



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

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

Brussels,  
Agri.ddg.1.C.4 Ares (2019) 7429833

## **MINUTES**

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

***Date: 3 October 2019***

Chair: Ms Christina Gerstgrasser

Delegations present: All Member States were present, except United Kingdom.

#### **1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

Ms Christina Gerstgrasser (DG AGRI, Unit C.4 – Monitoring and Evaluation) 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 16<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP held on 20 March 2019.

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.

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/ui/welcome>

#### **4. LIST OF POINTS DISCUSSED**

##### **4.1 Information**

Ms Gerstgrasser presents a PPT available on CIRCAbc showing the six evaluations launched by DG AGRI in 2019. The evaluations are publicly available information on the so-called road-map. The contractors for each of these evaluations may be contacting the Member States for data collection purposes. DG AGRI would be grateful for the Member States' support.

## **4.2 Towards the New Delivery Model: from Croatian National Strategy to CAP Strategic Plan**

Mr Tassos Haniotis (DG AGRI – Director of Strategy, Simplification, and Policy Analysis) opens this session by explaining that the presentation from Croatia is meant to provide a useful background on how to address the issue related to the gradual shift of the CAP from a system that is mainly driven by control to a system that is driven by performance. The SWOT analysis is the first step to design the CAP Strategic Plan. There are different approaches to arrive at assessing the current situation. The approach presented by Croatia is just one example.

Mr Haniotis passes the floor to Ms Bernardica Bošnjak and Mr Nikša Tkalec (from the Ministry of Agriculture of Croatia), to Ms Svetlana Edmeades, Mr Philip Van der Celen and Ms Jela Bilandžija (World Bank), and Mr Demetrios Psaltopoulos (Independent expert), who give a presentation entitled ‘*Towards the new delivery model: from Croatian National Strategy to CAP Strategic Plan*’.

*After the presentation, Member States’ delegations raised the following questions/comments:*

### **Data situation at farm level**

Germany asks, which data has been used for the econometric analysis and for the presented findings concerning small sized farms. It highlights, that in Germany the situation of data in this area is rather difficult.

*Croatia highlights that it has experienced the same data limitations and challenges as in other EU countries. FADN is considered the best tool available, with all its embedded flaws. Croatia is intensively working with farmers to improve the data collection and produce more sensitive analysis that better represent the situation on the ground. The World Bank explains that the most challenging task was to put different datasets together, for instance FADN with the dataset provided by the paying agency.*

### **Weights applied to stakeholder responses**

Germany asks if any weights were applied to the stakeholders’ responses when analysing the survey findings. It highlights that some farmers could have given strategic replies, while other replies may have been given by bodies which represent a larger group of stakeholders.

*The World Bank explains that instead of weighing the opinions on the characteristics of each respondent, the stakeholder survey considered the differences at regional level. For instance, the survey covered stakeholders from the coastal areas, Zagreb, Slavonia, etc.*

### **Approach for deducing conclusion and for the prioritisation of needs**

Germany observes that the presented analysis mainly focused on socio-economic aspects of the agricultural sector, whereas the conclusions related to the environment and climate protection were not entirely deducible from this analysis. Germany and France ask about the role of policy makers in the process of prioritising the needs: Will the ministry take only into account the needs expressed by the stakeholders or will it validate the findings and bring in its own ideas about how to develop rural areas?

*Croatia confirms that issues concerning climate change, environment, and the green agenda did not result as main priorities among the surveyed farmers. By contrast, the ministry sees the protection of the environment and mitigation of climate change as condition sine qua non for the agricultural policy. The Worldbank representative highlights, that there are considerable opportunities for Croatia to mainstream climate and environmental actions in farmers’ decisions linked to market, tourism, etc.*

### **CAP Strategic Plan and Croatian National Strategy**

France asks if the national strategy and the CAP strategic plan converge with each other, or if the latter will replace the first.

