



Brussels,  
AGRI.DDG1.C4/(2021)3831193

## MINUTES

### *Meeting of the Expert Group for monitoring and evaluating the CAP*

**27 April 2021**

Chair: Ms Sophie Helaine

Delegations present: All Member States were present.

#### **1. Approval of the agenda and of the minutes of previous meeting**

Ms Sophie Helaine (Head of Unit, DG AGRI Unit C.4, Monitoring and Evaluation) welcomes the participants and explains the technical aspects of the meeting, the rules of the online meeting and the characteristics of the interpretation.

Ms Helaine asks if any modifications to the minutes of the previous Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP meeting should be made.

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

Ms Helaine lists the points of the agenda. The point 'State of play of discussions on Annex I' has been added after Point 4, 'State of play of DG AGRI and JRC project on avoiding double-counting of supported areas'.

Sweden suggests adding a point to the AOB concerning the CAP Strategic Plan and the SFC.

After informing on these changes, the agenda is adopted.

#### **2. 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>.

### **3. List of points discussed**

#### **3.1 Introduction on Data for Monitoring and Evaluation**

An introduction to the meeting is given by Mr Tassos Haniotis (Director, DG AGRI Unit C, Strategy, simplification and Policy Analysis) and Ms Christina Borchmann (Director, DG AGRI Unit H, Assurance and Audit).

Mr Haniotis informs that the aim is to bring the negotiations on the proposal of the future Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) to an end in May. For Annex I small technical details remain to be clarified. Mr Haniotis thanks the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP for the work regarding Annex I, which will ensure that robust data on the CAP will be received from the Member States.

He highlights, that the Annual Performance Reports (APR) are not enough to answer to the question of transparency on the results of the CAP. The proposal for the future CAP is based on a shift from compliance to performance and responds to an overall aim to increase the ambition especially in the area of environment and climate action. Monitoring and evaluation is an integral part of the accountability towards the European citizens. Most of the required data, presented to the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP in the proposal in January, already exists or will be introduced with new CAP. This is not a proposal about data creation, but about data sharing in the digital era. Mr Haniotis reminds the delegates of the shared responsibility between Member States and the European Commission to preserve the credibility and robustness of the new delivery model.

Ms Borchmann explains the changes in the delivery model from the assurance and audit perspective, responding also to the concerns raised by the Paying Agencies on the administrative burden and future use of the data. The main change of the new deliverable model is that detailed information at beneficiary level (i.e. control data, control statistics, current Xtable) will no longer be reported to the European Commission for audit and control purposes (see Article 57 of the soon to be adopted Horizontal Regulation). However, the Commission will need this data still for monitoring and evaluation purposes. The Member States are already required and will continue to be required under the transparency provisions of the Horizontal Regulation to make all the information about the individual beneficiaries public, which is the information the Commission will need also to demonstrate the performance of the CAP.

Ms Borchmann reassures the delegates that the certification bodies will only use the information from the Annual APR for their work under Article 11 of the Horizontal Regulation, while any information provided for monitoring and evaluation purposes outside of this report and of Annex I is not under the remit of the certification bodies. The Commission will audit whether the Member States implement the CAP Strategic Plans but not the compliance of the beneficiaries with the detailed eligibility rules as defined in the CAP Strategic Plan. Some detailed data like those contained in the current Xtable or CATS will still be needed for monitoring and evaluation of the performance of the CAP, but not for audit purposes.

*After the introduction, delegates from Member States raise the following questions and remarks:*

Germany asks for more clarification on how exactly it will work in the APR, on data privacy (i.e. how data will be anonymised), data security and the legal basis for this comprehensive data collection exercise.

Germany and France consider that the proposal of providing data on individual beneficiaries contradicts the simplification objective and implies administrative burden.

Germany introduces a scrutiny reservation concerning the claim that the data can actually be provided, which still needs to be checked. It also expresses disagreement with one statement made in the document, which claimed that the data requirement for sector programmes and EIP were commonly agreed on.

France highlights that the CAP impact study mentioned a streamlining of the monitoring mechanism/system and therefore opposes to the obligation to communicate other indicators than those listed in Annex I. Together with other Member States, France has also called on the Portuguese Presidency since March to indicate in Article 129 that Member States would not have to provide individual data to the Commission.

Sweden highlights that despite the fact that a lot of data is based on existing reporting systems, the additional reporting at this detailed level will still require a fair amount of work on the Member States' IT systems at an already busy time while adapting the systems to the interventions and reporting requirements of the new delivery model.

Denmark asks if the data, which is not used for audit and control purposes, could still entail any financial consequences for the Member States.

Denmark and Sweden inform that they will send further specific comments and questions of technical nature after this meeting.

