



Brussels
AGRI.DDG1.C4/2021

NOTE FOR THE FILE

Subject: Data needs for Monitoring and Evaluation

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this note is to explain why and which type of information is necessary in order to monitor, analyse, evaluate and communicate the future Common Agricultural Policy (CAP).

The changes in the CAP towards a more result-oriented policy implies a focus on evidence and data.

Annex I of the legislative proposal was designed to carry-out the performance clearance and performance review, thus concentrating on a limited set of indicators for assurance and to assess the progress of Member States (MS) towards the targets set for result indicators. However, performance is a broader concept, covering the evaluation of the CAP plans and EU progress towards objectives and targets set in the Biodiversity and Farm to Fork strategies. Therefore, monitoring and communication needs to go beyond the indicators set in Annex I.

This also entails further efforts by all administrations involved in the management of public resources to guarantee high quality of the data obtained as well as enhance data sharing approaches.

2. THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL DATA FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION (BEYOND ANNEX I/APR)

There are several reasons why there is an additional need for the collection of data beyond the annual performance report (APR):

- First, the output indicators in the APR are primarily for performance clearance and **not for monitoring and evaluation**.

Output indicators clear expenditure through the number of actions, operational programmes or hectares supported with CAP funds. The number of actions or the number of operational programmes do not provide enough information to assess the coverage of the various interventions. What is required instead is the number of participants to

trainings, to EIP projects, the hectares under crop insurance, the number of producer organisations (PO) members, etc.

- Second, the result indicators of the APR are primarily for performance review and do **not provide the necessary detail(s) for monitoring and evaluation**.

Interventions are grouped together in result indicators according to their purpose and result indicators are not split by type of interventions. The link established by MS between interventions and objectives in the CAP plan will provide some useful information. However, when the result indicator is very broad and when the output does not correspond to the need (see above), precious information will be missing, including on e.g. linking investments (EUR and farms) to animal welfare or water use efficiency.... Neither would it provide a comprehensive information on budget allocation by elements of specific objectives (although one intervention, thus one euro can contribute to several objectives).

- Third, the APR **does not provide data at lower geographical level** than MS on the implementation of the CAP.

Especially for agri-environmental requirements (GAECs) and interventions, it is needed to **contextualise output indicators in their agro-environmental context** (e.g. location of beneficiaries thanks to geographical information in Natura 2000 or Nitrate vulnerable zones ...) and **monitor data at low geographical level** for visualisation purposes (e.g. NUTS3 – communes). Such data would also be important in view of the Green Deal, Farm to Fork and Biodiversity Strategies. Localise the implementation of the green architecture can help to improve the assessment and evaluation of **environmental and climate impact** of the CAP and contribute to the implementation of the relevant environment and climate policies, such as LULUCF (Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry) accounting, which has not been possible so far in the current programming period.

- In addition, DG AGRI needs additional data (at beneficiary level) **to calculate the impact indicator on the distribution of support** (I.24) and the EU aggregate for R.6¹ (redistribution to smaller farmers).

To calculate the distribution of CAP support which is one of the key topic of the Strategic Plan Regulation proposal, DG AGRI **needs payment data at the level of the individual beneficiary**. There is no other data source. The Farm Accountancy Data Network (FADN) would not allow calculating an accurate estimate, because it is based on a sample and representing only professional farms.

- Moreover, **crop-specific payment for cotton is excluded from performance clearance and review**.

Nevertheless, Article 122a (and the separate chapter IIa ‘Reporting for the crop-specific payment for cotton’ under title VII) allows the Commission to collect some implementation data (i.e. number of beneficiaries, amount of payment per hectare and number of hectares paid) for various purposes (e.g. WTO needs).

¹ This aggregate would thus not be based on certified data (it is not foreseen that these individual data would be certified by the certifying bodies). However, there seems to be no other means to calculate it based on MS data in the APR.

- Finally, there are **needs for better data to perform good evaluations** and impact assessments.

Crucially, the additional data will serve the **CAP performance assessment and evaluation** by the Commission and external contractors². It will help building the next CAP, providing the necessary data for example for the **Impact Assessment** or to better **feed models**, and not only for DG AGRI.

The European Court of Auditors and contractors recommend having more detailed information to perform good evaluations as compared to today. For example, the evaluation support study on CAP impact on biodiversity concluded that due to a lack of data, it was not possible to estimate the net combined impact of the CAP instruments and measures on biodiversity, even in semi-quantitative terms. In addition, managing authorities in charge of evaluating Rural Development Plans complain on the lack of appropriate monitoring information on LEADER.

3. THE LEGAL BASIS TO ASK FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION DATA

Article 129 of the legislative proposal for CAP Strategic Plan states: “*Member States shall provide the Commission with all the necessary information enabling it to perform the monitoring and evaluation of the CAP*”. This enables DG AGRI to request for the information set out below and in more detail in the Annexes to this note.

