

WORKSHOP OUTCOMES

Specific challenges in using Common Rural Development indicators at regional level

Good Practice Workshop
Rome, 6 and 7 March 2013

Contents

1. Introduction to the workshop.....	3
2. Workshop agenda	4
3. Questions & answers on Common Context Indicators.....	5
4. Case studies	8
5. Outcome of working group discussions	11
6. Feedback of workshop participants	18
7. Annex 1: Working document on “Approaches in using common Rural Development indicators in regional RDP”	20
8. Annex 2: List of workshop participants	34

The Evaluation Expert Network operates under the guidance of DG AGRI – Unit L4. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the official views of the European Commission.

1. Introduction to the workshop

The Common Rural Development Indicators are used to develop RDP strategies and to monitor and evaluate the effects of rural development policy. The impact of this policy and its contribution to the CAP and EU objectives is assessed with impact indicators in the specific socio-economic and environmental context of the country or region.

In the current programming period (2007-2013) the RDP is analysed with the set of objective and context related baseline indicators and the RDP effects are assessed with the seven common impact indicators. For the next programming period (2014-2020), the impact indicators are included in the set of context indicators which are used in conducting the SWOT analysis, needs assessment and developing the RDP strategy. Context and impact indicators will also be used in the later assessment of the RDP impacts and contributions to the CAP objectives and the Union strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. Baseline values are required at the starting point of the RDP implementation, and updated values will be required at later stages.

Data for most indicators (and their measurement units) is available from official EU statistical data sources such as Eurostat, FADN etc. at least at national level, whereas not always at lower territorial levels. This represents a specific challenge for Member States with regional RDPs as they will have to put in place adequate approaches to provide indicator values at the RDP level. Furthermore, enhancing the data availability at regional level is also an important concern for all Member States that aim to include regional specificities in their national RDPs.

In order to discuss specific challenges in identifying appropriate values for the common indicators at regional level, a workshop was organized by the Evaluation Helpdesk in cooperation with the *Ministero delle politiche agricole alimentari e forestali* (Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry) of Italy in collaboration with *Istituto Nazionale di Economia Agraria* (National Institute of Agriculture Economics) – INEA on 6 & 7 March 2013 in Rome. A series of recommendations to improve data availability for rural development indicators at regional and national level was proposed as the main outcomes of the workshop.




A **full documentation** of the workshop can be found [on the website](#) and includes:

- Workshop agenda
- Presentations
- Newsletter of the Good Practice Workshop
- Further reading.

The present document summarizes the main outcomes of the workshop discussions.

2. Workshop agenda

Day 1: Introductory presentations & case studies¹

- **Opening and welcome**
Graziella Romito – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry
Leo Maier - European Commission DG Agriculture and Rural Development – Unit L4
Evaluation of measures applicable to agriculture; studies
- **Objectives of the workshop**
Hannes Wimmer– Helpdesk of the Evaluation Expert Network [PDF ]
- **What is needed and what is available at regional level?**
Zélie Peppiette, Paloma Cortes-Paya and Christophe Derzelle
European Commission DG Agriculture and Rural Development [PDF ]
- **Approaches in using common RD indicators in regional RDPs – Results from a survey**
Enrique Nieto and Jela Tvrdonova - Helpdesk of the Evaluation Expert Network [PDF ]


Exchange Session – Case studies on using common indicators (context and impact) in Member States

- **“Data availability at regional RDP level”,** *Antonella Trisorio* – INEA, Italy [PDF ]
- **“Farmland Bird Index in Italy”,** *Patrizia Rossi, Gianpiero Calvi-* LIPU Birdlife, Italy [PDF ]
- **“Overview of data availability at RDP level – Case Study - Spain”,** *Paula Rodríguez Andreu* – MAGRAMA, Spain [PDF ]
- **“Overview of data availability at RDP level – Case Study RDP Azores - Portugal”,** *Magda Porta*, Instituto de Estudos Sociais e Económicos, Portugal [PDF ]

Day 2: Working group discussions

- Using national rural networks to improve collection of regional Rural Development data?
- Using coordination bodies to get data-providers from different sectors together and provide better Rural Development data
- Using proxies to bridge data gaps for regional RDPs
- Cost-effectiveness of data collection for RD indicators
- Using context indicators in the programme design-phase? How to proceed with the CI when programming is already advanced? How to ensure continuity of consistent data collection?
- The use of context indicators for the assessment of impacts
- The role of beneficiaries in data collection

Other related documentation

- **“Rural Typologies for indicators”,** *Paloma Cortes-Paya* - European Commission DG Agriculture and Rural Development [PDF ]

¹ All presentations of the workshop can be found on the website: http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/evaluation/good-practices-workshops/common-rural-development-indicators-at-regional-level/en/common-rural-development-indicators-at-regional-level_home.cfm

3. Questions & answers on Common Context Indicators

The following questions and answers have been recorded after the introductory presentations.

Question #1: Will data for the Common Context Indicators be provided by the EC at national/regional level?

Answer DG Agri: We intend to provide as much data as we can. The basic principle for the context indicators is that we have selected indicators for which we have information at the national level. The one exception is HNV farming. Apart from that indicator, we have data at national level and will provide it to Member States. Moreover, for a number of the indicators we will also have the information at NUTS1 and NUTS2 level. So for those indicators we will be providing the information that we have at RDP level. It may be however that when we ask for information in the RDPs you have more up-to-date information so you are free to use that.

Question #2: How to collect data at sub-regional level (rural/urban typology, HNV typology, LFA typology)?

Answer DG Agri: We know that the adapted OECD typology for rural/urban is now being adopted within the EU. Eurostat is gradually introducing more and more rural/urban split for indicators. This is not necessarily consistent with the definitions that are used within different MS. Compared to the current period we have reduced the number of indicators in the common list where there is a rural/urban split. For those remaining indicators where there is rural/urban split either the data is already available or available at NUTS 3-level so that we have the basic building blocks to make the calculations requested. So we can provide the information for those indicators where a rural/urban split is specified. However this is a very limited number of indicators. We recognize that many countries have different definitions of rural and this affects the territory where the RDP is applied. So you are actively encouraged in your programmes to adopt programme specific indicators which use your own definition of rural territory that correspond to the application of your RDP policies so that you have indicators that match where your RDP is applied.

Question #3: Why do we only talk about *context indicators* at regional level and not about the whole set of common Rural Development indicators?

Answer DG Agri: Because we are including all the impact indicators in the list of context indicators, we are therefore automatically discussing impact indicators and looking on how to provide regional data there. The reason we are not looking at result indicators, performance framework or milestones is because all those other sets of indicators come directly out of the programme implementation. The context indicators and impact indicators come from other sources than statistics which are not necessarily at RDP level. But for everything to do with implementation, everything to do with monitoring, everything to do with a direct result of a programme (e.g. how much renewable energy is produced as a result of the programme activity, etc.) the information is at programme level. So there is not an issue about having RDP level data for any of the indicator levels other than the context and impact. There will undoubtedly be other issues to deal with in establishing that data and

we will be looking at those - e.g. the methodologies for the complementary results indicators etc. - but the issue there is not the territorial level.

