EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

WORKING PAPER

Monitoring-related questions re. result indicators

FINAL

1. MEASURES FOR WHICH REPORTING OBLIGATIONS ARE DEFINED WITH RESPECT TO RESULT INDICATORS # 2 AND #6

Some MS asked whether all the "related measures" proposed in the indicator fiches would need to have a clear contribution shown to the value-added result indicators (e.g. contribution of the investments in infrastructure to the GVA in the farm sector). Practice among MS already suggests that, if some of these measures are considered to have an insignificant contribution to given results, "0" can be filled in the corresponding monitoring tables.

'0' is normally used when there is no result achieved. However, when the MS considers that the calculation of the indicator is not relevant for a given measure, the MS should duly justify the reasons why. In that case, '0' is also used. This should only concern a small number of measures per given indicator (i.e. indicator #2/#6 is not relevant for measure x, whereas it could still be relevant for other measures which would then need values). The MA should make sure that this practice does not create gaps in the monitoring and evaluation scheme of their programme. In those cases, additional indicator(s) should be defined to allow a complete monitoring and evaluation.

2. REGISTRATION FREQUENCY (RAISED FOR GVA BUT CONCERNS OTHER RESULT INDICATORS)

The indicator fiches of result indicators #2 and #6 specify that surveys "should be at least scheduled in function of the evaluation moments of rural development programmes (mid term, ex post)". In turn, the indicator fiches of impact indicators #1 and #3 specify the registration and reporting frequency for these indicators in relation to the ex-ante, mid-term, and ex-post evaluations.

The Member States asked for clarifications as to when to conduct surveys among the programme beneficiaries, i.e. (i) on fixed dates or on a rolling basis (as applications are received/approved), and (ii) with what periodicity (once a year, once every two years etc.)?

In addition, the difficulties in reporting on these indicators on yearly basis create confusion about the demarcation line between result and impact indicators (i.e. between monitoring and evaluation).

With regard to the registration frequency of result indicators #2 and #6, the approach described below is recommended. It constitutes a well-balanced compromise because it maintains the workload at a reasonable level but, nevertheless, it ensures reliable and usable data to meet the objectives of monitoring and evaluation.

The minimum number of measurements for each project is two times, per application for support and upon completion of the project (for example see table below). To be able to measure a real change of GVA, it seems a relevant practice to measure the achievement 2 years after completion of project (n+2). For projects completed after 2013, the measurement should be done for the last annual report due in 2015.

As a data source, the CMEF suggests Member States to carry out surveys. The findings of these surveys should allow as much as possible a yearly update of the result indicator tables by at least filling in projects reaching n+2.

The surveys should be made at the most appropriate moments given the nature of the project funded by a given measure (2 years after completion of the project). This means that the mid-term and ex-post evaluations will take into account all projects that have been measured up to the moment of the respective evaluation event and will assess the trends on the basis of the figures provided. They will also provide the relevant interpretations.

How to fill in the tables[1]

According to the CMEF fiche (Guidance note I, pages 5 and 14), the reporting of this indicator should start upon completion of the project. In the following example we show how the result table could be filled in:

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Holding a		Application/completion GVA 240,000		(n+2) GVA 250,000					
Holding b		Application/completion GVA 160,000 completion		(n+2) GVA 155,000					
Holding c			Application /completion GVA 100,000 completion		(n+2) GVA 150,000				
Holding d[2]				Application GVA 80,000	Completion		(n+2) GVA 120,000		
Sum cumulative increase (Δ) of GVA				**+5,000**	**+55,000**	**+55,000**	**+95,000**	...	...

"n+2" = time two years after completion of the project

[1] All the result indicators have to be reported cumulatively in the monitoring tables.

[2] Holding d illustrates how to fill in the table when application for funds and completion of the project do not fall into the same year (e.g. application in November and completion in April of the following year).

2.1. Same type of question about the result indicator 'increase of jobs'.

The same approach as described under 2 should be applied for the result indicator 'increase of jobs'.

Two measurements should be done: per application for support and upon completion of the project (e.g. n+2). Reporting should follow the same format as in the above table. Interpretation will fall under the responsibility of the evaluators at the moment of the main evaluation events (mid-term and the ex-post evaluation).

