



# Monitoring and evaluation of the CAP post 2013 –

## Result indicators for Pillar II

12th Expert Committee on Evaluation of Rural  
Development Programmes  
Brussels, 20 September 2012



## Work done since last ExCo in June 2012

- *Comments from MS received after ExCo recorded in table*
- *Structure for indicator fiches for Pillar II result indicators established*
- *Indicator fiches filled in in cooperation between DG AGRI monitoring and evaluation units and expert units, taking MS comments into account*

## Comments from MS after last ExCo meeting (1)

- *All comments recorded: questions for clarification, comments on substance, proposals for alternatives...*
- *Most critical comments on:*
  - P2A: Change in agricultural output on supported farms
  - P5A – P5D: Water savings, Energy savings, Renewable energy produced, Reducing emissions
- *Generally demand for clear definition and methodology for calculation*

# Comments from MS after last ExCo (2)

| <i>Focus Area</i>  | <i>Indicator name</i>  | <i>Comments</i>   | <i>Allocation<br/>(lead unit in bold)</i> |
|--|--|---|---|
|  |  | <b>FR:</b> Fiabilité de l'indicateur: Problème délicat de la définition des notions citées, en particulier les circuits courts / Faisabilité de l'indicateur: Peut être difficile de tracer parmi les exploitations certifiées, celles qui ont bénéficié d'un soutien, des autres   |   |
| <b>P3 B</b><br><i>Supporting farm risk management</i>  | % (of total farms) of farms participating under risk management schemes        | <p><b>BE:</b> Specify that the indicator concerns risk management schemes supported by the rural development programme. It will be difficult to set a target for this indicator, since it is a completely new indicator and it is hard to predict how many farmers will sign up. Moreover we don't know yet how the measure will be elaborated exactly.</p> <p><b>CZ:</b> This indicator does not seem appropriate with regard to the size diversity of Czech agricultural enterprises. We would like to suggest an amendment or supplement of a new indicator - share of crop areas or animals included in the insurance contracts of the total area or number of animals.</p> <p><b>EL:</b> P3B Additional indicator proposed: % (of total farms) of farms benefited from payouts under risk management schemes.</p> <p><b>SE:</b> There is a need of clarification of the definition of Risk management. / How shall we treat farms that are part of a scheme under just a limited period? Or is the purpose that the schemes should be permanent? Shall we control that the farms are still members in the schemes on yearly basis?</p> <p><b>UK:</b> What constitutes improvement in this indicator?</p> <p><b>DE:</b> same as comment under P3 A</p> <p><b>IT:</b> risk of double counting</p> <p><b>PT:</b> The problem with the indicator is the definition of the target since there is no prior experience with this type of intervention.</p> <p><b>PL:</b> In our opinion the indicator omits operations concerning prevention against disasters and restoration activities.</p> <p><b>FR:</b> Fiabilité de l'indicateur: Problème délicat de la définition « risk management schemes</p>   | <b>G.1</b>                                |
| <b>P4 A</b><br><i>Restoring and preserving biodiversity, ..., and the state of European landscapes</i> | Forest or other wooded area under management contracts supporting biodiversity | <p><b>BE:</b> How will "supporting biodiversity" be defined? How will be defined which "forest or other wooded area" supports biodiversity? Will that be defined at European level? Without evaluation or scientific basis to determine the contribution of the different measures, this indicator gives no indication about the quality of the measures. What about the non-area related measures that contribute to biodiversity?</p> <p><b>SL:</b> Ind. definition: Absolute area and % of forest or other wooded area.... What does it mean absolute area (total or physical?), % - percentage in relation to what? Data source: beneficiary, MA based on outputs (definition is missing!) + cross check (in what way?). Frequency: cumulative or annually data (e.g. approved and paid in year N) would be provided? We propose to report on annually data and not as in RPD 2007-2013 on cumulative level.</p> <p>All agri- and forest-environmental data (e.g. current 2nd axis) are collected via direct payment campaign, thus separate IT system is established. This applies that all data collection cannot be treated in the same way (unique application form for all measures under RDP 2014-2020 - this relates also to EC proposal in Annex IV (proposed operation level data items, including output indicators), which, in this framework, cannot be useful for measures related to area based payments. Furthermore, this mean that all monitoring data would probably be collected separately and not automatically.</p> <p><b>UK:</b> Further information would be useful on what the management contracts are actually achieving. Management contracts need to be captured spatially through SRDP. Woodland maps are generated by FCS (notably Native Woodland Survey, to be completed in 2013). / Total area of forest in NI not known (as area of private forest not accurately measured yet) / The result indicators proposed for Restoring, preserving and enhancing ecosystems dependent on agriculture and forestry refer to the % of land (UAA or forested) under management supporting/improving different</p> | <b>G.3/H.1/L.4/L.2/H.4</b>                |