Question #4: What is the comparative function of indicators? Can proxies be compared between different RDPs?

Answer DG AGRI: The reason for having a Common Context Indicator list is because we do need some basic information that can be aggregated at EU-level or is comparable at EU-level. For those *common indicators* there is really a common definition and there should not be this issue of different meaning. Certainly when we look at proxies or programme specific indicators, there will be different interpretations. It is not an issue as long as it is defined in the programme, because in many cases it is not a direct comparison between different RDPs. For example in the case of HNV where different methodologies will be used, we do will not look at the numbers in a way such as this MS has got 40% and that MS has only got 12%; the idea is to find out what is happening over the long term as a trend: Is the RDP managing to support and sustain the level of HNV farming? Is it deteriorating? Etc. If there is a trend that is being considered it does not matter if the actual methodology used is the same.

Question #5: How to deal with outdated data for the Common Context Indicators?

Answer DG Agri: At the moment the RDPs are doing their situation analysis, SWOT and needs assessment but at the moment nobody has 2013 data. Consequently, we are all working with the latest data available. When it becomes available, the baseline data should be updated so that the baseline is 2013 as a description of what the situation was when the programme began to be implemented. It is possible that the data that we reflect back to you is the data that we have got from Eurostat. Now, to get into Eurostat, the data has first been collected in your MS, has gone to your national statistical office, was sent to Eurostat, has been validated, gone back and forth a couple of times and been published. So it is quite possible that you may have data for a later year than what we have on Eurostat at a certain time. By all means use your latest available data.

Question #6: What is the date for setting up values for target indicators – 2020 or 2023?

Answer DG Agri: We have a programming period from 2014-2020 but with the n+2 and now the n+3 rule, expenditure will go beyond that. So what we are talking about in terms of target is a *programme target* and instead of putting a year on it, think what is the target to be achieved with the resources for this programme, however long it takes you to spend it. Some programmes will use a small part and other will have the full amount by 2020. So it is really a target for the programme.

Question #7: What flexibility do Member States have in using Common Context Indicators in the SWOT and needs assessment?

Answer DG Agri: We are trying to give as much flexibility as possible by really reducing the common set of indicators so that you have a lot more time, resources and scope to use for your programme specific ones. This common core set of indicators is pretty basic. It is hard to imagine how anyone could do an analysis of the territory, write a SWOT or a needs assessment without looking at

indicators such as population data, economic development activity by sector etc. We would expect such indicators to be considered even if we were not offering this common set of indicators. And where you might have a different definition (e.g. the working week in one MS is significantly different, the AWU does not correspond to the EU definition etc.) then you should introduce a programme specific indicator which reflects your needs. That is always possible. We have to have the common set of indicators but you may have as many programme specific indicators as may fit to your needs and match the situation.

Question #8: How to use Common Context Indicators for Thematic Sub-Programmes?

Answer DG Agri: When you have thematic sub-programme, you need the same steps as a full programme which means that you will need data. And if the geographical area in which your thematic sub-programme is applied, you should be using the data you have to describe that territory, that group of municipalities and their situation to justify the interventions that you are proposing within that area.

4. Case studies

Case study presenters from Italy, Spain and Portugal were invited to give an overview about.

Overview of data availability at RDP level

- Main challenges in 2007-13: What are the main challenges in obtaining regional data for RD baselines and impacts? For which indicators?
- Solutions adopted in 2007-13: For which indicators have you found approaches? What kind of approaches (proxies, additional activities etc.)?
- What are the lessons learnt to achieve data at regional level?

Solutions adopted to improve data collection at regional level in 2007-13

- Specific approach chosen (for one or more indicators)
- How is it done? By whom? Which results did it bring?
- Conditions: What was needed to set up this solution? How much does it cost? What are its strengths/weaknesses?

Outlook on next programming period?

- Which of the applied approaches can be used in the next programming period?
- What new challenges can you identify in the proposed common RD indicators 2014-20 and how are you planning to approach them.

	ITALY	SPAIN	AZORES (PT)
Main challenges concerning regional data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data is not available at regional level particularly for environmental indicators. Regions implement different methodological solutions for data collection which hampers comparability of results among regions. Lack of long time series of data for environmental indicators. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data is not available at regional level particularly for environmental indicators. Regions implement different methodological solutions for data collection which hampers comparability of results among regions. Insufficient disaggregation of statistical data for lower territorial levels (rural/ urban) and by sectors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data is not available at regional level particularly for environmental and agricultural indicators. Insufficient disaggregation of statistical data for lower territorial levels (rural/ urban) and by sector Azores and continent (PT) implement different methodological solutions for data collection which hampers comparability among both regions
Approaches to improve data at regional level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confer to the National Rural Network (NRN) the leading role for data collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data collection through ad hoc studies coordinated by the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creation of a Monitoring Committee to include Azores forest-related data into national forestry inventory report. Implementation of proxies when data is not available for a particular indicator Establish protocol agreements between responsible entities (e.g. environmental agencies, water agencies, etc.) and main data providers, under the coordination of the RDP Managing Authorities
Applicability of approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNV, FBI, Gross Nutrient Balance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNV, FBI, Water Quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental and agricultural indicators.
Main activities in 2007-2013	<p>The National Rural Network...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides technical support to MAs and evaluators in data collection. Acquires information in data and methodologies through workshops, conferences and research studies. Facilitates knowledge sharing among main RD stakeholders (MAs, evaluators, data providers, etc.). Activates collaboration and partnership with relevant stakeholders to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) develop methods for data collection b) provide data on problematic RD indicators Identifies governance solutions for data collection Identifies expert/focal points in specific topics 	<p>The Ministry of Agriculture...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinates the improvement of statistical systems relevant for RD with other Government Directorates Conducts ad hoc studies to collect data for RD indicators (HNV, FBI, Water Quality) in collaboration with other Directorates and in partnership with NGOs (e.g. SEO Birdlife) and research institutes (e.g. Universities). 	<p>The Regional Government of Azores....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raises awareness among main stakeholders on the importance of RD indicators Promotes meetings between MAs, evaluators and regional statistical services in regards data availability for RD indicators Organizes institutional meetings to define governance structures for data collection (responsibilities) Collects studies and articles on relevant issues Participates in workshops (e.g. Good practice workshops organized by the Evaluation Helpdesk)