*Croatia explains that the presented analysis for the National Rural Development Strategic Transformation gives a wider picture of the agricultural sector. It goes beyond the CAP Strategic Plan, but it will provide recommendations for designing the intervention strategy and interventions in the future CAP Strategic Plan.*

## **Definition of needs**

France asks what official definition of needs was used in the assessment.

*The World Bank representative highlights that theory of change is used as common methodology in the international community to build the chain of actions between interventions, outputs, outcomes and results, and ultimately impacts. Needs were defined at outcome or result level. In the context of this work, needs are defined as key changes that need to be brought about in order for Croatia to realise its long-term impacts.*

*Mr Tassos Haniotis reminds that the consultation of different stakeholders and the prioritisation of the assessed needs are under the responsibility of the Member States, while the Commission is responsible of judging and assessing the CAP Strategic Plan on the basis of the evidence.*

### **4.3 CAP post-2020: PMEF indicators**

Ms Gerstgrasser passes the floor to Ms Sophie Helaine (DG AGRI, Unit C.2 – Analysis and Outlook) who gives a presentation entitled ‘*Output and result indicators*’. The presentation and discussion is structured into three parts: (1) area-related indicators; (2) investment related indicators, (3) indicators related to livestock units.

*After the presentation, Member States’ delegations raised the following questions/comments:*

#### **4.3.1 Area-related indicators**

### **Organic Farming in eco-schemes supported under Pillar I**

Based on the presented examples, Slovakia asks if organic farming can be included in eco-schemes supported under Pillar I.

### **O.4 Number of ha for decoupled DP**

Slovakia understands that all the decoupled direct payment schemes should feed into the indicator O.4. However, the data will be received in different points in time, according to each direct payment scheme. Therefore, Slovakia asks what the timeframe is to collect the data for this indicator. Spain expresses doubts on the aggregation of data for this indicator with a view to avoid double counting. Spain asks what happens if the same surface area (in hectares) should be counted twice if it receives payments from two different production seasons but in the same year.

*The Commission explains that if a farmer claims for direct payment around April or June, the first payment takes place at the end of October of the same year, and the farmer will be fully paid within the year after. This will have to be reported by the 15<sup>th</sup> of February of the year after that. Regarding the aggregation of data in O.04, as explained in the fiche, the Commission aims to avoid double counting. The idea is to count the beneficiaries only once even if they have received two payments from two different years.*

### **Unit amount**

Slovakia questions why the hectares should be reported on the basis of the unit amount.

*The Commission confirms that the interventions are defined by unit amount which is easier to handle for performance clearance.*

### **O.31 Number of ha under environmental practices and O.32 Number of ha subject to conditionality**

Belgium, France, and Slovakia argue that the calculation of O.31 and O.32 is complicated as the amount of data to be aggregated under these indicators is too much. Slovakia suggests that O.32 should be revised to select only the necessary sub-indicators. Spain asks if O.31 can include also interventions supporting the prevention of fires in forestry areas, or other forestry activities with environmental purposes which can be expressed also in hectares. If not, Spain asks where these types of interventions could be linked to, considering that O.31 is not used for the performance clearance. Furthermore, Spain argues that O.32 should be collected for the total area eligible and complying with GAECs and not only for the areas receiving CAP support. Poland argues that two separate categories shall be used in O.32: one for peatland and one for wetlands under GAEC 2. However, the definitions of these two areas remain unclear. Poland

believes that the collection data for both areas will be difficult. Finally, Poland asks to specify the legal basis for the interventions included in the indicator fiches, particularly for the O.31.

*The Commission stresses the importance of these indicators to show the environmental ambition of the CAP. The two output indicators are key elements in the CAP green architecture. For a matter of simplification, the Commission believes that O.32 should be collected only for the area receiving CAP support. However, the Commission welcomes any request to include also other eligible area complying with the GAECs.*

*The Commission explains that O.31 captures the areas under management commitments. The types of interventions mentioned by Spain shall be considered either as investments or as afforested areas. In the latter case, the forestry area shall be recorded under R.17 Afforested land.*

*The Commission clarifies that the definition of peatland and wetland under GAEC 2 shall be defined by the Member States, considering also the easiest solution for the data collection and reporting. The Member States shall only report the total area under GAEC 2. Further details on the parcel, location, or farmer receiving support are not requested.*

*The Commission takes note of the observation made by Poland and will consider specifying the legal reference for O.31.*

### **Denominator for result indicators**

Poland asks if the denominator used in some result indicators will be stable for the entire programming period. Poland asks clarifications on the reviews of the denominator in monthly or other periods as established in the presented indicator fiches.

