



**EUROPEAN COMMISSION**  
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Directorate C. Strategy, simplification and Policy Analysis  
**Director**

Brussels,  
Agri.ddg.1.c.4 - Ares(2018) 7332175

## **MINUTES**

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

***Date: 27 November 2018***

Chair: Mr Yves Plees

Delegations present: All Member States were present, except Bulgaria and Malta.

#### **1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

Mr Plees (DG AGRI, Unit C.4 – Monitoring and Evaluation) chairs the meeting, welcomes participants and announces the available interpretations.

He invites participants to bring forward any suggestions for modifications of the minutes of the 14<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP held on 19 September 2018.

No modifications are requested, and the minutes of the previous meeting are approved.

#### **2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

Mr Plees asks if changes in the meeting's agenda are requested.

No changes to the meeting's agenda are proposed, and the agenda is approved.

#### **3. 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>

#### **4. LIST OF POINTS DISCUSSED**

##### **4.1 Information**

Mr Plees informs about:

- The publication of the [report on the Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework \(CMEF\)](#) and of the interactive [dashboards for the visualisation of the trends of the CAP indicators](#) presented at the 14<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP held on 19 September 2018 is planned for early December 2018;

- The European Commission – DG AGRI has recently launched two evaluation studies on ‘the impact of the CAP on water’ and ‘the CAP impact on generational renewal, local development, and jobs in rural areas’. The contractors might contact the Member States to collect relevant information. An evaluation on biodiversity will be launched before the end of 2018.

#### **4.2 Evaluation of School Schemes**

Ms Giulia Medico (DG AGRI, Unit G.3 – Animal Products) gives a presentation entitled ‘*Evaluation of the EU school scheme*’ and explains the legal references and guidelines for the monitoring and evaluation of the EU school scheme.

*After the presentation, no questions were raised by the Member States’ delegates.*

#### **4.3 Evaluation of the CAP Greening Measures**

Mr Plees informs that the Commission Staff Working Document accompanying the final report ‘*Evaluation of the CAP Greening Measures*’ was finalised. He passes the floor to Mr Andreas Lillig (DG AGRI, Unit C.4 – Monitoring and Evaluation) who gives a presentation entitled ‘*Evaluation of greening in direct payments. Tool for policy evolution*’. The presentation describes the structure of the Commission Staff Working Document, the evaluation process, the main recommendation and lessons learnt.

*After the presentation, Member States’ delegates raised the following questions:*

##### **Criteria to approve the CAP Strategic Plans**

Greece argues that the greening measures established in the current programming period provided a homogenous level of ambition across the Member States. In the new programming period, this level of ambition is defined at Member States level within the CAP Strategic Plans. Greece asks which criteria are going to be used by the Commission to ensure a level playing field when approving the CAP Strategic Plans.

*The Commission explains that the [Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the rules on support for CAP Strategic Plans](#) (hereafter ‘legislative proposal’) sets out the general and specific CAP objectives in all relevant domains, including environment. The ways through which the Member States aim to achieve these objectives need to be spelled out in the CAP Strategic Plans. The CAP objectives correspond to the level playing field across the Member States. The Member States should define their own approach to achieve commonly agreed objectives. The ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach does not work if the wide variety of landscapes and environmental challenges across the European Union are considered.*

##### **Support to voluntary schemes for the climate and the environment (‘eco-schemes’)**

Greece asks more information on the support to ‘eco-schemes’, as set out in Art. 28 of the legislative proposal. Greece understands that the payment of ‘eco-schemes’ could be additional to the basic support and not linked to income forgone and additional costs.

*The Commission explains that the support might be calculated based on a rough estimation of the costs, which are currently available on the greening measures.*

#### **4.4 Update on the activities of the Evaluation Helpdesk (Draft Annual Work Programme 2019)**

Mr Plees passes the floor to Mr Myles Stiffler and Mr Matteo Metta (European Evaluation Helpdesk for Rural Development, hereinafter referred to as ‘Evaluation Helpdesk’) who give a presentation on the ‘*Recent and Upcoming Evaluation Helpdesk activities*’. Mr Hannes Wimmer (Evaluation Helpdesk, Team Leader) presents the Evaluation Helpdesk’s ‘*Draft Annual Work Programme 2019*’. After the presentation, Mr Wimmer invites the Member States’ delegates to share their views on the relevance and timing of the suggested topics.

