



**EUROPEAN COMMISSION**  
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Directorate C. Strategy, simplification and Policy Analysis  
**Director**

Brussels,  
Agri.ddg1.c.4(2018) 5736541

## **MINUTES**

### ***14<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP***

***Date: 19 September 2018***

Chair: Ms Christina Gerstgrasser

Delegations present: All Member States were present, except Bulgaria, Cyprus and Lithuania.

#### **1. Approval of the minutes of the last meeting**

Ms Gerstgrasser chairs the meeting, welcomes participants and announces the available interpretations.

She invites participants to bring forward any suggestions for modifications of the minutes of the 13<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP, held on 12 March 2018.

No modifications are requested, and the minutes of the previous meeting are approved.

#### **2. Adoption of the agenda**

Ms Gerstgrasser asks if changes in the meeting's agenda are requested and explains that the meeting is an opportunity to clarify the legislative proposals for the CAP 2021 - 2027, particularly the CAP Strategic Plan. This clarification takes place in parallel to the discussions in the Council Working Party and with the European Parliament.

No changes to the meeting's agenda are proposed, and the agenda is approved.

#### **3. Nature of the meeting**

The Expert Group meeting is open to appointed representatives of the Member States. The meeting documents and presentations are available on <https://circabc.europa.eu>.

#### **4. List of points discussed**

##### **4.1 Information**

Ms Gerstgrasser informs about:

- The "[Proposed Simplification - SFC2014 EAFRD AIR technical guidance](#)" for Chapter 7 of the Annual Implementation Reports to be submitted in 2019 has been uploaded on

CIRCAbc, as announced during the 12<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Expert Group held on 8 February 2018. The SFC-template takes into account the comments received by the Member States;

- The [Community-Led Local Development \(CLLD\) Evaluation Handbook for Local Action Groups \(LAGs\) and Fishery Local Action Groups \(FLAGs\)](#) has been uploaded on CIRCAbc. It is available in English, French, German, Italian, Spanish and Polish. The Evaluation Handbook has been prepared by the European Commission DG MARE and its support unit FARNET, in coordination with other Directorate Generals. The Handbook contains practical guidelines for the self-assessment of multi-funded or mono-funded LAGs or FLAGs (whereas the Guidelines ‘Evaluation of LEADER/CLLD, prepared by the Evaluation Helpdesk apply exclusively to LAGS funded by EARFD).
- The *Staff Working Document of the Evaluation of the CAP Greening Measures* will not be presented in the meeting. If Member States wish a presentation during the next meeting of the Expert Group on 21 November 2018, they are invited to send an email to [AGRI-EVALUATION@ec.europa.eu](mailto:AGRI-EVALUATION@ec.europa.eu).

## 4.2 CAP post-2020: presentation of Commission proposals

### (a) Overview: A shift from compliance to performance

Ms Gerstgrasser passes the floor to Ms Florence Buchholzer (DG AGRI, Advisor, Directorate C - Strategy, simplification and policy analysis) who gave a presentation entitled ‘*Overview - A shift from compliance to performance*’ on the [Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the rules on support for CAP Strategic Plans](#) (hereafter ‘legislative proposal’).

### (b) The CAP Strategic Plan

Ms Gerstgrasser passes the floor to Mr Ricard Ramon i Sumoy (DG AGRI, Unit C.1 - Policy perspectives) who gave a presentation entitled ‘*The CAP Strategic Plan. Towards a more performance-oriented CAP*’, followed by a presentation by Mr Guido Castellano (DG AGRI, Unit F.1 - Conception and consistency of rural development) on ‘*The Performance Framework in the CAP Strategic Plan Legislative proposal*’ (see [PPTs](#)).

*After the presentation, Member States' delegates raised the following questions:*

#### **Coverage of CAP specific objectives in CAP Strategic Plans**

Spain asks if the CAP Strategic Plans should address all the CAP specific objectives or if the Member States can select some of them.

*The Commission clarifies that the number of CAP specific objectives to be addressed in the CAP Strategic Plan should be based on the results of the SWOT analysis and the assessment of needs, which are carried out over all the nine CAP specific objectives.*

#### **Approval of the CAP Strategic Plan**

Spain asks to learn more about the approval procedure for the CAP Strategic Plans and the criteria to assess the annual milestones and targets set out by the Member States in the CAP Strategic Plans.

