



Brussels,
agri.ddg1.c.4(2020)5762801 JK

MINUTES

20th Meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP 2 September 2020

Chair: Mr Tassos Haniotis and Ms Sophie Helaine

Delegations present: All Member States participated in the online meeting.

Introduction

Ms Helaine (Head of Unit, DG AGRI Unit C.4 Monitoring and Evaluation) welcomes the participants, provides instructions for the virtual meeting and announces that firstly the Director Tassos Haniotis will give an introduction.

Mr Haniotis (DG AGRI, Director of Directorates A, B, C - Strategy, simplification and Policy Analysis) expresses his delight that despite the current COVID-crisis the expert group meetings are getting back to normal even if in a new format. He stresses the importance of the timing of this meeting to progress on indicators, which are important for the future of the Common Agricultural Policy, the Farm to Fork Strategy and the broader Green Deal priorities. He explains that the discussion of the meeting will focus on the definition of indicators rather than on the performance review, which is discussed in the European Council. He reminds that any decisions on the indicator list and labels are with the Council and the Parliament. The discussion in this Expert Group meeting will therefore be extremely helpful in clarifying aspects of the debate and in helping to understand what indicators are meant to do, what type of data they require and what their aim and broader objective is. Performance is not only about clearance and review. Indicators are extremely important also for the broader assessment of the policy and here is where evaluations play a major role. A key part of the discussion in this meeting will be on the conclusions of two recent evaluation studies on biodiversity and on water which will be nurture the discussions and debate to follow.

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

No modifications of the minutes of the previous Expert Group meeting are requested by the Member States' representatives which are therefore approved.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Ms Helaine suggests that the agenda point ‘Information on Horizon Europe partnership on Agriculture of data’ is moved up on the agenda and included in the morning session. No further modifications are requested by the Member States’ representatives and the agenda is therefore 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/ui/welcome>.

4. LIST OF POINTS DISCUSSED

4.1. Outcomes of the evaluation support studies on the impact of the CAP impact on (i) water and (ii) habitats, landscapes and biodiversity + QA

Ms Helaine introduces the two evaluation support studies on biodiversity and water, which have been published in Spring 2020. A third evaluation on soil is still ongoing. All three evaluation studies will be accompanied by one Commission Staff Working Document, which is planned to be published next year.

Ms Helaine informs that currently the open public consultation on ‘[the EU Common Agricultural Policy Impact on natural resources, biodiversity, soil and water](#)’ is running and it will feed into the Commission Evaluation Staff Working Document and she invites the Member States’ representatives to participate in this public consultation. Ms Helaine reminds of the important role of evaluators in identifying the net effects of the policy, even if this is sometimes difficult to quantify. DG AGRI is therefore trying to improve data collection in the future Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Framework to facilitate the task of evaluators to quantify the effects of the Common Agricultural Policy.

Ms Helaine introduces Ms Alice Devot and David Mottershead, who will present the Evaluation Support Study on water and biodiversity, respectively.

Ms Alice Devot (Oréade-Brèche, contractor) gives a presentation called ‘Support study to the Evaluation of the impact of the CAP on water: Main findings and recommendations’, with the objective to examine where and how CAP instruments and measures have impacted water quality and quantity.

Mr David Mottershead (IEEP, contractor) presents the ‘Evaluation of the impact of the CAP on habitats, landscapes and biodiversity’, a summary of an evaluation study based in an extensive literature review, FADN data analysis and case studies.

After the presentations, Ms Helaine reminds that good practices, such as those presented here and also during the Good Practice Workshops organised by the Evaluation Helpdesk are important in order to promote learning. She then invites Mr Norbert Roeder, one of the researchers interested in improving the performance framework of the CAP, to start with posing questions to the contractors of the two studies, before the wider audience is invited to raise questions.

Impact of the CAP on water quality

Mr Norbert Roeder (Thuenen institute) enquires where the higher standards recommended by Ms Devot in her presentation should be implemented (e.g. in cross-compliance or conditionality). Higher standards in the conditionality open up the question if intensive farms would still be covered in the CAP or forsake the payments. Mr Roeder also asks why for eco-schemes there was no reference to catch crops which do have an impact on water quality. Moreover, he questions the argument concerning the importance of direct payments for farms in the vegetables, fruits and flowers sector as being a high share of their income. This raises the issue whether with the available CAP budget you could really address the farms in the highly intensive regions where there is a problem with water quality.

Ms Devot (Oréade-Brèche, contractor) explains that the analysis has been made based on FADN data, examining the average amount of direct payments received, and comparing it with the average Farm Net Value Added (FNVA) of farmers from a given sector, to explore whether a farm would be profitable without the CAP payment. The results highlighted that maize growers and the fruits and vegetables sectors are (1) water-consuming crops and (2) receiving significant levels of Pillar I support (either relatively - % of FNVA or in absolute value - €/ha).

Denmark supports the conclusion that there should be higher incentives to ensure that commitments are taken up by farmers. In relation to higher standards, there is also a need to expand the scope of current measures to better support targeted implementation of obligatory requirements in relation to certain areas rather than increasing the standards for good agricultural and environmental condition of land (GAEC) and Statutory Management Requirements (SMRs) for all farmers.

Greece shares a recent publication called ‘A New Model-Based Approach for the Evaluation of the Net Contribution of the European Union Rural Development Program to the Reduction of Water Abstractions in Agriculture’, which has been prepared as part of the 2019 enhanced AIR in Greece¹. The work is based on a hydrological model which obtains data (soil, climate, land use, etc.) from IACS and then assesses the actual water needs by different crops used in various places. For the counterfactual, a canvas with a 5x5 km size was prepared. Cells where agri-environmental measures were present and cells where they were not present were identified. Along with several other parameters it was possible to match cells that were similar. Propensity Score Matching was applied to calculate the effect of the agri-environmental measures on the reduction of water abstraction. The scientific team found a significant reduction of water abstraction.

Impact of the CAP on habitats, landscapes and biodiversity

Mr Roeder (Thuenen institute) comments on the presentation and raises the concern as to whether the eligible area and the definitions of what is considered ‘agricultural land’ in the policy recommendations really suit environmental needs. He questions the recommendation, made in the presentation, to save money by not mapping landscape features already covered by cross-compliance, because the mapping is still needed to allow controlling these landscape features.

Mr Mottershead (IEEP, contractor) points out that farmers are often incentivised to remove hedges, trees and rocks as a means to increase eligible land for direct payments.

¹ More information about this project can be found in the following website: <https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/12/17/7137>

The recommendation is to change this so that anything that is valuable for biodiversity or any other environmental objective is not subject to such incentives.

Mr Mottershead (IEEP, contractor) encourages Member States to use an extended definition of permanent grassland with a view to save biodiversity as a key objective. He furthermore explains that a cross-compliance map would only need to indicate if a landscape element is there or not.

Denmark raises a concern regarding the recommendation on better monitoring of biodiversity, as currently, definitions of High Nature Value (HNV) areas vary making it difficult to assess the overall impact, thus rendering HNV definition inefficient.