# Structure of Result Indicator fiches (1)

- *Indicator Name*
- *Indicator code*
- *Target indicator Y/N*
- *The related priority*
- *The related focus area*
- *Definition*
- *Unit of measurement*

## Structure of Result Indicator fiches (2)

- *Methodology/formula*
- *Data required for the individual operation*
- *Data source*
- *References/location of the data*
- *Point of data collection*
- *Frequency*



# Structure of Result Indicator fiches (3)

- *Delay*
- *Means of transmission to Commission*
- *Comments/caveats*

# Completed Result Indicator fiches (1)

- *Completed draft indicator fiches for Priorities 1 – 4 distributed*
- *Priority 1: Target indicators defined (output-type indicators)*
- *Priority 2: Indicators unchanged – with exception of P2A (for discussion)*
- *Priority 3: Indicators unchanged*
- *Priority 4: Indicators unchanged – but P4B and P4C split agriculture/forestry*

# Completed Result Indicator fiches (2)

- *Example: P2B: % of agricultural holdings with RDP supported business development plan for young farmers*

## DRAFT INDICATOR FICHE

### RESULT (TARGET) INDICATORS (PILLAR II)

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Indicator Name</b><br><i>Title of the indicator which will be used in implementing regulation/guidance documents</i> | % of agriculture holdings with RDP supported business development plan for young farmers |
| <b>Indicator code</b><br><i>Alphanumeric identifier</i>   | P2B  |
| <b>Target indicator</b><br><i>Identification of whether the indicator is a target indicator?</i>                        | Yes  |

# Completed Result Indicator fiches (3)

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>The related priority</b><br/><i>Identification of the priority to which the indicator is linked as defined in the Pillar II intervention logic</i></p>     | <p>2<br/>Enhancing competitiveness of all types of agriculture and enhancing farm viability</p>  |
| <p><b>The related focus area</b><br/><i>Identification of the focus area to which the indicator is linked as defined in the Pillar II intervention logic</i></p> | <p>2B Facilitating generational renewal in the agricultural sector</p>   |
| <p><b>Definition</b><br/><i>Concise definition of the concept, including if the indicator already exists, e.g. AEI, EUROSTAT indicator</i></p>                   | <p>Total number of farm holding receiving business start-up aid for young farmers under art. 20 over the programming period expressed as a percentage of the total number of agricultural holdings in base year for the RDP area</p> |

# Completed Result Indicator fiches (4)

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Unit of measurement</b><br/><i>Unit used to record the value (e.g. ha, tonnes, €, %)</i></p>  | <p>Nbr.<br/>%</p>   |
| <p><b>Methodology/formula</b><br/><i>Identification of what is needed to transform data from the operation database into value for the indicator</i></p>  | <p>Ratio a/b in %</p> <p>a) Total number of farm holding receiving business start-up aid for young farmers over the programming period<br/>b) Total number of agricultural holdings in base year for the RDP area.</p> <p>Relevant measures contributing to target:<br/>Art.20: farm and business development</p> |
| <p><b>Data required for the individual operation</b><br/><i>Data required from the operation database in order to calculate the relevant indicator (e.g. area of solar panels, ha of trees planted per species...). The Units of measurement of these outputs should be specified</i></p> | <p>a) Total number of farm holding receiving business start-up aid for young farmers under art. 20 (cumulative)</p> <p>b) Total number of agricultural holdings in base year for the RDP area</p>   |

# Completed Result Indicator fiches (5)

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>Data source</b><br/><i>Identification of where the data for the indicator comes from</i></p>   | <p>a) Total number of farm holdings receiving business start-up aid for young farmers: MA/PA operation database (output indicator)<br/>b) Eurostat (or national statistical office)</p>                                    |
| <p><b>References/location of the data</b><br/><i>Links or other references to data sources (e.g. in EUROSTAT specifying exact tables, FAO, World bank) AEI definitions, regulations establishing indicators, etc</i></p> | <p>a) Total number of farm holding receiving business start-up aid for young farmers: /<br/>b) Total number of agricultural holdings: Eurostat: Farm Structure Survey</p>  |
| <p><b>Point of data collection</b><br/><i>Point(s) in time at which data is collected (e.g. operation/project approval, completion or during evaluation activities)</i></p>  | <p>a) Total number of farm holding receiving business start-up aid for young farmers: data collected at application level but reported when the operation is completed<br/>b) Total number of agricultural holdings: /</p> |