*The Commission reminds that Article 106(2) of the legislative proposal lays out the criteria against which the CAP Strategic Plans will be assessed. The approval will be based on the evidence collected in the SWOT analysis and need assessment.*

#### **Common set of indicators included in the basic acts**

Belgium, Germany, Greece, Denmark, Portugal, Spain and Slovenia suggest adding the common set of indicators in the basic acts, including the common context indicators. Belgium also asks to include indicators' fiches in the basic act. This list should be stable for the whole programming period, and the methodology and data requirements should be included. The information should be made available within short time in order to be able to start drafting the CAP Strategic Plans.

*The Commission explains that there is no intention of continuously changing the indicators in the performance framework. Although Article 7(2) empowers the Commission to adopt delegated acts to adapt the common list of indicators, these adaptations will be made only if needed.*

### **Common context indicators**

Spain suggests that common context indicators should be in line with the common impact indicators. The data for their calculation should be based on existing and official data sources and be available also at regional level.

*The Commission reminds that the list of indicators proposed in Annex I to the legislative proposal is based on the experiences of the current common monitoring and evaluation framework (CMEF), as well as on existing information and data sources. Moreover, new indicators address emerging challenges, such as those related to biodiversity, pesticides, and antibiotics.*

### **Link between interventions, indicators and objectives**

Belgium, Greece and Spain asked for further information on how to link the indicators and objectives in the CAP Strategic Plan. Spain asks if a specific intervention can be linked to more than one output or result indicators. Belgium asks for clear instructions on how to link the interventions with result indicators in order to ensure comparability across the Member States. Greece asks if one intervention can be linked to several specific objectives.

*The Commission explains that each intervention has a one-to-one relationship with an output indicator. Based on the intervention logic, one intervention can however be related to one or more result indicators. For example, an intervention supporting renewable energy could contribute to different economic and environmental objectives of the CAP Strategic Plan. Within the new CAP delivery model, the Member States will design the linkages between interventions, indicators and objectives based on the results of their SWOT analysis and the assessment of needs. The Commission will not pre-establish linkages for the Member States.*

### **Setting up of targets and annual milestones**

Denmark asks for more clarifications and guidelines on how to set the targets and annual milestones, e.g. can national instruments be included and what is the proposed incentive mechanism in Article 115.

Greece asks if annual milestones should be set out at the target plan of the CAP Strategic Plan and for each result indicator. Greece suggests that the performance review can be focused on a small set of annual milestones and result indicators, such as those listed in Annex XII to the legislative proposal. Greece also asks if targets and annual milestones should be set out in the SWOT analysis or ex-ante evaluation.

Austria asks if annual milestones should be set out also at the level of outputs. Spain needs more information on who needs to do what between the Commission and regionalised Member States.

Belgium expresses concern about the frequency of setting annual milestones and felt complexity of the proposed system. The delegation also expresses doubts about the utility of setting actions plans in case of missing the targets.

*The Commission explains that the core set of indicators set out in Annex XII to the legislative proposal is established in accordance with Article 128 of the same legislation. The Commission will report information on these indicators to the European Parliament and the European Council for accountability reasons. Although the Member States provide the relevant information to collect these indicators, the reporting on this core list of indicators is under the Commission's responsibility.*

*The Commission clarifies that the performance clearance is based on output indicators and consists of checking the budget expenditure with respect to the output achieved. The performance review is based on result indicators and consists of annually checking the results achieved with respect to the planned targets and annual milestones.*

*The Commission explains that accordance with the legislative proposal, targets and annual milestones should be set out in the CAP Strategic Plan, therefore at national level. The Commission is aware that several interventions of the CAP Strategic Plans will be implemented at regional level and the Member*

States will work to aggregate the regional achievements in national figures to be sent to the Commission. The Commission invites the Member States to send written questions on the performance framework to [AGRI-EVALUATION@ec.europa.eu](mailto:AGRI-EVALUATION@ec.europa.eu)

### **Performance clearance vs. performance review**

Hungary asks clarifications as regards the procedures in case of a 25% gap between the reported values of one or more result indicators and the respective annual milestones, as established in Article 121 of the legislative proposal. This concerns the relationship between Article 52(2) and Article 39 of the [Proposal for a Regulation on the financing, management and monitoring of the common agricultural policy](#) (hereinafter CAP horizontal regulation).