Mr. Pe'er (UFZ - Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research) says that it is possible to analyse HNV farming systems by using farm and field level data. Hence the problem is not a problem of definitions, but of data accessibility.

The Commission reminds that the HNV indicator has been dropped from the Annex I of the SPR because of the different definitions and the lack of reliability of the data and the lack in comparability.

Calculation of net effects

Mr Roeder (Thuenen institute) asks both contractors how the baseline required to calculate the net effects has been identified in the two presented evaluation studies in order to establish what would have happened without the CAP.

Ms Devot (Oréade-Brèche, contractor) highlights that the limitations and the robustness of the analysis on how the net effects were assessed are fully detailed in the corresponding report. She agrees with Mr Roeder that it is difficult to have a counterfactual situation in the framework of the presented exercise. The CAP is only one of the numerous factors influencing farming practices. The analysis and conclusions of the evaluation are therefore also based on discussions with stakeholders, which were however confirmed with the available data.

Mr Mottershead (IEEP, contractor) confirms that building a counterfactual has been a difficult task, given that most farmers receive CAP support. An attempt was made in their study by looking at FADN data and the figures for pesticides and fertiliser use. However, data was only available for 2-3 years, which did not allow to see much changes. Other challenges included sample sizes and the nature of the data available (e.g. expenditure data without information on the active ingredients of the products). If longer time series of FADN data were available, such counterfactual could be constructed in the future.

The Commission announces that FADN data collection on certain variables will improve with time. The intention is that FADN becomes a tool not only to assess the economic but also the environmental performance of farms. A big project will be launched in this respect by 2022. Without data, there is no possibility to perform a sound analysis and modelling.

The Commission informs that there are other available studies conducted by the Joint Research Centre (JRC) that analyse what the situation would be if there was no CAP in place². In particular, some conclusions point out that a certain percentage of

² <https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/JRC109053/kjna28883enn.pdf>

agricultural land would be abandoned, and the impacts on, for example, biodiversity, would be positive or negative depending on the activity that would take place on the abandoned land.

Data sharing

Lithuania informs that its lawyers and evaluators see limitations in the Regulations regarding the use of individual data for counterfactuals (e.g. Art 99 of HZR (2021-2027)), Where personal data are processed for monitoring and evaluation purposes under Regulation (EU) .../... [Regulation on the CAP financing, management and monitoring], and for statistical purposes, they shall be made anonymous and processed in aggregated form only.

Mr Roeder (Thuenen institute) points out that the problem of the proposed SPR lies in the wording ‘processed in aggregated form’. This could be interpreted in a way that only the analysis of aggregated data (i.e. no micro level) is feasible. A better wording would be ‘published in aggregated form’. Current discussions with data protection officers in Germany highlighted that, with the current wording, it is not clear if individual data could be used for evaluation, policy advise and research. This implies in a strict interpretation, that micro-level CAP or IACS data could not be used for evaluation.

Lithuania argues that the current formulation allows to use aggregated data only and is not suitable for counterfactual evaluation.

Mr Mottershead (IEEP, contractor) points out that they were allowed to use individual farm FADN data, however the results of the analysis undertaken could not be published for fewer than five farms.

The Commission acknowledges that in some Member States evaluators have problems in accessing individual data, especially IACS data. DG AGRI Unit D.3 – Implementation support and IACS, is currently working on improving data sharing, which could potentially be a point of discussion in the next meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP. The Commission confirms that FADN data at individual level can be shared with evaluators; if data is anonymised, and it is made clear that the data will not be used for anything else than the analysis during the evaluation and be destroyed after use. The same applies for the Farm Structure Survey (FSS) data from Eurostat. The Commission underlines the future potentials of IACS also in combination with other databases.

The Commission points out that SPR is not the place where the decision regarding the analysis level is made. The discussion on individual data is dealt with in the FADN regulation and FSS regulation. For the case of CAP data, the Commission is working with Member States on data sharing in the framework of a broader European strategy on data.

Relevance of the presented evaluation studies for the CAP Strategic Plans

Lithuania argues that the recommendations of the presented evaluation studies come too late to be included into the new CAP 2021-2027 and asks, to what extent the Commission will evaluate the recommendations and want Member States still to incorporate some of the recommendations in the new CAP Strategic Plans.

The Commission highlights that the proposed CAP Strategic Plan Regulation (SPR) is already taking on board some of the recommendations of the presented evaluation

studies. For example, the need to improve the strategic approach towards biodiversity and water is present in the Regulation as well as the obligation for Member States to draft their CAP Strategic Plans based on their needs. The two evaluation studies show that impacts highly depend on the implementation choices and ambition set by Member States. According to the proposed Regulation, there will be a stage where the Commission will check the level of ambition set by the Member States. In this light, the presented evaluation studies are on time and Member States are encouraged to consider the results in the design of their CAP Strategic Plans. For example, Member States have the possibility to decide whether it is more convenient to push for the green architecture in the legislation or with eco-schemes (i.e. incentives) or with agri-environment-climate commitments. In this context, the Commission rebounds on one of the results of the evaluation study on water and reminds that Member States can increase the legal requirements with respect to the water framework directive or Natura 2000 and use the measure M.12 to compensate farmers for these higher requirements.

4.2. Information on Horizon Europe partnership on Agriculture of data

Ms Doris Marquardt (DG AGRI, Unit B2 – Research and Innovation) gives a presentation called ‘Horizon Europe partnership on Agriculture of Data’.

After the presentation, no questions were raised by the Member States’ representatives.

4.3. How to measure landscape features (I.20, O.32) – State of play (MS, JRC and EEA experiences)

Ms Helaine highlights the relevance of this part of the agenda, since there is a new target set by the Biodiversity Strategy on landscape elements. She reminds that the first step before targets can be set is to measure landscape features. Ms Helaine announces that colleagues of the European Commission will give an introduction of the topic, before Belgium and Germany will share their experiences with mapping landscape elements.

Ms Helaine gives first the floor to Mr Alfonso Gutierrez Teira, followed by Mr Hans Dufourmont and Jean-Michel Terres.

4.3.1. Setting the context and info-point about C.36 (I.19) indicator state of play.

Mr Gutierrez Teira explains also the state of play on the indicator C.36 – I.19 - species and habitats of Community interest related to agriculture with stable or increasing trends, for which a consultation with MS on the national lists of habitats and species to be used has been finalised. Analysis of the lists and first calculation of the indicator is currently ongoing by the EEA.

After the presentation, the Member States’ representatives raised the following questions and comments:

FR asks whether an EU aggregate will be calculated for the indicator on species and habitats (I.19/C.36)

The Commission clarifies that in principle it is not planned to have a calculation of the I.19 (C.36) indicator at the EU level because this would mean additional methodological issues.

4.3.2. *Setting the context and info-point about C.21 (I.20) indicator on landscape features state of play.*

Mr Alfonso Gutierrez Teira (DG AGRI Unit D.4 Environment, climate change, forestry and bio-economy) presents the state of play of the indicator on landscape features and explains the agenda of the ongoing work. There is still work that needs to be done for the creation of the indicator, especially regarding the sources of information. For that purpose, the Commission is exploring options to use new products and methodological approaches, beyond the Small Woody Features layer, with the European Environment Agency. The Joint Research Centre is also assessing other options to support mapping and measuring landscape elements.