*Member States’ delegates raised the following questions:*

##### **Guidelines for the ex-ante evaluation**

France asks if the [guidelines for the 'Ex-ante evaluation 2014-2020 RDPs'](#) published in 2014 will be updated. France argues that the methods suggested in these guidelines are still relevant, but the guidelines could be updated to consider the aspects of the new programming period (e.g. consistency between CAP Pillar I and II). France asks if the updated version could be available by the end of 2018 or beginning of 2019.

*The Commission will explore which guidelines can be updated, including also those related to the ex-ante evaluation of the RDPs 2014-2020. The Evaluation Helpdesk clarifies that the guidelines published so far are linked to the current programming period. However, if there are any questions or observations related to these guidelines, the Member States are invited to send an email to [info@ruralevaluation.eu](mailto:info@ruralevaluation.eu) for clarifications.*

### **Good Practice Workshops**

Finland considers the proposed Evaluation Helpdesk activities to address the lessons learnt from the CMES 2014-2020 and the preparation of the ex-ante evaluation of the CAP Strategic Plan very relevant for their needs. However, Finland believes that Good Practice Workshops should discuss how the Member States can plan their evaluation in line with the new policy, rather than discussing the technical details of how to carry out the ex-ante evaluation. Finland announces that a plan for the evaluations to be carried out next year is being prepared and suggests organising these workshops in the upcoming months. Italy asks to clarify if the Good Practice Workshops will replace the guidelines for the ex-ante evaluation. Italy believes that the guidelines for the ex-ante evaluation are very relevant and should be realised possibly soon.

*The Evaluation Helpdesk takes note of the Member States' remarks on the relevance and timeline of the suggested topics and activities. The Evaluation Helpdesk will jointly establish a time plan with DG AGRI and aim to meet the Member States' needs.*

## **4.5 Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (PMEF)**

### **(a) State of play on Context and Impact Indicators**

Mr Plees thanks the members of the Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP for the questions and comments sent on the common indicators for the next programming period. While these comments are a useful feedback to understand the main Member States' concerns, he explains that the Commission will answer to the written questions in coordination with the work done in the Council Working Parties. Mr Plees clarifies that the role of Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP is to provide a forum to exchange views at technical level between the Member States and the Commission.

He then passes the floor to Ms Joanna Kiszko (DG AGRI, Unit C.4 – Monitoring and Evaluation) who introduces the work made on the technical fiches related to the context and impact indicators. She informs that the final draft of the technical fiches for the 47 context indicators proposed for the CAP 2021 – 2027 are ready. The fiches which are still pending are those related to two new impact indicators (I.1 *Sharing Knowledge and innovation*; I.24 *A Fairer CAP*) and to one context indicator (C.45 *Direct agricultural loss attributed to disasters*).

Ms Kiszko explains that the technical fiches of some common context indicators used in the current programming period 2014-2020 have been updated. She passes the floor to Ms Laura Aguglia (DG AGRI, Unit C.3 – Farm economics) and Ms Edit Konya (DG AGRI, Unit D.4 – Environment, Climate Change, Forestry and Bio-economy) who explain the main revisions in a presentation entitled '*Context and Impact Indicators*'.

After the presentation, Ms Kiszko informs that all the technical fiches are available on CIRCAbc. They have the status 'Final draft' as last changes are still possible and they need to go through the validation process.

*After the presentation, the Member States' delegates raised the following questions:*

### **Forestry sector**

Portugal highlights that the values of the common context indicators related to the forestry sector are not available, especially those expressed in terms of surface area. Portugal reminds that the forestry sector needs to be included in the environmental and climate analysis of the CAP specific objectives linked to

sustainable forestry, as set out in Article 6 (h) of the legislative proposal. Italy asks if proxy indicators can be used as additional indicators, without the obligation of monitoring them along the programming period.

*The Commission explains that the indicators related to the forestry sector are listed in the result indicators set out in Annex I of the legislative proposal. The Commission will further explore the question from Italy on the use of proxy indicators.*

#### **Common Context Indicator C.16 Number of new (young) farmers**

Portugal believes that the Common Context Indicator C.16 *Number of new (young) farmers* is very important and the updated values should be made available soon for the SWOT analysis for the CAP Strategic Plan.