Article 136 “exchange of information and documents” provides a basis to set up a data system in which Member States would transfer data in a harmonised way.

According to the legal proposal it is clear that the question of what information Member States will have to send in accordance with Article 129 will be laid down and discussed in the framework of the adoption of an **Implementing Act**. These discussions will take place in the second half of 2021.

4. WHICH DATA TO COLLECT?

4.1. Individual data on payment claims and beneficiaries

The request for individual data (see Annex I) aims to collect (i) data at the level of the application/claim by amount and unit paid, and (ii) information on the beneficiary and its farm/business to perform meaningful analyses.

This means that in one table, each data row contains **information on the claim** from one beneficiary for a specific intervention/amount (e.g. amount and number of units paid). Moreover, additional columns provide information³ on the specific objective, the investment type or the sector the intervention contributes to (e.g. energy savings,

² Currently, CATS control data is extensively used by contractors for the evaluation studies (at Nuts2 and Nuts3), as well AIR detailed information by measure and focus area, on beneficiaries, participants, expenditure, hectares, livestock units...

³ When the contribution of an intervention to a specific objective can be retrieved automatically from the CAP Plan, this would not be requested to the MS.

pesticides, animal welfare). This table can be linked to the CAP Plan and APR via the code identifying interventions.

In a second table, each row contains **details on the beneficiary**: e.g. farm location, including “environmental” zoning (e.g., Nitrates Vulnerable Zones) and beneficiary characteristics (young, organic farmer), as well as areas subject to GAECs (for a selection of standards where the data on areas cannot be inferred from the figures provided under other labels). More details are presented in Annex I.

The two tables can be linked via the unique beneficiary ID, to cross information and analyse e.g. the total amount of support to young farmers or organic farmers in region X for Integrated Administration and Control System (IACS) related interventions. The unique beneficiary identifier, in perspective, can also potentially be used to link to other databases at individual level, such as FSDN (Farm Sustainability Data Network).

A **reporting by claim year** is proposed (as currently in CATS control), or calendar year for non-IACS EAFRD interventions, rather than financial year. It would enable DG AGRI to collect data and analyse the real trends in the number of beneficiaries, hectares, animals over time. Data by claim year reflect what is delivered/intended to be paid by the policy (unlike financial year data where delays in payments and penalties are included). In addition, reporting by claim year allows receiving data earlier than financial year.

Under the current policy, most of this data is already included in operational databases (as required for MS to comply with their reporting obligations in Annex I) and in IACS⁴. A large share of this data is currently reported to us for audit purposes in CATS control data.

4.2. Data on EIP by operational groups

Moreover, information on the implementation and projects run by **EIP operational groups** is needed. Currently, guidelines are available on the programming for innovation of the EIP for agricultural productivity and sustainability. These guidelines only contain an obligation to disseminate the results of the operational groups (OGs). In the new CAP, and for the sake of enabling effective EU-wide innovation networking and cross-border OGs, it has been made obligatory in the CAP Plan Regulation to provide a description of the project plans at their outset.

Moreover, the indication of the partners and their category are essential to assess the functioning of the OGs and to see whether different stakeholders are sufficiently involved in the different projects.

This, together with the use of keywords and other project information, is helping OGs to find related Horizon Europe research projects and contact the respective partners (and vice-versa). The latter is essential to continue ensuring synergies between the CAP and Horizon Europe, as is now also foreseen in Horizon Europe legal texts.

⁴ IACS covers about 90% of the CAP expenditure, contains details on the area and livestock units supported, and the various land uses, and practices under the current greening obligations.

4.3. Aggregated data for other topics

For other data needs aggregates would be more relevant (the individual level not being necessary or meaningful):

- Monitoring data on the implementation of **sectoral programmes (SP)**

In the APR, key information for the monitoring and evaluation of **sectoral programmes** will not be provided (such as the number of PO members, targeted countries under wine promotion measures, the organisation rate of beekeepers...). In addition, for simplification, it is now proposed by the Presidency to carry-out the performance clearance for fruit and vegetables and 'other sectors' on the number of operational programmes (Output indicator O.33), rather than by intervention; this would provide no information at all on how producer organisations (PO) spend EU funds, increasing the need for data collection (beyond the APR).

This type of information is in the 2014-2020 CAP period received through annual reports (fruit and vegetables, wine⁵) and a tri-annual study for apiculture, which details are laid down in implementing acts. Annex II details the proposed list of data to be collected. It was streamlined compared to the current situation.