4.3.3. *Small woody features - state of play*

Mr Hans Dufourmont (European Environment Agency) gives a presentation with the title 'How to monitor Small Landscape Features (SLF) using Copernicus land monitoring products' and informs about the status of affairs with the HRL SWF, the progress in the use of AI in the detection of SLF, using VHR data for training, and then deploying on VHR, as well as the roadmap ahead.

4.3.4. *JRC Activities on landscape features*

Mr Jean-Michel Terres (Joint Research Centre, Unit D.5 Food Security) gives a presentation with the title 'JRC Activities on Landscape features'. He summarises the work of the Joint Research Centre on the data sources for landscape features monitoring, the planned role of the LUCAS surveys in 2022 and different methodologies to estimate changes in landscape features.

After the presentations, the Member States' representatives and experts raised the following questions and comments:

Spain asks the Commission to review and clarify the results of their qualitative and quantitative evaluation of the Copernicus Land Surveillance Service and the High Resolution Layer of Small Woody Features, which show a percentage of coincidence of less than 50% between Copernicus' images and their national data contained in their LPIS database. Spain is concerned about the quality of the initial data for the design of their National Strategic Plan, the results of the context and impact indicators and their divergence from the results and output indicators, as well as their impact on the achievement of the target established for the European Biodiversity Strategy.

France asks Mr Dufourmont if access could be given to the data for the maps shown on slide 13 of his presentation and if he could explain what the differences between category 1 and 2 are, for example for the indicator: % of SWF within CLC agricultural classes.

Mr. Roeder (Thuenen institute) asks if the Commission is planning to expand the use of high-resolution aerial photos for previous years and if the exercise will be on the whole set of points or just on a subset similarly to what has been done with other LUCAS surveys.

Mr Dufourmont clarifies that the EEA is in the process of validating the independent geostatistical validation report on the HRL SWF 2015 product provided by a consortium. The report articulates in detail the results from accuracy assessments across the EU, but also at MS level. He acknowledges that in the southern part of Europe, particularly in some types of landscape, it is more difficult to identify small woody features. He specifies

that the focus should be on the overall picture across Europe. The report will be published within a few weeks on the website <https://land.copernicus.eu>. He invites Member States to check the accuracy of the figures by country and by biogeographical region.

The Commission explains that in the Member States' factsheet's the available statistics are provided, based on the results of the 2015 LUCAS Transects survey for landscape features processed by JRC at the time of the impact assessment. The Commission clarifies that there is not full correspondence between the impact indicator I.20 'Enhanced provision of ecosystem services: share of UAA covered with landscape features' and the target that appears in the Biodiversity Strategy (10 % of agricultural area under high-diversity landscape features). The reason is that the Biodiversity Strategy has been adopted recently and still needs to be developed in terms of definition and identification of features and monitoring methodology, while the indicator was conceived 2 years earlier and solely for the purpose of the CAP and the role identified for impact and context indicators therein. Discussions are ongoing within the Commission on the implementation and monitoring of the target '10% landscape features'. However, the Communication on the Biodiversity Strategy states that the Member States will have to translate this target to the lower geographical scale to ensure connectivity by considering all the available information at different scales - from European to local level. The impact indicator I.20 'Enhanced provision of ecosystem services: share of UAA covered with landscape features' will be a synthetic indicator at European and MS level, with all the limitations that this involves in terms of being able to present a full picture of all relevant landscape features in each country. I.20, if successfully developed, could thus be one among several possible sources of information to this target. And this links to the concern of Spain stated before. There are landscapes that have very few landscape features but they are very high in biodiversity, and this has to be considered as well. Therefore, the definition of areas and actions by the Member States will be crucial.

Mr Terres explains that the JRC is currently concentrating on the 2022 survey. At this stage, the past situation is not considered yet. The survey will depend on the availability of resources and of aerial photos availability. Tests were performed and it was found that for 2020 a full coverage of very high-resolution orthophoto in Europe should be accessible depending on the Member State; very high resolution aerial orthophoto data for the past years are also existing in most MS. For LUCAS survey in 2022, the scope is to cover identified LUCAS agricultural points, starting with around 100.000 points and maybe more depending on the sampling strategy.

4.3.5. Member States' experiences with measuring landscape features

Belgium Wallonia (presentation)

Belgium Wallonia gives a presentation with the title 'Identification and measurement of landscape features (LPIS) in Wallonia (Belgium) (C.21 and O.32)' focusing on its experience with landscape features mapping, the process of creating the layers created for LPIS and the challenges identified regarding definitions, accuracy in mapping and validation taking into account time and resources limitations.

Germany (Info-point)

Germany informs that it has currently thirteen Paying Agencies in the federal system; which requires a national law for all the GAECs. There are rules at the national and the federal level and some common definitions on landscape features that all federal agencies have to take over. Germany has a similar system of landscape features than the one described by Belgium. Small differences concern the sizes of field margins and terraces. The farmer is obliged to declare all these landscape features in the application. Landscape features relevant for cross-compliance and for Ecological Focus Area have the same definition. There is an automatic system to overview the landscape features given by the farmer and the landscape features to be seen on the screen or aerial photographs. The difficulties are similar to those described by Belgium, such as to differentiate between some landscape features on the ortho-images, which makes field visits necessary.

The Commission points out that it would be useful to know approximately the quantification of the area of landscape features, and if possible, by category. To start collecting this information allows to check the consistency of the data with the estimate provided in the impact assessment.

Belgium specifies that it had established a buffer width of less than 2 meters to avoid taking into account hedges and other landscape features which could be on the other part of a road. However, the numbers are overestimated as it remains difficult to know if the features belong to agricultural parcels or not. While the values shown refer to the number of landscape features, it would be possible to convert them into hectares. Belgium asks if the EFA factor conversion should be used.

Belgium points out that the definition in each Member State might be different which could affect the possibility of aggregating data. If each Member State applied the same conversion factors, it might be useful to analyse how to make the ponderation.

The Commission comments that the question of width was posed when the JRC calculated the estimation that was used in the impact assessment, because there the LUCAS transect was based on linear features. Applying the existing conversion factor in the EFA would be a good option for all Member States, since this will be consistent with what was done by the JRC with the impact assessment estimation.

The Commission explains that the output indicator O.32 'Number of ha subject to conditionality (broken down by GAEC practice) will monitor the implementation of the conditionality. It is not meant to be as exhaustive as and comparable to the Impact Indicator I.20. It allows to know how Member States have defined GAEC9 and how they will frame the future EFA obligation. The Commission acknowledges the effort made by Belgium to register all landscape features and will consider the difficulties encountered when updating the system based on the farmer declaration. Further assistance can be provided in the future (as already done for the greening implementation). However, it is still not certain what will be the change in GAEC9 (depending on the final outcome with co-legislators).