*The Commission explains that a precise answer to this question is contained in the cover note to the indicator fiches. The cover note explains that the denominator of the result indicators will be kept constant over the entire programming period, except for the result indicators related to the market, where the denominator will be adapted to remove the price volatility.*

### **Surface areas supported under Pillar II**

Poland asks how to consider surface areas supported with advances or partial payments under Pillar II with a view of avoiding double counting. Poland argues that this should be aligned with the output indicators. Moreover, Poland asks how the collection of the proposed indicators will deal with the transition period, namely with new and old obligations.

*The Commission clarifies that for the performance clearance and the matching between the unit amounts and the hectares, partial hectares can be considered in the related output indicators. To avoid problems with aggregates and double counting in the result indicators, the Commission suggests considering only hectares in full, even if these were only partially paid. As regards the transfer of commitments to the new period, the collection of the indicator will depend on the transitional rules for which there is no proposal yet. However, the principle in the current programming period looks at where the money comes from. If the money to support the payments comes from the new programming period, these have to be taken into account.*

### **O.9 Number of ha benefitting from coupled support**

Poland sees that various schemes can be linked to one hectare benefitting from coupled support, therefore asks to receive an example to clarify how O.9 will be calculated.

*The Commission explains that this indicator is linked to coupled support and Member States shall report interventions per unit amount. Currently, there are approximately 220 coupled payment schemes across all the Member States (i.e. 220 lines). If in a Member States there are 20 different coupled payments schemes, this means 20 different lines shall be created under this indicator. If there is also degressivity in the schemes, further lines can be added.*

### **O.13 Number of ha (agricultural) covered by environment/climate commitments going beyond mandatory requirements and R.7 Enhancing support to farms in areas with specific needs**

Poland argues that the eco-schemes should be also included in the indicator fiche for O.13. Poland asks if eco-schemes shall be included in the calculation of R.7, considering that Article 28(6)(b) of the Commission's proposal establishes that payments shall compensate beneficiaries for all or part of the additional costs incurred and income foregone as a result of the commitments pursuant Article 65. Spain believes that O.13 should cover both hectares and livestock units.

*The Commission explains that eco-schemes shall be recorded under O.31. To include eco-schemes under O.13, the Council's Presidency shall remove the first column of the table 'output indicators' included in Annex I to the Commission's proposal, which provides reference to the types of interventions. Regarding "What if the eco-scheme aid is calculated based on income forgone and costs incurred and not as a total, it should not count as income support in R6, R7". We consider that as it is a decoupled payment it serves income support. That is why we count it for in R7 and R6. The Commission does not see the need to record livestock units in O.13 because these are tracked already under O.15 (see indicator fiches). Moreover, other result indicators allow to record livestock units receiving CAP support.*

#### **O.18 Number of supported on-farm productive investments and R.17 Afforested land**

Poland asks if areas receiving support for reforestation shall also be included in O.18 and R.17.

#### **R.14 Carbon storage in soils and biomass and R.25 Supporting sustainable forest management**

Poland asks clarifications on the differences between R.14 and R.25 vis a vis the annual payment for reforestation. Specifically, Poland asks if the area mentioned in R.14 shall be understood as the same area to be considered for R.25. Moreover, Poland asks if R.14 relates only to reforested areas in previously rural zones. In other cases, Poland asks which indicator shall be considered for the reforestation of areas under the previous system.

#### **R.27 Preserving habitat and species and R.04 Linking income support to standards and good practices**

Poland asks about the rationale for deleting the reference to Article 65 in R.27. Poland argues that payments under Natura2000 should be under the environmental objective as they deal with nature, habitat, and species conservation. Moreover, Poland asks if interventions for Article 65 shall be considered in R.04.