- Monitoring data for the notification to the World Trade Organisation (WTO)

Moreover, DG AGRI requires notifying annually to the World Trade Organisation (**WTO**) information on expenditure under the Green, Blue and Amber box. If the declaration of expenditure and the APR does not cover all WTO reporting needs, the data should be collected together with the data needs for monitoring and evaluation. However, DG AGRI expects that most of the information currently collected through ISAMM form 714 on Member States co-financing, top-ups etc. on measures covered by EU Regulations could in fact be sent as an additional table to the Annual Declaration and collected in the SFC21 Data warehouse (not part of the clearance procedure). This will significantly reduce and simplify the information MS later will have to forward to DG AGRI on Domestic Support. In addition, MS will annually need to report to the Commission all oilseed area (rape- and colza seed, sunflower seed and soybean) which have received product specific aid irrespective under which scheme, in order to respect EU commitments as set out in the EU WTO schedule (originating from the Blair House agreement). In case that a further support to oilseed area would fall within WTO commitments under CMO, an annual reporting of the area supported will be needed.

- Data for **MS evaluation of net effects of the CAP**

Currently for evaluation purposes, MS are required to report **complementary result indicators** linking rural development CAP support with direct achievements three times during the programming period. Some of these indicators are now part of Annex I (R.15 Renewable energy production capacity, R.16 Energy Savings).

However, some key indicators were not integrated, such as 'Reduced emissions of methane and nitrous oxide'. We propose to work on these elements in a second stage, together with Member States in the GREXE.

⁵ Templates in annex iii of implementing regulation (EU) 2016/1150

5. DATA COLLECTION

Main principles followed to define the data needs:

- Most of the data requested is available under the current CAP in MS or should be introduced in any case in their operational databases to fill-in the APR.
- Any data collected outside the APR would not be certified.
- No reconciliation of the data collected with the APR is intended and even possible (claim year vs financial year). However, data users might spot differences and ask for explanations.

Data to be collected

- aggregated monitoring data of interventions implemented by operational programmes
- data for the notification to the WTO (if not provided elsewhere)
- data on EIP operational groups
- information on type of beneficiary (genuine farmer, young farmer, forest area), focusing on information that is for a large part already available in IACS
- units and amount paid per beneficiary and claim covering Pillar I and II
- monitoring of the different units (e.g. heads, livestock units) supported by interventions and number of participants involved
- individual data on environmental indicators and GAECs with geographic location of the farm
- allocation of expenditure and all interventions by objective (specific objective and below: Antimicrobial reduction, Animal welfare, Pesticides, Forestry, Renewable energy, exact list of categories to be updated)
- national co-financing of rural development interventions
- information on LEADER projects

6. INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND TIMING OF DATA SUBMISSION

When and how to report the data collected for monitoring and evaluation?

Current situation

Currently the monitoring data for **sectoral programmes** is notified via **ISAMM**. Currently the notification of the **WTO** comes from the **budget execution** in the annual EAGF/EAFRD reports, while the national co-financing and the information on direct payments (Rural Development co-financing, TNA, CNDP, implementation choices and greening output indicators) comes in through **ISAMM**. For some market measures (OP fruit and vegetables, wine programmes, school schemes etc. market data send to DG AGRI through ISAMM is used) For Rural Development (**AIR**) and the individual data on direct payments and Rural Development (**CATS control data**), the information comes via **SFC**.

For **EIP** operational groups, the information is currently received through **SFC** where Managing Authorities are responsible to submit information on selected Operational Groups (OG) projects Managing Authorities provide updates on the status of new or existing OGs projects on an ongoing basis; therefore, these data do not come in the form of a report.

- **We propose to keep ISAMM for sectoral programmes as this system of notification proved to be efficient and use SFC for the rest.**

Regarding the reporting period, as illustrated in Figure 1, currently the first information notified to the Commission relates to greening output indicators in December Year N for claim year N followed by Rural Development Programmes (RD) in the Annual Implementation Reports (AIR) in June Year N+1 on operations carried out in calendar year N and the last information received relates to Fruits and Vegetable (F&V) sectoral programmes in November Year N+2 on the operations carried out and paid in financial year N+1.

Figure 1: Current reporting periods and options for the future

	Year N				Year N+1							Year N+2																		
	Jan-15 Oct.	O	N	D	J-M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D						
Operations	DP and RD (CY)		Sectoral programmes																											
Payments	FY Payments																													
Current Reporting			Greening		AIR	CATS Control							CATS Finan.	Wine Api.									WTO	F&V						
Future Reporting														APR																
Option 1						DME-DP+RD									Wine Api.										F&V					
Option 2								DME-DP+RD										DME-SP												
Option 3														DME																
Exception	EIP																													

*DP: Direct Payments; RD: Rural Development Programmes; CY: Claim Year; FY: Financial Year; DME: Data needs for Monitoring and Evaluation; SP: Sectoral programme; F&V: Fruits and Vegetable (F&V) sectoral programmes; EIP: European Innovation Partnership

For the reporting date, asking for the data on direct payments and RD by claim year (for IACS and by calendar year for non-IACS interventions) would allow receiving the data earlier (at least 6 months) than the APR as the information on claimed amounts is available before the data on paid amounts. This would provide precious information for analysis and communicating on the CAP and it would strengthen the evidence-base, notably for the preparation of the legal proposals for the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) period after 2027.