Belgium explains that it digitised all the elements at the beginning of the period (2015) by market procurement. Only a small part of these elements is declared for the greening and for the Second Pillar. These ones are the priority to be updated over the years. They do not update all the landscape features of the territory, which would be an extensive exercise.

The Commission clarifies that there is always a difference between the initial numbers and the real implementation, and there is still a need to update again at some stage.

Mr Pe'er (researcher from the Helmholtz-Centre for Environmental Research) comments that the main issue is that there are many spatial inaccuracies, which were well depicted in the presentation. In some cases farmers have complained that these inaccuracies bring them into risk of sanctions if they are making mistakes or if the calculations are not accurate regarding landscape features compared to what is mapped in the IACS. He wonders whether scientists or other experts could be used to visit the sites and check compliance to avoid the risk of getting inaccurate values.

Denmark shares some of the concerns of Germany and Belgium regarding certain landscape features and their manual digitalisation, which will be expensive. Moreover, as Belgium points out, there are problems with regards to updating mistakes of farmers, which would lead to high costs. The attribution of hedges is overall problematic. Denmark suggests to create easier rules for individual farmers to ask for features to be included.

Czechia asks if it would be possible to merge definitions of landscape features. They have notified at least eight different landscape features and it is difficult for the Paying Agency to identify them. Merging the eight different landscape features into three and classifying them in linear or non-linear, would make it easier for the farmers to declare and for the Paying Agency to identify them.

Belgium specifies that after building the layers, a lot of field visits were carried out to check the declared elements.

The Commission answers that from a GAEC point of view, it is necessary to ensure that the farmers comply with certain obligations. Therefore, the focus is set on this obligation and it is not possible to expand too much on other concepts. GAEC9 considers firstly the protection and the presence or removal of some elements, but does not concern the accurate measurement of the element. The quantification will be made when the EFA obligation would be pursued. There is an experience on greening and there are some factors to convert the indication of the presence of landscape features into an area. In greening the Commission tried to provide some simplification to merge some of the different features. When quantifying the landscape features, the Commission tries to be flexible and not to define in detail all landscape features.

Ms Helaine explains that there are different exercises: the GAEC9 on the presence of landscape features, the Ecological Focus Area on the share of landscape features, and the impact indicator that deals with measuring landscape elements related to agriculture and not only to what is financed with the CAP. Since these are different exercises, different methodologies, tools and preciseness obligations are needed

Belgium argues that the difference between greening and cross-compliance is that the greening is based on declaration, whereas cross-compliance carries out checks on the spot. To check the cross compliance with monitoring is however new. Belgium finds it difficult to do checks on the spot since it does not have all the necessary tools in place.

The Commission concludes that for conditionality all the farmers are considered. Concerning the classification of landscape features, the approach of the JRC with LUCAS is to ensure consistency with the EFA classification because it is very comprehensive, and it could be a good solution to have the same framework across

Member States. It is planned to start from this classification and try to merge the categories. It is very important to clearly distinguish what are the control issues regarding obligations under conditionality and the measurement under impact indicator. Another proposal still under assessment for LUCAS 2022 is to merge separately the woody features (e.g. trees, hedges) and herbaceous features (e.g. buffer strips and field margins). This can simplify the classification but still considering the different ecological values of these features. For the classification, another important requirement is the consistent information across data sources.

4.4. Information on planned tasks as regards IACS, relevant to the reporting on indicators (avoid double counting for area-related indicators)

Mr Pierluigi Londero (DG AGRI, Unit D.3 - Implementation support and IACS) gives a presentation called ‘Avoiding double counting of areas when reporting on area related Output and Result indicators in the future CAP’ where he explains the importance of avoiding double counting and the specific challenges related to it.

Philippe Loudjani (Joint Research Centre, Unit D.5 Food Security) gives a presentation called ‘No double counting of areas when reporting on area-related Output and Result indicators’ in which he explains the work of the JRC in analysing the characteristics and constraints of the information of area-related interventions in IACS. The Commission is looking for Member States that would like to participate to case studies to see if it is possible and how to do it.

While the focus of this work is to support Member States to calculate, ex-post, output and result indicators for the Annual Performance Reports, i.e. after interventions are deployed, Italy expresses concerns about the estimation of particularly the area-based result indicators based on the current situation, because there can occur double-counting and many variables may change the estimates. It is therefore very likely that the planned result indicators in the programme will need to be modified after the 1st year of implementation.

The Commission acknowledges Italy’s concerns and explains that planning output and result indicator in the CAP Plan is a process that involves several uncertainties, and such as the level of uptake. Because of that, there are discussions afterwards and potentially the plan needs to be adapted because the uptake needs to be maximised. The Commission states that there is room for manoeuvre and adjustment possibilities so that Member States can adapt to this situation.

Sweden states that it is important that the problems in relation to physical areas are resolved. Given that the CAP negotiations are soon to be finalised, it is important to have a full understanding of the problems now so that data implementation problems can be avoided. In Sweden, there have been discussions about changes for the reporting of physical areas. The proposal is to base the reporting on one claim year within the financial year so that the number would be easier to understand for the citizens.

The Commission clarifies that there is no other possibility than to relate the reporting for the output indicators used for clearance to the financial year, and to keep this reference for the result indicators reporting, for consistency. The Commission will send an answer to this question. An explanation on the use of the financial year can be found in the written answers that were addressed to the Member States. The Commission acknowledges the difficulty to avoid double counting when in the same financial year, the same hectares receive payments related to 2 different claim years. There are also certain

indicators where the different layers are much more numerous, such as for output indicator O.32 'Number of ha subject to conditionality'. The Commission will come back to Sweden on this.

Greece points out that the calculation of all indicators needs to be known for the programming stage, not for the reporting stage, as in some months Member States will have to submit the CAP Strategic Plans. Greece is trying to build the information systems with the indicators and the issue of double counting is crucial for output indicators O.31 'Number of ha under environmental practices' and O.32 'Number of ha subject to conditionality (broken down by GAEC practice)'.

The Commission clarifies that output indicators O.31 and O.32 are not used for clearance, so there is no need to plan them. What needs to be planned is how much Member States intend to do under eco-scheme, under agri-environmental commitments and to link it to the purpose, i.e. how much of those commitments are expected to be related to soil and water. The definitions as such should be clear by now, fiches have been provided and the final details are being discussed. Regarding the technical calculation of area-based result indicators, currently Member States should provide the physical area under agri-environmental schemes too. It is already a requirement of the current reporting that there is no double counting with agri-environmental commitments. Eco-schemes are completely new and it is difficult to plan their uptake in advance. Therefore, it is important to well calibrate the incentive or the level of payment. The Commission is trying to help Member States and to create tools that will provide support at the time of reporting.

Belgium states that on top of the difficulty in planning the level of uptake for the different schemes one has to add the level of overlapping between these schemes, which is something new, but needed to be able to set up the targets for the result indicators. Concerning calculating and reporting the indicators ex-post, Belgium and Finland confirmed that it should be easier, as information is available in their administrative databases.

The Commission understands that this is a challenge but explains that there will be ways to adjust once there is more clarity on the level of uptake and overlapping.

