

EUROPEAN  
EVALUATION  
HELPDESK  
FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT



# WORKING DOCUMENT

## EVALUATION-RELATED QUERIES

UPDATE NOVEMBER 2015

Copyright notice

© European Communities, 2015

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

Recommended citation: EUROPEAN COMMISSION – Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development – Unit E.4 (2015): Evaluation related queries. Working Document. Update November 2015. Brussels

The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the official views of the European Commission.



The Evaluation Helpdesk is responsible for the evaluation function within the European Network for Rural Development (ENRD) by providing guidance on the evaluation of RDPs and policies falling under the remit and guidance of DG AGRI's Unit E.4 'Evaluation and studies' of the European Commission (EC). In order to improve the evaluation of EU rural development policy the Evaluation Helpdesk supports all evaluation stakeholders, in particular DG AGRI, national authorities, RDP managing authorities and evaluators, through the development and dissemination of appropriate methodologies and tools; the collection and exchange of good practices; capacity building, and communicating with network members on evaluation related topics.

Additional information about the activities of European Evaluation Helpdesk for Rural Development is available on the Internet through the Europa server (<http://enrd.ec.europa.eu>).

# WORKING DOCUMENT

## EVALUATION-RELATED QUERIES

UPDATE NOVEMBER 2015

# CONTENT

1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
2. <i>EX POST</i> EVALUATION.....	1
2.1. What should be the content of the <i>ex post</i> evaluation report 2007-2013? .....	1
3. INDICATORS.....	2
3.1 Which type of data to use for result indicator R2 "Change in Agricultural output on supported farms/ AWU"? .....	2
3.2 What to measure under Target indicator T20 "jobs created in supported projects"? .....	3
3.3 How to calculate result indicator R2? (NEW).....	4
4. ASSESSMENT OF RDP EFFECTS .....	5
4.1 How to consider contributions of nature conservation measures (Art. 20) when programmed under another Focus Area (FA 4a)?.....	5
4.2 How to monitor, quantify or asses additional contributions to Focus Areas? .....	6
5. EVALUATION PLAN (EP) AND ANNUAL IMPLMENTATION REPORT (AIR).....	7
5.1 How to prepare the assessment of effectiveness and efficiency of area based measures in the evaluation plan for 2014-2020? .....	7
5.2 What to report on the evaluation plan in the AIR 2015 and AIR 2016?.....	8
5.3 At which stage is the SFC 2014 development? (NEW) .....	9
5.4 Are there special conditions or a special form for the 2007-2013 AIR? or is it under the same form as the others? (NEW).....	9
6. MONITORING.....	9
6.1 Will the CMEF Technical Handbook contain the final monitoring tables? .....	9
6.2 What should the monitoring reports contain? .....	10
6.3 How do we have to report on data items added , n°23 and 24, in the WD Data item list for pillar II operations database? (NEW) .....	12
6.4 How to collect the data for the data item O.20, Table B4 and new breakdown of indicators Table C in the WD Monitoring (2014-2020) – Implementation report tables (2015)? (NEW) .....	12
6.5 How to fill code COM 4.1, 4.2, 4.4 and 6.1 on Commission's table C? (NEW) .....	13

6.6	When will monitoring Indicator tables or its structures in SFC2014 on 2014 and 2015 for the CAP 2014-2020 be available? (NEW) .....	14
6.7	Which are the new requirements in the monitoring tables of "type of agricultural branch" and "Size in hectares of holdings"? (NEW) .....	14
6.8	Do we have to collect only the default indicators (total public expenditure and jobs created) for these focus areas (1A and 6A)? Is there no extra indicator for these focus areas? (NEW) .....	15
6.9	How to deal with the fact that the 2016 report cover two years of payment whereas table B3 and E are meant for an annual reporting? ; ; Is it necessary to assess CRI if no measure is programmed on one or some of the focus area? (NEW) .....	15
6.10	Could you explain if this discrepancy between EU Reg. 220/2015 and the set of codes from the list in the Data Item List (page 3 data item number 23) is intentional? (NEW) .....	16
6.11	How to allocate the support funds according to the focus areas in the administration system? (NEW) .....	17
6.12	What should be considered when evaluating the complementary result indicators R2, R13, R14, R15, R18 and R19? (NEW) .....	18
6.13	How do we have to fill AIR monitoring tables? (NEW) .....	18
6.14	How to process the continuous requirements to "Bi-annual indicator data provision" that should be submitted before 31/10? (NEW) .....	19
6.15	Do the multi-annual commitments have to be registered annually? (NEW) .....	19
6.16	Specific questions on monitoring .....	20

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This working document compiles a selection of evaluation-related queries raised by the Member States in the period from January to November 2015. The topics cover:

- *ex post* evaluation,
- indicators,
- Evaluation Plan (EP) and
- Annual Implementation Report (AIR).
- monitoring

Answers in relation to queries on **evaluation** were prepared by European Evaluation Helpdesk for Rural Development in collaboration with the responsible Commission services.