Denmark asks for the performance review process to be regulated in more detail in the basic act.

*The Commission clarifies that in the context of the annual performance review, the distance between the annual results indicators and the annual milestones is checked and, if higher than 25%, the Commission may ask the Member State to establish an action plan to resolve cases of under-performance. If the Member State carries out the action plan correctly, no further actions will be required. If problems occur in the conduction of the action plan, the Commission may suspend the payments in relation to those results. The suspension mechanisms are set out in the CAP horizontal regulation.*

### **Simplification of the CAP delivery model**

Poland asks which kind of simplification can be expected with the new delivery model for the Member States and beneficiaries. Poland stresses that the design of interventions in the CAP Strategic Plans will require the definition of criteria, even if these are not set out anymore at the EU level. Italy underlines that simplification depends also on the clarity as regards the information to be exchanged and on the transparency on the criteria for the assessment of CAP Strategic Plans by the European Commission.

*The Commission explains that simplification of the CAP delivery model has reduced the scope of the rules set out at EU level. While specific details need to be defined by Member States, they have more flexibility to adapt to their specific needs and to reduce the administrative burden for beneficiaries. There will remain a link between beneficiaries and the Commission through EU support, EU supporting networks, such as the European Innovation Partnership (EIP) for Agricultural Productivity and Sustainability, and the provision of data and information for monitoring and evaluation.*

### **Role of audit**

Poland asks for information on the role of audit. It believes that the compliance of the beneficiaries with the criteria set out for the specific interventions at the Member States level is fundamental, regardless if these are defined at EU level.

*The Commission explains that the new delivery model of the CAP 2021 – 2027 reduces the audit relationship between the EU and the beneficiaries. The legislative proposal does not define the eligibility conditions at level of beneficiaries but defines broad types of intervention. The EU audit will focus on the systems required to carry out the broad types of interventions.*

### **Performance Framework**

Poland asks if the Member States need to define the performance framework within the CAP Strategic Plan or in a separate document.

*The Commission explains that the elements of the CAP Strategic Plans are detailed in Article 95 of the legislative proposal. The performance framework is not a separate section but some elements will be included in the CAP Strategic Plan (e.g. targets and annual milestones established in relation to the CAP specific objectives). Other elements of the performance framework will not be included in the CAP Strategic Plan, such as the evaluation plan to be submitted only to the Monitoring Committee.*

### **Timeline for comprehensive evaluation**

Poland believes that the Member States should submit their comprehensive evaluations of the CAP Strategic Plan earlier than 31 December 2031. In this way, the Commission could use the findings of the

comprehensive evaluations also for the ex post evaluation, which shall be presented by the Commission no later than 31 December 2031. Moreover, Poland and Portugal ask clarifications as regards the exact meaning of the term “comprehensive evaluation” and if it shall be agreed with the Commission.

*The Commission clarifies that, during the programming period, the Member States may carry out evaluations on specific elements of the CAP Strategic Plans (e.g. environment and climate actions). However, at the end of the programming period, a comprehensive evaluation should be carried out over all the objectives set out in the CAP Strategic Plans.*

### **Result indicators**

Spain and Poland ask if the Member States will be required to measure all result indicators listed in Annex I to the legislative proposal or if only those that are relevant for the specific CAP Strategic Plans’ intervention logic and the data availability in the Member States.

*The Commission informs that the Member States should calculate only the output and result indicators linked to the interventions and objectives pursued in their CAP Strategic Plans. Result indicators should be quantified only if a relevant intervention is foreseen in the CAP Strategic Plan.*

### **Performance review**

Austria, Belgium, Germany, and Slovenia fear that the development of an action plan in case of underperformance may create an administrative burden for both the Commission and the Member States. Austria, Germany and Belgium ask for an open and flexible dialogue, and a less formal approach for the performance review. The Netherlands suggest to keep the performance mechanism of the current programming period. France questions the relevance of an action plan in case there is no risk to the fund.