*The Commission explains that payments pursuing Article 65 provide income support to compensate for the constraints faced by being in Natura 2000. This does not mean that beneficiaries are going beyond the obligations established for Natura 2000. The Commission explains that the reference to Article 65 was removed from the indicator fiche R.27 because this indicator looks at the actions going beyond the GAEC and the obligations for Natura 2000.*

#### **Double counting in hectares receiving enhanced income support for young farmer and basic income support and the issue of capping.**

Finland asks clarifications on the calculation of the output indicators related to areas receiving both enhanced income support for young farmers and basic income support, especially with a view of avoiding double counting. Moreover, Finland asks if the capping of income support affects the calculation of the output indicator.

*The Commission explains that the capping consists of reducing the amount paid per hectare, but it does not reduce the hectares receiving income support. Therefore, this should not affect the reporting on hectares.*

#### **Basis for calculation of output indicators**

Finland asks if output indicators shall be calculated on the basis of final payments or beneficiary application.

*The Commission explains that output indicators shall be based on the final payments.*

#### **R.04 Linking income support to standards and good practices**

Spain asks if forestry areas can be included in the nominator of R.04 considering that these areas were not part of the denominator.

*The Commission explains that forestry and agricultural areas are always dealt into different indicators. Therefore, forestry areas cannot be included in this indicator.*

## **R.12 Adaptation to climate change**

Spain asks about the rationale for removing the reference to environmentally friendly agriculture in the indicator fiche for R.12.

### **Context indicators**

France asks when the context indicator fiches will be made available for the Member States. Furthermore, France reminds that over 45 context indicators, seven or eight are without data. France asks who will collect the missing data for these context indicators.

*The Commission does not aim to add new context indicators. For the SWOT analysis and assessment of needs to develop the CAP Strategic Plan, the Member States can use the existing data and the most updated information available in hand. The Commission aims to include the list of common context indicators in the legal basis before its approval.*

### **General improvements for the indicator fiches**

France argues that the presented indicator fiches can be improved in line with the following points:

1. To standardise the terms used in the indicators: e.g. sometimes the term ‘farmer’ is used instead of ‘beneficiaries’
2. To delete ambiguous indicators
3. To avoid the consolidation of multi-intervention data or to have several specific objectives at the same time. The calculation of indicators shall be made as automatic as possible for the Member States
4. To distinguish output indicators that are for the annual performance clearance from those that are not
5. To set the number of result indicators and indicate which specific objectives they are aiming at. If environmental indicators can aim to several objectives, to clarify if this principle can also apply for other indicators.

Based on the latest indicator fiches, France asks a consolidation of data needs across the output indicators. The fiches seem suggesting the aggregation of data for output indicators and this shall be avoided considering its difficulties, unless it is linked to the performance clearance.

*The Commission is working on increasing the homogeneity in the terminologies. The use of different terms (e.g. beneficiary vs farmers) shall be understood as outlined in the Regulation and used in Eurostat. These explanations are provided in the cover note. The Commission welcomes any detailed suggestion and specific references to aspects that do not seem homogeneous or are still unclear. This applies also for indicators considered to be ambiguous.*

*About the link between CAP specific objectives, interventions, and result indicators, the new delivery model gives flexibility to the Member States on how to set up the intervention logic and reach the CAP specific objectives. In the current Rural Development Programme, one result indicator is linked to each focus area’s objective, expect for the use of complementary result indicators. For the future, more result indicators can be linked to one CAP specific objective. Regarding the distinctions of indicators to be used for the performance clearance, the Commission reminds that the cover note provides clear explanations.*

### **Automatic calculation of result indicators**

To ensure that the CAP strategic plan is understandable to the public, France argues that the output indicators shall show only the main contribution to the intervention logic, whereas the denominator and the numerator should not go down to the level of expenditure heading. In order to make the calculation of result indicators more automatic, France thinks that their numerator should be calculated on the basis of output indicators. At the moment, only nine output indicators out of the 35 are used to calculate 14 result indicators. France believes that this principle should be applied for all result indicators in order to reduce the burden to collect information from other data sources.