	ITALY	SPAIN	AZORES (PT)
Lessons learnt for 2014-2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Horizontal and vertical communication at regional, national and EU level plays an important role. A central authority shall play the key role in coordinating data collection methods among regions, involving data providers and evaluators in discussions The implementation of common methods of data collection for all regions which are built on existent experiences enhances efficiency and ensures the provision of consistent data series. Financial support is needed to update data on RD indicators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ad hoc studies are adequate to collect data on some indicators, e.g. FBI and Pollution by nitrates, but more problematic in case of HNV and Pollution by pesticides Ad hoc studies shall use common methods for all regions, compatible with standard national methods. Ad hoc studies are highly dependent on public funding. Therefore they cannot secure the continuity of data provision Ad hoc studies often show some delays in delivering results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is challenging to provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Disaggregated data at lower territorial levels and by agricultural branches (agriculture indicators). b) Data for certain environmental and agricultural indicators.
Outlook on next programming period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional MAs will have data available based on sound and common methodologies for all Common Context Indicators at the beginning of the programming period or alternatively: Data will be provided at national level while allowing regions to implement programme specific indicators for further details. Financial resources will be needed to address open issues in regards data collection for the HNV and Gross Nutrient Balance indicators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Common Context Indicators for which data is not available might not be used in case of regional RDPs, in order to avoid additional costs compare to national RDPs, where data are available. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the beginning of the programming period, data gaps will remain for 19 out of the 50 proposed Common Context Indicators, mainly environmental and agricultural indicators.

5. Outcome of working group discussions

Working groups (“open space”) were used during the second day of the Good Practice Workshop to discuss identified challenges and possible solutions to overcome data gaps for rural development indicators. Participants have selected 7 out of 9 topics to be discussed in open space working groups. Results of the discussions were presented by the rapporteurs to the plenary.

Working Group #1a: Using national rural networks to improve collection of regional Rural Development data?

- *What does it require to apply this solution? What does it cost?*
- *Where can this be applied? For which indicators is it most effective?*
- *Which recommendations can be given?*

Summary of discussion

The Italian National Rural Network is considered as good example to demonstrate how networks can help to bridge data-gaps for RD indicators at regional level.

Member States with several RDPs have the possibility to establish and finance the National Rural Network Programmes using EAFRD funds. The legal framework establishes a set of minimum tasks for National Rural Networks, which however can be further extended also to Monitoring and Evaluation activities (in the current and also in the next programming period)

Networks can be used for carrying out monitoring and evaluation tasks including data collection for RD indicators (e.g. NRN of Italy). If this solution is used, strong leadership of the NRN is one important precondition as well a dedicated budget to finance tasks such as the systematization of monitoring, harmonization of methodological approaches, capacity building activities etc. In Italy a specific Task Force within the NRN has been created to deal with M&E.

If the NRN should coordinate monitoring and evaluation activities including data collection it is important that all regional RDPs are involved. This “integrated approach” facilitates broad knowledge-sharing, effective coordination of activities, setting up the common monitoring systems and systematization of data collection. For example, the NRN can involve relevant regional and national data providers e.g. statistical and research institutions and create a central data base (e.g. Geodata warehouse in case of Italy) from which all regions can extract data for RD indicators.

National Rural Networks need sufficient capacities in terms of resources, technical knowledge and responsibilities if they are expected to take over the role coordination M&E coordinator in the area of data collection.

The NRN at MS level can facilitate the screening and coordination of data providers at various levels (regional, national and EU level) – horizontally and vertically. This can be applied for all types of indicators.

The Evaluation Helpdesk at the EU level is expected to coordinate stakeholders in the evaluation vertically (EC - MS – region), but also facilitate the horizontal collaboration among Managing Authorities, evaluators and other evaluation stakeholders in order to encourage exchange of experiences, practices, e.g. via organizing good practice workshops.

Working Group #1b: Using coordination bodies to get data-providers from different sectors together and provide better Rural Development data

- *What does it require to use coordination bodies? What are the costs?*
- *For which indicators and countries can it be applied?*
- *Which recommendations can be given?*

Summary of discussion:

Various bodies (Monitoring Committee, Steering Groups) can be used as coordinators of regional data providers from different sectors at the RDP and MS level.

The coordination body (e.g. Steering Group) has to be able to manage its own budget in order to finance the necessary activities. It is vital to coordinate different ministries, agencies and other data providers, collecting various data which can be used for common RD indicators at regional level. This would allow the institutionalization, harmonization and systematization of data collection and a more efficient use of resource.

At EU level the coordination among evaluation, monitoring units and geographic desks within DG AGRI shall be also enhanced. This will allow streamlining data from existing EU data sources to be used for M&E purposes in a more efficient and effective way.

This approach can potentially be used to collect data for all types of indicators.

Working Group #2: Using proxies to bridge data gaps for regional RDPs

- *What is a good proxy and what not? What is needed in terms of flexibility from the EU? Relevance?*
- *To what extent can and should proxies be used? For which indicators are they most relevant?*
- *Which recommendations can be given?*

Summary of discussion

A proxy can be an alternative measurement unit of a proposed Common Context Indicator (CCI) for which data is not available. The participants identified the following characteristics for proxies in order to be considered as a good approximation to the CCI: a) Proxies should be *temporary solutions* to bridge data gaps for specific CCIs; b) proxies should be *representative* in so far as the values they provide reflect accurately the situation in the area; b) proxies should be *widely accepted* by the main stakeholders of the concerned area.

The identification of an adequate proxy and a proper calculation method should ideally be conducted by the scientific community. Consultation with main stakeholders is also needed in order to ensure that the information provided by the proxy reflects the reality. It is suggested that Managing Authorities of RDPs or alternatively the ex ante evaluator are responsible for the final validation of the proposed proxy.

It is suggested to consider the possibility for proxies to become permanent indicators, if they are more cost effective than the proposed CCI. Nonetheless, in further discussions in the plenary, EC representatives stated that proxies can be just temporary solutions while it is intended to obtain values for the requested CCI.

Flexibility for the acceptance and use of proxies is needed from the EC in those cases where data is not available for the proposed CI. In terms of “additionality” it is important that proxies could be added also to the list of impact indicators. Taking into consideration limited resources for the assessment of impacts it is suggested to give certain flexibility to MAs to prioritize and focus the assessment of impacts to the most relevant impact indicators for a given region.

DG Agri underlines that proxies are accepted in those situations for which the EC cannot provide data for specific CCI at RDP level. Also, it was stated that Desk Officers will consult with Unit L4 concerning the adequacy of the proposed proxy.

Proxies are mainly applicable for environmental indicators (technical difficulties) and to forestry-related indicators (marginal sector in some contexts).

The working group recommends:

- **Communication concerning proxies (principle, use, etc.) should be improved at EU-level.**
- **A list of indicative proxies should be elaborated by the EC** in order to bring more clarity about the adequacy of specific proxies and to guide MAs when choosing between different possible options.

- **The main stakeholders (MA, evaluators, NGOs, Stakeholders, research, Paying Agencies) should be involved when developing adequate proxy indicators.** It is important to share practices and experience among RDPs in regards the use of potential proxies through communication and cooperation at national and EU level.
- **Support and cooperation is needed** (at regional, national and EU levels) to facilitate the implementation of proxies and to overcome potential difficulties and constraints that the MA might face.