*The Commission reminds that an action plan will not be automatically requested from the Member State in case of a 25% gap between the achieved results and the planned annual milestones. If the Member State does provide reasonable justifications and evidence on the distance with the planned annual milestones, the Commission may not ask an action plan. The Commission reminds that the performance review will be based on the annual performance report, in which the Member States have the opportunity to provide besides the values on the result indicators, also possible explanations and justifications.*

### **Common Evaluation Questions**

Greece asks if a list of common evaluation questions will be defined at EU level.

### **Support for drafting the CAP Strategic Plan**

Slovenia asks for guidelines on the ex-ante evaluation and a template of the CAP Strategic Plan to start the preparatory works soon.

### **Sectorial programmes in the CAP Strategic Plan**

Slovenia asks how the current sectorial plans, such as the honey and bees programme, wine and school scheme, fit into the CAP Strategic Plan.

*The Commission explains that sectorial programmes, such as apiculture, shall be integrated in the CAP Strategic Plans under the sectorial interventions. This is justified by the fact that apiculture can provide contributions to several objectives, including biodiversity. Output indicator O.35 is related to the actions for beekeeping preservation/improvement. As concerns the school programmes (e.g. school fruit and milk schemes), these are not included in the legislative proposal on CAP Plans mainly because they follow their own planning, financing, governance, and monitoring arrangements. Although these schemes are not formally integrated in the legislative proposal, the Member State may consider them in the CAP Strategic Plan, for instance, in the SWOT analysis, the assessment of needs on societal demand, food and nutrition, etc.*

### **Evaluations during the programming period**

The Netherlands and Portugal ask if an interim evaluation is obligatory for the Member States. The Netherlands are concerned that the deadline of 2023 might be too early. Hungary believes that the SWOT

analysis, assessment of needs, ex-ante evaluation, and the annual performance reviews are a sufficient analysis to prove that the CAP Strategic Plans are well designed and functioning, therefore, the purpose of an interim evaluation to be carried out at the Member States level should be reconsidered. Hungary asks to clarify the relationship between the interim evaluation to be carried out by the Commission and the annual performance review and interim evaluations to be carried out by the Member States.

*The Commission explains that an interim evaluation is not mandatory for the Member States. The Member States have the obligation to develop an evaluation plan in which the timeline of the evaluations to be carried out during the programming period are set out. In accordance with Article 127 of the legislative proposal, the interim evaluation to be carried out by the end of the third year following the start of the implementation of the CAP Strategic Plan is under the responsibility of the Commission. The Commission will carry out the interim evaluation based on the available evidence and information from Member States. This does not imply that an interim evaluation will be requested from the Member States.*

### **Certifying bodies on data quality**

Germany highlights that certification bodies are expected to examine and validate the data on the financial expenditure and the output indicators which are submitted by the Member States to the Commission. As the development of the IT systems will need to start soon, German asks, if for this purpose the existing definitions are considered sufficient or if each Member State is expected to develop its own detailed definitions. France asks to clarify how the certification bodies will have to check the data concerning financial expenditures, output indicators, and progresses towards the achievement of annual milestones.

### **Indicators for investments**

The Netherlands ask if further indicators for interventions related to investments (Art. 68 of the legislative proposal) will be made available. Specifically, it should be clarified if the Output Indicator O.18 set out in Annex I to the legislative proposal can be used for different types of investments supported by the CAP Strategic Plans, or if the Member States can design their own indicators in their national information system.

*The Commission explains that under the broad types of intervention related to investments, the Member States can design different interventions based on their SWOT analysis and assessment of needs. Depending on how a Member State designs its intervention logic, the interventions related to investments can be linked to different output and result indicators set out in Annex I to the legislative proposal. For example, in the case of the Output Indicator O.18, the Member State should report the number of supported on-farm productive investments and the related financial expenditure in the annual performance clearance. The contribution towards one or more result indicators will depend on the very nature of the on-farm productive investments that have been supported and how they fit in the intervention logic designed in the given CAP Strategic Plan.*

### **CAP Strategic Plans' sections related to modernisation and simplification**

Italy asks what the Commission expects to be described in the CAP Strategic Plan sections on 'elements that ensure modernisation of the CAP' (=section g) and 'elements related to simplification and reduced administrative burden for final beneficiaries' (=section h).