It is important to recall that there is no intention to reconcile and compare the data collected for monitoring and evaluation with the figures in the APR (which is anyway not possible as the reference period is different between claim year and financial year). Thus, another date of transmission than APR is feasible.

Regarding the **reporting date**, there are 3 options:

1. Keep the existing reporting dates
2. Streamline the reporting in two blocks RD and DP in September Claim Year N+1 and Sectoral Programmes in June Financial Year N+1
3. Request all data by 15 February Financial Year N+1 at the same time as the Annual Performance Report

	Pro	Con
Option 1:	Very small change of well established	No streamline of all reports into

<p>same dates as now</p>	<p>data flows</p> <p>Earlier delivery of RD and DP data than APR, anyhow, these are different data sets (financial year vs claim year).</p> <p>Different reporting frequencies could be envisaged as yearly monitoring may be not necessary for all elements (e.g. GAEC).</p>	<p>one date (5 reports + APR).</p> <p>Split reporting for sectoral programmes: APR and data for monitoring and evaluation</p> <p>Although data for monitoring and evaluation cannot be certified, the data system is certified and the reporting at the same time of APR could increase confidence in the data.</p>
<p>Option 2: 2 dates</p>	<p>Limited change of well established data flows, while reducing the number of reports.</p> <p>Earlier delivery of RD and DP data than APR, anyhow, these are different data sets (financial year vs claim year).</p> <p>Earlier delivery of data on Sectoral Programmes than currently</p> <p>Different reporting frequencies could be envisaged</p>	<p>Only one report on sectoral programmes (in total 1 report + APR)</p> <p>Split reporting for sectoral programmes: APR and data for monitoring and evaluation</p> <p>Reporting at the same time of APR could increase confidence in the data</p> <p>Early delivery for F&V (but still reasonable)</p>
<p>Option 3: same data as APR</p>	<p>Streamlined reporting together with APR</p> <p>Increased confidence in the data as reported together with certified APR, although the data refers to a different period.</p> <p>MS need anyhow to report in part on Sectoral Programmes in APR.</p> <p>Earlier delivery of data on Sectoral Programmes than currently</p>	<p>Delivering APR at 15/02 N+2 adds burden to MS</p> <p>Missed opportunity: late delivery of data available earlier in MS</p> <p>Users might attempt to reconcile data sets, while it's not meaningful: it would raise more questions</p> <p>The data system is anyhow certified.</p> <p>Strong reduction in the time to deliver F&V data.</p> <p>To be able to communicate on the CAP soon after implementation, it should then be envisaged to ask MS for a short list of data/key information in the first year of implementation.</p>

Annex I.a): Overview of data collection

	Application/payment claim for an intervention	Beneficiary characteristics	unique ID beneficiary
	Unique beneficiary ID		Genuine farmer (Y/N)
	Intervention code (type of intervention and specific code) + cotton		Gender
	Identification code below intervention level		Young farmer (Y/N)
Amount	Total amount paid (EU funds)		Geographical location through LAU code
	Total public expenditure (EU-funds + national co-financing)		Area with Natural Constraints (Y/N)
	Total expenditure (interventions with private contribution only)		Nitrate vulnerable zone (Y/N)
	Total amount determined		Characteristics of farm's location in a River basin
	Force majeure/exceptional circumstances (Y/N)		NATURA 2000 area (Y/N)
Units determined	Area determined (ha) <u>before</u> application ceiling PE		Number of hectares held by beneficiaries eligible to BISS
	Area determined (hectares) <u>after</u> application of ceiling PE		Net' Area claimed (hectares of arable land)
	Number of heads determined		Net' Area claimed (hectares of permanent grassland)
	Number of livestock units determined		Net' Area claimed (hectares with permanent crops)
	Number of other units determined		Forestry area
Units involved	Number of hectares involved		Agroforestry area (in hectares)
	Amount of capital insured		Conservation agriculture area (in hectares)
	Number of livestock units involved		Organic area (in hectares)
	Number of participants involved		Organic farm (Y/N-partial)
	Number of days (training, advice ...)		
Contribution to SO's	Contribution to specific objective 1 (viable farm income)		GAEC 1 (Y/N)
	Contribution to specific objective 2 (competitiveness)		GAEC 2 (Y/N)
	Contribution to specific objective 3 (food chain)		GAEC 3 (Y/N)
	Contribution to specific objective 4 (climate) - mitigation		GAEC 4 (Y/N)
	Contribution to specific objective 4 (climate) - adaptation		GAEC 5 (Y/N)
	Contribution to specific objective 5 (natural resources) - air		GAEC 6 (Y/N)
	Contribution to specific objective 5 (natural resources) - water		GAEC 7 (Y/N)
	Contribution to specific objective 5 (natural resources) - soil		GAEC 8 (Y/N)
	Contribution to specific objective 6 (biodiversity)		GAEC 9 (Y/N)
	Contribution to specific objective 7 (generational renewal)	GAEC 10 (Y/N)	
Categories	Energy savings (Y/N)	GAECs applicable: (yes/no)	GAEC 1: permanent grassland area used for determination of PG ratio
	Renewable energy, installed capacity (in MegaWatts)		GAEC 2 - wetlands: AL (ha)
	New irrigation installations (Y/N)		GAEC 2 - wetlands: PG (ha)
	Modernising of existing irrigation installations (Y/N)		GAEC 2 - wetlands: PC (ha)
	Forestry (Y/N)		GAEC 2 - peatlands: AL (ha)
	Pesticides (Y/N)		GAEC 2 - peatlands: PG (ha)
	Animal welfare (Y/N)		GAEC 2 - peatlands: PC (ha)
	Anti-microbial resistance (Y/N)		GAEC 4: total area with buffer strips (ha)
	Digital (Y/N)		GAEC 4: total length of buffer strips (in meters)
	Broadband (Y/N)		GAEC 6: Area under tillage management
	Social inclusion (Y/N)	GAEC 7: No bare soil on arable land (ha)	
	...	GAEC 7: No bare soil on permanent crops (ha)	
		GAEC 8: crop rotation on arable land (ha)	
		GAEC 9 - Hectares of non productive areas/features used for the calculation of the share (ha) by area/landscape feature	
	GAEC 9 - Areas subject to retention of landscape features (ha)		
LEADER only	Interritorial cooperation project (Y/N)		GAEC 10: PG areas subject to ban of conversion (ha)
	Transnational cooperation project (Y/N)		
	Multi-funded Local Development Strategy (Y/N)		
	Local Development Strategy with EAFRD as lead fund (Y/N)		
	Amount paid for running costs		
	Amount paid for animation		