Answers in relation queries on **monitoring** were prepared directly by the Commission services and are integrated in this document whenever a clear relevance for evaluation is given.

Please send your evaluation-related queries to [info@ruralevaluation.eu](mailto:info@ruralevaluation.eu)

## 2. EX POST EVALUATION

### 2.1. What should be the content of the *ex post* evaluation report 2007-2013?

**Q.** *With regards to ex post evaluation we have some questions.*

1. *It is not quite clear where should the information about measures be inserted (e.g. description about input and output indicators, implementation process, impact calculation methods used, etc.) as it is described in the Final Report of Investment Support under Rural Development Policy? The question arises because in the proposed outline of the ex post report there is no section where it could be addressed. Maybe be we do not need to do it? Or shall we include it in some Annexes?*
2. *Under sections:*

*Composition of the programme; description of priorities and measures. We understand that we should describe in general what measures have been selected to reach such and such objectives, etc.*

- a) *Intervention logic of single measures. There should be describe principle (in general) how to measure success i.e. that each measure have target and indicators what should be reached in the end of programme. Can we describe each measure in this section?*
3. *How extensive should the description of measures and axis be?*

**A.** *In the Handbook on CMEF, Annex 1, Guidance Note B – Evaluation guidelines, chapter 7 outlines the content of the evaluation report. Although the Handbook and its annexes are not legally binding, it is useful to apply this outline also in the case of the report on the ex post evaluation of the RDP 2007-2013.*

*Following this outline the information on the composition of the programme and the measures shall be placed in chapter 5 of the report.*

*With regard to the programme composition, the description of the overall and specific objectives, the priorities (axes) and measures allocation to these priorities shall be described. Although not specifically*

proposed by the report outline in Guidance B, it is useful to present here also expected results and impacts, especially if relevant indicators have been equipped with target values at the beginning of the programming period or at the stage of the MTE. For this purpose the actual net values of result and impact indicators at the end of the programming period accompanied with a robust explanation could be provided in the section of the Chapter 5 as well.

Regarding the presentation of the measures in Chapter 5 of the report, the Handbook, Annex 2, Guidance note E can be used as a format to provide the description of the measure, the visualisation of the measure's intervention logic, linking it to actually used evaluation questions, common and programme specific indicators. For the evaluation question the updated list published in the ex post evaluation guidelines for RDP 2007-2013 can be applied as well.

This information can be further completed with the input/output information (budget planned/spent and achieved outputs) and result/impacts of the measure, especially in case the measure could have significantly influenced the programme result and impacts (e.g. investment measures, LFA etc.).

The description of the evaluation design and methods used to calculate the net values of indicators, the information about sources for data collection and techniques used, shall be placed in chapter 4 of the report.

However, if the evaluator wishes to provide more information than proposed in the report outline of Guidance note B, he/she can develop new sections within the above-mentioned chapters or even introduce a new chapter, while complying with the legal requirements with regard to evaluation (Regulation (EU) No 1698/2005, Art. 84 and 86).

### 3. INDICATORS

#### 3.1 Which type of data to use for result indicator R2 "Change in Agricultural output on supported farms/ AWU"?

**Q.** *We would like to ask for more detailed interpretation about **result indicator R2 Change in Agricultural output** on supported farms/ AWU. From the current version of the working document "Draft target indicator fiches for Pillar II + complementary result indicators (Priorities 1 to 6), ver. 6/6/2014)" it is unclear, which type of FADN data should be taken into account.*

*Enclosed please find the basic scheme of the FADN variables. We would like to know, if Agricultural output present variable SE 131 (e.g. Total output, which includes coupled subsidies) or variables SE 131 + SE 600 (e.g. Balance current subsidies & taxes, which include also de-coupled subsidies which are prevailed ag subsidies in Slovenia) or even some other variable?*

*In addition, a hard task is envisaged by the cases of farms with other type of bookkeeping instead of FADN and registered non-farm activities. Those types of farms do not have separate part of bookkeeping only for agricultural activities, but they monitor and report for taxes purposes for the whole farm or company. Is there any proposal or idea how to tackle this kind of issue?*

**A.** The fiche of the result indicator "Change in agriculture output on supported farms/AWU" of the *Word Document: "Draft target indicators fiches for Pillar II and complementary result indicators"* does not provide sufficient information for its calculation. The revision of the fiche is ongoing and soon more guidance will be provided to Members States to calculate the indicator.