*The Commission explains that it is up to the Member State to decide the content of the CAP Strategic Plan sections on modernisation and simplification. The Commission is responsible for setting out the CAP common and specific objectives. The Member State should, based on its reality, define the CAP Strategic Plan to achieve these objectives. The Member States have already gained experience with the delivery of the Rural Development Programmes, as well as with CAP Pillar I support. The new CAP delivery model does not aim to reinvent the wheel but requires the Member States to bring more coherence and consistency between the CAP Pillar I and II. The Commission asks the Member States to focus their attention on the bigger picture, such as the CAP objectives, the system to assess its performance, and how the whole CAP can deliver better towards the Sustainable Development Goals and other climate-change and environmental commitments.*

### **Responsibility for evaluation of CAP Strategic Plan**

Hungary asks if the evaluations of the CAP Strategic Plans during the implementation period and ex post are under the responsibility of the Member State, the Managing Authority, or the functionally independent experts.

*The Commission explains that the annual performance review is a bilateral process between the Commission and the Member State in which the progress towards the achievement of annual milestones and targets is assessed. Differently, the evaluation of the CAP Strategic Plan is under the responsibility of the Member State and is set out in the evaluation plan to be submitted to the Monitoring Committee. The Member State should entrust functionally independent experts to carry out the evaluations. The Commission is not responsible of approving the evaluations carried out in the Member States on the CAP Strategic Plans. The Commission is responsible for carrying out evaluations of the CAP and can rely on the information available in the Member States.*

### **Timeframe of the last Annual Performance Report in 2030**

Hungary highlights that the final annual performance report to be submitted by 15 February 2030 covers the previous financial year until 15 October 2029. Therefore, it is unclear how the expenditure between 16 October 2029 and 31 December 2029 will be accounted.

*The Commission takes note of the remark.*

## **4.3 State of play of the CMEF indicators**

### **(a) Publication of the indicators and visualisation tool**

Ms Marijke Van Schagen (DG AGRI, Unit C.2 - Analysis and Outlook) presents the ‘State of Play of the CMEF indicators’.

Ms Sophie Helaine (DG AGRI, Unit C.2 - Analysis and Outlook) presents dashboards which visualise the trends in the CAP indicators. The dashboards are interactive and currently still in a testing phase. Before their publication, various data has to be aggregated and data quality issues will have to be checked. The dashboards are visualisations of indicators organised by main topic. One topic corresponds to one dashboard. There are nine dashboards in total covering the Member State level. The icons are those used in the [communication on the future of food and farming](#) and the legislative proposal of the future CAP. Dashboards put together different databases, including CAP Pillar I and II. Each dashboard will be accompanied by a fiche providing information on the indicator.

Dashboards on complementary result indicators were not produced because not all Member States provided data in the Annual Implementation Reports submitted in 2017, or because the aggregation was not possible due to different units reported.

*For the next meeting of the Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP (on 21 November 2018), the Commission invites the Member States to share ideas and experiences on how to improve the quality of reporting on data and in particular how to address issues highlighted during the presentation and send them to [AGRI-EVALUATION@ec.europa.eu](mailto:AGRI-EVALUATION@ec.europa.eu)*

### **(b) Lessons learnt**

*The Commission closes the session by stressing that the publication of indicators and the visualisation tool represents a very important transparency exercise for the CAP. It is the first time that information on rural development programmes is available and comparable among the Member States. Moreover, the Commission stresses also the importance of reducing errors in data collection. Human errors will always exist, but some technical improvements are possible by working on common methodologies used across different Member States. This requires serious efforts and the current CMEF should be the starting point to move towards a new system for monitoring and evaluating the CAP performance.*

*After the presentation, Member State’s delegates raised the following questions:*

### **Relationship with data published on Cohesion Policy website**

Germany asks how the data on rural development programmes presented on the Cohesion Policy's website is related to the data shown in the dashboards that will soon be published on the DG AGRI's website. Germany would like to know if Cohesion Policy Open Data Portal will no longer present the data on the rural development funds.