Annex I.b) – Data request by application - intervention

Data by application - intervention

Application/payment claim for an intervention

This column gives a unique code per application claim per intervention. In case of a single IACS application, the data needs to be reported separately by intervention in the table. Data are reported by claim year for IACS interventions/calendar year for non-IACS interventions. Applicants/payment claims are reported at the time of the claim. In case applicants were not admissible, they can be filtered from the database as the payment was zero.

Unique beneficiary ID

Each beneficiary should have a unique beneficiary ID (which is already the case for IACS interventions) in order to aggregate data by beneficiary and be able to link the values of the first database with ‘beneficiary characteristics’ and data on GAECs.

Intervention code

The intervention code indicates to which intervention the application/payment claim relates. It should be the same as in the CAP strategic plan. This parameter will be important when undertaking evaluations, as could link for example the detailed commitments in the intervention to the correspondent number of hectares with a better estimation of their environmental effects. The column allows aggregating data by interventions, for example: the number of beneficiaries, the amount paid, or the area supported. The list of interventions in this request covers direct payment interventions⁶ (including the crop-specific payment for cotton) and rural development types of interventions. Sectoral types of interventions are not included in this request.

Identification code below intervention level

This column provide a code to identify the intervention at the level of the (average/uniform) unit amount. The code enables to report and receive data for interventions with different characteristics (e.g. AECM, BISS, investments) and to aggregate them according to the data needs.

Total amount paid (EU funds)

Provides the total amount of EU funds (EAGF or EAFRD) paid for the claim by intervention in Euros. The amount is after application of penalties.

Total public expenditure (EU funds + national co-financing)

Provides the total amount of public support received paid for the claim by intervention (including the national co-financing).

⁶ It may need to cover as well potential transitional national aids (TNA) if they are prolonged (as it is currently the case in the Presidency text).

Total expenditure (interventions with private contribution only)

This column provides the total amount of expenditure for the claims by intervention for which there is also a private contribution. This applies for example for certain rural development interventions.

Total amount determined

This column corresponds to code C559 in CATS. It is the amount of payment corresponding to the area determined following controls (e.g. administrative and/or on-the-spot checks) but before the application of penalties for IACS interventions. It is used to monitor the amount paid and be able to compare to the long-term trend based on the amounts received in the current period (2014-2020)

Force majeure/exceptional circumstances

This column is ticked in case the payment made for the intervention is subject to force majeure, or exceptional circumstances apply.

Area determined (area found eligible for payments after controls) before application of the ceiling of payment entitlements

This column only requires to be filled in for the interventions: Basic Income Support for Sustainability (BISS) and the round-sum payments. This data is currently not in CATS, but it could be extracted from IACS databases. This column provides the area after controls (e.g. after administrative and on the spot checks) before application of the ceiling of entitlements and enables to have the full area coverage of direct payments.

Area determined (area found eligible for payments after controls) after application of the ceiling of payment entitlements

This column corresponds to the area determined (C558 in CATS): it means the number of hectares for which all conditions laid down for the granting of the payment have been met resulting from the administrative and on-the-spot checks after application of the ceiling in number of entitlements in the case of BISS.