Mr Roeder (Thuenen institute) states that in some regions there are highly modular agro-environmental schemes, where in the same piece of land the geometries are overlapping. This could create problems in the calculation because some corrections should be made.

Germany asks how accurate the reported numbers should be: to 1000 hectares, 100 hectares or to the last hectare. To solve such problems much time and IT resources are needed. In order to set up the IT system it would be necessary to know how accurate the results should be, considering also that the Second Pillar will be managed by different Paying Agencies in Germany.

Denmark asks if the certification body should approve the performance report.

The Commission clarifies that the focus here is on performance and not on the last hectare in order to look at the bigger picture, since these are indicators for the entire territory of a Member State. At the same time there will still be audits in the Member States on CAP expenditures. The question on the accuracy is therefore not only for the Commission but also for the Member States.

The Commission confirms that the certification body will have to approve the performance report, but for the indicators it will not request an accuracy higher than those requested by compliance audits in Member States. The certification body can also set the rules and look at the system as a whole to ensure an accurate reporting of the data without imposing too much of an administrative burden and keeping in mind the proportionality.

4.5. Performance clearance of sectoral interventions: implications for Annex I and reporting

Mr Tauno Lukas (DG AGRI, Unit G.1 – Governance of the agri-food markets), gives a presentation called ‘Performance clearance of sectoral interventions: implications for Annex I and reporting’. {The Commission corrected a mistake in the presented presentation, the realised average unit amount for insurance (slide 6) is 600 EUR, and not 635 EUR}

After the presentation, delegates from different Member States raised the following questions and comments:

Denmark enquires if the method presented is similar to what is envisaged for Local Action Groups (LAGs). Cyprus agrees that the approach presented is identical regarding the role of LAGs.

Austria would like to confirm if, for R.10 Better supply chain organisation, and R.11 Concentration of supply, there will be the need to define targets and milestones, being hence relevant for performance review; and if, according to what has been presented, the contributions to other result indicators would fall outside of performance review.

Ireland asks for clarification in the context of planning for R.11 Concentration of supply, on how to proceed when the total marketed value is not known. In the case of translational operational programmes some elements of the indicator would not be appropriate, given that the denominator of this indicator is the total ‘national’ production [while the reality is a ‘transnational’ situation].

Poland has experienced challenges in the planning of unit amounts for operational programmes. These are difficult to calculate because Poland allocates a support rate as a percentage of the turnover, and the turnover of the Producer Organisations (POs) cannot be predicted as it depends on fluctuating market prices. In the same line, Denmark remarks that the realised unit amount will most likely not match due to expected fluctuations in the value of marketed production of the POs, which in the Danish case influences the allocation of funds to the operational program. Lithuania raises parallel concerns, as the Member State has no previous experience regarding POs, meaning that it is not possible to plan for outputs and units amounts, fearing a deviation between the planned and the realised unit amount of over 50%.

Hungary asks if potential double counting shall be checked for non-area related result indicators.

Finally, France suggests that a complete example showing the financial flow on the indicator O.27 Number of local development strategies (LEADER), would be appreciated.

The Commission confirms that what has presented is similar to the LEADER approach and the LAGs. It was indeed used as inspiration for what was proposed by the Presidency for Article 31(c) on sectoral interventions managed by POs. In the case of LEADER and LAGs, the LEADER approach is planned in one result indicator, R.31a LEADER coverage; for sectoral interventions, R.10 Better supply chain organisation, and R.11 Concentration of supply, are used. Once the contributions of the different interventions are known, the link with the relevant indicators is established. In the case of LEADER, this link (with social inclusion, training, etc.) is established once the strategies are known; in the case of sectoral interventions, the information from the different interventions implemented by the POs (concerning soil, organic matter, investments, etc.) is then reported in the relevant result indicator.

The Commission reminds that the discussion on performance review is outside the scope of the current Expert Group meeting because there is not yet any agreement on which indicators will be under the performance review. However, it is clear, that there is the need to establish targets and milestones for all result indicators anyhow.

The Commission clarifies that in the current evaluation of the sectoral programmes, there is the reporting of marketing value. For the typical case of fruits and vegetables, the share of the marketed value that is marketed by POs is approximately known. The Commission acknowledges that the question becomes more challenging when it relates to new sectors covered by operational programmes. If, for example, a Member State plans to do a sectoral programme for dairy, recognised POs have the obligation to communicate the share of marketed value for those POs, as comprised in the Common Market Organisation regulation. There remain other sectors which can be also covered, especially the meat sector. In these cases, it is necessary to plan and estimate based on the structure and/or the production of the corresponding Member State. The Commission further acknowledges that price fluctuation would be, in any case, a good explanation for discrepancies between the planned and the final unit amount. A lack of experience with POs is another case where deviations can be explained. There will also be the possibility to adjust the estimations once there is a clearer idea of what is happening on the ground for the indicator R.11 Concentration of supply.

For transnational operational programmes, the whole marketed value is to be attributed to the Member State where the highest share of the activity is taking place. The Commission clarifies that if the marketed value by transnational operational programmes is so large that, when compared to the national production it leads to results above 100 %, this should be taken as a value for comparison, used to analyse the evolution of the situation over time. In these cases, the value above 100 % can be explained.

The Commission explains that, because sectoral interventions are not managed in IACS, it is difficult to have a unique identifier of the beneficiaries as on one side there are farmers beneficiaries of CAP, and on the other side there are farmers participating in POs. Some POs may have a unique ID because they can also benefit from payments from the rural development programmes, so where possible and if there is system of unique ID in place, it should be used. However, [when this is not the case], exceptions are made for sectoral interventions (including the number of farmers and the number of livestock units) for the double counting.

The Commission proposes to include a complete example showing the financial flow on the indicator O.27 Number of local development strategies (LEADER), in the next meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP.

4.6. Changes to indicator fiches introduced further to Member States' written questions + Q&A

Ms Helaine gives a presentation called 'MS questions on indicators. Summary of the answers', opening the floor for questions and remarks several times during the session. The discussions concerned the following indicators/topics:

Indicators R.31 Growth and jobs in rural areas, R.33 Digitising the rural economy, R.34 Connecting rural Europe and R.35, Promoting social inclusion

France asks why the data necessary for the indicator R.33 Digitising the rural economy, should not be collected at the same time as R.31 Growth and jobs in rural areas, i.e. at the time of the last payment. Sweden asks for clarification regarding the reasons why different methodologies are proposed for the same underlying issues regarding the indicators R.31 Growth and jobs in rural areas, R.33 Digitising the rural economy, R.34 Connecting rural Europe, and R.35 Promoting social inclusion. It could be more efficient to report all values either at the time of project start or at the time of project completion. Similarly, France asks if, for R.34 Connecting rural Europe, it would not be simpler to only collect data at the completion of the project in order to avoid collecting data twice (to avoid sample checks).

Regarding the indicator R. 35 Promoting social inclusion, France agrees that the proposed simplification is good and should allow the computation; France enquires what kind of justification or proof will be needed to report the evidence of these data (number of participants). There exist concerns regarding the new function of the certification body that will require double checking and certifying the data for performance review. A comment on the indicator fiche about this would be appreciated.