Working Group #3: Cost-effectiveness of data collection for RD indicators

- *Which approaches of data collection at regional/national level are cost-effective?*
- *How to best use technical assistance money for data-collection? Which other funds could be used? How to avoid duplication of efforts?*
- *Which recommendations can be given?*

Summary of discussion

The participants the cost effectiveness of data collection for indicators with the following formula: Information/Money. It concerns ‘Quantity and Quality’ of information received per unit of funds paid

To create a data collection system which avoids additional adjustments and additional data collections can considerable reduce the costs.

Cost effectiveness means also reducing the statistical burden on farmers and to create a system in which most information will be collected via already existing statistical systems without asking additional information from farmers.

A good approach for more cost-effective data collection is to

- 1) Use administrative data: 1. IACS (which collects information on Pillar 1+Pillar2 operations linked to more than 90% of farmland); ‘Non Agri’ issues (existing information on tourism, ICT, handicrafts)
- 2) use standardized application forms based on the agreement between Managing Authorities and Paying Agencies , which can collect a lot of data and be used in development of consistent time series also for evaluation purposes

Open access to statistical data bases sources (e.g. national, regional statistics, Census, FSS, FADN) including the possibility to access individual data will require solving the privacy issues. However in several countries this might have legal implications.

Costs of data collection for the common RD indicators (context, impacts) can be covered with the funds of technical assistance (data collection on both RDP beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries to conduct the counterfactual analysis).

Working Group #4: Using context indicators in the programme design-phase? How to proceed with the CI when programming is already advanced? How to ensure continuity of consistent data collection?

- *What is needed to do a good programme design? Which role do context indicators have in this? What does the legislation require? when?*
- *How to link them practically to SWOT, needs assessment, intervention logic? Are they sufficient to justify your programme strategy? Should the RDPs use the draft CI? How to integrate the context indicators in an already existing SWOT? How to establish long-time series? For which indicator is it most difficult?*
- *Which recommendations can be given?*

Summary of discussion

Although Common Context Indicators are considered useful for comparisons among Member States at the EU level, their relevance in the description of the SWOT analysis is questioned for regional RDPs. The EC is asked to inform about the use of Common Context Indicators.

The role of stakeholders in the development of the SWOT analysis and the needs assessment is considered as very important. Managing Authorities shall involve them in this work, benefiting from their knowledge of the territory. This can bring qualitative evidence to SWOT also in cases Common Context Indicators are not very useful.

It is suggested that main trends in the SWOT could also described without Common Context Indicators or with the programme specific indicators more relevant to the specific context of the regional RDP. Based on this the list of Common Context Indicators shall be reduced for regional RDPs.

The European Commission additionally highlights that

- **The EC has developed a set of Common Context Indicators as a result of a series of consultations with Member States.** The EC will equip all of Common Context Indicators (except of HNVE) with baseline data at national level.
- **Most of regional RDPs baseline data will also be provided by the EC.** The data will be updated across the implementation of programmes, so that trends could be observed.
- **Common Context Indicators are compulsory for all RDPs.** They allow the evaluation of Pillar II (rural development) integrated together with Pillar I into the evaluation of the whole CAP.
- **Proxies can temporarily be used for those indicators at regional RDP level, which for which neither data is provided by the EC, nor national or regional data is available.** However the Managing Authority shall make an effort to replace the proxies at a later stage with the measurement units originally proposed by the Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework.

Working Group #5: The use of context indicators for the assessment of impacts

- *What is needed to ensure the use of context indicators in later assessment of impacts?*
- *How to use the context indicators in the assessment of impacts?*
- *Which recommendations can be given?*

Summary of discussion

A common set of context indicators (including impact indicators) shall be equipped with baseline values updated across the programming period, using the same methodology provided by the EU. This allows creating a more consistent timelines of data, to observe changes in impact indicators together with changes of the contextual situation and the same time to aggregate them at regional/national and European level.

Data and indicator values alone are not sufficient for the assessment of impacts and do not replace evaluation. Many external factors of the RDP are influencing the observed value of indicators. (FBI, GHG emissions, GVA, labour productivity etc.). Therefore the nominal change in the context and impact indicator value, obtained in various time periods, has to be netted out by using appropriate evaluation methods during (e.g. GVA-supported farm and GVA at sectorial level).

It stays rather unclear who will be responsible for the calculation of the impact indicators in the evaluation. As for the regional RDPs data for context and impact indicators are not always available and collect them means additional costs.

There is a need to use programme specific indicators which (in case of impact indicators) might be more capable of showing causal links with programme intervention (e.g. soil biodiversity, or plant series composition). This however requires additional resources to be allocated by the MS for data collection for these indicators (Weaknesses).

The collected information on impact and context indicators (both common and programme specific) in time series shall be used also to observe the performance and the effectiveness of implemented measures.

Working Group #6: The role of beneficiaries in data collection

- *What is needed to ensure that data collected from beneficiaries can be used for evaluation?*
- *How to collect data for evaluation via beneficiaries?*
- *Which recommendations can be given?*

Summary of discussion

Beneficiaries of the RDP do not distinguish between policy and payment BUT: data provided by beneficiaries in application forms are collected by the Paying Agencies, being the subject of control and audit, and later used by the Managing Authorities and evaluators in the evaluation of the policy.

The question is how to turn data collected for financial control into useful and adequate data for evaluation of impacts?

There are several possibilities to collect data via beneficiaries: (a) Before the project starts (applications); (b) After completion of the project – where rather short term observation exists (payment request in case of investment projects), (c) 5 years after the completion of the project in case of area based payments – long-term observation possible (control)

The new proposal of the draft RDR sets up a legal base for type of data to be collected for monitoring and evaluation from beneficiaries in Art. 77, on Electronic information system. Art. 78 on the Provision of information further sets up the requirement for beneficiaries to provide data to the Managing authority and/or appointed bodies are delegated to perform functions on its behalf.

6. Feedback of workshop participants

At the end of the 2nd day participants were invited to give feedback on the workshop by answering to the following question in written:

“What is the most useful thing you are taking away to help with filling gaps in regional data?”