Number of heads determined

This column is only required to be filled in for the coupled income support interventions that are animal-related. It reports the number of head determined for which all conditions laid down for the granting of the payment have been met resulting for the administrative and on-the-spot checks.

Number of livestock units supported

This column is only required to be filled in for those interventions that are paid based on the number of livestock units. It reports the number of livestock units determined for which all conditions laid down for the granting of the payment have been met after the administrative and on-the-spot checks. EUROSTAT definition to use for livestock units calculation.

Number of other units determined

This column is only required to be filled in for those interventions that are not paid based on the number of hectares, heads or livestock units. This can be for example where the expenditure is based on the number of cocoons for silkworms, etc. The column reports the number of units determined for which all conditions laid down for the granting of the payment have been met after the administrative and on-the-spot checks.

Number of hectares involved

This column reports the number of hectares involved for the transaction/operation: (forestry) investments, and risk management in case the amount of the payment is not related to the number of hectares, but the investment or insurance scheme does cover a certain amount of area. It for example requires reporting the number of hectares insured. The European Court of Auditors recommended this.

Amount of capital insured

This column reports the amount of capital insured thanks to CAP support for mutual funds under risk management tools. The amount is reported in thousands of Euros.

Number of livestock units involved

This column reports the number of livestock units involved for the transaction/operation for investment and risk management interventions where the amount of the payment is not related to the number of heads/livestock units, but the investment or insurance scheme/mutual fund does cover a certain number of animals. It for example requires reporting the number of livestock units insured.

Number of participants involved

This column reports the number of participants involved for the interventions related to training, knowledge and cooperation, LEADER, EIP, risk management, installation grants and EU quality schemes. It enables to identify the coverage of the scheme, provides information in terms of coverage of the rural population, and therefore tells something about the reach and effectiveness of the intervention.

Number of days (training, advice ...)

This column reports the number of days for training, advice, knowledge exchange, and training of advisors (related to Article 72). From the current Result indicator 1 it is not possible to retrieve such information. R.1 is assembling a variety of AKIS actions which are very different and it will be impossible to assess where exactly the policy is going well or wrong.

Contribution to specific objectives

These columns need to be ticked when a specific transaction/operation contributes to the relevant specific objective(s). Some environmental objectives are broken down into a lower level of detail, because the SO groups several purposes together. This enables receipt of more detailed information on for example the distinction between climate change mitigation and adaptation for investments, EIP operational groups, AECMC, coupled income support interventions. Columns can be automatically filled in for certain

interventions based on the CAP plans (e.g. decoupled DP). It also enables DG AGRI to aggregate expenditure data by specific objective.

Categories

These rows provide different categories that need to be ticked in case the transaction/operation addresses the topic mentioned in the respective column. For renewable energy, the column requires to report the capacity in Megawatts. These categories or “flags” provide DG AGRI more information on interventions (such as investments) and what elements they address. Having this information at application level allows aggregating the data based on different regions, age, farm sizes in combination with the database on beneficiary characteristics.

LEADER

These rows provide a first idea of the needed information on the different LEADER projects that are implemented. The information listed in Annex Ia. is an example of the data necessary for a good follow-up of the implementation of LEADER projects. However, this will require to be completed.

Data on beneficiary characteristics

Unique beneficiary ID

Each beneficiary should have a unique beneficiary ID (which is already the case for IACS interventions) in order to aggregate data by beneficiary and be able to link the values of the second database with the data by application*intervention’.

Genuine farmer

Identification whether the farmer is a genuine farmer according to the definition determined by the Member State.

Gender

Identification of the gender of the beneficiary.

Young farmer

Identification whether the farmer is a young farmer according to the definition determined by the Member State.

Geographical location (LAU code)

The agricultural holding is located where the main part or all agricultural production takes place. It can be an agricultural building (i.e. largest administrative building/construction used to house livestock or other buildings or constructions used for agricultural production e.g. a greenhouse) or the majority of the land farmed in a LAU delimitation.

In case there is no agricultural building to which a location of the holding could be attributed, the majority of the land farmed in a LAU delimitation will be chosen as the reference point. The same is valid for the agricultural holdings having the land area in different regions.

Area with natural constraints, Nitrate vulnerable zones, River basin of farm's location and Natura 2000 area

The column allow identifying the location of a farm in a particular zones/areas. For farms who are only partially located in a zone/area/region, the farm is classified as "yes" when the majority of the farm is located in that area/zone)

Number of hectares eligible to BISS

The number of hectares eligible to BISS would allow providing a concept that is used for the calculation of the external convergence and envelopes for the next MFF period.

Net area claimed (arable land), (permanent grassland), (permanent crops)

This area would provide the total areas of the farmer that he/she claims for direct payments split by land use without double counting. The land use refers to arable land, permanent grassland and permanent crops. For BISS, it is the area declared by the beneficiary and potentially eligible for payment which is topped off at the level of the payment entitlements.