With regards the same indicator, R.35 Promoting social inclusion, Italy asks for the meaning of 'participants to an operation' in the case of, for example, an employee who is involved by the promoter of the project beneficiary. In general, Italy would appreciate more information about the participants that the Commission proposes for R.35 Promoting social inclusion.

France remarks that R.34 Connecting rural Europe, is wider than broadband, as it also includes social services, tourism, infrastructure, etc. As this indicator is to be linked to the Green Deal, which relates to broadband, France asks if a new indicator covering only broadband is foreseen. France mentions the example of a Member State which does not invest or implement in broadband or uses national funding instead. In this case, the indicator R.34 Connecting rural Europe would not be able to monitor that effort. A reflection is needed on how the CAP indicators can be made consistent to measure the effect of the CAP on the Green Deal targets.

Slovenia supports the simplification of the indicator R.33 Digitising the rural economy. The Netherlands would still like to have some time to reflect about the simplification of this indicator. Ireland and Austria will further consult with the LEADER/CLLD units. Spain appreciates the inclusion of some of the questions raised and will further reflect on the document provided. Germany, Ireland, Cyprus, Finland, Greece and Portugal ask to see the fiche before validating certain changes.

Spain requests that the possibility of measuring the indicator O.20 Number of supported non-productive investments, in hectares instead of projects be studied.

The Commission clarifies that for the indicator R.33 Digitising the rural economy, a change has been proposed so that the indicator no longer measures the share of the rural population covered by smart villages strategies but the number of smart villages strategies. This data is already available at the start of the strategy and hence it is not necessary to wait until the completion of the project to see the actual results, as would be for the indicator R.31 Growth and jobs in rural areas.

The Commission clarifies that the kind of proof required to support the value of the indicator R.35 Promoting social inclusion, would not in any case involve names of individuals, as this would not be in line with data protection rules. The Commission suggests that the kind of proof required would be the same as the proof required for participants to training. Applicants should submit some information on the number of expected beneficiaries of the project.

The Commission clarifies that, for R.35 Promoting social inclusion, the definition of 'participants' depends on the project, and hence the term should not be very restrictive.

The Commission explains the use of different methodologies for each of the presented indicators. The most important aspect to consider is to make sure that the most relevant method is used for each indicator. For example, when looking at the indicator R.31 Growth and jobs in rural areas, which relates to projects where ultimately some jobs should be created, there is usually a lot of uncertainty on the number of jobs that can be created in the end. In order to avoid large discrepancies, it was proposed to simplify the data collection and only look at the values at the time of project completion. In this case, there will be delay on the information that the Commission needs in order to know how the CAP is performing. Because of this, the number of indicator where reporting is only required at the time of project completion has been limited as much as possible. For the indicator R.33 Digitising the rural economy, the newly proposed value is already meaningful if collected at the time of the first payment. A potential concern regarding this indicator could be that Member States consider that looking at the number of smart villages strategies is not as informative as looking at the share of rural population covered by these strategies, but the Commission has understood that the latter was difficult to calculate. However, for the indicator R.34 Connecting rural Europe, the share of rural population has been kept as this is something which is key in this case, because the ultimate beneficiary of services or broadband is the rural population. It is important also to have the value for this indicator at the time of the first payment because there is a lot of attention on this indicator, which is linked to the Green Deal. Having a look at how the CAP is performing in this field should be known as fast as possible. Infrastructure projects take a long time before being completed; in some cases, it can take up to five years. This means that for a long time the Commission has no data on this indicator although an investment has been planned. Based on the experience from the current programming period, it has been seen that when there is a first payment of this kind of investments -infrastructure or ICT-, the project will be finalised, so the risk of discrepancy is small. Having explained the simplifications and how the definitions of each indicator justifies in each case the different use of methodology, if no further comments are made, the Commission will consider that the changes are indeed a simplification that helps working with the indicators.

The Commission explains that it is already the current situation in the Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (CMEF) that there is one indicator which is related to ICT, and another one dedicated to infrastructure and services. When the Annex 1 of the SPR was developed, the Green Deal targets were not on the table, so proposing a unique indicator which brings together broadband and services seemed

enough. Splitting the indicator in two again would face resistance from several Member States and will only be suggested in case most Member States would like to have it separated. The Commission clarifies that, in case a Member State is not using the CAP for broadband, an explanation would be needed along with the indicator value provided.

The Commission announces that updated fiches will be shared before the next meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP. However, the Commission reminds that the changes to the fiches are the ones that have been presented in the Power Point Presentation, that can be also found in the written answers, which can already be discussed by each Member State.

Indicator R.3 Digitising agriculture

The Commission opens the floor by asking feedback from Member States on whether the simplification to restrict the indicator R.3 Digitising agriculture, to Articles 68, 71 and 72 is enough, or if it should be further simplified and include Article 68 only.

France asks if R.3 Digitising agriculture covers now only rural development intervention and no longer sectoral interventions. Furthermore, it is not clear if the indicator R.3 Digitising agriculture, concerns farmers or beneficiaries. Slovenia points out that the denominator of the indicator R.3 Digitising agriculture, is ‘number of farmers’, therefore it is logical to count only farmers. The Netherlands asks whether, for sectoral interventions, when a PO is beneficiary of an intervention, the indicator R.3 Digitising agriculture, is covering the PO members, and not the PO itself.

Belgium remarks that R.3 Digitising agriculture, could be a more sectoral indicator as compared to R.1 Enhancing performance through knowledge and innovation. The Commission has enlarged the definition of R.1 Enhancing performance through knowledge and innovation, to beneficiaries, not only farmers, so that it is a general indicator. For R.3 Digitising agriculture, as it includes also Article 72, the definition also refers to beneficiaries. Belgium hence suggests that there are two options, either to follow the same logic for the two indicators, or to consider R.3 Digitising agriculture, only as a sectoral indicator in which only farmers who are following digital interventions are considered.

Slovenia, Finland and Belgium support the proposal to focus the indicator R.3 Digitising agriculture, on Article 68 (investments) only. Belgium considers that this could avoid double counting of the same farmer who participates to trainings and who at the same time receives support for investments. ‘Number of farmers’ of interventions from Article 72 could be a breakdown of the indicator R.1 Enhancing performance through knowledge and innovation.

The Commission clarifies that when it is stated ‘investments’, it covers also investments in the sectoral programmes. If a Member State has investments in sectoral programmes that lead to digitalisation, then this would be covered by the indicator R.3 Digitising agriculture.

The Commission clarifies that the indicator R.3 Digitising agriculture refers to beneficiaries. If the indicator is restricted to only investments, then the indicator can refer only to farmers. Speaking of beneficiaries at large and not only farmers is necessary because in trainings, it is not possible to distinguish between farmers and non-farmers. Training participants are however mostly farmers, so when the indicator R.3

Digitising agriculture, covers training, it is measuring primarily farmers focused on digital farming technologies.

