

EUROPEAN
EVALUATION
HELPDESK
FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT



10TH MEETING OF THE EXPERT GROUP ON MONITORING AND EVALUATING THE CAP

18 November 2016



1. Adoption of the agenda

The Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP meets for the tenth time in the European Commission's premises in Brussels on 18 November 2016.

Adelina dos Reis (DG AGRI Unit E.4) chairs the meeting, welcomes participants, and announces the languages in which the meeting is held.

Adelina dos Reis asks the participants if there are any proposals for changes of the agenda.

No changes are proposed, and the agenda is adopted.

2. Information

Adelina dos Reis informs that in relation to the Thematic Working Group 1 "[Guidelines Assessment of RDP results: how to prepare for reporting on evaluation in 2017](#)" – three documents have been uploaded on [CIRCABC](#) and on the [Evaluation Helpdesk's website](#) at the end of October 2016, namely:

- [The guidelines](#);
- [Annex 11](#), containing the fiches to answer the Common Evaluation Questions no. 1 to 21;
- [SFC templates](#), chapter 7 of the Annual Implementation Report (AIR) submitted in 2017.

While the guidelines and Annex 11 are uploaded on both CIRCABC and the Evaluation Helpdesk's Website, the SFC templates are uploaded only on CIRCABC.

The three documents take into account the comments received by the Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP in May 2016, and of the meeting of the Rural Development Committee, which took place in July 2016. Among the aspects clarified in the last version of the documents, Adelina dos Reis explains the following ones:

- In case of no uptake under a specific focus area by the end of 2017, there is no obligation to evaluate that focus area, nor to calculate the values of indicators or to answer the related evaluation question;
- The SFC templates, chapter 7, have been simplified and are now structured in seven points. Point 5 about "Problems encountered influencing the validity and reliability of evaluation findings" and the "Recommendations" in point 7 are not mandatory;
- In Annex 11, guidance is given on how to answer each Common Evaluation Question in the Annual Implementation Report submitted in 2017.

As regards the translation of the Guidelines, Adelina dos Reis explains that the main parts will be translated by the first quarter of 2017.

Member States representatives raised the following questions:

Overlaps in the Annual Implementation Report

Germany reminds that chapter 7 is part of the AIR and should therefore not be looked at in an isolated way. Rather, it should be checked carefully if there are any overlaps with chapter 1 and 2 of the AIR.

The EC informs that the revision of the templates for the AIR took carefully into account what should be answered in chapter 1 and 2. The EC reminds that the AIR submitted in 2017 is a learning exercise not only for the evaluation unit of DG AGRI, but also for the Member States when reporting the information in the templates. DG AGRI is also considering a simplification of the AIR.

Timing issues affecting the quality of evaluation

Poland highlights that, in the Polish RDP, there is no uptake in some focus areas yet and consequently related Common Evaluation Questions will not be answered. Moreover, Poland informs to be under time pressure for the AIR to submit in 2017, as the evaluation reports should be approved by the monitoring committee. Poland raises concerns on the quality of the evaluations. Italy, Belgium, and Austria share this concern. Italy informs that, currently, the Italian National Rural Network (NRN) is working with all the stakeholders to learn how to fill the SFC templates, and to identify possible difficulties. Finally, Italy points out that some of the data from the RDP 2007-2013 has to be included within the framework of these templates.

The EC stresses that the guidelines are there for helping the Member States, and the available time for the AIR submitted in 2017 is the same for every Member State. The EC reminds that there is no need to do an assessment when there is no uptake. The EC does have expectations on the quality of evaluation, and the guidelines are produced for this reason.

Changes in the last version of the TWG 1 guidelines

Denmark asks if the main parts of the final version of the TWG 1 guidelines have had significant changes compared to the draft version sent out by the Evaluation Helpdesk to the Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP in early Autumn 2016.

The EC confirms that in the main report only minor corrections were made during the final revisions, without significant changes between the draft and final versions. Major revisions concerned the Annex documents and the SFC template.

Answering the Focus Area related CEQs.

Austria informs that, within the Austrian RDP, there are some Focus Areas under which no measures have been programmed. However, there are some other measures which have flagged secondary contributions to such Focus Areas. In this case, Austria asks if the CEQs related to the Focus Areas supported only by secondary contributions need to be answered.

The EC reminds that Article 14 of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 808/2014 establishes that whenever there are secondary contributions of measures to other Focus Areas than those primarily identified, there is the need to evaluate them.