For, the CRISS, the payment for areas with natural constraints, the CIS-YF and the round-sum payment for small farmers, it is the area declared by the beneficiary and potentially eligible for payment.

For EAFRD area and animal related interventions, it is the area declared taking into account applicable ceilings for individual beneficiaries fixed by agricultural provisions or by the rural development programmes (e.g. maximum quantity of support per holding or beneficiary). As an example, following the overshoot of an individual ceiling, the fixed ceiling shall be considered as the quantity claimed.

Forestry area

This column would provide the total forest area by beneficiary

Agroforestry area, Conservation agriculture and Organic area

On the "beneficiaries" characteristics (agro-forestry, organic, conservation agriculture), this information is very important to get better appraisal of the occurrence of the acknowledged environmentally beneficial farming approaches in relation to other obligations or interventions undertaken by beneficiaries. It would provide the total number of hectares farmed by the beneficiary under the farming approach which is not necessarily fully supported by a CAP plan intervention.

Organic farm

The column allow identifying whether the farm is organic, partial organic or not organic. For farms of which only some parcels are organic, the farm is classified as "yes" when the majority of the farm's parcels (>50% of the total area) are farmed organic and "partial" when only of a minority of farm's parcels (<50% of the total area) are farmed organic.

GAEC applicable (yes/no)

For each GAEC there should be a flag "Applicable Y/N". Otherwise, we know that a GAEC have to be respected by a particular beneficiary only if the areas in hectares are valorised.

GAECs

Data on GAECs would report the area in hectares (or in meters for buffer strips) that is subject to the environmental requirement under each of the relevant GAEC as indicated in Annex I.a. Where areas under GAEC can be inferred from other columns, the data for that GAEC is not requested.

Annex II – Description of needs for sectoral programmes

The below list refers to the needs assuming that the performance clearance for the sectoral programmes will be done at the level of the operational group (the two stars ** indicate that this information would be available under Annex I if clearance was not done via O.33).

A. Operational Programme level

- I. All sectors except wine and apiculture, broken down by sector
 1. References (hyperlinks) to national legislation adopted by MSs in order to implement sectoral programmes
 2. Number of new/merged/suspended/withdrawn recognised POs/APOs/TPOs and TAPOs
 3. Number of POs/APOs/TPOs and TAPOs beneficiaries from support for sectoral interventions. List of TPOs and TAPOs having their head office in the MS
 4. For crop sectors, total area (ha) covered and/or volume (t) produced by POs/APOs/TPOs and TAPOs
 5. For livestock sectors, total number of animals and/or volume (t) produced by POs/APOs/TPOs and TAPOs
 6. Value of approved operational funds split by POs/APOs/TPOs and TAPOs (total, POs participation EU participation)
 7. Value of final operational fund split by POs/APOs/TPOs and TAPOs (total spent, POs contribution, EU contribution)
- II. F&V sector
 1. Part of the production intended for the fresh market (value (€) and volume (tonnes))
 2. Part of the production intended for the processing (value (€) and volume (tonnes))
 3. Administrative and other costs by POs/APOs/TPOs and TAPOs

B. Intervention level

- I. All sectors with operational programmes, excluding wine and apiculture, broken down by sector concerned in the MS and by type of organisation (POs, APOs, TPOs, TAPOs)
 1. number of POs beneficiary and financial allocation, for each intervention**
 2. number of POs beneficiary and financial allocation, per intervention / per objective
 3. total area (ha) and volumes (t) for the interventions on quality schemes
 4. total area (ha) for the interventions on replanting of orchards, green-harvesting and non-harvesting, organic production, integrated production, improved use or management of water, actions to conserve soil, actions to create or maintain habitats for biodiversity or to maintain the landscape, actions favouring energy savings**

5. number of promotion campaigns for the interventions on promotion and communication**, per objective
6. number of actions for the interventions on training and exchange of best practices, advisory services and technical assistance**
 - a. per objective.
7. number of actions for the interventions on marketing**, market withdrawal, green-harvesting and non-harvesting
8. difference of volume (m³) for interventions on improved use or management of water
9. difference of fertiliser use per ha for interventions on actions to conserve soils
10. difference of energy consumption for interventions on actions favouring energy saving and in transport, per energy type (solids, liquids, gas, electricity)
11. difference of volume of waste and volume of packaging (m³/volume of marketed production)
12. For Market withdrawal for free distribution and other destinations
 - as laid down in Art 41b(2) of SPR broken down by product:
 - a. total annual volume (tonne)**,
 - b. total expenditure (€),
 - c. amount of EU financial assistance**,
 - and in volume (tonnes) broken down by:
 - d. Free distribution.
 - e. Composting.
 - f. Processing industry.
 - g. Other destination.