*The Commission suggests that in case the updated values of this common context indicator are not available for the Member States' assessment of needs, the most recent national data sources should be used.*

#### **Common Impact and Context Indicator I.17 and C.37 Reducing pressure on water resource**

Portugal expresses reservations on the methodology of the Common Context Indicator C.37 WEI+, which covers the water consumption from agriculture. Germany argues that the calculation of this indicator is problematic and no further obligations for data provision should be given to the Member States. Germany expects that data for context and impact indicators is provided by the Commission.

*The Commission informs that the European Environmental Agency (EEA) is working with other data sources to elaborate and estimate this indicator according to the Member States' reports. The EEA's website shows how the Member State report data at different level of analysis (e.g. river basin or sub-river basin).*

#### **Common Context Indicator C.44 Index of farm resilience**

Portugal views the Common Context Indicator C.44 *Index of farm resilience* as impact indicator and argues that it should not be used as context indicator in the assessment of needs.

#### **Common Impact Indicator I.1 Sharing knowledge and innovation**

Germany believes that a clarification on which funds and measures support the information exchange is necessary.

#### **Common Impact Indicator I.9 Improving Farm Resilience: Index**

Denmark asks if the information to calculate this new impact indicator is already available. Germany believes that the five components of this index are problematic and expresses some doubts if these can lead to a meaningful indicator. Germany asks if the indicator could be skipped.

*The Commission informs that the methodology of this new indicator is under development. An indicator on adaptation is important, but it also challenging because it needs to consider all the elements composing farm resilience.*

#### **Common Impact Indicators I.10 Reducing GHG emission from agriculture and I.18 Increasing farmland bird populations**

Germany asks to generally reconsider the name of these indicators: the indicators should be linked to the CAP specific objectives, but not be formulated as objectives.

Germany argues that the comparison of the farmland bird index across the Member States is difficult because different methodologies are used. Germany asks if a new indicator will be developed or the methodology of the current farmland bird index will be used.

*The Commission explains that the information on the methodology of the common impact indicator I.18 Increasing farmland bird populations has been shared with the Member States. It is based on the already existing farmland bird index of the current programming period. The Commission is aware of the*

*methodological limitations of the farmland bird index. However, it is already part of the current monitoring and evaluation framework, as well as of the sustainability development goals (SDGs). The Commission is working with the Joint Research Centre to develop a methodology which would allow to assess biodiversity and its link with landscape features.*

#### **Common Impact Indicator I.15 Gross Nutrient Balance**

Denmark understands that the number of aspects to be considered in the national reports can differ across the Member States. Therefore, Denmark asks clarifications on how the Commission will harmonise the different national reports.

*The Commission explains that the I.15 Gross Nutrient Balance is based on an existing indicator, with the addition of some new elements. It is collected by the Member States and reported to Eurostat. Ms Ebba Barany (Eurostat, Agri-environmental statistics) explains that the methodology for the Gross Nutrient Balance and a handbook are already existing. Eurostat is working to simplify the data collection burden for the Member States. However, the calculation of this indicator depends on the Member States' provision of data. The Member States are invited to send questions on the methodology of this indicator to the working group of the Eurostat, agri-environmental statistics (ESTAT-AGRI-ENVIRONMENT@EC.EUROPA.EU).*

#### **Common Impact Indicator I.19 Enhanced biodiversity protection**

Germany highlights that the impact indicator I.19, which replaces the High Nature Value (HNV) farming indicator, is problematic because it is working with Natura 2000 and does not anymore cover all areas under contract for nature conservation. Germany asks to include nature conservation into the methodology of this impact indicator. This could be done through Natura 2000 and HNV areas. Austria argues that it has had positive experiences with the HNV farming indicator in the current period and therefore supports the continuation of this indicator in future.

*The Commission confirms that the HNV farming indicator is not anymore included in the new list of indicators set out in the legislative proposal. The Commission explains that for I.19 the species and habitats depend on the eco-system and should be defined by the Member States according to the regional or geographical context. The reporting on this indicator is obligatory and should be done every six years. The Commission has elaborated the fiches for this indicator, but the Member States should prepare a list of species and habitats.*

#### **Common Impact Indicator I.21 Evolution of number of new farmers**

Denmark asks if the business development in rural areas will be reflected in the common impact indicator I.21. Denmark stresses that this impact indicator is linked to the CAP specific objective set out in Article 6 (g), which refers to business development in rural areas, as well as to generational renewal and attract young farmers in agriculture.