*The Commission reiterates that only the data provided in the APR is used for the Annual Performance Review and could entail an action plan and, potentially, the suspension of payment. The detailed data reported outside of the APR will neither be used for audit purposes, nor for the performance clearance (where there can be financial consequences if the expenditure does not have a corresponding output). Financial corrections are made when there are serious deficiencies in the Member States' systems. That will be done based on a systems' audit by the certification bodies or by the Commission. The reporting of additional data might in such a case even be an advantage for Member States: if the Commission finds serious deficiencies in the system and proposes a flat rate because it is not possible to calculate the actual financial risk, the Member State might want to use its own data that is reported for monitoring to calculate the actual risk.*

*The Commission underlines the sensitiveness of the data privacy issue, which has been discussed also in other forums, such as in the Farm Advisory Data Network, and the future Farm Sustainability Data Network. Currently the Commission disposes about individual beneficiary data without having any problems with data privacy because it aggregates this data respecting very strict rules. Any information should be provided under full respect of the privacy of individual beneficiaries. Member States are therefore asked to share only anonymised data, without a name and address of the beneficiary, but with the unique identification number (ID). With the ID only it is not possible to link the information to the person. For the localisation it is proposed to use the Local*

*Administrative Units, so the precise address of the farmer is not revealed. This will give a better idea of the localisation of the farm and allows to contextualise the information, to enrich the assessment. The data is moreover protected by the General Data Protection Regulation, which ensures that the data can only be published at aggregated level so that the farmer cannot be identified. Anonymised data are also provided to researchers and contractors carrying out studies or evaluations. Researchers and contractors are anyhow obliged to sign a confidentiality agreement.*

*The legal basis for the additional data requirement is Article 129 of the draft CAP Strategic Plan Regulation (SPR). Under Article 129, the Commission has the empowerment to ask the necessary information to perform the monitoring and evaluation of the CAP. Individual data is needed, for example, to assess the distribution of CAP support (i.e. I.24), the redistribution towards smaller farms (i.e. R.6) and the support provided to farms in areas with specific needs (i.e. R.7).*

*Regarding the administrative burden of providing additional information, it is important to consider that for any EU or national contribution, it is always necessary to provide information about where the money is allocated and for which purpose. It is up to the Member States to ensure that the beneficiaries provide the information once in their application and not multiple times. Member States are encouraged to learn also from each other's best practises with a view to minimise additional burden for beneficiaries.*

*The localisation of farms and interventions is needed to contextualise the information and to establish causality, i.e. the net-impact of the CAP. Sharing the latest information available is of mutual benefit. The specificities of the format and the level of complexity or simplification requires discussions, cooperation and learning from best practises that already exist. Satellite imagery that is available will provide an understanding of the situation in various regions, but this is not sufficient and it is necessary to collect further information as regard the results achieved.*

## **3.2 Details on data for monitoring and evaluation**

Ms Helaine gives a presentation called 'PMEF Data needs for evaluation and monitoring' to provide some additional detailed explanations.

*After the presentation, delegates from Member States raise the following questions and remarks:*

### *3.2.1. Format and scope*

Austria, Germany, Spain, France, Italy and Slovenia stress the importance of having the overall timeline and providing more clarity on how the actual data monitoring will look like and what information is needed from the applicants. This is essential in order to be able to prepare the Member States' information systems well in advance.

Italy and France ask about the status of the shared note on data for monitoring and evaluation, if it replaces the January document or if it will still be changed in the near future.

Spain asks what IT system will be used to transfer the data and if it refers to applications made or already paid.

Italy enquires whether the data are sent per beneficiary or if the records will be linked to payment; whether it will be cumulative or done annually; whether there will be any

aggregation to be carried out by the Member State or if the record of payments can be provided; and whether beneficiaries should be pinpointed.

France asks if the data covers all the CAP interventions and if it well understood that the Annex II to the note circulated in January regarding statistics on sectoral interventions is repealed and only the new Annex I will be applied?

Slovakia enquires in which units the data in Annex I should be reported.

Germany asks for more clarity on the format and definitions of data to be provided. Since significant expansion is needed as compared to the checklist that the Paying Agencies would usually send, it would be useful to know how exactly the Xtable would be worked out with additional data requirements.

Belgium asks if the data for checking legal requirements is referring only to Cross compliance and GAEC or to the other legal requirements.

Belgium also asks regarding the different GAECs declared, if it is possible to obtain data from cartographic information for GAEC 1, 2 and 10, which the Managing Authority can calculate. However, there are concerns regarding the administrative burden regarding GAEC 9. Farmers do not declare the landscape features. Cross compliance for landscape in the countryside is done on the spot. It is not possible to check on all the elements, and therefore to have a database with all the elements.