Space-limitations in SFC template

Austria highlights that, with regard to the SFC template, chapter 7, in point 1 “List of measures contributing to the FA”, the character-limitation of 1000 is not sufficient for reporting, specifically with regard to FA 4A, 4B, and 4C.

The EC asks Austria and other delegations that wish to discuss technical details of the SFC template to send questions in writing

Reporting values of impact indicators

Austria highlights that with regard to point 4 of the SFC template on “Quantitative values of indicators”, it is not clear how the context and impact indicators need to be reported and used. There are some indicators which are published by the EC, but there are others whose values have to be supplied by the Member States, such as those concerning CO₂, carbon sequestration index of the soil, HNV farming, and the Farmland Bird index. Austria considers that a link for reporting the values of these impact indicators should be made in order to build a baseline, otherwise a change cannot be measured. Therefore, Austria asks if it is mandatory to report on these values, and if yes, where.

The EC considers to address this question in point 5 of the meeting agenda, which is focused specifically on “High Nature Value Farming: outcome of the survey to Member States and of the Good Practice Workshop in Bonn”.

Quality of AIR submitted in 2017

Belgium informs that some Member States have appointed the external evaluators before the publication of the guidelines, not taking into account all the requirements as foreseen in the SFC templates. As consequence, the quality of the evaluation work could be negatively affected. For these reasons, Belgium asks what is expected by the EC as regards the quality of the AIR submitted in 2017 and what happens if the quality is low.

The EC reminds that the SFC template provides a structure to the information needed to reply to the Common Evaluation Questions established in the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 808/2014. Therefore, and taking into account that the level of implementation of the RDPs is still very low, it should be feasible for Member States to find a solution with the evaluators.

Evaluation related questions and answers

Austria highlights the importance of addressing detailed questions in the plenary meeting since they concern all Member States. Luxemburg agrees with Austria, and asks whether these detailed questions can be sent by email to the EC or the Evaluation Helpdesk, and eventually, if a written document compiling all questions and answers can be produced and sent out to the Member States.

The EC agrees with both delegations. Detailed questions concern all Member States, but as some of them are very technical, it's more interesting and less time-consuming if the EC answers in writing to the specific questions and then includes all the received questions and the related answers in a written document. It reminds that the Evaluation Helpdesk already provides a “[Working Document – Evaluation-related queries](#)” which compiles the most relevant questions raised by the Member States.

After the plenary discussion, Adelina dos Reis informs that the translations of the main sections of guidelines on the "Evaluation of National Rural Networks" are now available on [CIRCABC](#), and published [online](#) on the Evaluation Helpdesk's website in 12 languages (Bulgarian, German, Greek, Spanish, French, Croatian, Hungarian, Italian, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian and Slovenian).

Adelina dos Reis also informs that two Thematic Working Groups are going to be launched in 2016-2017:

- Thematic Working Group – 4 for guidelines on the "Evaluation of Innovation";
- Thematic Working Group – 5 for guidelines on the “Assessment of RDP impacts: how to prepare for reporting on evaluation in 2019”.

Finally, Adelina dos Reis concludes the point of the agenda by informing that DG AGRI – Unit E. 4 has launched the evaluation of greening in Direct Payments (pillar I of the CAP). The work of the contractor has recently started. The evaluators are now collecting all the available data. The participants are invited to exchange existing studies from the Member States to AGRI-evaluation@ec.europa.eu.

3. Thematic Working Group 3 " Guidelines Evaluation of LEADER/CLLD": presentation"

Adelina dos Reis informs the participants on the state of play of the Guidelines "Evaluation of Leader/CLLD". She reminds that on 24th May 2016, the EC presented an outline of the guidelines to the Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP. Between May and August 2016, the Evaluation Helpdesk has collected comments on the outline and drafted the guidelines. On 13th September 2016,

the Sounding Board met in Brussels to give feedback on the guidelines. A revised version of the guidelines was sent out to the members of the Sounding Board to receive further comments by written procedure by 15 November. The Evaluation Helpdesk and DG AGRI - Unit E.4 are in the process of revising and improving the guidelines taking into account the comments of the Sounding Board.

Furthermore, a legal clarification as regards the evaluation requirements at LAG level is currently undertaken. Once the legal clarification will be obtained, the guidelines will be revised accordingly, with the aim of making them helpful, clear, and user-friendly. The revised guidelines will then be uploaded on CIRCABC and the members of the Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP will be invited for written comments (a period of three working weeks will be granted).