#### **Common Impact Indicator I.24 A fairer CAP**

Denmark does not agree with the underlining assumption of this indicator: The redistribution of the CAP support does not necessarily reflect the fairness of the CAP. Denmark therefore believes that this indicator does not fit the purpose.

#### **Common Impact Indicator I.26 Limiting antibiotic use in agriculture**

Germany asks to align this indicator in accordance with the new rules governing EU veterinary medicines.

#### **Timing and responsibility for the provision of Common Context and Impact Indicator values**

Belgium, Germany and Portugal ask if the updated values of the Common Context Indicators will be made available by the Commission for the Member States in due time to carry out the assessment of needs and the SWOT analysis for the CAP Strategic Plans. Portugal stresses the important link between the availability of the common context indicators and the setting of the specific objectives of the CAP Strategic Plans. Moreover, Germany and Portugal ask to receive the final technical fiches for the common context and impact indicators as soon as possible.

Austria asks to clarify whether the updated values of the existing list of common context indicators will be made available by December 2018, while a new list of common context indicators will be produced for the future programming period.

*The Commission clarifies that the [updated values of the set of common context indicators](#) for the current period will be made available in December 2018. By 5 December 2018, the Commission will publish the data on the entire set of output, result, impact and context indicators for the European Council and the European Parliament. This data will be published together with the [report on the current Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework \(CMEF\)](#) and the [online dashboards on the CAP indicators](#).*

*Regarding the common context indicators for the CAP 2021 – 2027, it is too early to calculate and publish them, as the co-legislators still have to express their opinion. The Commission is going to work on the new set of indicators until 2020. The overall idea is to provide the Member States with the necessary information to carry out the assessment of needs and SWOT analysis for the CAP Strategic Plans. For some of the new common context indicators, the updated values will become available only after the assessment of needs and SWOT analysis because the new methodologies are being decided. In these situations, the Member States should use the most recent data available at national level. Moreover, the Commission clarifies that the SWOT analysis should not be limited to the assessment of the common context indicator values, but take into consideration all the available information at national, regional or local level.*

*The Commission will update the Expert Group members on the progress of the work on the proposed list of indicators for the new Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (PMEF), but the final decision needs to be taken by the co-legislators (i.e. European Council and European Parliament).*

#### **Responsibility for calculating Common Context Indicators**

Belgium asks who is going to calculate the Common Context Indicators. Belgium understands that the values will be collected by the Commission, including also those at regional level.

*The Commission explains that the values of the common context indicators are published on an annual basis, based on Eurostat data and other statistical data reported by the Member States.*

#### **Written comments to the technical fiches of indicators**

Denmark, Germany, Italy, and Portugal announce that written comments will be sent soon to the Commission on the indicators listed in Annex I of the legislative proposal and the technical fiches updated on CIRCabc. Italy informs that an analysis is being carried out to compare the new list of common indicators with those used in the current programming period, as well as to check their ability to reflect the CAP objectives. Italy argues that although the new indicators are similar to those used in the current programming period, their strategic importance in the planning phase has changed.

#### **Rural area definition**

Italy asks if different definitions of rural areas can be used. Specifically, Italy asks if the Eurostat definition for rural areas should be used, or if this can be adapted to consider more detailed and up-to-date data. For example, an intermediate rural area identified by Eurostat can be considered as predominantly rural area in Italy. This decision will have an influence on the type of actions to take.

#### **(b) Information on Output and Result Indicators**

Mr Plees passes the floor to Ms Sophie Helaine (DG AGRI, Unit C.2 – Analysis and Outlook) who explains the role of output and result indicators in a presentation entitled ‘*From planning through reporting to performance and assurance*’.

*After the presentation, Member States’ delegates raise the following questions:*

#### **Definition of interventions in Annual Performance Clearance**

Austria understands that in the CAP Strategic Plan for each output indicator linked to an intervention a target value needs to be indicated. With a view to the Annual Performance clearance, Austria and Germany highlight that it is important to have an exact definition of ‘intervention’: is it a measure, a sub-measure or

type of operation? Austria argues that this definition is necessary in order to understand if the targets should be at a very detailed or a more aggregate level. Sweden argues that although interventions should be close to the support, this estimation is very difficult for investments that are rather broad. Therefore, Sweden asks to consider dividing the expenditure/output ratio between the different components of an intervention.