*The Commission aims to provide clarity on the requested data in a detailed document (similar to CATS), specifying the format of the data and its definition. First, however, a general agreement on the concept is needed, which is the very purpose of the current meeting on simplification. The implementing act will define the scope of this data request, whereas guidelines will detail the way the data is exchanged, its structure and format. During the second half of the year the details will be made available, while it is not expected that the guidelines and secondary legislation will be ready by then.*

*The Commission clarifies that data at individual level will be sent via SFC, but unlike for the AIR, where it is necessary to fill in a field, SFC will be here only used as a channel for data transfer, similar to CATS. The use of SFC is also proposed for the notifications on the European Innovation Partnership (EIP). For sectoral programmes, the reporting is currently made via ISAMM, which does not need to be changed as it works well.*

*The Commission informs that Annex II and Annex III of the note on data needs for monitoring and evaluation circulated in January, regarding EIP and data on sectoral programmes, are not removed. Member States were asking mainly for simplifications on the data at individual level, which resulted in the proposed simplification of Annex I, as reflected in the note Data needs for monitoring and evaluation-simplification. The simplification of the performance clearance for sectoral programmes (i.e. at programme level without data collection on interventions in the APR) is currently under discussion and could be envisaged only if additional data would be sent as proposed. As the Commission needs information about the interventions financed under sectoral programmes, this additional data monitoring is very important. It is not asked to collect individual data by Producer Organisations, but rather aggregated data by interventions.*

*The information that Member States collect for conditionality must comply with the corresponding legal requirements. Since simplification is needed, it is proposed to work on declared areas. Paid area was included in Annex I of the note on data needs for*

*monitoring and evaluation to keep consistency between all output indicators, but it is not needed for conditionality.*

*The units to be used in Annex I of the note on data needs for monitoring and evaluation will be very much linked to how the intervention can be paid. For example, if an investment intervention is defined per livestock unit for the renovation of stables as it was done in the Swedish example, then the livestock units would be reported because this is the way the intervention is managed. In addition, for this number of livestock units the number of operations would also be reflected, which is one in this case for a given beneficiary. It is necessary to have the common denominator of a common unit and therefore being able to aggregate the information from the Member States, which are managing their interventions differently. The discussion on which units are possible for commitments and eco-schemes is still ongoing, together with the discussion on the green architecture. Regarding the units involved, for the installed capacity of renewable energy the units are typically megawatts and for animal welfare, livestock units. This matches with the units needed for the result indicators. The payments should be provided in Euro.*

*The data is asked by beneficiary and by claim. Guidelines similar to the existing ones for CATS will be developed. A difference regarding the current use would be, for example, that there will be no fields to justify differences, as there is no need for reconciliation. What needs to be provided is in Annex I: 'List of variables for the individual data request' of the note on data needs for monitoring and evaluation.*

*For GAEC 9 on the retention of landscape elements there is no need to collect the information only and always at beneficiary level for the retention aspect, but it would be important to have information at beneficiary level on the share of non-productive elements. The aim is to get this very important information on GAEC while limiting the administrative burden.*

*Another data request linked to requirements beyond the GAEC is for example on water. There is one field about the investments related to water used, which is not necessary for the APR because there is nothing specific on investments into production of water use. But all investments related to water use have specific requirements that need to be checked.*

### *3.2.2. Indicator O.32 Number of ha subject to conditionality*

Slovakia asks for confirmation that the indicator O.32 was dropped from Annex I.

*The Commission informs that O.32 Number of ha subject to conditionality has been removed from Annex I by co-legislators.*

### *3.2.3. Legal framework and administrative burden*

Belgium notes that regulatory reference on Article 129 of the draft SPR is quite general and therefore asks by which date the data should be sent, whether there could be sanctions in case the data is not sent at the right time, and if all this will be specified in a delegated act, implementing act or just guidelines. The data is available, but not necessarily structured in the format asked, such as linking the result indicators to each operation. This causes a large amount of work, even if the data is available, because checks, controls, the population of each sample and the individual selected need to be registered.

*The Commission explains that it has not yet reflected on how to handle possible delays in data provision, but does not think that penalties for delays would be appropriate. In case there would be a need to correct the data because there is an obvious technical mistake, Member States would be invited to correct the data. The focus is on the analysis, not on minor details. It is necessary to have robust data to perform analysis, but the level of preciseness of data needed is not the same as for control purposes.*

*The details for the data request will be set in an implementing act. The date and other details depend on the on-going discussions with Member States.*

#### *3.2.4. Preference for financial year or claim year*

Germany asks for clarification on the date for data submission, whether it is 15 February of the following year, and if a performance report should be provided by then. It furthermore asks how to deal with top ups.

Belgium asks for clarification on the question on the preference between the financial year or the year of application. It is not well understood whether the question refers to the dates of the data covering the period for 16 October N-1 to 15 October N, or the period 1 January to 31 December; or whether it refers to types of data, and different collection times e.g. the data relating to the applications for support or the payments. In the last case, the date of each is different. For the applications, there are more controls and possible connections as compared with what is really paid. The basis of the report would be different. There is a preference for the consistency and compliance with the performance reporting.