Information & answers to open issues

- *To have clear answers on open issues from the EC.*
- *Information that indicators have to be valorized at programme level → There is the need to formalize better in the EC documents → a) Valorization at programme level but need in addition at higher level and first pillar.;*
- *We need a short list of common mandatory context indicators and we have to choose a long list of specific context indicators at regional and local level.*
- *To stress and point out the issues in data gaps (no data available) that are common in several MS → revised list of CI that would be acceptable.*

Flexibility vs. bindingness of context indicators, application of proxies:

- *There is hope that there will be more flexibility than expected.*
- *To explore the possibility to use proxies for some indicators, where data gaps especially at regional level are identified.*
- *Flexibility, proxies*
- *Proxies*
- *Gaps in regional data: a) Using survey data (samples); b) flexibility / proxies*
- *To utilize “proxy” in order to cover gaps and also the involvement of beneficiaries into providing data.*
- *The possibility to use proxies to get context indicators when data is not available;*
- *Flexibility in valorizing indicators with regional data and proxies.;*
- *Role of ex ante evaluator in bridging the gap through the involvement of local relevant stakeholders in order to build sound proxies and/or specific indicators.*
- *Disappointed by the fact we only discussed the indicators in terms of data availability. There is a lot to say in terms of which indicators is relevant for each scale (National regional ...) but the Commission keeps saying “indicators are at programme level, it is the legal requirement” end of discussion. By doing so, it encourages MA to use only their own indicators to set the frame of a programme or to evaluate it and in the best case to fulfill the requirements of common indicators only because is compulsory but without knowing how it will be use and why is it useful. More flexibility is needed.*

Exchange of experiences

- *Exchange of experiences (MS);*
- *It is a great to reflect on issues that in these kind of forums, and take that reflection to our programme/country (I think through several sides → to have coherence and evaluation consistency in developing our work); c) the possibility of exchange information about approached/work methodologies to eventually apply in our programme.*
- *Be aware of the difficulties (we are not alone so we can get assistance/help to overcome those difficulties);*

Coordination and working together

- *The relevance of working together and the need to have fund to support particular need of RDP.*
- *Coordination with monitoring and desk officers inside E.C.*
- *We will try to do an open space between all our regions to share proxies, their data availability and ideas to get data.*

The role of the NRN

- *Involvement of the NRN in M&E (data collection)*
- *In order to filling gaps in regional data it is useful to strengthen coordination within the national rural network.*

Raising awareness of beneficiaries for evaluation via data collection

- *Let the beneficiaries be aware of the need of data collection in view of better address interventions (Evidence base policies) based on participatory monitoring approaches (Not only requirements)*
- *Involvement of beneficiaries into providing data.*
- *In our OP (national) there is no such problem. Reporting of data is an obligatory part of the agreement with beneficiaries. There is no possibility to pay money if this condition is not met.*

7. Annex 1: Working document on “Approaches in using common Rural Development indicators in regional RDP”

The following working document reflects the outcomes of a survey that has been sent to Managing Authorities of regional RDPs before the Good Practice Workshop.

METHODOLOGY

The objectives of this working document are: (a) to identify problematic indicators from the point of view of data availability, (b) to screen and inform on approaches to overcome existing data gaps. For this purpose first a screening on the availability of data for Rural Development indicators took place and then a survey has been conducted with Managing Authorities of RDPs in multi-regional Member States.

1. The **screening of data availability** was carried out for objective and context related baseline indicators of 2007-2013² and for Common Context Indicators (CCIs) of 2014-2020³. It led to the identification of problematic indicators for which values could not be extracted for their measurement units at RDP level (national and/or regional) from EU-data-sources (Eurostat, Rural Development Report 2012, etc.).
2. Based on this, a **survey** was sent to Managing Authorities of regional RDPs at the end of January 2013 in order to identify approaches employed to overcome data gaps in problematic indicators. Answers were received from 14 Rural Development Programmes, as shown in the table below. The findings obtained from the survey are presented in Annex 1.

Table 1 : Overview of replies to the survey on the availability of regional data for common RD indicators

Member State	Number of RDPs	Feedback received from
Italy	21	Sardegna Trento
Spain	17	Castilia y Leon Cataluna Extramadura Galicia Murcia Pays Vasco
Portugal	4	Continent Acores
Germany	14	Sachsen Anhalt Baden Württemberg Berlin Brandenburg
United Kingdom	4	-
Belgium	2	Flanders
Total	62	14

² CMEF Handbook, Guidance note F

³ Working document for the Evaluation Expert Committee: “Proposed list of Common Context indicators, December 2012.

MAIN FINDINGS

Findings of the screening of data availability shows that data gaps must be addressed in order to design SWOT, needs assessment and the Programme strategy, as well as to conduct the Ex ante evaluation. The survey has also provided some examples of data sources and approaches, which MAs of regional RDPs employ to overcome data gaps for problematic indicators. The results of the survey can be found in Annex 1 of this Working Document.

Based on the survey the following can be concluded:

- ✓ **The most common approach to bridge data gaps is to obtain data from regional and national statistical services.** In case of indicators and their measurements units which are problematic in obtaining values from the EU sources, Managing Authorities of RDPs use **national and/or regional statistical** services (statistical/sectorial yearbook) or databases of the national/regional Ministry of Agriculture.
- ✓ **Sectorial Reports are used as data source for food processing and forestry indicators.** For forestry indicators the **national forestry inventory** is often used as a source. This approach is found in Spain, Portugal and Germany, where the relevant Ministry releases the report periodically (e.g. every 10 years in the Spanish case) describing the state of the forestry sector at national and regional level. A similar approach was found for the indicators for food industry (e.g. Spain and Portugal), where data at regional and national level can be extracted from the **annual statistical reports** elaborated by the relevant Ministry.
- ✓ **Using information of the Paying Agencies.** For example, data for HNV farmland can be collected via application forms of direct payments once the HNV areas are defined in the system. This approach has been used in the RDP of Portugal Acores. The information on investments in renewable energy, including expected production, is used to fill the data gaps of the Common Context Indicator 31 in Flanders (BE).
- ✓ **Environmental Agencies are main data providers for environmental indicators.** Sources of national or regional **environmental agencies** or specialized departments such as Water management agencies, Nature conservation agencies are often used to provide data on environmental indicators. e.g. via **Geographic Information Systems (GIS)**.
- ✓ **EC and European Parliament provide reports about the implementation of the Directive 91/676/CEE of the Council**, concerning the protection of waters against nitrate pollution which was used for the approximation of data for Objective related context indicator 21 and Common Context Indicator 38 in PT Continent.
- ✓ **The collaboration with non-governmental agencies, organizations and academy helps to obtain data.** Partnership and collaboration between governmental and **non-governmental agencies** is applied in order to acquire data for specific indicators. This approach is found in the Farmland Bird Index Indicator where RD authorities and non-governmental organizations such as Birdlife or ornithology society jointly collaborate to provide data for indicators at regional level. Other forms of collaboration are found also with Universities and research centers which offer their reports as sources of information and data as well.
- ✓ **Proxies are employed for certain indicators.** In some cases alternative measurement units - **proxies** are applied if data for the required measurement units cannot be found. The following tables show proxies described by MAs of regional RDPs:

Table 2: Proxies for common RD indicators extracted from survey (by programming period)