*The Commission clarifies that both data visualisation tools will be kept in place and coordinated.*

#### **4.4 Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (PMEF)**

##### **(a) Context/Impact indicators + draft new/modified fiches**

Ms Gerstgrasser opens the session on the context and impact indicators and the indicators fiches uploaded on CIRCabc. She recalls that indicators will be discussed in an upcoming Working Council Party's meeting and that further explanations will be given during the next meeting of the Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP on 21 November 2018.

Ms Gerstgrasser passes the floor to Ms Helaine who gives the presentation on 'Impact and Context indicators'. She informs that the material uploaded on CIRCabc contain the list of 48 context indicators, including the 28 impact indicators set out in Annex I to the legislative proposal as well as a set of fiches. Among these 48 indicators, 6 context indicators and 12 impact indicators require the elaboration of new fiches. No new data will be required, however, there is need to improve data quality and completeness for some indicators. The new indicators will rely on data already collected by existing sources, such as ESTAT and other DGs. The fiches uploaded on CIRCabc are not yet finalised but provide an idea on how the Commission intends to develop the new indicators.

Commission representatives gives a more detailed presentation on a number of impact indicators (see PPT)

*After the presentation, Member States' delegates raised the following questions:*

##### **Stability of the list of context indicators**

Germany believes that it is problematic to present context indicators to the Member States that are still under development. In order to be used by Member States, the context indicators should be tested, be clearly described and remain stable throughout the programming period.

*The Commission explains that although some of the context indicators are still under development, they will in each case rely on existing data sources. Therefore, the basic data and information is already available to the Member States to carry out the SWOT analysis and the assessment of needs.*

##### **Replacement of High Nature Value farming indicator**

Germany asks why the High Nature Value (HNV) farming indicator has been replaced by a new indicator while considerable time and money has been invested by the Member States.

*The Commission explains that the indicator on High Nature Value (HNV) farming was difficult to be compared across Member States. However, Germany may still consider to use this indicator in the assessment of needs or as additional indicator.*

##### **Impact Indicator I.24 A fairer CAP: Improve the distribution of CAP support**

Hungary asks how the fairness in the distribution of CAP support will be measured. Hungary believes that redistribution of funds from larger to smaller farmers can lead to larger farms splitting up and adapt towards a policy supporting smaller farms. Therefore, this approach risks to channel the funds towards less efficient, hobby, and subsistence farms, which do not generate income. Hungary considers that some indicators are in contradiction with each other (e.g. fairness vs farm income).

*The Commission explains that indicators are proposed to meet certain objectives. The indicators should be seen in the overall policy context. The discussion on the indicator I.24 should take place when assessing the policy effectiveness and efficiency, and how the Member States have met the objective. Fairness will be assessed by a series of indicators which can be combined in different ways.*

##### **Names of indicators set out in Annex I to the legislative proposal**



Austria believes that the names of the indicators set out in Annex I to the legislative proposal are confusing as they are formulated like policy objectives. For instance, impact indicator I.06 *Increasing farm productivity* looks like an objective rather than the name of an indicator.

*The European Commission informs that names of proposed indicators cannot be discussed here but may still be subject to modifications.*

#### **Timeline for measurement of indicators**

Luxembourg and Austria argue that several economic and environmental indicators are difficult to be measured on an annual basis. Poland asks to clarify when the result and impact indicators will have to be assessed by the Member States and when the net value shall be measured. Denmark asks if the impact indicators will be used only in the context of the interim and ex-post evaluation.

*The Commission confirms that impact indicators cannot be measured annually and are affected by multiple factors. Only result indicators will be measured annually to assess the progress towards the achievements of annual milestones. Net effects will not be measured annually, but in the context of evaluations. Modelling techniques are necessary to separate external factors and observe the net effects towards a certain impact.*

#### **Context and impact indicators**

Luxembourg and Slovenia ask where and when the final set of context and impact indicators will be made available for the Member States. Slovenia asks if further changes are expected in the current version of the indicators set out in Annex I to the legislative proposal.