Belgium suggests having a hybrid approach depending on the type of measure. For example, to report the claim year for area-related measures, because the claims are linked to the declaration of areas which is carried out at the same time of the year for all beneficiaries, and payments are made at the same time as well. This would enable to make comparisons on the areas - and corresponding paid amounts – applied for any year with the total area in the region of the Member State. On the contrary, if option for data by financial year, if all areas paid in one year are included, there might be an area accounted for twice because two applications for aid in different years were paid in the same year due to a delay in the payment. When comparing with the total area in a Member State or region, there might be overestimations. Therefore, for area-related measures it appears suitable to report by claim year. On the contrary, for interventions involving investments, it is easier to report by financial year because it might take different times to deal with the file and the payout. Belgium is in favour of this mixed approach based on experience in previous periods of working on monitoring.

Spain suggests a similar implementation as with control statistics data. Art. 9.1 of R809/14: Application of year N; payments from 16 October of year N to 15 October of year N+1. The data would be transferred e.g., in autumn-winter of one year, providing detailed data paid for the previous year.

*The Commission explains that its initial proposal in January was to report data by claim year as it seemed easier for the Member States, but it is ready to accept a reporting of the data by financial year, as for Annex I. To limit the differences between what is reported in the APR and what would be available at individual level, it would be logical if Member States saved the data at the same date.*

*The Commission confirms that within a financial year more claim years can be paid. It was understood that Member States wanted data for monitoring and evaluation (data beyond Annex I) collected by financial year in order to remain as close as possible to the APR. That would mean that everything which is paid within this financial year would be reported and that would possibly relate to several claim years. Most of the time it is claim year N which is reported in February financial year N+2 and relates to financial year N+1. But all these details can be discussed together. The minimum would be to report in financial year, February financial year N+2, the elements made related to claim N. The main element that should be clarified by Member States is if it is preferred to stay as close as possible to the APR or if it is preferred to be simpler than the APR.*

*The Commission invites the Member States to express their opinion on the points that Belgium raised and on the hybrid approach for data provision in the remarks that Member States will share after the meeting. Specifically, if Member States prefer to work based on the claim year for IACS interventions and by financial year for non-IACS interventions, or if they prefer to have both under the same reporting system. For IACS the share of interventions which is paid after a financial year N+1, is small and that level of precision is not of interest for analysis.*

### *3.2.5. Data-collection for LEADER*

Finland asks for clarification on whether data collection for LEADER running costs and animation costs should be conducted separately.

Poland asks for clarification regarding the need to update the target indicators from the local action group level. Would this update apply to indicators for the performance review procedure?

Greece would like to know who is in charge of changing this data.

*The Commission clarifies that there is no specification yet regarding the required breakdown or the distinction in reporting the running costs separate from the animation costs. This topic should be further explored to achieve the right balance between the burden associated with making a breakdown and the information needed for evaluation. The current LEADER evaluation has for example shown, that the information on animation costs is relevant in order to make a distinction about the involvement of the Local Action Groups in promoting participation in their areas.*

*The Commission clarifies that once there is more clarity on the Local Development Strategies, it will be necessary to update the CAP Strategic Plans to introduce the contribution from LEADER in the result indicators and targets, where this contribution is direct and significant. Corrections are also necessary if there is a mistake, typically in the unit size. The coordinating Managing Authority is in charge of changing the data. This subject can be discussed in the future.*

### *3.2.6. Questions on linking interventions to result indicators*

Poland asks if different units can be used within the same intervention? For example, in the intervention investments, is it possible to use a number of operations as a first unit and additionally use another unit, for example livestock units?

*For investment and cooperation interventions, it might be necessary to have more than one unit within one intervention. This means that several unit amounts will be defined. For example, under O.18 Number of supported on-farm productive investment several*



*interventions could be defined. One of these interventions could have an intervention with a unit amount per operation, and another one per livestock unit. Under outputs there are also several cases where interventions can be paid in several units.*

*The Commission informs that it has received several questions from Member States on how to link interventions to result indicators and on units. Answers will be provided directly to the Member States, but also gathered and shared with all Member States.*

### **3.3 State of play of DG AGRI and JRC project on avoiding double-counting of supported areas**

Ms Evangelia Mourmoura (Team Leader, DG AGRI Unit D.3, Implementation support and IACS) and Mr Philippe Loudjani (Project Officer, JRC Ispra Unit D.5, Food Security) give a presentation called ‘Avoiding double counting of areas when reporting on area related output and result indicators in the future CAP’.

*After the presentation, delegates from Member States raise the following questions and remarks:*

Germany asks if it is certain that the indicator O.32 Number of ha subject to conditionality (broken down by GAEC practice), will not stay in Annex I. In any case, since the information on conditionality is needed, it would be necessary to have the definition of the standards early enough to be able to implement it into the IT systems.

