Monitoring and Evaluation for RDPs 2014-2020 Comments from Greece

Programming & Evaluation Unit Managing Authority for Greek RDP



Workshop with Greek Steering Group for proposed intervention logic and indicators 27.4.2012

Purpose:

- Exchange views concerning the proposed M+E system post-2013
- Identify needs of Implementing Bodies in M+E system

Procedure:

- Presentation concerning the link among Europe Strategy 2020, Common Strategic Framework, General Objectives of CAP and Priorities for Rural Development. Description of the proposed intervention logic and indicators
- Work in three groups (competitiveness, environment and local development)



OUTPUT INDICATORS



Common data items for all measures				
No.	Outputs/Data Item	Example values	Likely information source	Comments from Greek Workshop
1	Measure code		Prefilled by MA on application form	
2	Total public expenditure (€)		Application form	Which Public Expenditure? The planned/approved payments or the final payments?
3	Operation type		MA/PA to code when processing application	A complete list is needed but not too detailed
4	Priorities to which operation contributes	One main priority identified (2-6)	Either prefilled (e.g. for specific call for tender) or filled by MA/PA when processing application	Not accurate. Clarification is needed. Criteria must be determined. It isn't easy to identify one main priority



Com	Common data items for all measures				
No.	Outputs/Data Item	Example values	Likely information source	Comments from Greek Workshop	
5	Is operation linked to priority 1?	Y/N	Automatically filled: all operations under measures Knowledge transfer and innovation, Advisory services and cooperation are automatically considered as contributing to Priority 1		
6	1st Focus area to which operation contributes	Is it always possible to identify just one? E.g. individual agri-env climate schemes can contribute to HNV, water and soil management	Either prefilled (e.g. for specific call for tender) or filled by MA/PA when processing application	Not accurate. Clarification needed. It isn't easy to identify just one focus area.	
9	Sub-programme concerned	0=none; 1=young farmers; 2=small farms; 3=mountain areas; 4=short supply chain	Either prefilled or coded by MA/PA when processing application		



No.	Data Item	Relevant measures (examples)	Likely information source	Comments from Greek Workshop
10	Type of LFA area	All measures except knowledge transfer 0-none; 1=mountain; 2=other; 3=mixed	Either IACS (area based measures) or application form (other measures)	
11	Total expenditure (including private) (€)	All with co- financed investments	Application form	Which Total Expenditure? The planned/approved payments or the final payments?
12	Area (ha)	Agri-env climate; Organic farming; LEADER	IACS/Application form	
13	Physical area supported (ha)	Agri-env climate	IACS	



No.	Data Item	Relevant	Likely	Comments from Greek Workshop
NO.	Data Item	measures (examples)	information source	Comments from Greek Workshop
14	Is area NATURA?	Area based measures	Application form (tick box)	Provided that the characterization of NATURA is at farm level and can be achieved by applying the GIS database of digitized farms on the existing GIS database of NATURA areas that is in force
15	Is operation for an organic farm?	All agricultural operations	Application form (tick box)	
16	Is operation promoter young farmer?	All agricultural operations	Application form (tick box)	
17	Gender of project promoter	Investment measures	Application form	
18	No. farmers participating in supported schemes	Mutual funds; Income stabilisation tool	Application form	
19	No. of farmers benefiting from payouts	Mutual funds; Income stabilisation tool	Application form	Provided that the info source will be the Insurance Body that issues the relevant certificate



Additional output indicators for specific measures

No.	Indicator	Measure	Likely information source	Comments from Greek Workshop
20	No. training days given	Knowledge transfer and information actions	Application form (checked by PA at operation completion/payment)	Unsuitable because it doesn't provide essential information about the training content
21	No. participants trained	Knowledge transfer and information actions	Application form (checked by PA at operation completion/payment)	
22	No. advisory personnel trained	Advisory services	Application form (checked by PA at operation completion/payment)	
23	Population supported by broadband internet	Basic services and village renewal	Application form	
24	No. producers concerned	Setting up of producer groups	Application form	



Additional output indicators for specific measures

No.	Indicator	Measure	Likely information source	Comments from Greek Workshop
25	No. LU supported	Animal welfare	Application form (Animal register?)	Insufficient indicator Alternative Proposal:
				No. of stables with licensed premises and installation
26	No. partners in co-operation	Co-operation; LEADER cooperation	Application form	
27	No. different types of partner in the operation (EIP, public- private etc.)	Co-operation; LEADER cooperation	Application form	
28	Population covered by LAG	LEADER		