*Regarding the automatic calculation of result indicators, the Commission agrees with this approach. For instance, the Commission suggests counting the hectares in full instead of partial accounts for the numerator of several result indicators. For the performance clearance, the Commission will not ask the Member States to report twice on the output indicators (e.g. once for the output indicator itself and once for the result indicator).*

## **R.12 Adaptation to climate change and R.05 Risk Management**

France asks to record area financed under Article 66 in R.12. France argues that the idea of commitment shall be replaced with aid or assistance climate change adaptation. Finally, France highlights that R.05 is not only related to climate change.

*The Commission explains that ANC is about climate adaptation and not about mitigation; mitigation is in R14. In ANC (Article 66), you have mountain areas and many other measures behind ANC and not all can be justified to be linked to climate mitigation. As regards the sequestration of carbon on pasture land, it depends on how the pasture is managed. It has to be described in a way that it proves it does contribute to R.14.*

## **Revision of the indicator fiches**

Austria agrees with France on the need to harmonise the terminologies in the indicator fiches. Moreover, Austria notes that only a number of draft amendments put forward by the Romanian Presidency were included in the indicator fiches, whereas others were discarded. Austria asks if this was a deliberate decision.

*Regarding the redrafting of Annex I during the Romanian's Presidency, the Commission explains that it cannot pre-empt the trialogue therefore the labels in the latest indicator fiches are exactly the same as in the main proposal of 2018. This explains why the indicator fiches proposed by the Romanian's Presidency were not circulated.*

### **4.3.2 Investment-related indicators**

## **General remarks on indicators and complexity of the system**

Italy, Belgium and France are generally concerned about the number of indicators and the necessary IT system to get the indicator values. Italy argues that with the indicator break-downs the overall number of indicators has increased, and it is very complex to aggregate the values in a regionalised system. Cyprus claims that the detailed information to be collected by the Member States represents a high bureaucratic and administrative effort for a small programme.

*The Commission is aware of the costs, however it strongly believes that Member States will be able to provide the detailed information that the Commission is asking.*

## **Attributing investments to results**

Belgium and Luxemburg are concerned about linking investment projects to result indicators as this requires to go down to the level of the content of the investment. As this information is not categorised the task becomes very complex and subjective. While the intention would be to automate the system as much as possible, this high level of detail requires to go manually through each file. Luxembourg asks if it is mandatory to justify why an investment was attributed to a certain result? Both Belgium and France support the automation of indicator calculation as far as possible.

*The Commission clarifies that the Member States need to be able to demonstrate what is being done with investments (e.g. for an important objective like animal welfare). In order to automate this process, further categories of interventions of investments can be defined. This allows tracing information automatically right from the beginning, instead of going back to the files afterwards. For other investments, the traceability may be easier: e.g. for the non-productive investments a direct link with R.23 can be established; for investments on infrastructure, the connecting rural area can be linked as it is about basic services. While target setting and planning depend very much on what farmers are going to apply for, this situation is not entirely different from the current RDPs. It depends very much on how the interventions are designed: Member States could design very broad interventions covering all kind of farm investments and*

decide then for each project separately, which result indicator it contributes to. Alternatively, thematic calls could be organised where some categories, certain kinds of investments, are pre-established.

### **Administrative burden of performance monitoring**

Greece observes that when it comes to linking the objectives of an intervention with result indicators, this will create a high level of administrative effort because many result indicators, means many targets and many milestones per intervention to be followed.

*The Commission reminds that Member States have to change their mind-set to the new delivery model: there are common objectives and Member States are free to choose the interventions to reach these goals. Moving away from compliance, Member States will however need to report on performance towards the objectives.*

### **Criteria for certifying the correctness of the data**

Germany notes that the output indicator fiches, although a good starting point for developing a reporting system, are still too general for the certifying body to assess the correctness of the data. It asks on what basis this should be done.