Member States' representatives raised the following questions:

Use of the guidelines

Germany asks how precisely the guidelines should be used in Germany's ongoing evaluation where several RDP are already implemented in the 2nd year.

The EC reminds that its mandate is to assist the Member States, and guidelines are produced because they have been requested. Although the capacities, expertise, and needs among Member States are quite different, the EC should take into account the needs of all Member States, mainly the ones which need more guidance.

Legal basis of external evaluation at LAG level

Germany asks what is the legal basis for requiring an external evaluation of LEADER/CLLD at LAG level as mentioned in Chapter 3 of the guidelines. Germany and Italy argue that the evaluation of LEADER/CLLD at LAG level should be done by the LAG themselves, as self-assessment. Moreover, Italy asks from a legal point of view, how external evaluation should be financed, how the terms of references should be designed, and how the results of the external evaluation should be reported to the EC.

The EC understands the concerns of Germany and Italy and reminds of the legal clarification that is currently undertaken in this respect. The EC recalls that the term self-evaluation/self-assessment is not mentioned in the regulation although it is still considered to be a useful practice. Since the evaluation of LEADER/CLLD at LAG level is under the Common Provision Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013, an interpretation of the legal acts is taken in agreement with the legal services of other Directorate Generals. For this reason, the guidelines are in stand-by and the Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP will be informed on the developments as soon as a clarification is achieved.

[Link to the PPT](#)

4. LEADER/CLLD evaluation – Member States' presentations and exchange of views

Adelina dos Reis passes the floor to Anke Wehmeyer from the German National Rural Network (Deutsche Vernetzungsstelle Ländliche Räume) to present the [guidelines on the LAG's self-assessment](#) developed and used in Germany.

Anke Wehmeyer explains that the German self-assessment guidelines were produced as reaction to the criticism of the report of the European Court of Auditors which concluded that the objectives of Local Action Groups are not used for controlling their success. After a meeting with all the German Managing Authorities, it was decided to produce the guidelines to help the LAGs to know their own objectives, to communicate their success, and to formulate concrete, realistic and ambitious objectives due to the new

EU-rules. The guidelines were finalized at the end of the last programming period, and were mainly aimed at avoiding the costs of external evaluation for the LAGs.

The guidelines contain about 19 methods of self-assessment, and based on the discussion with other Member States and the members of the LEADER-sub group of the Rural Network's Steering Group, Anke Wehmeyer argues that these can be used also in other Member States. Capacity building workshops were also held to train the LAGs about how to use the guidelines. LAG representatives have confirmed that the guidelines are useful for their work, while others reported that they have rarely used them, as they have not yet started their evaluation activities.

After the presentation, Adelina dos Reis thanks the German delegation for having proposed to present their LAG's self-assessment guidelines and open the discussion to the other Member States.

Member States' representatives raised the following questions:

Link between self-assessment and external evaluation

Belgium asks the German representative to clarify how Germany links self-assessment and evaluation. Italy asks if formal procedures or methods have been established in Germany to integrate the results of the LAG's self-assessment with the external evaluation of LEADER at RDP level.

Anke Wehmeyer explains that the use of the self-assessment guidelines among LAGs was a decision of the National German Ministry. The guidelines could be used for both self-assessment and evaluation. They were designed keeping in mind the distinction, but with a view to make these two exercises not too much different from each other.

Evaluation experiences among EU LAGs

Poland highlights that, the Polish RDP Managing Authority requested an external evaluation for all the Polish LAGs. The results of this external evaluation will take the form of a handbook which will be finally used by all the 300 LAGs in Poland. Therefore, the issue of external evaluation is considered to be very important, and Poland encourages the EC to present more experiences from other Member States.

The EC invites the members of the Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP to share their experiences related to the evaluation of LEADER/CLLD at LAG level. As regards self-assessment, the EC stresses again that this practice is considered useful, but its application should be always adapted to the situation in each Member States.

German approach to the evaluation of LEADER

Germany describes the evaluation of LEADER at RDP level and LAG level. At LAG level, the Local Development Strategies, as part of the RDP evaluation, are evaluated by an external evaluator. Additionally, each individual LAG conducts its own self-assessment on the bases of their specific objectives. The self-assessment guidelines are a management support for the LAGs. Furthermore, Germany seeks to define possible ways to integrate each LAG's self-assessment with the external evaluation of LEADER at RDP level. However, Germany concludes that this integration is overall very difficult to achieve.