3. DOUBLE COUNTING AND PERIODICITY OF THE FOLLOWING INDICATOR: AREA UNDER SUCCESSFUL AGRICULTURAL/FORESTRY LAND MANAGEMENT (R6) (QUESTION NOT RAISED DURING THE EEN)

Indicator "Area under successful agricultural/forestry land management contributing to biodiversity, water quality, mitigating climate change, soil quality, avoidance of marginalisation and land abandonment (ha)":

1) Frequency: should we cumulate the areas every year, in that case the first areas reported in year 2008 would be counted every year?

2) Is double counting allowed? It might be very difficult to isolate only one predominant objective

3) ' Successful land management ' How should be interpreted this definition? Are any examples available?

1)

For this indicator, the cumulative aggregation of the areas should follow the same approach used for the output area indicators. Areas should be captured in the year of the first payment. Each year the previous supported areas are retrieved and only the new areas are added (example)

Example (i.e. for water management)

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
214 Plot A (50)	50	50	50	50	50	/	/	/	/
214 Plot B (80)	/	80	80	80	80	80	/	/	/
214 Plot C (25)	/	/	25	25	25	25	25	/	/

The monitoring table is filled in as following (i.e. for water management):

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Total	50	130	155	155	155	155	155	155	155

2) This question has been replied as follows in the FAQs provided to the MS in 2007:

'The number of hectares under a measure that contributes to several objectives mentioned in table R.6 should be reported under each of the objectives it contributes to. This will entail indeed a double counting. '

3) This question has been replied as follows in the FAQs provided to the MS in 2007:

'Successful land management should fulfil the conditions that are required by the commitment and/or the measure. It is a measurement of the extent to which necessary practices for biodiversity, water quality and climate change have been carried out.'

4. PROBLEMS IN ESTABLISHING TARGET LEVELS (RAISED FOR GVA BUT COULD CONCERN OTHER RESULT INDICATOR)

One Member State also pointed out that the requirement of establishing target levels for the impact indicators at the level of single measures brings limited added value compared to the resources to be allocated for doing so.

The assessment of impact is built up from the outputs and results of individual measures through the hierarchy of objectives. Therefore, it is a good practice to establish target levels at measure level, at least for those measures that have a significant contribution to a given impact. Definition of impacts targets at measure level is not collected/aggregated at EU-27.

5. VALUES TO BE INCLUDED IN THE MONITORING TABLES FOR THE INDICATOR GVA (R2 AND R6)

a) The units of measurement in the indicator fiches of result indicators # 2 and #6 indicate "euros", hence suggesting absolute values. This (also corroborated by the registration/reporting frequencies) gives rise to at least the following reporting possibilities:

– report the *changes* in the absolute GVA value for the aggregated beneficiary population in the given period: yearly/biannual/(other frequency);

– report the absolute GVA *values* for the aggregated beneficiary population, achieved over a period of one/two/ (other frequency) years.

b) Moreover, the formula presented in the "collection method" of the result indicator fiches indicates an average value per beneficiary (supported holding), which creates further uncertainties about whether *aggregate* or *average* values are required for the monitoring tables.

a) 'Change vs total'

The indicator is called 'Increase of GVA', therefore it is requested to report the changes in the GVA in Euros.

Otherwise, using the total GVA would have required separate tables in the APR between the total GVA when the application is approved and upon completion of the project.

'Absolute value *vs ratio*'

It is requested to report the indicators in absolute values because they are intended to support the assessment of the direct effects of the money spent through the concerned RD measures on the economic performance of the beneficiaries of these measures. *Mutatis mutandi*, the same reasoning applies for other result indicators. Where relevant, the absolute values will be used to calculate relevant ratios by using the output indicators (e.g. with respect to n° of beneficiaries, or with respect to the money spent). The comparison between the result indicator defined as an absolute value and the output indicators (expenditures, number of holdings supported…) will allow assessing the indicators in relative term.