*The Commission explains that output indicators should be linked to each intervention set out in the CAP Strategic Plan. The Commission clarifies that there is no prescriptive definition of an intervention at this stage. The Commission is having a thorough look at this definition because it influences both the planning and monitoring of the whole CAP. Output indicators are important for the performance clearance as well and, for this exercise, should be as closely related as possible to a uniform rate of support. Moreover, the Commission clarifies that the planned output indicators are not meant as targets or goals in terms of results to be achieved. They are not negotiated with the Commission and should be set out indicatively. Planned outputs should help to understand the size of an intervention and the estimated financial allocation for it. The Commission agrees that the definition of intervention supporting investments is difficult compared to other types of support (e.g. area based). In principle, the rate of support for the interventions should be homogenous or constitute a plausible average for the purpose of the annual performance clearance. However, the annual performance clearance should not lead the exercise. In case of deviations between the planned average rates of support per output and the realised ones, Article 121(4) of the legislative proposal asks not only to provide the figures but also a qualitative justification in the annual performance reports.*

### **Timing for the publication of the technical fiches**

Denmark and Portugal ask when the technical fiches for the output and result indicators will be made available.

*The Commission explains that the technical fiches for the output and result indicators might be ready as of the beginning of next year.*

### **Calculation of result indicators**

Portugal asks to identify which result indicators are based on the output and context indicators. Portugal argues that some indicators require the calculation of more indicators than those listed in Annex I to the legislative proposal. Portugal expects to find difficulties in using some of the indicators, especially the area-based ones.

*The Commission explains that result indicators help to create a consistent link between the interventions and the specific objectives planned in the CAP Strategic Plan. In many cases, they are indeed a ratio between an output and a context indicator. However, the calculation of certain result indicators may require the more detailed data than that the sole output of the related interventions. The technical fiches on result indicators will give more visibility on these aspects.*

### **Denominator in result indicators**

Belgium asks if the denominator of some of the results indicators (e.g. number of farms and number of hectares) is linked to different sources, for instance the common context indicators. Belgium asks whether the total arable land or the total eligible land should be considered when calculating the surface areas. Belgium asks whether the context indicator's values used when setting the targets in the CAP Strategic Plan will remain stable over the entire programming period. Belgium argues that the identification of single beneficiaries or the cross reference between different databases in order to calculate the result indicators and avoid double-counting can be a challenging task for the Managing Authority.

*The Commission explains that the most updated values of the common context indicators should be used for calculating the result indicator. Moreover, double counting should be avoided by identifying the beneficiaries with a single identifier. Finally, the Commission explains that the technical fiches will clearly specify which agricultural area should be considered in the denominator of some of the result indicators (e.g. arable vs eligible land).*

### **Target setting for result indicators**

Belgium asks to clarify whether the targets of the result indicators should be set out annually or if they can be cumulative. Belgium argues that the target setting of result indicators linked to voluntary schemes will be challenging.

*The Commission clarifies that the targets for the result indicators are set up annually.*

### **Calculation of result indicators in regionalised Member States**

Belgium and France ask if the result indicators should be collected at regional or national level.

*The Commission explains that in principle one single value of the result indicator should be reported at level of the CAP Strategic Plan, even for result indicators build on differentiated values at regional or territorial levels.*

*The Commission explains the common result indicator R.7 'Enhancing support to farms in areas with specific needs'. It is the percentage of additional support per hectare in areas with higher needs. It is a composite indicator built from differentiated values in different territories. This indicator allows to analyse how certain interventions are targeting specific territories and providing an additional support for farmers. It will have one single value based on payments distributed in different territories. Its calculation method would be further specified in the technical fiches.*

### **Reference year for the calculation of result indicators**

Portugal asks if the calculation of the result indicators linked to the specific objectives planned in the CAP Strategic Plans should be based on the financial or calendar year.

*The Commission clarifies that the calculation of result indicators for the annual performance reports should be based on the financial year.*

### **Advisors setting up or participating in Operational Group projects**

Germany expresses concerns on the added value of a mandatory membership of advisors in Operational Group projects, which is estimated to be a consequence from the output indicator O.2 "Number of advisors setting up or participating in EIP Operational Groups". Germany argues that the membership of advisors in Operational Group projects should not be mandatory. External advisors are also involved in Operational Group projects to meet their needs for advice, without necessarily having to become members of the group. Denmark considers that the result indicators related to the farm advisory services (R.2 "Linking advice and knowledge systems") should take into account also the situation of those Member States with a market-based farm advisory system or existing producers' organisations.