#### **Responsibilities for assessing impact indicators**

Slovenia asks to clarify the responsibility and obligations of the Member States with respect to the assessment of impact indicators and their inclusion in the CAP Strategic Plans.

#### **Missing indicator on technical assistance**

Slovenia asks if an indicator on technical assistance will be included in Annex I to the legislative proposal.

*The Commission closes the session by recalling the overall context behind the list of indicators set out in Annex I to the legislative proposal. The agricultural policy faces unique challenges, especially in relation to environment, climate, and biodiversity. Indicators should be considered as necessary tools for providing feedback to policy makers, researchers, advisory system, farmers and other actors. Indicators are important tools to show the extent to which the policy has been able to progress towards the commitments taken.*

#### **(b) Result and output indicators, link to data collection systems**

Ms Gerstgrasser invites the Member States to send their written comments or questions on the result and output indicators as listed in Annex I to the legislative proposal to: [AGRI-EVALUATION@ec.europa.eu](mailto:AGRI-EVALUATION@ec.europa.eu). The Commission will seek to provide the requested clarifications in the next meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP on the 21 November 2018.

#### **4.5 CAP post-2020: Round table on Member States' evaluation support needs for the preparation of CAP Strategic Plans**

Ms Gerstgrasser invites the Member States' representatives to express their evaluation support needs for the preparation of the CAP Strategic Plans. The Member States expressed the following needs:

Clarifications:

- Clarify details on SWOT and timeline to prepare evaluation plan (AT)
- Clarify responsibility for assessment of impacts (IT)
- Clarify if in future there will be Common Evaluation Questions (CZ)
- Clarify details on the Performance Framework (HU, AT)

CAP Strategic Plan:

- Provide template for CAP Strategic Plan (including example) (DE, DK, PT, ES)
- Clarify links between CAP Strategic Plan with other funds (IT)
- Provide help how to formulate the scope of the objectives (NL)
- Provide clarifications on mechanism and criteria for the approval of the CAP Strategic Plan (e.g. checklist defining the criteria for completeness, consistency, coherence etc.) (HU)

Indicators:

- Provide indicator fiches (PT, ES)
- Give clear definitions of result indicators in order to be able to define targets (CZ, NL)
- Include a discussion on indicators in the fiches during the meeting on 21 November (ES)

Ex-ante evaluation:

- Present timeline for necessary activities to prepare ex ante (IT)
- Develop ex-ante guidelines covering Pillar 1 and 2 (IT, AT, ES, CZ)

Support

- Currently offered support instruments (workshops, trainings) are useful and should be kept (AT, ES)
- Answering-function for ongoing questions (FAQs) and written answers to questions sent (DK, ES, CZ)
- Concise and practical guidelines (ES) Support for data-gathering and validation systems (ES)
- Show best practices/guidelines on contracting of independent evaluators. How do other Member States choose them? For which period of time are evaluators appointed? What resources are given to them? (PL, PT)

#### **4.6 Evaluation of School Schemes**

Ms Gerstgrasser informs that this agenda point will be addressed in the next meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP on 21 November 2018.

#### **4.7 Thematic Working Group 5 "Assessing RDP achievements and impacts in 2019": presentation**

Ms Gerstgrasser passes the floor to Ms Jela Tvrdonova and Mr Hannes Wimmer (European Evaluation Helpdesk for Rural Development) to present the Guidelines: [Assessing RDP achievements and impacts and in 2019](#). The Guidelines were drafted by eight thematic experts coordinated by the European Evaluation Helpdesk for Rural Development. Comments to draft versions of the Guidelines were provided by 41 Sounding Board members, by the Expert Group on Monitoring and evaluating the CAP, and three peer reviewers. . The drafts were shared for consultation, and around 400 comments were received and addressed. The Guidelines were published on 8 August 2018.

Mr Wimmer explains that the Guidelines recommend several evaluation approaches for assessing the Common CAP impact indicators of Pillar 2 in 2019 and the ex post. Possible approaches to be applied in an optimal data-situation as well in a situation of data gaps are described. Qualitative approaches are proposed in particular for the assessment of environmental impacts. Ms Tvrdonova explains the structure of the Guidelines, consisting of four parts. The Guidelines propose a logic model to choose the most suitable evaluation approach in a specific situation.