The Commission clarifies that for sectoral interventions under R.3 Digitising agriculture, it should be referred to the PO members rather than to the PO as a beneficiary. However, this depends on the case, because if the PO as such is making an investment on digitalisation at the premises of the PO for the benefit of all its members, then all PO members would be beneficiaries; if the investments take place on the farm of one of the PO members, then it is not correct to count all PO members as beneficiaries.

The Commission acknowledges the comments from Member States mentioning that it would make sense to count only farmers and translates from this that it would be an accepted simplification if the indicator relied only on investments. The discussion on whether the indicator covers farmers or non-farmers should be further analysed when the scope of the indicator has been decided. The Commission considers it more informative to include investments as well as other types of support such as knowledge and cooperation. 20% of the EIP (innovation partnership) is dealing with digital application, which is a reason for the indicator to account for cooperation. However, the Commission acknowledges the difficulties in the Member States and hence would like to get feedback.

The Commission points out that a split of R.1 Enhancing performance through knowledge and innovation, by objective is not being asked for in the APR.

Indicator R.8 Targeting farms in sectors in difficulties

The Commission reminds that sectoral interventions are not targeted to sectors in difficulty. The only cases that would be counted would be cases in which a Member State would have declared in their CAP Strategic Plan that, in order to address sectors in difficulties, an operational programme would be implemented. Doing so however could bring additional complexity as things that are different in nature are being mixed. Most sectoral programmes do not address sectors in difficulty. The Commission would like to know if it would be simpler for most Member States to go back to the initial proposal by the Commission to limit R.8 Targeting farms in sectors in difficulty, to coupled payments. In addition, the Commission asks for feedback from Member States on whether it makes sense to split the indicator R.8 Targeting farms in sectors in difficulties, by sector.

France points out that, when brainstorming on how to simplify the list of indicators together with other Member States, it was proposed to add other sectors to the indicator R.8 Targeting farms in sectors in difficulties, in case a Member state was supporting a particular sector facing difficulties in order to be consistent with the title of the indicator. The indicator would hence cover those farms with coupled support but also with a specific sectoral intervention under the ‘other sectors’ interventions.

Austria and Slovenia agree that the ‘other sectors’ supported with operational funds are not sectors in difficulty. Austria, Slovenia, Cyprus and France agree to go back to the original Commission proposal of the indicator R.8 Targeting farms in sectors in difficulty. France considers that this would diminish the administrative burden.

France asks if the updated fiches that would be provided will follow the original list of indicators or the Croatian list of result indicators. Croatia and Spain request to have the updated indicator fiches at least five days before the next meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP.

The Commission explains that the updated fiches version would try to compile what has been proposed by the Commission as well as what has been proposed by the Croatian presidency, in a way that it can be easily seen where each of the changes comes from. Sometimes, on units, the discussion must take place on the intervention definition and not in the fiches, which should reflect the outcome of the discussions on the legal text. The updated list that will be shared will also include the indicators that are no longer proposed by the Croatian presidency, such as R.35 Promoting social inclusion, with a remark. The status on the indicators with respect to the German presidency will also be indicated.

The Commission encourages Member States to discuss with the German presidency and inform of the preference to come back to the original label for the indicator R.8 Targeting farms in sectors in difficulties, as has been expressed in the present meeting.

Indicator R.10 Better supply chain organisation

France considers that the proposed simplification on the indicator R.10 Better supply chain organisation, is going in the right direction. The Netherlands confirms that there would be no further problems for the calculation of the indicator given the simplifications.

Ireland would further reflect on the documents and presentations and will send written feedback.

Indicator R.28: Natura 2000

Sweden points out that the natural grassland (CLC 321) should not be included in the agricultural area that constitutes the denominator in R.28 Supporting Natura 2000.

France asks for further clarifications on why Article 67 has been excluded from the numerator of the indicator R.28 Supporting Natura 2000. Maybe the title of the indicator would then need to be changed, as the income support in Natura 2000 intervention would no longer be covered under this indicator.

The Commission explains that for land cover (C.05) and farming in Natura 2000 (C.19) two definitions of agricultural area have been proposed one with and one without the natural grassland, so that the indicator is able to depict the situation in all Member States.

*The Commission acknowledges that certain confusion might arise from the titles given to the indicators. The actual bold title of the indicator R.28 is **Supporting Natura 2000**, while the more specific label is 'Area in Natura 2000 sites under commitments for protection, maintenance and restoration'; these 'commitments' refer to 'agri-environment-climate commitments' and 'eco-schemes'. Support for Article 67 is income support only, hence not a commitment. The idea with indicator R.28 Supporting Natura 2000, is to have a purely environmental indicator. Therefore Article 67 has been excluded from this result indicator. The Commission acknowledges that the bold part of the label is confusing.*

Indicators R.30 Generational renewal, and R.31 Growth and jobs in rural areas

Sweden points out at the proposal by the Commission that complementary income support for young farmers should be added in the fiche for the indicator R.31 Growth and jobs in rural areas: New jobs in supported projects. If complementary income support for

young farmers is included here, the indicator will be more complex because this support type is area-based, while the support for young farmers is mainly for generation shifts, and thus it does not automatically create new jobs, but rather maintain jobs. Therefore, Sweden does not agree that support for young farmers should be included in indicator R.31 Growth and jobs in rural areas.

Sweden further asks how to express in full time equivalent the jobs for young farmers in pillar I.

Belgium explains that for the indicators R.30 Generational renewal, and R.31 Growth and jobs in rural areas, there is the frequent situation that two young farmers receive support for the setting-up on the same farm. Belgium asks if it is correct, in this case, to count two new farmers for the indicator R.30 Generational renewal, and two new jobs for the indicator R.31 Growth and jobs in rural areas. There is a difference with setting-up support (Article 69), which is for young farmers, and Article 27, which is paid to young farmers already set-up.

Lithuania enquires about the inclusion of family members in the case of young farmers under the indicator R.31 Growth and jobs in rural areas.

Austria states that it would be helpful to have clear definitions and calculation methods for as much indicators as possible. It will help supporting the planning process and the development of interventions correctly.

The Commission explains that looking at new young farmers who are setting up is important. There is not a big difference between the rural development support and the support under direct payments because it can also be that the farmers benefitting from the setting up under the rural development are also taking over after someone else as a farmer. This would not be a good reason not to account for the young farmers support under the indicator R.31 Growth and jobs in rural areas. Considering both payments is relevant because direct payments also contribute in the same sense to the setting up of young farmers. In some cases, it has been seen that young farmers newly set-up would not always go for rural development support because of the administrative complexity, while they would indeed go for direct support, and vice versa. The Commission is interested in acknowledging the contribution of both pillars to the setting up of farmers. In this context, a potential difficulty would be double counting. However, even though the support for young farmers is area-based, the ID of the beneficiary is available. Member States are expected to check and use the unique ID to avoid any double counting between the number of jobs created through to the rural development and through pillar I. This is something that is already required for R.30 Generational renewal; the same information is required also for R.31 Growth and jobs in rural areas.

The Commission acknowledges that, for pillar I, it is not possible to know if the job of the beneficiary is part time or full time. This information is not collected in the management of aids and the operations for direct payments. The Commission would accept to do the simplification that Member States would count these jobs in full time equivalent.