*The Commission confirms that the indicator O.32 is no longer in Annex I, as deleted by co-legislators. In any case, because of the complexities of this indicator, the proposal for simplification is to limit the reporting to four GAEC. The work of the JRC will help better define the standards.*

*The JRC explains that the indicator O.32 is also part of another project that deals with the technical aspects of, in particular, GAEC 2: areas of peatland, with the objective to find a common agreement on the conditions that would allow Member States to start making the calculations by 2023: either on the definition or on the way of representing peatland areas that facilitates the provision of the information (e.g., a rough estimate of these peatland areas).*

### **3.4 State of play of discussions on Annex I**

Mr Ruggero Fornoni (Evaluation Officer, DG AGRI Unit C.4, Monitoring and Evaluation) presents ‘State of play of discussions on Annex I’.

*After the presentation, delegates from Member States raised the following questions and remarks:*

#### *3.4.1 Indicator R.6 Redistribution to smaller farms*

Sweden enquires how to set a target for the indicator R.6 Redistribution to smaller farms, and how it will be reviewed in a situation where the CAP Strategic Plan does not have a specific goal for small farms, now that the indicator is part of the performance review. Member States cannot choose which interventions are included in R.6; R.6 is compulsory and based on direct payments. However, not all Member States will implement the redistributive payment. Nevertheless, all Member States will have eco-schemes. In

Sweden, it is anticipated that eco-schemes will attract large farms to a bigger extent than smaller farms.

Poland asks whether the Commission will weight the value of the indicator R.6 Redistribution to smaller farms, at 100%. The planning of R.6 Redistribution to smaller farms, will be complex as the unknown eco-schemes are also in it.

*The Commission reminds that the issues of targeting are still under discussion at the trilogue. In any case, the redistributive payment is not the only way to redistribute to smaller farms (e.g., capping, decisions on thresholds, how the basic payment is distributed). It should be a whole strategy encompassing all the outcomes of Member States' actions. The Commission is aware that the eco-schemes might attract larger farms. In this case, the defined target must be justified by this fact.*

*The Commission clarifies that the indicator R.6 Redistribution to smaller farms, aims at showing the ambition of Member States in better targeting smaller farms and hence focuses on the path and the progress on the indicator along the programming period. If, for example, the starting point of a Member State is a value of 50% for this indicator, meaning that smaller farms receive per hectare less than larger farms, the focus would not be necessarily on achieving a value of 100%, but on putting solutions in place to improve this value.*

#### 3.4.2 Reporting for performance review

Belgium asks how to proceed with the result indicators in Annex I which are not marked with 'PR' for performance review: if these also need to be calculated and included in the performance report or if they will only be used for sending the supplementary data as discussed previously.

France asks if the milestones and targets need to be planned for every result indicator chosen in their strategy, or only for the indicators that are under performance review; and if milestones need to be planned for each year, or only for the times when the performance review exercise will be run with DG AGRI.

Belgium, Denmark and Estonia ask if it is necessary to report on result indicators that cannot be linked to the interventions defined by a Member State in the CAP Strategic Plan. Belgium informs that further questions regarding technical clarification for some indicators (regarding, e.g., the years that should be used for the production values for sectoral interventions for the indicator R.10 Better supply chain organisation) will be sent to the Commission.

Germany asks whether the statement mentioned in the trilogue that no national indicators should be implemented in the CAP Strategic Plan, concerns the result indicators for performance review, or if this is a general statement.

*The set of 22 result indicators marked with 'PR' are the indicators subject to the performance review exercise which should take place twice in the programming period: if there is a gap between the planned value and reported value, and if this deviation is larger than a given percentage without sufficient justification, Member States would be*

*asked to provide an action plan. If Member State fail in implementing this action plan, ultimately it could lead to financial suspension.*

*The Commission explains that all the result indicators of Annex I are to be reported annually in the APR, when relevant, i.e. when selected by Member States in the CAP Strategic Plans. In view of the needs, Member States implement interventions to address the needs under the different specific objectives, linking interventions to the relevant results indicator (i.e., result indicators to which interventions can be linked because they have a direct and significant link to the purpose illustrated by the result indicator). These relevant indicators are not limited to the 22 result indicators highlighted for performance review. All relevant result indicators must be monitored and reported annually. Member States need to plan annual milestones and targets for all relevant result indicators. The relevant indicators will be assessed and discussed during the annual review meeting with Member States.*

### *3.4.3 Other*

Poland asks for further feedback on the indicator R.35 Promoting social inclusion and a clarification regarding the intervention for the development of small farmers.

France raises concerns regarding the sectors that can be implemented as operational programmes, such as the olive oil sector. The indicator O.33 Number of producer organisations setting up an operational fund/programme, will be used for performance clearance. However, trilogue discussions also point at the possibility to implement the olive oil sector as a national programme. In that case, an output indicator, such as the one used for the wine sector, would be needed, in order to have a different approach for performance clearance.