Programming period 2007-2013

No	Indicator	Measurement units	Potential Proxies	RDP
Objective related baseline indicator				
20	Water quality: Gross Nutrient Balance.	Surplus of Nitrogen in kg/ha Surplus of phosphorous kg/g	The amount of individual fertilizers (N and K) applied at the utilized agricultural area (kg/ha).	PT_Acores
21	Water quality pollution by nitrates and pesticides	Annual trends in concentration of nitrate in ground and surface waters	Average level of nitrate concentrates - % obtained from monitoring stations, considering the following classifications: < 25,25-50,>50mg NO3/L.	PT_Continente
24	Climate change: Production of renewable energy from agriculture and forestry	Production of renewable energy from agriculture	Share of renewable energy in gross power production (%) {Regional statistics} Hectares of different energy crops Production of renewable energy from biomass	DE_Sachsen Anhalt BE_Flanders ES_Galicia
25	Climate change: UAA devoted to renewable energy	UAA devoted to energy and biomass crops	Agriculture land covered with energy crops	DE_Baden Wuerttemberg
26	Climate change/air quality: gas emission from agriculture	Emission of greenhouse gases and ammonia from agriculture	Estimation of CO2 emissions from main agricultural crops and exploitations based on the initiative "Less CO2" Approximation based on emission from other industries branches Quantification of methane (CH4) emissions from enteric fermentation, in small regions where the main agricultural activity is cattle production	ES_Murcia DE_Sachsen Anhalt PT_Acores
32	Internet take up in rural areas	% of population having subscribed to DSL internet	Approximation based on the number of households in rural areas with internet connection	ES_Murcia

No	Indicator	Measurement units	Potential Proxies	RDP
Context related baseline indicator				
9	Areas of extensive agriculture	% of UAA for extensive arable crops	Calculations based on the permanent pastures compared to the total crop area Using assumptions on labour intensity of extensive agriculture areas.	ES_Murcia BE_Flanders
14	Water quality	% of the territory designated as nitrate vulnerable zones	Approximation based on gross nutrient balance	DE_Sachsen Anhalt
23	Internet infrastructure	DSL coverage	Calculation of the share of households with access to Internet	ES_Murcia

Programming period 2014-2020

No	Indicator	Measurement units	Potential Proxies	RDP
Common Context Indicator				
12	Agricultural productivity	Total factor productivity (TFP) compares total outputs relative to the total inputs used in term of volumes (index)	This indicator could be calculated with the following formula (unit in €): Agricultural Production + Subsidies - Intermediate inputs	ES_Extremadura
13	Labour productivity in agriculture	GVA / AWU (€)	Calculation based on GVA in primary sector and employment in primary sector.	BE_Flanders
37	Water abstraction in agriculture	Volume of water which is applied to soils for irrigation purposes (m3); (water abstraction for irrigation purposes as a % of the total gross abstraction could be added)	Total water consumption in agriculture	BE_Flanders
42	Biodiversity: protected forest	% FOWL protected to conserve biodiversity, landscapes and specific natural elements (MCPFE 4.9, classes 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 & 2)	Estimation of forest area that is within protected areas of the region, or in the Catalogue of Public Forests with protection purpose. Therefore, the forest area could be determined by crossing different maps in GIS. Using area of forest under forest stewardships	ES_Extremadura BE_Flanders

Source: Survey on the availability of regional data for common rural development indicators (Jan./Feb. 2013)

OVERVIEW TABLE – IDENTIFIED SOURCES AND APPROACHES

A) Objective related baseline indicators (2007-2013)

No	INDICATOR	MAIN CHALLENGES	IDENTIFIED SOURCES AND APPROACHES
11	Gross fixed capital formation in food industry	Desegregation of data for food industry	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National statistical service - Regional statistical service - Ministry of agriculture databases
13	Economic development in food industry	Desegregation of data for food industry	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National statistical service - Regional statistical service - Ministry of agriculture database - Statistical year book of the sector
15	Gross fixed capital formation in forestry	Disaggregation of data for forestry	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National statistical service - Regional statistical service - Ministry of agriculture database Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Testing samples of the forestry companies
17	Biodiversity: population of farmland birds	Not available	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional statistical service - Data sources of Environmental agencies - Other governmental institutions, e.g. such as Regional Museum of Natural Sciences Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data of non-governmental agencies e.g. Birdlife, ornithology society, National Society for the Study of Birds etc., which calculate population of birds associated to agro areas
18	Biodiversity: High value farmland and forestry	Not clear definition of the indicator Areas not defined for HV forestry Data only partially developed	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional statistical service - Ministry of agriculture data sources - Government agencies on nature conservation and protection Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NRN data collection - Data collection via application forms for direct payments of paying agencies
19	Biodiversity: Tree species composition	Not available	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional statistical service - National forestry inventory - Calculations based on data from a Statistical

No	INDICATOR	MAIN CHALLENGES	IDENTIFIED SOURCES AND APPROACHES
			<p>yearbook</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Calculations based on data from Ministry of agriculture - European Environmental agency CORINE databases
20	Water quality: Gross Nutrient Balance.	Disaggregation of national data	<p>Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research report of research centers, companies and universities which monitor the use of nitrogen in agriculture, - Ministry of agriculture data base <p>Approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NRN data collection - Proxy: The amount of individual fertilizers (N and K) applied at the utilized agricultural area (kg/ha).applied at the utilized agricultural area (kg/ha).
21	Water quality: Pollution by nitrates and pesticides	<p>Data for ground waters and pesticides not available</p> <p>Studies on individual parcels are available but do not conclusive results for RDP.</p>	<p>Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional environmental agencies databases - Regional statistical services <p>Approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ministry of agriculture reports on water quality and contamination by nitrates in underground and ground waters - Waste water and water management agencies data (Monitoring of water facilities , nitrates, pesticides according Directive 2000/60/EC) - Existing information from EC and European Parliament reports about the implementation of the Directive 91/676/CEE of the Counsel, concerning the protection of waters against pollution caused by nitrates from agricultural source. - Proxy (Nitrates): Average level of nitrate concentrates - % obtained from monitoring stations, considering the following classifications: < 25,25-50,>50mg NO3/L.
22	Areas at risk of soil erosion	Not available	<p>Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Calculations based on data for total soil loss by erosion
24	Climate change: Production of renewable energy from agriculture and forestry	<p>Not clear definition of the indicator</p> <p>Data not available</p>	<p>Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional environmental agency data <p>Approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studies based on the experimental parcels and estimation of regional values based on these parcels - Estimations on the basis of certificates for green energy

