



Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the CAP post-2020

Lessons learned current CMEF – Points raised by Member States

Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP
Brussels, 12 March 2018

DG Agriculture and Rural Development
European Commission

#FutureofCAP



Discussion on data quality/reliability:

- DE: reliability of data from PA-database, clarify data in PA, tasks for certifying authorities are increasing*
- FR: break-down of indicators considerably complicate the system: will this be reproduced?*
- FR: Changes of methodologies create problems in data-reliability; how will data be consolidated? What is expected to ensure data reliability?*
- EL: Usefulness of PA-data: adjustments needed? CATS data is reliable*
- FI: How to address if no indicator values in the starting phase of projects (if not yet paid)*
- BE: Same indicator definition important: when has data to be collected? If only one CAP plan, aggregation is more difficult for regionalized MS*
- SE: Announce early the data-requirements to integrate them well in IT system*

Discussion on data quality/reliability :

- LV: Different methodologies are a problem; clearly define methodologies and baseline*
- IT: Which is the data the MS have to report? FADN data available only with 2 years of delay; system seems to be based on Pillar 1 not well adjusted to 2nd Pillar; effects of 2nd pillar are under-estimated.*
- IT: Single CAP plan goes back to one-size-fits-all: complex for implementation (in regionalized MS)*
- IE: Counting operations not yet completed ? Are certifying bodies only certifying output indicators (in x-tables) or also impact indicators?*
- DE: Use of PA-data does not fit for annual reporting (as delay of 3 years occurs); for area-based measures also delay for AEM; would also need a plausibility check (for areas)*

Further comments can be sent to: Agri-evaluation@ec.europa.eu