II. Apiculture

1. the number of beekeepers; the number of beekeepers managing more than 150 beehives
2. the total number of beehives managed by beekeepers with more than 150 beehives
3. the number of beekeepers organised in beekeepers' associations
4. the annual national production of honey in kg in the last two calendar years preceding the notification of the apiculture programme for approval
5. the range of prices for multi-floral honey at the site of production
6. the range of prices for multi-floral honey in bulk at wholesalers
7. the estimated average production cost (fixed and variable) per kg of honey produced
8. implementing arrangements for the apiculture programme, including:
 - a. the designation by the Member State of a contact point responsible for the management of the apiculture programmes;
 - b. the provisions to ensure that the approved programme is publicised in the Member State;
 - c. the actions taken to cooperate with representative organisations in the beekeeping field.

III. Wine

See template annual report

Per Intervention

- Information in MS / Promotion in third countries
 - o Total expenditure, Total expenditure of beneficiaries, Number of beneficiaries, Total amount State Aid
 - o Per information or promotion action: beneficiaries, eligible measure, description, targeted market, period, eligible expenditure of which other support if any
- Restructuring and conversion of vineyards / Green harvesting:
 - o Total expenditure, Total expenditure of beneficiaries, Number of beneficiaries, Number of operations
- Harvest insurance
 - o Total expenditure, Total expenditure of beneficiaries, Number of beneficiaries, [Number of financed insurance policies], Total amount State Aid
- Investments in enterprises / Investments in enterprises in convergence regions / Investments in enterprise in other than convergence regions / Investments in enterprise in outermost regions / Investment in enterprise in small Aegean Islands regions
 - o Total expenditure, Total expenditure of beneficiaries, Number of beneficiaries, Total amount State Aid
- Innovation
 - o Total expenditure, Total expenditure of beneficiaries, Number of beneficiaries
- By-products distillation
 - o Total expenditure, Number of beneficiaries (distilleries), Lees (range of max support (EUR/%vol/hl), Marcs (range of max support (EUR/%vol/t), hl of lees distilled, t of marcs distilled, mio hl alcohol obtained.

Other information

- Information on State aid: name, legal basis, duration
- Trade:
 - o Evolution of the part of MS wines on the foreign markets per target market

Annex III: Collection of data on EIP Operational Groups

Currently, Managing Authorities are responsible to submit information on selected Operational Groups (OG) projects. The transmission of such information is formally done **via SFC** based on the 2014-2020 Commission’s guidelines on the implementation of the EIP-AGRI.

A dedicated module is available under the ‘Programming’ section of the SFC14 application (European Innovation Partnership – EAFRD) through which MAs can submit, per project, a number of obligatory, recommended and optional information as established by the EC guidelines.

The following table summarises these elements. In view of continuing the collection of such information in 2021-2027 and based on lessons learnt and feedback received by the MS, some indications about future improvements are also provided.

Required information (As foreseen in the official EC guidelines on the EIP-AGRI common format)	Type of information	Comments
Title (native language)	Obligatory	-
Title (in English)	Obligatory	-
Editor	Obligatory	-
Project coordinator	Obligatory	-
Project partners	Obligatory	-
Keyword-category	Obligatory	Selection from pre-defined list (subject to further review)
Productive sector	Obligatory	NEW (2021-2027) Selection from pre-defined list
Type of innovation	Obligatory	NEW (2021-2027) Selection from pre-defined list
Contribution to CAP objectives	Obligatory	NEW (2021-2027) Selection from pre-defined list
Project status	Obligatory	Ongoing/Completed
Total budget	Obligatory	-
Cross-border cooperation	Obligatory	NEW (2021-2027) Yes/No
Main geographical location (NUTS3)	Obligatory	-
Other geographical location	Optional	-
Other geographical location	Optional	-
Final report	Obligatory	(Attachment - only when project ends)
Objective of the project (native language)	Obligatory	-

Objective of the project (in English)	Obligatory	-
Short summary for practitioners (Practice abstract) in native language	Obligatory	(Possibility to add further entries)
Description of project activities (native language)	Recommended	-
Description of project activities (in English)	Recommended	-
Short summary for practitioners (Practice abstract) in English	Recommended	(Possibility to add further entries)
Audio-visual material	Recommended	Links to existing online resources
Website	Recommended	URL
Links to other websites	Recommended	Links to existing online resources
Additional practice abstracts (native language)	Optional	-
Additional practice abstracts (in English)	Optional	-
Description of the context	Optional	-
Additional information	Optional	-
Additional comments	Optional	-

The SFC module allows MAs to provide information **all along the life cycle of the project**, so its content can be updated at any moment when useful. However, it is foreseen for 2021-2027 that information on projects is made available at the beginning, as soon the project is approved.

This information will be ready for delivery once the contract between the MA and the Operational Groups is signed and the project can start. Later during the lifetime of the project, MA might update the project information. This update will be particularly needed for the intermediate and final results. Then, a number of "practice abstracts" with outcomes and recommendations, and eventually the final report will be expected.

It is expected that most of the information required (for example: title of the project, objective of the project, description of project activities, total budget, etc.) will be **provided by the beneficiaries already through the application form** when applying for CAP funding.