The Commission explains that information on how many farmers are setting up is known for the case of setting-up support from rural development. However, this information is not known for the case of the management of the direct payments, and there can be a situation where there are two young farmers setting up while accounting only for one beneficiary. There are exceptions to this, for example, the case of GAEC in France. Because of this, the Commission suggests that the most consolidated information possible

for all Member States would be the information based on the rural development programme. This information could be taken on board. When the situation involves the direct payments, it is then necessary to limit to the beneficiary. Therefore, the indicators – in particular, R.30 Generational renewal – refer to ‘beneficiary’. This issue, as well as the issue of family members, which goes in the same direction, will be further considered and a final decision will be reflected in the fiche.

Other questions and remarks

Czech Republic asks if non-productive investments should also be under the indicator R.17a Investment support to the forest sector.

Lithuania enquires if hectares under support for maintenance from previous programming period should be included under the indicator R.25 Supporting sustainable forest management.

The Commission clarifies that as long as non-productive investments are forestry investments, they should be recorded under the indicator R.17a Investment support to the forest sector.

The Commission explains that hectares under support for maintenance from previous programming period should be included if they are paid with new money. However, this answer will be further revised.

Belgium asks if the last version of complete list of output and result indicators is dated at 9 September and if the last version of the complete list of context/impact indicators is dated at 28 November.

The Commission confirms that the last version of complete list of output and result indicators is dated at 9 September and if the last version of the complete list of context/impact indicators is dated at 28 November.

The Netherlands asks where WK 7390/2020 that is mentioned in the presentation is available.

The Commission clarifies that WK 7390/2020 is available on CIRCA and that it has been circulated to the Council Working Group of Experts’ participants.

4.7. AOB

Mr Hannes Wimmer (ENRD Evaluation Helpdesk, Team Leader) gives a presentation called ‘Summary of recent and upcoming recent activities’.

Delegates from Member States raise the following questions and comments.

France asks when an explanation in how to plan impact and results indicators related to Green Deal is foreseen.

Germany enquires about the timeline for the ex post evaluation: 2024 or 2025.

The Commission states that Green Deal targets are currently under work, and a timeline is not yet available.

Regarding the timeline for the ex post evaluation, the Commission reminds that the most recent update is available on CIRCA. The Commission will nevertheless come back on these questions at the next GREXE,

5. CONCLUSIONS

Ms Helaine asks the delegates if any further questions are open. As this is not the case the meeting is closed.

6. NEXT STEPS

Member States are asked send their feedback to questions on indicators to the functional mailbox AGRI-C4-GREXE@ec.europa.eu, until Tuesday 8 September.

7. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP is planned for 1 October 2020.

8. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

In Annex.

< e-signed >
Tassos HANIOTIS
Director

List of participants– Minutes
Expert group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP

2 September 2020

MEMBER STATE	Ministry Or Organisation	NUMBER OF PERSONS
BELGIQUE/BELGIË (Belgium)	Flanders MA	2
BELGIQUE/BELGIË (Belgium)	Service public de Wallonie - DGARNE	3
БЪЛГАРИЯ (Bulgaria)	Bulgarian Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry	6
ČESKO (Czechia)	Ministry of Agriculture	2
DANMARK (Denmark)	The Danish Agricultural Agency	1
DEUTSCHLAND (Germany)	Federal Ministry for Food and Agriculture, Germany	2
DEUTSCHLAND (Germany)	MEND	1
DEUTSCHLAND (Germany)	Thuenen-Institute	2
EESTI (Estonia)	Agricultural Registers and Information Board	1
EESTI (Estonia)	Ministry of Rural Affairs	2
EIRE- IRELAND	Department of Agriculture, Food and Marine	5
ΕΛΛΑΔΑ (Greece)	MANAGING AUTHORITY OF GREEK RDP, Evaluation Unit	2
ΕΛΛΑΔΑ (Greece)	Ministry of Rural Development and Food, Tree Crops Unit	4
ΕΛΛΑΔΑ (Greece)	OPEKEPE (Paying Agency), Direct Payments Directorate	3
ΕΛΛΑΔΑ (Greece)	Permanent Representation of Greece to the EU	1
ESPAÑA (Spain)	Fondo Español de Garantía Agraria (FEGA)	1
ESPAÑA (Spain)	Ministry of Agriculture	5
FRANCE (France)	ASP	1
FRANCE (France)	FranceAgriMer	1
FRANCE (France)	MCFA	1
FRANCE (France)	Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation	1
FRANCE	Permanent Representation	1

(France)		
HRVATSKA (Croatia)	Ministry of Agriculture	2
ITALIA (Italy)	Ministero delle Politiche agricole alimentari e forestali	1
ITALIA (Italy)	Ministry of Agricultural (National Rural Network Programme on M&E)	3
ΚΥΠΡΟΣ (Cyprus)	Evaluator	1
ΚΥΠΡΟΣ (Cyprus)	Ministry of Agriculture, Rural Development and Environment (Managing Authority of Cyprus RDP)	1
LATVIJA (Latvia)	INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES AND ECONOMICS	2
LATVIJA (Latvia)	Ministry of Agriculture	5
LATVIJA (Latvia)	Rural Support Service	1
LIETUVA (Lithuania)	National Paying Agency under the Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Lithuania	1
LIETUVA (Lithuania)	The Ministry of Agriculture	4
LUXEMBOURG (Luxembourg)	Ministry of Agriculture; Service d'Economie rurale	1
MAGYARORSZÁG (Hungary)	Ministry of Agriculture	3
MALTA (Malta)	Managing Authority EAFRD, Ministry for Foreign and European Affairs	4
NEDERLAND (Netherlands)	Regiebureau POP	2
NEDERLAND (Netherlands)	Rijksdienst voor Ondernemend Nederland RVO	2
ÖSTERREICH (Austria)	Federal Ministry for Agriculture, Regions and Tourism	3
POLSKA (Poland)	Agency for Restructuring and Modernisation of Agriculture	1
POLSKA (Poland)	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	6
PORTUGAL (Portugal)	Gabinete de Planeamento, Políticas e Administração Geral - Ministério da Agricultura	2
ROMÂNIA (Romania)	Managing Authority for the National Rural Development Programme - NRDP 2014-2020	3
ROMÂNIA (Romania)	Paying and Intervention Agency for Agriculture	1
SLOVENIJA (Slovenia)	Agency for Agricultural Markets and Rural Development	6
SLOVENIJA (Slovenia)	Budget Supervision Office of the Republic of Slovenia (Certification body)	2
SLOVENIJA (Slovenia)	Ministry of agriculture, forestry and food	1
SLOVENSKO (Slovakia)	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	3

SUOMI/FINLAND (Finland)	Finnish Food Authority	2
SUOMI/FINLAND (Finland)	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry	2
SVERIGE (Sweden)	Ministry of Enterprise and Innovation	1
SVERIGE (Sweden)	Statens Jordbruksverk	2
<i>COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION</i>		0
<i>EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT</i>		0