[Link to the PPT](#)

After the presentation of the German guidelines, Adelina dos Reis passes the floor to Matteo Metta (Evaluation Helpdesk) who presents two cases studies of support for the LEADER/CLLD evaluation at LAG level. The first case study is about PROMIS (Project Result Oriented Management and Information System), which is a LAG operation database developed in Denmark; the second case study concerns a training conducted via National Rural Network in Portugal (2015) for building evaluation capacity of the Local Action Groups.

After this presentation, Member States do not raise any question.

Finally, Adelina dos Reis concludes the last point on the evaluation of LEADER by informing that from the 6th to the 8th December 2016, a seminar on “Achieving results - the CLLD way: putting the method to work” will be held in Båstad (Sweden). The seminar is organized by the EC - DG AGRI, in collaboration with DG MARE, DG REGIO, and DG EMPL. The main purpose of the seminar is to clarify what can be achieved through the CLLD method, to promote local development. More detailed information can be found on the web site of the [European Network for Rural Development](#).

[Link to the PPT](#)

5. High Nature Value farming: outcome of the survey to Member States and of the Good Practice Workshop in Bonn

Adelina dos Reis passes the floor to Vincenzo Angrisani (Evaluation Helpdesk) who presents the outcomes of the HNV survey conducted among the EU Member States and the Good Practice Workshop on “Preparing the assessment of High Nature Value Farming in Rural Development Programmes 2014-2020” held in Bonn, in June 2016. The presentation starts with the definition of High Nature Value (HNV) farming within the EU legislative framework of the Rural Development Programmes 2007-2013 and within the CMEF covering the whole CAP in the current period 2014-2020. He explains that the HNV farming indicator is receiving a special attention by the EC since it is a key indicator for assessing the impact of the CAP on biodiversity and because HNV farming is the only CAP common impact indicator for which there is no common methodology provided at the EU level. In order to explore the different approaches in Member States to identify, monitor and assess HNV farming, the Evaluation Helpdesk, with the collaboration of DG AGRI, launched a survey in Spring 2016 and organized the HNV farming workshop in Bonn (DE).

Vincenzo Angrisani informs the members that a list of criteria derived from the indicator fiche will be applied to validate the HNV approaches used by the Member States to calculate the Context Indicator No 37. The final goal is to publish the validated values on the [DG AGRI website](#) in the yearly CAP context indicator update. More information about the results of the survey are reported in the [Working Document on “Practices to identify, monitor and assess HNV farming in RDPs 2014-2020”](#) which has been uploaded on CIRCABC.

After the presentation, Member States do not raise any question. Adelina dos Reis highlights the importance and the state of play of this Context Indicator. Information gathered through the survey points out major information gaps and deficiencies in MS approaches. Finally, she informs that DG AGRI will take into account the several gaps currently existing, and take steps towards MS to close information gaps and insist on robust indicator values of CI N°37.

[Link to the PPT](#)

6. Presentation of the working paper "Assessment of the implementation of the Evaluation Plans of RDPs"

Adelina dos Reis passes the floor to Hannes Wimmer (Evaluation Helpdesk) who presents the synthesis assessment conducted by the Evaluation Helpdesk between June and August 2016 on the Evaluation Plans (EPs) included in the RDPs 2014-2020 and on the section 2 of the AIRs submitted in 2016.

The first assessment consisted in the screening of the seven sections of the EPs, as specified by point 9 of Part 1 of Annex I to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 808/2014. The screening was based on different questions and criteria drawn from the EU regulation and the Evaluation Helpdesk's

Guidelines on “[Establishing and Implementing Evaluation the Evaluation Plan of RDPs 2014-2020](#)”. For each section of the EPs, Hannes Wimmer presents good practices and discusses on the existing issues to be addressed. More detailed information on the screening of the EPs can be found in the [Summary Report](#) on CIRCABC

Jakob Weiss (Evaluation Helpdesk) presents the results of the assessment of section 2 of the AIR submitted in 2016 (reporting period 2014 and 2015). The assessment focused on different topics, such as: the completeness of section 2; the modifications of EP; and on the evaluation activities undertaken within different evaluation phases (i.e. planning & preparation, structuring, and conducting & dissemination).