France also asks for a continuation of the discussions of last November on how to calculate the indicator R.30 Generational renewal.

Germany asks for an update of the indicator fiches before the end of the trilogue.

*The Commission clarifies that the discussion on the description of the interventions is not yet finalised. This will clarify whether the intervention to small farm development would be included under the article related to the setup of farmers or under investments. Once this discussion is finalised, a decision on whether to introduce a new result indicator on small farms development or to include this intervention under an existing indicator will be taken.*

*The Commission acknowledges the concern regarding the sectors that can be implemented as an operational programme or as a national programme and reminds that Annex I will be fine-tuned once there is clarity on the description of the interventions.*

*The Commission clarifies that an updated set of indicator fiches will be available for the next meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP in June.*

### **3.5 Meta-analysis literature review on farming practices: launching a wiki website for Member States**

Mr Andrea Furlan (Socio-economic analyst, DG AGRI Unit C.2, Analysis and Outlook) presents 'Meta-analysis literature review on farming practices: launching a wiki website for Member States'.

Ms Marta Perez-Soba (Project Officer, JRC Ispra Unit D.5, Food Security) and Mr Vincenzo Angileri (Project Officer – Scientific, JRC Ispra Unit D.5, Food Security) present 'Farming practices fiches: why they are relevant for you.'

Mr Andrea Schievano (Project Officer – Scientific, JRC Ispra Unit D.5, Food Security), Ms Maria Luisa Paracchini (Project Officer – Scientific, JRC Ispra Unit D.5, Food Security) and Mr Michael Assouline (Technical Officer – Technical Project Officer, JRC Ispra Unit D.5, Food Security) present 'Wiki demonstration'.

*After the presentations, delegates from the Member States raised the following questions and remarks:*

Belgium asks if the impacts of each practice that will be pinpointed in the meta-analysis relate only to the environment and climate, or if the impacts on other aspects, such as sustainability of food production or food safety, will also be included.

Greece asks if a presentation of the circumstances under which Member States have implemented interventions and used the different practices is foreseen: an overview of the practices, their connection to the specific objectives, and how they have been used by Member States.

Czechia enquires about the procedure that the Commission will follow in case the practices suggested by Member States in the CAP Strategic Plans are not covered under the presented fiches.

*The Commission clarifies that the meta-analysis so far only involves environmental and climate issues and environmental and climate objectives. Opening to the economic dimension, food safety or other issues is not foreseen for the moment. However, the advantage of the method is that it can be updated with other relevant meta-analysis, that could be added to the existing fiches. Member States are invited to browse the tool, assess its usability, and suggest extensions.*

*The JRC informs that the current meta-analysis includes information on crop yields for all the practices analysed so far, including (organic farming, organic fertilisation and agroforestry). Although crop yields values offer limited economic indication, it does offer a sort of information that is of high importance to the farmer.*

*The Commission clarifies that, for the moment, the presented work consists of synthesising systematically the available scientific knowledge. This goes beyond the CAP Strategic Plans. The presented classification and technologies will constitute a standard typology that will be applied as a label on each intervention. In due time, it will be possible to provide an overview. A summary report of the plans implemented by Member States to show the EU picture within the first year of the CAP implementation is*

*currently under discussion in the trilogues. This mapping exercise would be available by 2023.*

*There is no guarantee that all practices undertaken by Member States will be covered by the meta-analysis. The present work consists of a summary of the current scientific knowledge available, hence not being a political decision. Member States will in any case need to justify the interventions that target other objectives in the CAP Strategic Plan. Member States may use the presented work, interpreting it in their own context with their own design specificities. GeoHubs may furthermore rely on this analytical tool when looking at CAP Strategic Plans.*

*The current work covers the results for seven practices, as well as for other practices that are not in the remit of rural development but that are however related to the environmental and climate debate. At the end of 2021, the work will cover more than 40 farming practices. The presented work is a flexible instrument open to further information and to covering knowledge gaps.*

### **3.6 Landscape features: presentation of the LUCAS 2022 module methodology and JRC support activities**

Mr Balint Czucz (Technical Officer – Technical Project Officer, JRC Ispra Unit D.5, Food Security) presents ‘Landscape features in the LUCAS 2022 survey’.

*The Commission invites Member States to come back to the JRC to exchange on how to improve what is being gathered.*

*After the presentation, delegates from the Member States raised the following questions and remarks:*

#### *3.6.1 LUCAS survey: definitions and sampling*

Latvia asks for clarification on where the definition of landscape feature is, who will carry out the LUCAS survey and to what extent Member States will be involved.

Finland asks how the LUCAS survey sampling will consider Member States where there is a small share of Utilised Agricultural Area (UAA). LUCAS sampling and survey is guided by Eurostat and the Commission, and many LUCAS sampling points fall on forest areas.