No	INDICATOR	MAIN CHALLENGES	IDENTIFIED SOURCES AND APPROACHES
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proxy: Share of renewable energy in gross power production (%) {Regional statistics} - Proxy: Estimations and own calculation based on hectares of different energy crops - Proxy: Production of renewable energy from biomass
25	Climate change: UAA devoted to renewable energy	Data not available	<p>Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional environmental agency data <p>Approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Estimations of regional values based on national statistics - Using databases of areas receiving direct payments - Proxy: Agriculture land covered with energy crops
26	Climate change/air quality: gas emissions from agriculture	<p>Disaggregation of data by source of emission</p> <p>Data for agriculture not available.</p>	<p>Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - JRC reports - National inventory of GHG emissions - Regional environmental agency data bases <p>Approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proxy: Estimation of CO2 emissions from main agricultural crops and exploitations based on the initiative "Less CO2" - Proxy: Approximations based on the other industry branches - Proxy: quantification of methane (CH4) emissions from enteric fermentation, in small regions where the main agricultural activity is cattle production.
28	Employment development in non-agriculture sector	Data not available	<p>Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National and regional data sources on employment disaggregated in Agriculture, livestock and fishing, industry, contraction and services, summing up employment in secondary and tertiary sectors (industry and services).
29	Economic development in non-agriculture sector	Data not available	<p>Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National and regional data sources on_GVA , aggregation of values of secondary and tertiary sector (industry and services).
32	Internet take-up in rural areas	Data not available	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eurostat data, - Information sources from various press media. - Regional Internet Networks and Telecommunication Service <p>Approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proxy: Approximation based on the number of households in rural areas with internet connection

No	INDICATOR	MAIN CHALLENGES	IDENTIFIED SOURCES AND APPROACHES
36	Development of local action groups	Data not available	<p>Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional statistic services - LAG registry - MTE results <p>Approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Calculation of the population of LEADER territories in the region.

B) Context related baseline indicators (2007-2013)

No	INDICATOR	MAIN CHALLENGES	IDENTIFIED SOURCES AND APPROACHES
5	Forestry structure	Data not available	<p>Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National forest inventory - Regional forest agency reports and data
6	Forest productivity	Data not available	<p>Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National forest inventory - Regional forest agency reports and data
8	Less Favoured Areas	Outdated Data	<p>Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National statistical services - Regional statistical services - Regional forest agency reports and data - Geographic information systems <p>Approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aggregation areas at NUTS 2 level in each one of the Less Favoured Areas.
9	Areas of extensive agriculture	Data not available	<p>Approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proxy: Using assumptions on labour intensity of extensive agriculture areas. - Proxy: Calculations based on the permanent pastures compared to the total crop area.
10	Natura 2000	Data not available	<p>Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional statistical services - Environmental agencies data sources - Red Europa reports, data sources - GIS database from National and regional agencies - Forest research institutes data sources <p>Approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For forestry and agriculture areas: Intersection of maps from CORINE Land Cover, Natura 2000 delimitations and Local Administrative Units

No	INDICATOR	MAIN CHALLENGES	IDENTIFIED SOURCES AND APPROACHES
			delimitations with agricultural census data.
11	Biodiversity: Protected forest	Data not available	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional statistical service and reports, - Forest research institutes data sources, - Environmental agencies data sources
12	Development of forest area	Data not available	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Forest Inventory - GIS database from regional and national agencies
13	Forest ecosystem	Data not available	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Forestry inventory - Regional forestry agency reports and databases - Red Europa database - INFC 2006 Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest reports, surveys and research
14	Water quality	Data not available	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DG ENV data sources - Ministry of agriculture sources - Regional forestry agency reports and databases Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Considering the areas marked s vulnerable for contamination with nitrates compared to total area. - Proxy: Approximation based on gross nutrient balance
16	Protective forests concerning primarily soil and water	Data not available	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ministry of agriculture data sources on reforested areas with protective function - National Forest Inventory - National statistical services - Regional forestry agency reports and databases Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forestry surveys and research - Using GIS database - Estimations based on the National inventory soil erosion report and the criteria established in the Regional Forest Plan in determining the maximum admissible erosion (t / ha / year) which require greater forest protection to ensure the protection and quality of soil and water.
23	Internet infrastructure	Not clear definition of the indicator Desegregation of	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional Network and Telecommunication Service

No	INDICATOR	MAIN CHALLENGES	IDENTIFIED SOURCES AND APPROACHES
		data by urban/rural	Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proxy: calculation of the share of households with the access to Internet

C) Common context indicator including impact indicators (2014-2020)

No	INDICATOR	MAIN CHALLENGES	IDENTIFIED SOURCES AND APPROACHES
CI 2	Structure of the Economy	Disaggregation by sector and branch	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National statistical sources - Regional statistical sources - Sectorial statistical yearbook. Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Using calculations GVA forestry: GVA primary sector – GVA agriculture
CI 3	Employment	Disaggregation by age	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sectorial statistical yearbook of the Ministry of Agriculture - National statistical service Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Using data from municipality level
CI 10	Agricultural entrepreneurial income	Not clear definition of the indicator Disaggregate GVA by sectors Data not available	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional statistical service Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disaggregating national data - Using national statistics (e.g. wages/employees) and comparing them with FADN calculations for comparing standards of living of farmers to the rest of economy
CI 11	Agricultural factor income	Not clear definition of the indicator	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional statistical service Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disaggregating national data
CI 12	Agricultural productivity	Not available Methodology not clearly defined in the fiches	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FADN Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proxy: (unit in €): Agricultural Production + Subsidies - Intermediate inputs
CI 13	Labour Productivity in agriculture	Not available Disaggregate GVA	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional statistical services.

No	INDICATOR	MAIN CHALLENGES	IDENTIFIED SOURCES AND APPROACHES
		by sectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National statistics data Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disaggregating national data - Proxy: Calculation based on GVA in primary sector and employment in primary sector.
CI 25	LFA	<p>Not clear definition of the indicator</p> <p>Disaggregation of data</p>	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disaggregating national data - Summing up the areas at NUTS 2 in level in each one of the Less Favoured Areas.
CI 28	Labour productivity in food industry	Not available	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sectorial statistical yearbook conducted by the Ministry of agriculture and environment. - Regional statistical services
CI 29	Labour productivity in forestry	Not available	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional statistical services
CI 30	Forest Area	Not available	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Statistical yearbook conducted by the Ministry of agriculture and environment - National Forest Inventory - Regional statistical services
CI 31	Production of renewable energy	Not available	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National statistical service Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Estimation by requesting companies registered as special energy producer to report on the energy produced from both crops. - Agriculture: information derived from databank of the investment funds
CI 32	GHG Emissions from agriculture	Not available	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National inventory report by the relevant Ministry. - JRC reports and data Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disaggregating national data
CI 33	Farmland Bird Index	Expected to be delivered	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional statistical services Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Society for the Study of Birds monitoring funded by the National Rural Network.