*The Commission highlights that this question is not for this group.*

### **R.3 Digitising agriculture**

In reference to R.3, France agrees with Belgium that it requires consolidating data. For this this purpose however, a clear definition of ‘digital farming technology’ is needed to ensure harmonized reporting.

*The Commission takes notes of the difficulties Member States might face.*

### **R.9 Farm modernisation**

Poland notes that the objective of R.9 is to strengthen market orientation and competitiveness, with a focus on research, technology and digitalisation, and though it is a broad objective, the proposed indicator only refers to the restructuring and modernisation of agricultural holdings. Poland argues that in order to better reflect what is included in objective 2, restructuring and modernisation could be deleted while only the modernisation aspect should be highlighted. Moreover, Poland suggests using this indicator as a universal indicator for other investments where there are no specific result indicators.

*The Commission asks Poland to send an example in writing.*

Denmark asks if in R9, the fact that the number of beekeepers is not part of Eurostat data refers to the survey the MS undertake under the current common market organisation.

*The Commission clarifies that the number of beekeepers refers to the one collected via the CMO, as in the FSS there is no standard output for beehives. Beekeepers that are only doing no other agricultural activities are not included. To avoid counting all beekeepers, what should be done is a census of which part of farmers have beehives, when that number is calculated, it should be checked with the CMO and the difference should be added so to cover the whole population.*

Slovakia asks if productive investment in agricultural holdings, which are processing their own primary production, can be included in R.9.

*The Commission confirms that if there is an investment on a farm for processing it can be counted in R.9 as well, because it is on the farm. If it is off farm but the farmer is benefiting from it, it is also in R.9.*

### **R.23 Environment-/climate-related performance through investment**

Poland asks for confirmation if holdings that receive support for construction or renovation farming in natural disaster or an exceptional climate event, can use this indicator.

France notes that in R.23 it is restricted just to farmers, and asks how non-farm operators, forest managers, agroindustry, non-agricultural producer organisations should be included.



*The Commission states that natural disasters do not fit with investments and asks Poland to come back in writing and to explain the question better.*

Denmark finds it problematic that if during the programming period, a farm benefits from several investment operations, it counts only as one. Denmark fails to see the logic behind this, as different investments to the same farmer throughout the period would all have a separate effect. The current wording in the fiche could lead to problems: the contributions to targets and milestones could not be reflected correctly, or MS might tend to exclude farmers from applying for more than one investment during the period.

*The EC explains, that there should be an incentive to grant support to farmers who did not already have support.*

Regarding R.23, Slovakia suggests that also investments where farms are indirect beneficiaries should be included in this indicator. An example could be a non-productive investment in landscape features on agricultural land resulting from land consolidation projects.

*The Commission explains that already R.9 relates to investments on farms and R.32 to investments elsewhere, basically SMEs (everything which is beyond the farm); this is why there is this wide definition of bio-economy; this is the one which is used in the literature, while there are two for bio-economy, the Commission chose the large one to ensure that all support to SMEs is reported in the result indicators.*

### **R.31 Growth and jobs in rural areas**

France notes that there are two methods for calculating indicator R.31 depending on the time of data collection: the number of jobs created *during* the investment and the number *after* the payment of the remaining amount. France furthermore asks for a clarification on how to deal with negative impacts (jobs destroyed), and how to deal with predicted results (before project start) versus real results and the need to adjust the milestones.

*The Commission clarifies that there are different periods in time for the investment of other business, start-ups and so on, it is indeed not the same point in time for data collection. Here it is furthermore not intended to look at the negative effects. The EC is aware that there might be a discrepancy with what is foreseen and what is actually created; that is why it is asked in the fiche to make a check based on a sample of completed projects and not to check all projects.*

### **O.31 Number of ha under environmental practices: Investment support to the forestry sector**

About indicators on surface area, about O.31 for forest activity, Spain understands that management commitments for forestry were included and investments in forestry would be in R.17. However, there are a series of other forestry activities which are also investments, and which also affect surface area that also have an environmental objective that are not afforestation necessarily. Spain stresses that prevention of forest fires is very important. Restoring degraded forest land, forestry with an environmental aim, is 10% of the EAFRD, Spain argues that it does not go in either of the indicators mentioned, and therefore would like to know where these kinds of forestry activities involving investment and surface area could be included.

