tree Crops Unit	0
<b>ΕΛΛΑΔΑ (Greece)</b>	OPEKEPE (Paying Agency), Direct Payments Directorate	3
<b>ESPAÑA (Spain)</b>	Fondo Español de Garantía Agraria (FEGA)	1
<b>ESPAÑA (Spain)</b>	Ministry of Agriculture	5
<b>FRANCE (France)</b>	ASP	1
<b>FRANCE (France)</b>	FranceAgriMer	1
<b>FRANCE (France)</b>	MCFA	0
<b>FRANCE (France)</b>	Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation	1
<b>HRVATSKA (Croatia)</b>	Ministry of Agriculture	1
<b>ITALIA</b>	Ministero delle Politiche agricole alimentari e	1

<b>(Italy)</b>	forestali	
<b>ITALIA (Italy)</b>	Consiglio per la ricerca in agricoltura e l'analisi dell'economia agrarian - Piemonte	1
<b>ITALIA (Italy)</b>	Ministry of Agricultural (National Rural Network Programme on M&E)	2
<b>KYIΠOΣ (Cyprus)</b>	Evaluator	1
<b>LATVIJA (Latvia)</b>	INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES AND ECONOMICS	2
<b>LATVIJA (Latvia)</b>	Ministry of Agriculture	3
<b>LATVIJA (Latvia)</b>	Rural Support Service	2
<b>LIETUVA (Lithuania)</b>	National Paying Agency under the Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Lithuania	1
<b>LIETUVA (Lithuania)</b>	The Ministry of Agriculture	3
<b>LIETUVA (Lithuania)</b>	AIRBC	2
<b>LUXEMBOURG (Luxembourg)</b>	Ministry of Agriculture; Service d'Economie rurale	1
<b>MAGYARORSZÁG (Hungary)</b>	Ministry of Agriculture	3
<b>MALTA (Malta)</b>		0
<b>NEDERLAND (Netherlands)</b>	Regiebureau POP	1
<b>NEDERLAND (Netherlands)</b>	Rijksdienst voor Ondernemend Nederland RVO	3
<b>ÖSTERREICH (Austria)</b>	Federal Ministry for Agriculture, Regions and Tourism	1
<b>POLSKA (Poland)</b>	Agency for Restructuring and Modernisation of Agriculture	1
<b>POLSKA (Poland)</b>	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	6
<b>PORTUGAL (Portugal)</b>	Gabinete de Planeamento, Políticas e Administração Geral - Ministério da Agricultura	1
<b>PORTUGAL (Portugal)</b>	GPP-MAFDR	1
<b>PORTUGAL (Portugal)</b>	IFAP- Paying Agency	1
<b>ROMÂNIA (Romania)</b>	Managing Authority for the National Rural Development Programme - NRDP 2014-2020	2
<b>ROMÂNIA (Romania)</b>	Paying and Intervention Agency for Agriculture	1
<b>SLOVENIJA (Slovenia)</b>	Agency for Agricultural Markets and Rural Development	2
<b>SLOVENIJA (Slovenia)</b>	Budget Supervision Office of the Republic of Slovenia (Certification body)	2
<b>SLOVENIJA (Slovenia)</b>	Ministry of agriculture, forestry and food	4

<b>SLOVENSKO (Slovakia)</b>	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	4
<b>SUOMI/FINLAND (Finland)</b>	Finnish Food Authority	2
<b>SUOMI/FINLAND (Finland)</b>	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry	2
<b>SVERIGE (Sweden)</b>	Statens Jordbruksverk	2
<b><i>COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION</i></b>		0
<b><i>EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT</i></b>		0