Finally, Mr Wimmer informs that the Evaluation Helpdesk's yearly capacity building events in the Member States will start in October 2018. Two good practice workshops are planned by the end of 2018. The first workshop on [Approaches to assess socio-economic and sector related RDP impacts in 2019](#) will take place in Warsaw (Poland), on 24-25 October 2018. The second workshop is dedicated to Approaches to assess environmental RDP impacts in 2019 and will take place in December.

*After the presentation, Member State's delegates raised the following questions:*

### **Translation of the Guidelines**

Italy asks if the Guidelines on the Assessment of RDP achievements and impacts will be translated in other languages.

*The Commission announces that Part I of the Guidelines is planned to be translated soon. The parts that are more technical for evaluators will not be translated (Parts II, III, and IV).*

### **Evaluation challenges in the Member States**

Spain and Germany argue that the assessment of the impact indicators with the approaches proposed by the Guidelines is challenging given the data situation in regionalised RDPs. Spain asks to consider the proportionality and to allow the RDP Managing Authorities to focus their evaluation only on the most relevant indicators. Moreover, Spain believes that it will be premature to calculate the common impact indicators for the Annual Implementation Reports in 2019. Spain suggests assessing the complementary result indicators for the Annual Implementation Reports in 2019.

#### **4.8 Any other business**

None

### **5. Next steps**

*Member States' representatives are invited to send to [AGRI-EVALUATION@ec.europa.eu](mailto:AGRI-EVALUATION@ec.europa.eu):*

- a) issues/questions concerning the proposed performance framework and output, result, impact, context indicators to be discussed in the next meeting of the Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP on 21 November. (Please note: General comments to other parts CAP proposals, which are not pertinent to M&E, should be directed and tackled in other fora within the framework of trilateral negotiations.)*
- b) signal if a presentation of the Evaluation of the CAP Greening Measures should be given in the next meeting of the Expert Group.*

N.B. No written answers will be provided by DG AGRI before the next Expert Group meeting.

### **6. Next meeting**

The next meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP is foreseen for 21 November 2018.

**7. List of participants**

In Annex.

< e-signed >  
Tassos HANIOTIS  
Director

List of participants– Minutes

***Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP***

Date: 19 September 2018

MEMBER STATE	Ministry Or Organisation	NUMBER OF PERSONS
BE	Department of Agriculture and Fisheries	1
	Service public de Wallonie - Agriculture	1
BG	/	
CZ	Ministry of Agriculture	3
DK	The Danish Agricultural Agency	2
	Permanent Representation	1
DE	BMEL	2
	Thünen-Institut	1
	Monitoring- und Evaluierungsnetzwerk Deutschland (MEN-D)	1
EE	Ministry of Rural Affairs	2
IE	Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine	2
EL	Managing Authority of Greek RDP	1
ES	Ministry of Agriculture and fish, food and environment	2
	Fondo Español de Garantía Agraria (FEGA)	1
FR	Ministry of Agriculture	1
	ASP	2
HR	Ministry of Agriculture	2
IT	ISMEA (public entity within the Italian Ministry of Agriculture supervision)	1
	Consiglio par la ricerca in agricoltura e l'analisi dell'economia agraria	1
	Ministero delle Politiche Agricole	1
	Ministry of Agriculture	1
CY	/	
LV	Ministry of Agriculture	2
LT	/	
LU	Ministry of Agriculture	2
HU	Ministry of Agriculture	2

MT	Managing Authority	1
NL	Regiebureau POP	1
	RVO	1
AT	Federal Ministry of Sustainability and Tourism	2
PL	Ministry of Agriculture	2
	Agency for Restructuring and Modernisation of Agriculture	1
PT	MAFRD-GPP	2
RO	Ministry of Agriculture	2
	APIA	1
	Permanent Representation	1
SI	Ministry of Agriculture	2
SK	Ministry of Agriculture	1
	Agricultural Paying Agency	1
FI	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry	1
	Paying Agency	1
SE	Statens Jordbruksverk	2
UK	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)	1
<i>TOTAL</i>		58