*The Commission clarifies that LUCAS is a survey based on field observations, managed by models. In this case, the model is on landscape features. The objective is to have a quantification at EU level. The presentation showed an extract of the instruction that are being prepared in collaboration with other DGs (Eurostat, the JRC, DG ENV, DG CLIMA and the European Environmental Agency) to be used by surveyors. The survey is conducted by contractors on the ground, at field level. The definition of landscape feature is related to the elaborated technologies from the current EFA (Ecological Focus Area) in greening, trying to merge and simplify to create a common new framework that will be used for the context indicator. Further work on the technical details would also serve to see how to merge the data that will come from small woody features from LUCAS to the future definitions on the GAEC.*

*The JRC clarifies that indicators on landscape features in agricultural area include a numerator and a denominator, where it will only relate to the UAA.*

*The sampling framed is based on the general LUCAS core data; the stratification and the sampling are based on previous LUCAS surveys, meaning that the sample, as well as the points dedicated to agriculture, are known already. Satellite images are further used as an update and as a second input for stratification, to check if points are still dedicated to agriculture.*

*The Commission explains that, in the case lots of points in a Member States are falling on forest, the decision is to focus landscape features only on agricultural areas. The selection of points will target only agricultural areas, regardless of the coverage of the other points in LUCAS.*

### 3.6.2 LUCAS 2022 module methodology and JRC support activities

France asks by when Member States will have the updated data so that it will be possible to know the specific state of play of the impact indicator I.20 Agricultural land covered with landscape features, since it is based on the progress of this indicator that Member States will be judged. The current presentation is similar to what was presented in the meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP in September, while in February it was presented that a combination of LUCAS and Copernicus data would be available so that Member States could have a better-defined I.20 indicator, to better monitor the effects of the Green Deal.

France is concerned that there could be a discontinuity of data if not all Member States are involved in the pilot project, since so far only four are.

*The Commission explains that for the indicator I.20 Agricultural land covered by landscape features, as it is also indicated in the fiche, the basic information is the small woody feature. There is coordination between the European Environmental Agency and DG AGRI to have the result by the end of this year. The JRC and DG AGRI are conducting methodological work to see how to merge these results with the LUCAS survey, when it will be available. The JRC clarifies that the LUCAS survey will be conducted in 2022, so the first estimation would be available in 2023, after one year to process the data.*

*The present work is a pilot that the JRC is conducting at a technical level to start to compare the small woody feature and the LUCAS points. Full involvement from Member States is not necessary. However, Member States are invited to express their interest to move forward to the phase of dialogue with Member States.*

*The JRC clarifies that currently there is methodological test for combining Copernicus landscape feature layer with LUCAS landscape feature layer, with data from 2015 on both data sets, to see how to best merge and improve the synergies between the two data sets.*

## **3.7 I.9 – Agricultural sector resilience progress indicator, first results**

Mr Frank Dentener (Senior Expert, JRC Ispra Unit D.5, Food Security) and Mr Andrea Furlan present ‘I.09 (C.44) –Agricultural sector resilience progress indicator-first results’.

*After the presentation, delegates from Member States raised the following questions and remarks:*

Austria and Germany ask how to use the indicator efficiently to assess the net impact of the CAP given its complexity and the fact that it is made of different elements.

Sweden asks if there is an intention to have the data available at NUTS-2 level for all Member States.

France asks when the presented data will be available.

*The JRC explains that the main purpose of the composite indicator is to have an early warning system, in this case, for impacts of climate change and how these impacts influence the sector as a whole. Then, Member States would have to go in deeper detail into the contributing components, probably going to the ground level and understanding from the farmers what is the real influence on issues like production levels or water abstraction. Impact indicators are not intended to directly measure the impact of the CAP policy and/or other policies, but to demonstrate what the agricultural sector is doing in terms of those policies. The Commission highlights that a potential way to use the indicator for evaluations is to look at the single indicators behind the composite indicator.*

*The JRC clarifies that, for some indicators, there is an intention to bring the data up to NUTS-2 level. However, certain information such as factor income, is only available at Member State level. Activities are carried out where remote sensing data is combined with statistics. In this respect, in the years to come, a finer geographical detail of information such as production levels could be available.*

*The Commission reminds of the issue of data availability. For example, for the indicator on cash crops allocation, the latest information available is sourced from the Farm Structure Survey (FSS) and dates from 2010 census data. Having good information on the individual database on GAEC on this kind of indicators could also be useful for Member States. If data can be collected and if the methodology is common at Member State level, then the Member State can use its own information on GAEC and its own implementation to build the indicator at Member State level.*

*The JRC informs that further discussions with DG AGRI on how to implement the transfer of data via a specific platform are still needed. However, if a Member State wishes to have a closer look at the analysis, the JRC can already share the data.*

#### **4. AOB**

Sweden asks about the timing of the secondary legislation, and the SFC template.