Hannes Wimmer summarises the conclusions of both assessments, by highlighting that the main progress in the implementation of the EPs took place in the planning & preparing phases, although some Member States have also conducted and reported activities regarding to the structuring phase of the EPs. In most of the EPs, data management systems have been updated to meet the new needs of the RDP 2014-2020.

[Link to the PPT](#)

After this presentation, Member States do not raise any question.

7. Presentation to and consultation of the expert Group on the draft Annual Work Programme of the Helpdesk for 2017

Hannes Wimmer presents the highlights of the [Draft Annual Work Programme 2017](#) of the Helpdesk uploaded in November 2016 on CIRCABC.

Hannes Wimmer outlines the objectives and tasks of the next Thematic Working Groups on the “Evaluation of Innovation” (TWG-4) and “assessment of RDP impacts in 2019” (TWG-5). For both TWGs, technical guidance and support material will be produced. Furthermore, he announces that two good practice workshops will be foreseen in 2017: the first on the “Evaluation of National Rural Networks” is expected to be conducted during the first quarter of 2017; the second needs to be confirmed and he invites the members of the Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluating to send suggestions on topics to info@ruralevaluation.eu.

Member States’ representatives raised the following questions:

Guidelines on the evaluation of Financial Instruments

Italy suggests to produce additional evaluation guidelines or organizing a capacity building event on assessing the efficiency of Financial Instruments in Rural Development.

Court of Auditors

Italy reminds that, very often, the support from the National Rural Network is followed by a report of the European Court of Auditors. Often, the NRN receives new requests on the assessment of results from the European Court of Auditors, as it happened in 2012. Therefore, Italy suggests to invite the European Court of Auditors to the meeting of the Expert Group on the Monitoring and Evaluation to have an exchange and discussion on the follow up of these reports. Italy believes that this dialogue would benefit all the Member States.

The EC informs that DG AGRI is open to take into account the recommendations of the European Court of Auditors.

Summary of the ex-post evaluation

Poland asks if there is a plan to synthesize the ex post evaluations of the RDPs 2007-2013.

The EC reminds that, according to Article 87 of Regulation (EU) No 1698/2005, DG AGRI – Unit E.4 is responsible for the synthesis of the ex post evaluation of the 2007-2013 RDPs. Therefore, a tender procedure is going to be launched for the synthesis report, which will be finalized by the end of 2017.

Evaluation of greening

Germany suggests to organize a workshop on the evaluation of greening in the first and second pillar.

The EC confirms that the greening of the CAP is an important evaluation topic for the EC, and the request of Germany will be taken into account, as well as other further comments/suggestions from other Member States which can be sent in writing.

[Link to the PPT](#)

8. AOB – 1

Adelina dos Reis proposes to move point 8 of the original agenda on -*Thematic Working Group 4 "Evaluation of Innovation" – collection of Member States' needs* - to the afternoon, and to discuss Point 9 (*Any Other Business*) before the lunch break.

The proposal is accepted by the participants, and Adelina dos Reis passes the floor to Myles Stiffler (Evaluation Helpdesk) who briefs the participants about:

- **Yearly capacity building events in Member States “EvaluationWORKS!2016”**. Member States can choose between two topics (Preparation for AIR submitted in 2017 and evaluation of LEADER/CLLD). For supporting the Yearly Capacity Building event, Member States can send questions to the Geographic Expert of the Evaluation Helpdesk or to Blanca Casares (blanca@ruralevaluation.eu);
- **Updated working document “Evaluation-related queries”** (September 2016). Member states can download the updated working document from the website of the Evaluation Helpdesk, in the section on technical support;
- **Good Practice Workshop “Targeted data management for evidence based RDP evaluations”** in Bordeaux (France) on 5-6 December. Invitation to register for the Good Practice Workshop: <https://form.jotformeu.com/62991572987375h>;
- **HELPDESK Twitter account**. Member States are invited to follow the Helpdesk on twitter @ENRD_Evaluation https://twitter.com/ENRD_Evaluation;
- New **factsheets** have been uploaded on to the website (subsection “factsheets “), which cover topics such as the evaluation of HNV farming, the climate stability measures.
- **Newsletter no. 5** will be published online in EN, FR, and DE in the coming weeks.

Finally, Myles Stiffler invites the participants to send any good practices which could be useful for a broader community to myles@ruralevaluation.eu or matteo@ruralevaluation.eu.