*The Commission explains that, even if being a member of an Operational group is a great opportunity for the advisor to gain innovative knowledge, there is no intention for mandatory membership of advisors in Operational Group projects. The aim is to use innovative projects to make farmers change their behaviour, while also making use of advisors to influence this positively. This could be done by advisors being partner in the Operational Group, or by advisors providing services to the Operational group. It could even be done by advisors providing advice to one of the members of the Operational group, or by advisors being involved in the CAP network actions related to EIP Operational Groups, etc.*

*Currently Member States lead a separate 'Farm Advisory System' (FAS), where the real trusted advisors who can influence farms - to maybe change their behaviour - are not necessarily included. Several years have now been spent in training farm advisors. The Commission believes that all advisors, private or public, should be included into the Member State's Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation System (AKIS) to make sure that farmers are better informed and that real impact in the field is the result of the funding spent on advisors, training and information actions.*

*Therefore, in the current legal proposal, the Farm Advisory System (FAS) has been replaced by farm advisory services, which will be provided by impartial advisors integrated in a well-functioning AKIS. A key criterion is that advisors have no conflict of interest, as established in Art. 13(3) of the legislative proposal. The output indicator O.2 links to the funding spent on advisors, mostly through Art 71-72 interventions. These interventions should be coherent with a well-organised AKIS, which succeeds to connect advisors with up-to-date knowledge and innovation from research and from the CAP networks (Art 72(6) and 102). The Commission is working also with the budget from Horizon 2020 and Horizon Europe*



*to support EU farm advisors' networks which bring together advisors around digital tools and interactive innovations to upskill advisors, by sharing their knowledge, tools and experience across the EU.*

*Advisors are expressing their wish for an professional certification for advisors which could be based e.g. on a minimum level of education, adherence to a code of ethics guaranteeing impartiality, and a minimum of training hours to update their technological and scientific information thanks to an equitable AKIS. This type of certification could help the counting of advisors, but the Commission emphasises that flexibility is left to the Member States in this regard.*

*The Commission has an open approach. The idea is to have a one-to-one contact with the farmers. The proposal is to count the farm advisors who are in close and regular contact with the farms and as such on an almost daily basis are updated about farmers' needs. The advisors should be sufficiently aware of day-to-day farming to funnel and recognise true practice needs, while also being in the position to promote applicable solutions. For instance, advisors who spend minimum half of their time on the farm. Holistic advice on-farm works best. It is the most effective kind of action to influence farmers' behaviour who face a complexity of constraints on their farm and have to find the right balance to be both sustainable and profitable. The understanding of who is an advisor can be relatively broad and could also include someone from farm organisations, farmers' network, producers' organisations or even from an environmental NGO.*

*There is a real effort to be made to integrate the advisors into the AKIS. The main objective is to make the AKIS more inclusive towards private and public advisors. At the current stage, half of the 850 running Operational Group projects already have advisors in, and most likely, this number is going to increase.*

### **Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation System**

Germany asks to separate the AKIS from the CAP monitoring. Moreover, Germany asks if an output indicator to monitor the AKIS is necessary. Germany stresses that indicators should be linked only to the CAP interventions, whereas AKIS has more the nature of a conditionality.

*The Commission clarifies that the AKIS is not monitored, and that AKIS is not the same as the FAS system aiming at advice on cross-compliance. AKIS is not linked to conditionality. On the contrary, Article 102 of the legislative proposal is a request to look at all knowledge institutions and organisations, i.e. all the actors using and producing knowledge, and to the knowledge flows between them. AKIS is a thinking exercise to find out which actions and interventions can better connect and interlink researchers, advisors and CAP networks, and to analyse how they best deliver knowledge to the agricultural world. Part of this thinking exercise is also related to the performance of researchers, but no indicators have been proposed for this scope.*

*Concerning the farm advice supported by the CAP interventions, it is interesting to monitor how far these interventions are really delivering. The Member States have all the flexibility to organise their farm advisors and their services. The aim is to move away from a fixed and obligatory FAS system and to broaden up the type of services from the farm advisors. The future CAP will be open to support any advisors who go further than only advice on cross-compliance by making the AKIS more inclusive and supportive for advisors.*

### **Automatic calculation of indicators in IT system**

Germany asks to ensure that output and result indicators can be automatically calculated on an annual basis within the IT systems. It needs to be reflected now how the information should be validated and by whom, how to deal with the fact if the denominator changes without the RDP having an influence on it.