*Regarding the secondary legislation, the Commission explains that it is difficult to provide a precise timeline, given that the basic acts are still under negotiation. Work on the implementing acts and delegated acts is foreseen for the third quarter of 2021, so that secondary legislation will be in place by the end of 2022. Some elements of the PMEF will be available sooner, namely the calculation methods for the indicators in Annex I, including the indicator fiches and their accompanying note.*

*As for the SFC, the intention of the Commission is to share the SFC technical guidelines by June 2021. The draft implementing acts will also be shared by June, for an adoption by October 2021.*

*The Commission informs, with respect to the question received during the last Expert Group meeting on carrying out the ex post evaluations of RDPs 2014-2020 in regionalized Member States, that, according to the current legal provisions, it is not possible to carry out the ex post evaluation at the Member State level, covering all RDPs within one single report. Nevertheless, national authorities may carry out the ex post evaluation of each RDP, provided they conduct one ex post evaluation per RDP, i.e. means can be centralised, but the same scope needs to be kept. Synergies in the calculation of the complementary result indicators can be made; information can be collected in a centralised way, which would further ensure consistency in the calculation method and in the reporting, making sure that results can be aggregated at national at EU level. The future CAP Evaluation Helpdesk can assist Member States in the process of harmonizing the ex post evaluations; several workshops on methodologies for the ex post have also been organised by the current Helpdesk.*

## **5. CONCLUSIONS**

Ms Helaine thanks the delegates for their active participation, informs about the next steps and closes the meeting.

## **6. NEXT STEPS**

- *Member States will receive the update of the indicator fiches before the next Meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP.*
- *The next meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP will be dedicated to the indicator fiches, and to progress on the data needs beyond Annex I, compiling further comments coming from Member States.*
- *The Commission asks for comments from Member States until 17 May. Written comments may include Member States' contribution or reactions to the proposed simplification on the data collection for monitoring and evaluation, and specifically Member States are asked about their preferences on reporting date, as well as preferences on reporting by claim or by financial year, or a mix of the two: by claim year for IACS interventions, and financial year for non-IACS interventions.*

## **7. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Expert Group for Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP is planned for June, precise date will be communicated soon.



## **8. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

In Annex.

e-signed

Tassos HANIOTIS

List of participants– Minutes  
*Meeting of the Expert Group for monitoring and evaluating the CAP*  
**27 April 2021**

MEMBER STATE	Ministry or Organisation	NUMBER OF PERSONS
BE	Departement Landbouw en Visserij	2
	Service public de Wallonie	2
BG	Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry	2
	State Fund “Agriculture”	1
CZ	Ministry of Agriculture	4
DK	The Danish Agricultural Agency	3
DE	Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture	2
	Managing Authority Bavaria	1
	MEND	2
	Thünen-Institute	1
EE	Agricultural Registers and registration Board	1
	Ministry of Rural Affairs	2
IE	Department of Agricultural Food and the Marine	3
EL	Ministry of Rural Development and Food	1
	Managing Authority of Greek RDP, Evaluation unit	3
	Permanent Representation	1
ES	FEGA	2
	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE	5
FR	ASP	2
	MCFA	1
	Ministère de l’Agriculture et de l’Alimentation	2
HR	Ministry of Agriculture	3
	Paying Agency	1
IT	Ministry of Agriculture	5
	National Paying Agency AGEA	2
CY	Evaluator	1
LV	AREI	3
	Ministry of Agriculture	4
	Rural Support Service	2
LT	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE	1

	NATIONAL PAYING AGENCY	3
LU	MINISTÈRE DE L'AGRICULTURE	1
	SERVICE D'ECONOMIE RURALE	1
HU	HUNGARIAN STATE TRESORIE	1
	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE	3
MT	AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PAYING AGENCY	3
	STRATEGY AND IMPLEMENTATION DIVISION	1
	FUNDS AND PROGRAMS DIVISION	1
NL	RVO – PAYING AGENCY	2
AT	FEDERAL MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, REGIONAL AFFAIRES AND TOURISM	2
PL	AGENCY FOR RESTRUCTURING AND MODERNISATION OF AGRICULTURE	1
	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT	8
PT	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE	2
	IFAP	4
RO	AGENCY FOR PAYMENTS AND INTERVENTION IN AGRICULTURE	1
	MANAGING AUTHORITY FOR THE NATIONAL RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME - NRDP	2
SI	AGENCY FOR AGRICULTURAL MARKETS AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT	4
	BUDGET SUPERVISION OFFICE (CERTIFICATION BODY)	4
	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY AND FOOD	5
SK	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT	2
FI	FINNISH FOOD AUTHORITY	3
	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY	2
SE	STATENS JORDBRUKSVERK	6
	MINISTRY OF ENTERPRISE AND INNOVATION	1
DG	European Commission	NUMBER OF PERSONS
JRC		8
AGRI		12