Denmark asks if the list of Pillar I indicators have been updated on CIRCABC as agreed during the 9th meeting of the Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP.

The EC confirms that the list of Pillar I indicators has not yet been updated, but as soon as it will be available, Member States will be informed.

9. Thematic Working Group 4 "Evaluation of Innovation" – collection of Member States' needs

Adelina dos Reis opens the agenda point by informing the participants that these guidelines will take into account existing evaluation practices in different Member States. She passes the floor to Jela Tvrdonova (Evaluation Helpdesk) to provide an overview about the planned work.

Jela Tvrdonova informs the participants that the thematic working group "Evaluation of innovation" has the aim to (1) examine and address the major challenges in the evaluation of innovation; (2) review existing experiences in the evaluation of innovation; (3) identify and design effective solutions in the evaluation of innovation inside of the RDP; and (4) develop guidelines for the evaluation of innovation, complementing existing guidance and the CMES.

After the presentation, participants discuss in working groups about (1) existing practices with regard to the evaluation of innovation in the Member States, and (2) on the needs related to the evaluation of innovation to be addressed by the guidelines. The results of this interactive group work are summarized in the annex.

Plenary discussion

Indicators to measure the achievements of innovation

Sweden argues that the existing indicators on innovation are rather rough. Therefore, the guidelines should propose examples of indicators or suggest how to define new indicators which are able to measure accurately the effects of innovation in RDPs.

Definition of innovation

Poland and Italy highlight that the EU evaluation of innovation should start from a common understanding and definition of the meaning of innovation, for example, distinguishing clearly what is an innovative innovation and what is its impact.

Methods for assessing innovation

Poland and Italy suggest that the guidelines should propose tools and methods which are able to monitor the output of innovation and capture the extent to which it has had an impact. Furthermore, it is important to identify to what extent certain measures are innovative.

Defining the focus of the evaluation of innovation

Poland suggests that the guidelines should clarify carefully whether the evaluation of innovation should be focused on the impact achieved (e.g. innovation as means to achieve results and impact) or on the innovation itself (e.g. to what extent is a measure innovative?). If the focus is on the impact, the guidelines should clarify the object of the impact, which means defining the "what" (e.g. impact on the environment; impact on biodiversity, etc.). Furthermore, Poland suggests that the guidelines should prioritize the evaluation of the impact (e.g. what has the innovation achieved?) rather than assessing the level of innovativeness.

Existing evaluation practices in Italy

Italy highlights some existing evaluation practices from the last programming period on the assessment of innovation at national level, with a specific focus on the measure 124. Moreover, at national level, several researchers and Italian scientific groups are to be considered as helpful information sources since they have participated in EU research projects related to the evaluation of innovation (e.g. [IMPRESA](#)).

SFC template for reporting the results of the evaluation of innovation

Italy suggests that the guidelines should contain examples of the filled SFC template reporting the findings of the evaluation of innovation, as well as detailed indications how to reply to the common evaluation questions on innovation.

Timing of thematic working group no. 4

Germany suggests to adapt the timing of the thematic working group with a view to take into account also the relevant findings from the ex post evaluation of innovation in RDPs 2007-2013 as well as from the AIR submitted in 2017. The guidelines should consider the methodologies designed by the evaluators in the Member States to answer the Common Evaluation Questions related to Focus Area 1A and 1B.

The EC acknowledges the suggestion of Germany and considers that the guidelines should take into account any information that helps to make the guidelines useful for the Member States.

Evaluation study on the European Innovation Partnership

In this respect, Adelina dos Reis informs the participants that DG AGRI - Unit E.4 is finalizing an evaluation study on the European Innovation Partnership - Agricultural Productivity and Sustainability. Most likely, the evaluation study will be published on DG AGRI website by the end of 2016. It can also be used as information source by TWG 4 and by all the stakeholders interested in innovation.

Sounding Board for the Thematic Working Group

Finally, Jela Tvrdonova informs that in January 2017, the Evaluation Helpdesk will open the procedures to register to the Sounding Board, and will send an email to the members of the Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluation the CAP for this update.

[Link to the PPT](#)

10. AOB – 2

Adelina dos Reis passes the floor to Blanca Casares (Evaluation Helpdesk) to complete the point 9 of the original agenda on Any Other Business. Blanca Casares illustrates the results of the survey realized by the Evaluation Helpdesk on the ex post evaluation of RDP 2007-2013. The survey was conducted during the summer 2016 and shows the progress of Member States in preparing, structuring, conducting and reporting the ex-post evaluation.