*The Commission explains that, when investments in the forest sector which are not linked to the creation of woodland is mentioned, it would be recorded under R.17a proposed by the Romanian Presidency. This is where investment support to the forest sector beyond forest area creation will be collected.*

### **R.32 Developing the rural bioeconomy**

Poland asks whether creating new services in farming can be seen as part of R.32. Regarding the change of the title of Article 69, Poland asks if a new fiche is planned or if this will be added to an existing fiche. In this context, Poland asks the definition of 'small farm'.

*The Commission explains that the Commission trusts the Member States to decide whether the new service or activity is more on farm or off farm. Therefore, there is no need to discuss what would be a good intervention and what would be relevant because it is up to the MS to design the interventions according to the needs and the targets you establish and propose that to the EC. With regard to the change in Article 69 the Commission specifies that this is a work in progress, and it is not clear yet if it will be included in*

*another indicator or if there will be the proposal of a new indicator to cover small farms. In the latter case, a new fiche will be prepared.*

Denmark asks whether under R.32 the supported activities should contribute to all the objectives newly listed in the fiche or just to one.

*The Commission specifies that under R.32, supported activities may contribute to either of the listed objectives.*

France argues that the number of farms in the bio-economy sector is not a result indicator, but an output indicator. France is concerned that the definition of bio-economy is too broad, and a source of potential mistakes. Slovakia and Spain ask if investments in sustainable forestry can be included under this indicator. Spain asks whether forestry production, because it is not agricultural production (cork, fungi) could be included under bio-economy.

*The Commission clarifies that although it was stated that R.32 was not a result indicator, it believes it is important to grasp what is done in our policy with rural areas for SMEs and not only for farms. This is another pillar of our policy, it can be SMEs or POs and this is where we really look at these aspects. About what is good for environment and climate which is not done by farmers, it refers to the fiche R23a proposed by the Romanian Presidency.*

*The Commission highlights that, if it is about management commitment, there are the indicators R.25 and R.26; and when it is not about management commitment for sustainability in forestry, there is the indicator R.17a.*

#### **R.34 Connecting rural Europe**

France argues that R.34 will be difficult to calculate (e.g. the population benefitting from an investment).

*The Commission answers that during the next meeting all social indicators will be addressed, especially where there is the share of the rural population. The Commission asks to address all questions beforehand, and a presentation that meets the Member States' requests will be made and the Member States' questions will be answered at best.*

#### **4.3.3 Livestock-related indicators**

#### **R.36 Limiting antibiotic use and R38 Improving animal welfare**

France suggests that R.36 and R.38 could be made optional or removed to limit the number of specific indicators.

*The Commission argues that R.38 on welfare is one of the main objectives of the CAP and it will be hard to suppress it.*

Germany and Luxemburg ask for clarification as regards the calculation method and the underlying logic for R.38. Finland would like to know if just the Eurostat coefficients for the livestock can be used or if minor modifications are possible. Belgium asks if for interventions payments are made by hectare, how can this needs be transposed into livestock units? Sweden asks if the number of livestock units related to investments should be reported each year from the first payment, how long should it be?

*The EC clarifies that when it proposed the fiche for the first time, it had taken the production cycles into account and had received comments from MS saying that it was not what was done for the commitment on animal welfare. What counts here for animal welfare is livestock unit per place and not paid per livestock unit produced on the farm. The EC adapted the fiche to follow the way the management commitment for animal welfare is implemented currently and should be implemented in the future. We will relate to the number of livestock unit, the share of livestock unit in the total livestock unit. The total livestock unit is based on the livestock survey which is a point in time.*

*About the coefficient in the current regulation, there is a reference to another list of coefficients for livestock units in a delegated act. As for the future, it is unknown if this delegated act will still exist a reference to Eurostat is given.*