### **Linkages with result indicators**

Referring to 'the example of water quality and use' described in the presentation, France asks to clarify if the result indicators should be linked to the type of actions or to the CAP specific objective 'foster sustainable development and efficient management of natural resources such as water, soil, and air'.

*The Commission confirms that the intervention logic of the CAP Strategic Plan should be structured by CAP specific objectives.*

### **Result indicators linked to the EU cross-cutting objective: Modernisation**

Finland suggests that the result indicators linked to the 'EU cross-cutting objective: Modernisation' should consider also other actors than farmers. These indicators do not consider the broader rural socio-economic situation.

*The Commission agrees that the effects of the CAP cross-cutting objective: Modernisation go beyond the farmers and involved other rural actors. The Commission suggests using different result indicators listed in Annex I to the legislative proposal to assess these effects (e.g. R.33 Digitising the rural economy; R.34 Connecting rural Europe; R. 35 Promoting Social Inclusion).*

#### **Linkages between output indicators and interventions**

France argues that the list of indicators in Annex I to the legislative proposal presents some gaps in terms of linkages between indicators and interventions supporting sectorial and agri-environmental actions. Spain asks to receive a list of links between the interventions and the output indicators. Such a list should be kept flexible for the Member States to establish the link between its interventions and output indicators. Moreover, France and Spain ask if additional output indicators could be developed to overcome the gaps in Annex I to the legislative proposal, for instance for the interventions related to the forestry sector.

*The Commission explains that for the annual performance clearance, each intervention should be linked to an output indicator. Possible gaps between interventions and the current list of output indicators are being examined, especially for the outputs related to sectoral interventions. The output indicator should be meaningfully linked to the intervention and its expenditure.*

*Finally, as for result indicators, the Commission informs that Art. 97(a) of the legislative proposal establishes that the Member States can set up the targets also for the CAP Strategic Plan specific result indicators, when relevant.*

#### **Result Indicator R.8 Targeting farms in sectors in difficulties**

Denmark argues that the result indicator R.8 is wrongly linked to the CAP specific objective 'Enhance market orientation and increase competitiveness', and therefore the intervention logic should be corrected.

*The Commission clarifies that the result indicator R.8 has been linked with the CAP specific objective 'Enhance market orientation and increase competitiveness, including greater focus on research, technology and digitalisation' because the underlying logic of the coupled support is to support sectors in difficulty and improve their competitiveness, sustainability or quality. The Commission explains that coupled support does not necessarily target this CAP specific objective, but it can also target viable farm income for example.*

*It is important to note that result indicators are not strictly linked to one CAP specific objective. They can be related to different or more than one objective.*

#### **Result Indicator R.16 Enhance energy efficiency**

Denmark asks to receive information on the calculation of the result indicator R.16. Denmark argues that the measurement of actual energy savings will be very burdensome for the administration.

#### **Result Indicator R. 35 Promoting social inclusion**

Denmark suggests deleting this result indicator in Annex I to the legislative proposal because the collection of information seems very problematic and difficult.

*The Commission reiterates that changes in the list of indicators proposed in Annex I to the legislative proposal are not in the remit of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP.*

#### **Aggregation of common result indicators**

Sweden views some result indicators as being very country specific. This is particularly true for R.6 *Redistribution to smaller farmers* and R.7 *Enhancing support to farms in areas with specific needs*. Sweden asks how the Commission will aggregate these indicators at EU level.

*The Commission confirms that output indicators are requested from the Member States also in order to aggregate them at European level. This aggregation is very important to communicate on the achievements of the CAP. When an indicator is expressed in ratio values, the Commission will need to receive both the numerator and the denominator.*

#### **Output indicators related to interventions supporting sectorial programmes**

France understands that the interventions supporting sectorial programmes should be linked only with the output indicators O.33, O.34, O.35. However, France asks to confirm if the interventions supporting sectorial programmes can also be linked with other indicators.

*The Commission replies that interventions supporting sectorial programmes may need to use additional relevant output indicators than the three outputs O.33, O.34, O.35.*

#### **Double counting**

Luxembourg asks to confirm if one hectare or beneficiary is only counted once in an output indicator.