[Link to the PPT](#)

Finally, Blanca Casares presents the training modules of EvaluationWORKS!2016, the Helpdesk's yearly capacity building events in the Member States which is organized in the last quarter 2016 and the first quarter 2017. Two training topics have been designed: "Assessment of RDP results: how to prepare for reporting on evaluation in 2017" (available in 2016 and 2017); and "Evaluation of LEADER/CLLD" (available only from 2017 onwards).

Member States raised the following questions:

EvaluationWORKS! 2016 in Poland

Poland reminds that its preference for EvaluationWORKS! 2016 (date, training modules, etc.) had already been taken and sent to the Polish geographic expert of the Evaluation Helpdesk, but without receiving any feedback.

The Evaluation Helpdesk ensures that this issue will be clarified with the geographic expert for Poland.

Joint EvaluationWORKS! 2016 in Belgium (Wallonia) and Luxemburg

Belgium suggests to organize a joint EvaluationWORKS! event for Wallonia and Luxemburg.

The Evaluation Helpdesk confirms that this request is feasible and will be taken into consideration.

Link to the [PPT](#)

Adelina dos Reis thanks the interpreters and all the participants, and concludes the 10th Meeting of the Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP by informing the participants that the next meeting is envisaged for May 2017.

11. Annexes

The following Annexes summarize the outcome of the group work of Agenda Point 9.

Annex 1 - Needs to be addressed by TWG 4 guidelines on “Evaluation of Innovation”

Conceptual needs

- How to define a project as innovative;
- How to define innovation in a flexible way;
- How to deal with projects whose effects appear in the long term period;
- How to include failures with the evaluation of successful innovation;
- How to define relevant indicators;
- How to take into account indirect beneficiaries of innovative projects;
- How to assess impacts which are not tangible and material.

Methodological needs

- Propose case studies and practical examples of evaluation;
- Propose different evaluation approaches for different priorities/measures related to innovation, and for different definitions of innovation;
- Propose methods to monitor and evaluate interactions among partners, the sustainability of innovation projects;
- Propose methods to measure the impacts of innovation on entrepreneurial capabilities and farmers-driven research;
- Propose methods to classify innovative projects;
- Propose methods to assess the dissemination of results.

Governance needs

- How to address the evaluation of secondary contribution;
- Provides examples of filled SFC template and/or guidelines on how to fill it;
- Provides guidance on the selection criteria for innovations;
- Provides an integrated intervention logic which shows how innovation fits with the RDP objectives;
- Provide examples about how to link innovation to other Focus Areas;
- How to assess innovation as horizontal objective of the RDP;
- How to link the evaluation of innovation with the evaluation of CLLD;
- Specify if the evaluation of innovation should be submitted to the EC;
- Make sure that the guidelines address the evaluation of CEQs related to innovation in time for the AIR 2017
- How to assess the role of NRN in supporting innovation.

Annex 2 - Existing evaluation practices related to innovation

Member State	Practice
Portugal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ex ante evaluation of innovative projects in operational groups • Global evaluation of the whole funds;
Italy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ex post evaluation at national level, with a specific focus on the measure 124 of RDP 2007-2013
Sweden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline studies on innovation in rural Sweden

Annex 3 - List of proposed contacts of experts in the evaluation of innovation:

Member States	Name	Organization
Latvia	Elita Benga	Institute of Agro-resources and economics
Italy	Simona Cristiano	CREA/NRN
	Patrizia Proietti	CREA/NRN
Cyprus	/	Planning Bureau
France	Pascale Ricoboni	Ministry of Agriculture
Greece	Authi Katsimra	Managing Authority of RDP
Spain	/	Direccion general de desarrollo rural y politica forestall del minister de agricultura
Sweden	Frederik Hulstein	Board of Agriculture – Secretariat of Evaluation
Luxemburg	Marc Fiedlor	FILL
Portugal	Helena Sequiera	GPP
	Custodia Cureira	DGADR – RRN
	Rolucei Daminescu	AP
BE – Flanders	Anne Vuylsteke	Department of Agriculture
BE – Wallonia	Stephanie Lelong	DG Agriculture and environment

All presentations are available on the [CIRCABC platform](#).