No	INDICATOR	MAIN CHALLENGES	IDENTIFIED SOURCES AND APPROACHES
CI 34	HNV	Expected to be delivered	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional statistical services Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NRN data collection methodology - Regional environmental protection agency - Using various evaluation studies - Using data collected via applications for direct payments
CI 35	Conservation Status of species	Expected to be delivered No data available	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional statistical services - Regional environmental protection agency data Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Qualitative data from Red Natura fiches from Regional environmental authorities (data only available for Natura areas)
CI 36	Conservation Status of habitats	Expected to be delivered	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional statistical services - Regional environmental protection agency data Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Qualitative data from Red Natura fiches from Regional environmental authorities (data only available for Natura areas)
CI37	Water abstraction in agriculture	Not available	Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proxy: Total water consumption in agriculture
CI 38	Water quality	Not available	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monitoring Reports developed by the water departments of the Ministry of agriculture and environment. - National Rural Network data collection methodology - EC and European parliament reports about the implementation of the Directive 91/676/CEE of the council, concerning the protection of waters against pollution caused by nitrates from agricultural sources.
CI 41	Natura 2000 areas	Not available	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional statistical services - Regional environmental protection agency data Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For forestry and agriculture areas: Intersection of maps from CORINE Land Cover, Natura 2000 delimitations and Local Administrative Units

No	INDICATOR	MAIN CHALLENGES	IDENTIFIED SOURCES AND APPROACHES
			delimitations with agricultural census data.
CI 42	Biodiversity: protected forest	<p>Not available</p> <p>Not clearly defined</p> <p>Disaggregation of national data</p>	<p>Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GIS database <p>Approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proxy: Estimation of forest area that is within protected areas of the region, or in the Catalogue of Public Forests with protection purpose. Therefore, the forest area could be determined by crossing different maps in GIS. - Proxy: Using area of forest under forest stewardships
CI 43	Degree of rural poverty	Disaggregation of data by rural	<p>Approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Calculations based on data on income at municipal level (NUTS 4). (It is import to see, in how far the sparsely populated areas need to be delimited.)
CI 44	Rural GDP per capita	Disaggregation of data by rural	<p>Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National statistical service (GDP and population) - Regional statistical services <p>Approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possible calculation using the DEGURBA approach - Estimate for rural areas is based on information at NUTS III level. When the NUTS III area is not entirely rural, the % of the resident population living in rural LAU2 areas is calculated. If more than 50% of the resident population of the NUTS III area lives in rural LAU2, the area is considered rural at NUTS III.
CI 47	Distribution of territory by type of region	Disaggregation of data by type of region	<p>Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local statistical services data bases <p>Approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approximation from statistics rural counties/urban districts
CI 48	Distribution of population by type of region	Disaggregation of data by type of region	<p>Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local statistical services data bases <p>Approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approximation from statistics rural counties/urban districts
CI 49	Distribution of GVA by type of region	Disaggregation of data by type of region	<p>Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local statistical services data bases <p>Approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approximation from statistics rural counties/urban

No	INDICATOR	MAIN CHALLENGES	IDENTIFIED SOURCES AND APPROACHES
			districts
CI 50	Distribution of GVA by type of region	Disaggregation by rural areas and age	Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National statistical services - Regional statistical services - Local statistical services data bases

Source: Survey on the availability of regional data for common rural development Indicators (Jan./Feb. 2013)

8. Annex 2: List of workshop participants

	Name	First Name	Country	Organisation
1.	ANGRISANI	Vincenzo	IT	Ecosfera
2.	BALLIN	Marco	IT	ISTAT
3.	BERLETTI	Maria	IT	Regione del Veneto
4.	BERTINI	Simone	IT	IRPET
5.	BOLLI	Martina	IT	INEA
6.	BUGLIONE	Augusto	IT	Ismea PRN
7.	BUSCEMI	Virgilio	IT	Ecosfera VIC
8.	CAGLIERO	Roberto	IT	Rete Rurale Nazionale
9.	CALVI	Gianpiero	IT	MITO2000
10.	CAMAIONI	Beatrice	IT	INEA
11.	CICCARELLI	Franca	IT	Ismea
12.	CISILINO	Federica	IT	INEA
13.	CORAZZA	Enrico	IT	ISRI
14.	CORREIA	Luz	PT	Gabinete de Planeamento e Políticas - MAMAOT
15.	CORTES-PAYA	Paloma	European Commission	
16.	CRISTIANO	Simona	IT	INEA
17.	DEIAGO	Luigi	IT	ISTAT
18.	DERZELLE	Christophe	European Commission	
19.	DESSERS	Rein	BE	IDEA Consult
20.	DUDEK	Monika	PL	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
21.	DUMEZ	Linn	BE	Flemish Government
22.	DUMONT	Valerie	Evaluation Helpdesk	
23.	D'URSO	Giuseppina	IT	Regione Lazio
24.	ELBE	Sebastian	DE	MEN-D Monitoring and Evaluation Network Agrarian Structure and Rural Development Germany
25.	FALCO	Luigi	IT	Cogea Srl
26.	FINO	Ernesto	IT	Agriconsulting
27.	FURLAN	Andrea	IT	Regione Emilia Romagna - Monitoring and evaluation unit
28.	GAROFALO	Franco	IT	Regione Umbria
29.	GRANADO DÍAZ	Rubén	ES	Agencia de Gestión Agraria y Pesquera de Andalucía
30.	HERNANDEZ LUQUE	Jose Manuel	European Commission	
31.	HOCEVAR	Vida	SI	Ministry of Agriculture and Environment
32.	ILIESCU	Camelia	RO	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
33.	KOLOS	Katalin	Evaluation Helpdesk	
34.	KOSOBUECKA	Edyta	PL	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
35.	MAIER	Leo	European Commission	
36.	MENGUZZATO	Angela	IT	Provincia Autonoma di Trento
37.	MONTELEONE	Alessandro	IT	INEA
38.	NIETO ANTON	Enrique Javier	Evaluation Helpdesk	
39.	OWCZAREK	Tomasz	PL	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
40.	PAGAN	Massimiliano	IT	Regione Veneto
41.	PAMPALUNA	Mery	IT	Regione Lombardia
42.	PEHKONEN	Eero	FI	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
43.	PEPIETTE	Zélie	European Commission	
44.	PORTA	Magda	PT	IESE - Instituto de Estudos Sociais e Económicos
45.	POVELLATO	Andrea	IT	INEA
46.	RICCI	Carlo	Evaluation Helpdesk	
47.	RODRIGUEZ	Paula	ES	Ministerio Agricultura

	Name	First Name	Country	Organisation
48.	ROSSI	Patrizia	IT	LIPU - BirdLife Italia
49.	SCHWARZ	Gerald	DE	Thünen Institute of Farm Economics
50.	SETTE	Manuela	IT	SIN
51.	SPECIALE	Sabrina	IT	Regione Marche
52.	STORTI	Daniela	IT	INEA
53.	STUART	Neil	UK	Welsh Government
54.	TENNA	Fabrizio	IT	Agriconsulting
55.	TRISORIO	Antonella	IT	INEA
56.	TUDINI	Lucia	IT	INEA
57.	TUINEA	Andreea	RO	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
58.	TVRDONOVA	Jela		Evaluation Helpdesk
59.	VENETO	Luisa	IT	Ecosfera VIC
60.	VILLIEN	Clément	FR	Ministry of Agriculture
61.	VINCENTINI	Christian	IT	Ministry of Agriculture
62.	WIMMER	Hannes		Evaluation Helpdesk