RESULT INDICATORS

Priority and focus area	Indicator(s)	Comments from Greek Workshop
1. Fostering knowledge transfer and innovation in agriculture, forestry and rural areas		
1A Fostering innovation and the knowledge base in rural areas		
1B Strengthening the links between agricultural and forestry and research and innovation	technologies as a result of	
1C Fostering lifelong learning and vocational training in the agriculture and forestry sectors		



Priority and focus area	Indicator(s)	Comments from Greek Workshop
2. Enhancing competitiveness of all types of agriculture and enhancing farm viability 2A Facilitating restructuring of	% of agriculture holdings with RDP supported business development plan for young farmers*	needed. Young in age or as new beneficiaries of the certain measure? Additional indicator proposal: Contribution of beneficiaries to the
farms facing major structural problems, notably farms with a low degree of market participation, market-oriented farms in particular sectors and farms in need of agricultural diversification	Changes in agricultural output of supported farms	Unsuitable and unfeasible Clarification of output is needed Alternative proposal: production value instead of agricultural output
2B Facilitating generational renewal in the agricultural sector	Changes in GVA/AWU on supported holdings*	Not absolutely suitable and not easily feasible especially in integrated investments Alternative proposal: Change in GVA/holding



Priority and focus area		Comments from Greek Workshop
_	Agricultural output under supported quality production scheme*	Suitable and feasible but clarification is needed for agricultural output (in € or in quantity). If it's in € how it can be measured between MS? It's difficult to set an ex-ante quantified target.
3A Better integrating primary producers into the food chain through quality schemes, promotion in local markets and short supply circuits, producer groups and inter-branch organisations	Agricultural outputs sold via short circuits* Agricultural output sold via producer groups or interbranch organisations* Agricultural output under RDP-supported risk management schemes	Suitable but clarification of output and short circuits is needed in order to be feasible Suitable and feasible. Additional indicator: percentage of the supported
3B Supporting farm risk management	% of used funds/% of farmers who used the schemes	Suitable and feasible



Priority and focus area	Indicator(s)	Comments from Greek Workshop
1. Fostering knowledge transfer and innovation in agriculture, forestry and rural areas 1A Fostering innovation and the knowledge base in rural areas 1B Strengthening the links between agricultural and forestry and research and innovation 1C Fostering lifelong learning and vocational training in the agriculture and forestry sectors	N° of holdings introducing new technologies as a result of cooperation projects targeting innovation.	Feasible but doesn't absolutely express the result. Clear definition is needed for innovation and new technologies. Additional indicator proposals: Percentage of holdings introducing new technologies as a result of cooperation projects targeting innovation Percentage of holdings introducing new technologies as a result of training actions



Priority and focus area	Indicator(s)	Comments from Greek Workshop
4. Restoring, preserving and enhancing ecosystems dependent on agriculture and forestry	% of UAA under management contracts supporting biodiversity and/or landscapes*	All indicators are feasible but the result is considered to be taken for granted before the completion of the intervention.
4A Restoring and preserving biodiversity, including in Natura 2000 areas and high nature value farming, and the state of European	% of UAA under management contracts improving water management*	The 1st indicator doesn't express the result of the actions that contribute to the fauna biodiversity.
landscapes 4B Improving water	% of UAA under management contracts preserving soil*	Alternative indicator: No. rare breeds that survived
management	% of forest or other wooded area under management	The contribution of actions in forest or other wooded area
4C Improving soil management	contracts supporting biodiversity*	supporting water management or preserving soil is proposed to be added in 4 th indicator



CROOT: ENVIRONMENT					
Priority and focus area	Indicator(s)	Comments from Greek Workshop			
5. Promoting resource efficiency and supporting the shift	Renewable energy produced*	Suitable and feasible			
towards a low carbon and climate resilient economy in agriculture, food and forestry sectors	Reduced T of CO2 equivalent emissions*	Suitable but not for monitoring needs. Not easily feasible			
5A Increasing efficiency in water use by agriculture 5B Increasing efficiency in energy use in agriculture and food processing	% of UAA/forestry under management contracts contributing to carbon sequestration*	Suitable provided that the result is preconceived but not for monitoring needs. Not easily feasible			
5C Facilitating the supply and use of renewable sources of energy, of by products, wastes, residues and other non food raw material for purposes	Energy savings in the agricultural and food processing sectors*	Suitable but not feasible			
of the bio-economy 5D Reducing nitrous oxide and	Energy efficiency	Unsuitable and unfeasible. It cannot be aggregated in measure level			
methane emissions from agriculture 5E Fostering carbon sequestration in agriculture and forestry	Water efficiency Water saved in agriculture*				