Additional (programme-specific) result indicators per AWU or per FTE can be provided by the MS. In the case of the corresponding impact indicators (#1 and # 3), these have to be calculated in PPS and per FTE, for the purpose of comparability (see page 14 and 15 of the EC working paper 'Definitions (measurement) of the CMEF Gross Value Added indicators').

b) The CMEF fiche (see attached draft fiche) is adapted to define the indicator as an aggregation of all the beneficiaries to be in line with the improving RDP targets exercise (initiated in December 2008). It allows an easier aggregation at EU level. Moreover, it is always possible to calculate the average with the output indicator 'number of holdings supported'.

6. LEVEL OF COLLECTION (RAISED FOR GVA BUT CONCERNS OTHER RESULT)

The indicator fiches of result indicators #2 and #6 suggest, as collection method/good practice, to collect output and intermediate consumption "per supported holdings". This is interpreted by some Member States as an obligation to collect data for *each* supported holding (i.e. to survey *all* beneficiaries), which is considered excessively burdening.

In addressing this question during the meeting, the Commission opened to the possibility of resorting to data collection methods based on relevant samples of beneficiaries, in view of increasing the cost-effectiveness of data collection systems at national/regional level. However, this should be clearly agreed and communicated to the Member States.

The use of samples could be accepted. It is under the responsibility of the MS to ensure the reliability and accuracy of the method applied for the sample definition and the indicator estimation.

7. GVA DEFINITION, TRANSITION

Some Member States asked what had to be done with the data collected before the adaptation of the definition as discussed at the meeting in June. Should the data be corrected and how will it be compared?

As regards the GVA baseline indicators, no change of the baseline indicators is requested. However, MS should be careful when comparing baseline trends with result indicators trends given the differences in their estimation (see point c., page 4 of the EC working paper).

As regards the GVA result indicators, the result indicators should be adapted including also those which have been measured before the change of the 'proxy' definition. Following the FADN methodology, the new proxy has to be calculated as: total output (SE 131) - total intermediate consumption (SE 275) (see answer to question 17, page 10 of the EC working paper), which allows for an immediate use of FADN data. If in previous years the result indicators have been estimated in terms of

- "Gross Farm Income" (SE 410): the estimated figures have to be revised by substracting the "balance of current subsidies and taxes" (SE 600)

- "Farm Net Value Added" (SE 415): the estimated figures have to be revised by substracting the "balance of current subsidies and taxes" (SE 600) and adding the "depreciation" (SE 360).

Please contact the DG AGRI services if you need some technical help.

ANNEX: CUMULATIVE REPORTING OF THE RESULT INDICATORS, EXAMPLES FOR SOME RESULT INDICATORS

a) Result indicator #10 'population in rural areas benefiting from improved services' and #11 'increase in internet penetration in rural areas'.

For these both indicators, a unique number of persons should be reported. The monitoring tables should be filled in cumulatively as following:

Example (for #10)

The project A, once completed, provides new services to a population of 50.000 people in 2009. By 2010, another project B provides new services to 10.00 people and finally in 2011, 60.000 people have access to new services supported by project C.

	2009	2010	2011	…
Project A	50.000	/	/	…
Project B	/	10.000	/	…
Project C	/	/	60.000	…

The monitoring table is filled in as following:

	2009	2010	2011	…
TOTAL	50.000	60.000	120.000	…

NB: In #10, the same population could be counted several times but only if this population get access to different services supported under different RD actions.

For #11, the same population should never be double counted because there is only one type of service (internet penetration).

b) Result indicator #4 'value of agricultural production under recognized quality label/standards'

Here, a value expressed as total market value of the agricultural production under recognized quality label/standards and supported by related RD measures should be reported upon completion of the project.

Example (for #4)

In 2009, project A is finished and the value of the production is 10 million. By 2010, project B has finished supporting a production of 20 million. Finally, in 2011, the project C supported for 5 million of agricultural product.

	2009	2010	2011	…
Project A	10.000.000	/	/	…
Project B	/	20.000.000	/	…
Project C	/	/	5.000.000	…

The monitoring table is filled in as following:

	2009	2010	2011	…
TOTAL	10.000.000	30.000.000	35.000.000	…