*The Commission gives an example on an intervention for the reduction of the use of fertilisers. This intervention can contribute to the result indicator R.21 Sustainable Nutrient Management, as well as result indicator R.14 Carbon Storage in soils and biomass. Therefore, one intervention supporting one single hectare can contribute to two result indicators. On the other hand, one hectare receiving two different interventions contributing to the same result should be counted only once, e.g. under the R.14 Carbon Storage in soils and biomass.*

#### **Reporting on national top ups**

Belgium asks to confirm if the reporting on national top ups must be integrated in the same way and with the same mechanism as for other CAP interventions.

*The Commission explains that the areas identified in the SWOT analysis could be addressed through the CAP, as well as through national top ups. National top ups shall be described in the annex to the CAP Strategic Plan. For the annual performance clearance, the Commission will clarify this question, but in principle, national top ups do not correspond to the CAP expenditure and therefore their output do not need to be reported for this exercise.*

#### **4.6 Any other business**

None

### **5. CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS/OPINIONS**

Mr Tassos Haniotis (DG AGRI – Director of Strategy, Simplification, and Policy Analysis) concludes the meeting by summarising the main points addressed by the Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP, namely:

**The broader objectives and long-term policy performance are the starting point for the new performance framework.** Other types of factors cannot be foreseen now, but they will probably affect the rural development. Therefore, it is important to go beyond the single effects of the CAP specific objectives expressed in terms of targets, and to look at how they are interlinked. One specific intervention can have multiple effects. For instance, precision farming can bring results in economic, environmental, and social terms. The weight given to each of these results should be based on the baseline situation analysed through evidence. While the overall level of ambition will be higher, the speed to meet this ambition will be different across regions and Member States.

**The implementation of the new CAP delivery model shall be based on the already existing information system.** The Member States will have to continue to keep this detailed system in place to implement a performance-based delivery model. There are only few exceptions, which concern areas such as climate, environment, and the Sustainable Development Goals. The society is looking at how the CAP will meet the commitments made in these areas; therefore, additional information is required. The

discussion on the microbial resistance in animal husbandry is a clear example which concern agriculture and food chain.

**The understanding and use of the result indicators are going to be a challenge.** Although the level of information required to calculate these result indicators is already high, the trickiest task is to find and understand the ways by which these are linked to the three policy layers. The Member States will have greater flexibility on how to link each indicator to the CAP specific objectives.

The real issue to face is not about whether what we want to do is more complex and more difficult. The real question is how the rest of the society assesses what we want to achieve.

## **6. NEXT STEPS**

*Member States' representatives are invited to send their written comments on the indicator fiches to AGRI-EVALUATION@ec.europa.eu*

## **7. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP i is planned for 6 February 2019 (date to be confirmed).

## **8. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

In Annex.

< e-signed >  
Tassos HANIOTIS  
Director

List of participants– Minutes

***Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP***

Date: 27 November 2018

MEMBER STATE	Ministry Or Organisation	NUMBER OF PERSONS
BE	Department of Agriculture and Fisheries	1
	Service public de Wallonie - Agriculture	2
BG	/	/
CZ	Ministry of Agriculture	2
DK	The Danish Agricultural Agency	2
DE	BMEL	1
	Bundesministerium für Ernährung und Landwirtschaft	1
	Monitoring- und Evaluierungsnetzwerk Deutschland (MEN-D)	1
EE	Ministry of Rural Affairs	1
	ESTONIAN Agricultural Registers and information Board	1
IE	Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine	1
	Direct payments Policy Unit	1
EL	Managing Authority of Greek RDP	2
ES	Ministry of Agriculture and fish, food and environment	2
FR	Ministry of Agriculture et de l'Alimentation	2
HR	Ministry of Agriculture	2
IT	Ministero delle Politiche Agricole alimentari e forestali	1
	Consiglio per la ricerca in agricoltura e l'analisi dell'economia agraria	2
	ISMEA (public entity within the Italian Ministry of Agriculture supervision)	1
CY	Evaluator	1
LV	Ministry of Agriculture	2
LT	Ministry of Agriculture	2
LU	Ministry of Agriculture, viticulture and consumer protection	1
HU	Ministry of Agriculture	1

MT	/	/
NL	Regiebureau POP	1
	RVO	1
AT	Federal Ministry of Sustainability and Tourism	2
PL	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	2
PT	MAFRD-GPP	2
RO	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	2
	Paying and Intervention Agency for Agriculture	1
SI	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food	2
SK	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	2
FI	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry	2
SE	Statens Jordbruksverk	1
UK	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)	1
<i>TOTAL</i>		52