# Completed Result Indicator fiches (6)

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Frequency</b><br/><i>In principle this would be annual. If annual is not adequate, please specify</i></p>   | <p>a) Total number of farm holding receiving business start-up aid for young farmers: annual</p> <p>b) Total number of agricultural holdings: /</p> |
| <p><b>Delay</b><br/><i>Delay between data collection and data aggregation (where external statistical data is used)</i></p>   | <p>a) Total number of farm holding receiving business start-up aid for young farmers: /</p> <p>b) Total number of agricultural holdings: /</p>      |
| <p><b>Means of transmission to Commission</b><br/><i>Identification of the way in which the data is made available to the Commission (e.g. submitted with enhanced AIR in 2019 or quarterly/annual electronic submission)</i></p> | <p>a) Monitoring tables of AIR</p>  |

# Completed Result Indicator fiches (7)

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>Comments/caveats</b><br/><i>Comments concerning interpretation of the indicator for monitoring and evaluation purposes and its caveats, if appropriate.<br/>Mention of context indicators specifically linked to this indicator (or required for its calculation).</i></p> | <p>The available base year for the total number of agricultural holdings might not be 2013 when RDP are drafted (depending on statistics availability). Update will be needed.</p> |
|--|--|

# Result Indicators requiring further discussion (1)

- *P2A: change in agricultural output on supported farms/AWU*
- *MS comments:*
  - complex to calculate
  - difficult to directly attribute effects of RDP support
- *Alternative:*
  - change target indicator to: % of agricultural holdings with RDP support for investments in restructuring (simple output-type target) AND
  - keep original indicator as additional result indicator

## Result Indicators requiring further discussion (2)

- *P5A – P5D:*
  - *Water saved in agriculture*
  - *Energy savings in agriculture and food sectors*
  - *Renewable energy produced*
  - *Reduced emissions of methane and nitrous oxide*
- *MS comments:*
  - definition of coefficients complex and difficult
  - diversity in production/climatic zones to be considered

## Result Indicators requiring further discussion (3)

- *Alternatives:*

A)

- change target indicators to output/input type indicators, e.g., P5A: % irrigated land switching to more efficient irrigation systems, P5B: Total investment in energy savings and efficiency AND
- keep original indicator as additional result indicator

B)

- maintain original indicator definition but simplify calculation:
- demand (estimate of) water saving/energy saving/renewable energy produced/emissions reduced from applicant at project application

## Result Indicators requiring further discussion (4)

- *P6A – P6BC:*
  - *Jobs created*
  - *% rural population covered by LDS*
  - *Rural population benefiting from new or improved services/infrastructures/IT infrastructures*
- *MS comments:*
  - unclear definition and methodology
  - indicators not adjusted to Focus Areas (esp. P6BC)



## Result Indicators requiring further discussion (5)

- *COM proposal:*
  - Restructuring of indicators:
  - P6B to contain 3 sub-indicators (% rural population covered by LDS, no. of jobs created in supported projects through LEADER, rural population benefiting from new or improved services/infrastructures)
  - P6A to contain only jobs created through other sources than LEADER
  - P6C to contain only population benefiting from new/improved IT infrastructures
- ***Further work required to ensure consistency with other CSF funds!***

## Issues for discussion (1)

*Draft indicator fiches:*

- *Is the proposed structure for the result indicator fiches for Pillar II reasonable? Is something missing? What should be changed?*
- *Are the completed fiches for Priorities 1-4 correct and useful?*

## Issues for discussion (2)

*Indicators for further discussion:*

- *Should P2A be split into a simple target and an additional result indicator?*
- *What approach is best for Priority 5?*
  - keep original methodology using coefficients
  - use simplified calculation on basis of estimates
  - establish simple target and keep original definition for additional result indicator
- *Does the restructuring of indicators in Priority 6 seem reasonable?*

## Next steps

- *Written comments from members of the Committee on existing draft indicator fiches and open issues invited until 10 October*
- *Draft indicator fiches for priorities 5 and 6 to be made available by end October*
- *Next meeting for discussion with ExCo November or December (date still to be confirmed)*
- *Complete draft list of indicator fiches for end 2012*