GROUP: LOCAL DEVELOPMENT

Priority and focus area	Indicator(s)	Comments from Greek Workshop
1. Fostering knowledge transfer and innovation in agriculture, forestry and rural areas 1A Fostering innovation and the knowledge base in rural areas 1B Strengthening the links between agricultural and forestry and research and innovation 1C Fostering lifelong learning and vocational training in the agriculture and forestry sectors	N° of holdings introducing new technologies as a result of cooperation projects targeting innovation	feasible.



GROUP: LOCAL DEVELOPMENT

Priority and focus area	Indicator(s)	Comments from Greek Workshop
6. Promoting social inclusion, poverty reduction and economic development in rural areas 6A Facilitating diversification, creation of new small enterprises and job creation 6B Fostering local development in rural areas 6C Enhancing accessibility to, use and quality of information and communication technologies (ICT) in rural	N° of jobs created through supported projects* Population covered by local development strategies*	Suitable and feasible. The time of its measurement is very crucial. If it is measured at application level it may be fictional but also it is difficult to be measured after the project completion Suitable and feasible but deficient. Two additional indicators proposed: 1. Support by local development strategies per capita. 2. Net migration indicator (expresses the population change)
areas	Population benefiting from New or improved services / infrastructures and IT infrastructures*	Suitable and feasible



IMPACT INDICATORS

General	Indicator(s)	Comments from Greek
Objective		Workshop
	1) Agricultural entrepreneurial income / AWU*	1) Suitable. Clarification of income is needed (is it the net profit?)
		Not easily feasible in Greece.
	2) Total factor productivity (TFP) *	A lot of data is needed either by beneficiaries or by existing databases (RICA, EUROSTAT,
	3) Expenditure in agricultural research and	NATIONAL STATISTICAL
Viable food	development expressed as share of agricultural GDP*	SERVICE)
production		
	- Agricultural entrepreneurial income / AWU	2) Suitable and feasible but very
	as % of wages and salaries / AWU in economy	demanding in credible data
- Commodity (market) price volatility - Consumer price volatility		3) Suitable and feasible
	- Production / consumption (commodities)	
	- Agricultural trade balance (overall)	
	- Share of food expenditure in total expenditure	



General Objective	Indicator(s)	Comments from Greek Workshop
	Net GHG emissions from agriculture*	Suitable but not feasible
	Share of agriculture in GHG emissions*	Suitable but not feasible
Sustainable management of natural resources and climate action	Farmland bird population index*	Suitable and feasible
	HNV indicator*	Suitable and feasible. Difficult to estimate the correlation with RDP contribution
	Share of agriculture in water use*	Unsuitable (influenced by climate and other exogenous factors) Unfeasible due to lack of data



General Objective	Indicator(s)	Comments from Greek Workshop
	Water use for irrigation*	Not absolutely suitable. Need for qualitative data. Variables are not defined. Not feasible due to lack of data. Need for indicators of water quantity and water reserve.
Sustainable management of natural resources and climate action	Water quality indicator *	Not absolutely suitable. Better definition is needed in order to estimate if it is feasible. Impacts should be assessed by case studies.
	Soil quality index*	Not absolutely suitable and not feasible due to lack of data
	Soil erosion indicator*	Suitable but not feasible



GROUP: LOCAL DEVELOPMENT

General Objective	Indicator(s)	Comments from Greek Workshop	
	Rural employment rate [compared to rest of economy] *	Suitable but not easily feasible. It must be checked whether the level in which the rural areas are defined is the same with the measurement level for risk	
Balanced territorial development	Share of rural population living at risk of poverty [compared to rest of economy]	of poverty and GDP used by Greek Statistical Service. Common methodologies must be given in time to all MS in order to quantify these indicators.	
	Rural GDP per capita in PPS [compared to rest of economy] *	It is proposed for impact indicators to be assessed at EU level provided that EU has access to all the necessary data from MS. "Compared to rest of economy" needs clarification. Compared to the other areas or other sectors and which sectors?	