*The EC did not have in mind to transform hectares into livestock units with a standard coefficient but rather that the data would be collected directly from the farm.*

*As regards the reporting of livestock units related to investments, the EC clarifies that for commitments this will be for the length of the commitment; for investment, it is for the whole programming period.*

#### **4.4 Update on the activities of the Evaluation Helpdesk**

Ms Gerstgrasser passes the floor to Mr Hannes Wimmer (Evaluation Helpdesk, Team Leader) who gives a presentation on the ‘Draft Annual Work Programme 2020’. Mr Hannes Wimmer invites the Member States’ delegates to share their views on the relevance and timing of the suggested activities of the Evaluation Helpdesk for 2020.

*After the presentation, Member States’ delegations raised the following questions/comments:*

Germany asks, if any activities on the assessment of animal welfare could be considered in the Annual Work Programme 2020.

*Mr Wimmer explains, that a factsheet on “How to Evaluate RDP Contributions to Animal Welfare” has recently been published at the website of the Evaluation Helpdesk. The Evaluation Helpdesk had further explored with Member States if there was interest to share experiences, but has received limited response.*

#### **4.5 Any other business: Member states’ needs on CAP post2020 monitoring**

Ms Gerstgrasser passes the floor to Mr Zélie Peppiette (Adviser CMEF Direct support and RD, Directorates D, E, F) who invites the Member States’ delegates to share their views on the following questions:

- What support have you valued in the current period concerning monitoring and evaluation?
- Thinking about the future, what support would you need in order to fulfil the monitoring and reporting requirements of the CAP Strategic Plan and the new delivery model?

Given the advanced time, Ms Peppiette invites the delegates to send answers to above questions in writing.

## **5 CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS/OPINIONS**

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

## **6 NEXT STEPS**

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

- Issues, questions, gaps and mistakes noted concerning the proposed performance framework and output, result, impact, context indicators.
- Reflections on Member states’ needs on CAP post2020 monitoring based on the questions raised in AOB.
-

## **7 NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP is planned for 03-12-2019.

## **8 LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

In Annex.

(e-signed )  
Tassos HANIOTIS

List of participants– Minutes

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

Date: 3 October 2019

MEMBER STATE	Ministry Or Organisation	NUMBER OF PERSONS
BE	Service public de Wallonie – Agriculture	2
	Flemish Department of Agriculture and Fisheries	2
BG	Ministry of Agriculture Food and Forestry	1
CZ	Ministry of Agriculture	2
DK	The Danish Agricultural Agency	1
DE	Thuenen-Institute	1
	Monitoring- und Evaluierungsnetzwerk Deutschland (MEN-D)	1
EE	Ministry of Rural Affairs	1
	Estonian Agricultural Register and Information Board	1
IE	Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine	1
EL	Managing Authority of Greek RDP	1
	Ministry of Rural Development and Food	1
ES	Ministry of Agriculture	3
FR	Ministry of Agriculture et de l'Alimentation	1
	ASP	1
	France AgriMer	1
HR	Ministry of Agriculture	3
IT	Ministry of Agriculture (National Rural Network)	1
	Ministero delle Politiche agricole alimentari e forestali	1
CY	LKN	1
LV	Ministry of Agriculture	2
LT	Ministry of Agriculture	2
LU	Ministère de l'Agriculture	1
	Service d'Economie Rurale	1
HU	Ministry of Agriculture	2
MT	Managing Authority EAFRD, MEAE	1
NL	Regiebureau POP	1
	RVO	1

AT	Federal Ministry of Sustainability and Tourism	2
PL	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	3
	Agency for Restructuring and Modernisation of Agriculture	1
PT	MAFRD-GPP	1
RO	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	1
	Paying and Intervention Agency for Agriculture	1
SI	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food	1
SK	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	2
FI	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry	2
SE	Statens Jordbruksverk	1
	Ministry of Enterprise and Innovation	1
UK		
	<i>Ad Hoc Experts</i>	4
	<i>TOTAL</i>	58