However, reading the fiche, it appears that what is requested here is to compare output per labour unit of beneficiaries/supported projects with output per labour unit of farms which did not receive support.

To ensure the comparability among Member States and farms, the FADN definition of total output (SE 131) can be used as the data source and not the definition for gross farm income (SE 410), bearing in mind that only the value of output contributes to the construction of SE131, while subsidies intervene later on in the next step of the construction of the income indicators (also see the interpretation of SE 131 in the scheme available at ([http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/rca/annex003\\_en.cfm#ii](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/rca/annex003_en.cfm#ii))).

### 3.2 What to measure under Target indicator T20 "jobs created in supported projects"?

**Q.** *We have a question concerning „jobs created or maintained" through supported measures*

*Indicator T20 "jobs created in supported projects" addresses this topic*

- *The definition says that jobs maintained should NOT be included.*
- *Concerning the jobs created for us it is however not clear, if this concerns the jobs created "in supported projects" when the project is running, or those jobs are jobs created " through supported projects" after the time of its completion.*
- *Both terms "in supported projects" and "through supported projects" are used in the indicator fiche.*

*We see the question how the programme affects jobs with a strong link to the Common Evaluation Question: To what extent has the RDP contributed to the CAP objective of achieving a balanced territorial development of rural economies and communities including the creation and maintenance of employment?*

*Also in ERDF and ESF the impact on jobs is gathered. What is measured in these funds? The jobs created during the programming period or those, that are maintained after the funding period? How are "maintained" jobs defined or measured?*

**A.** *The Working Document "The target indicator fiches and result indicator fiches" is presenting the indicator "Jobs created in supported projects" as target indicator (T20) and as the result indicator (R21) to measure the achievements of focus area 6A "Facilitating diversification, creation and development of small enterprises as well as job creation", under the rural development priority 6 "Promoting social inclusion, poverty reduction and economic development in rural areas".*

*This indicator has also the purpose to answer common evaluation question no. 16 "To what extent have RDP interventions supported the diversification, creation and development of small enterprises and job creation".*

*The above indicator "Jobs created in supported projects" is a result indicator, not an output indicator, and therefore it does not relate to employment when the project is running (i.e. it does not show the jobs created during the implementation of RDP operations as the direct effect of supported projects, but rather job generated "through supported projects". For example if the project is the creation of a farm shop, it does not include employment generated during the design/construction building phase – consultant/architect/builders, but the employment which is created when the shop is running (manager, sales assistants, etc.). This corresponds with the definition which is provided in the indicator's fiche in the section: "Data required for the individual operation" of the working document "The target indicator fiches and result indicator fiches".*

*On the other hand, the indicator does not include 'maintained jobs' because it is too difficult to assess them.*

*By comparison, in the assessment of ERDF interventions the common indicator 'Employment increase in supported enterprises' is used. This indicator represents the gross new working positions in supported enterprises in full time equivalents (FTE) (Regulation (EU) No 1301/2013, Annex I). Essentially this is a "before-after" indicator which captures the part of the employment increase that is a direct*



consequence of project completion (i.e. the staff employed to implement the project is not counted). The positions need to be filled (vacant posts are not counted) and increase the total number of jobs in the enterprise. If total employment in the enterprise does not increase, the value is zero – it is regarded as realignment, not increase. Safeguarded etc. jobs are not included (*Guidance document on M&E for ECF and EFRD 2014-2020*). As seen from text above this indicator relates to the jobs created via implementation of projects directly and it is defined as output indicator.

### 3.3 How to calculate result indicator R2? (NEW)

**Q.** I am in studying process on monitoring indicators which are in Annex IV of Regulation (EC) No 808/2014. I would like to ask you about who will help me to explain or where to search information about the Result indicators?

I have not clear methodology about the Result indicator R2: **Change in Agricultural output on supported farms/AWU (Annual Work Unit) (focus area 2A) (\*)**. Firstly, what does it mean Agricultural output (Is it a net turnover or profit of agricultural holding?) and Annual Work Unit (Is it an average number of employee in the holding during the year?). Secondly, how to calculate this indicator? Thirdly, what does it mean **change** in agricultural output? Is it increase of output comparing output of the first year after the Project implementation – output of the base year (the last closed year before Project application submission)?

Please, give me explanation or better calculation of this indicator. For example, **agricultural holding x1** and **agricultural holding x2**.

**Agricultural holding x1.** The Project implementation time is 2015. Project activity Investments in agricultural holdings (4.1)

Data (a net turnover (= Agricultural output) and an average number of employee in the holding(= Annual Work Unit))

2013 (the last closed year before the Project application submission) = 25000 euro and 1 employee

2016 (in the first year after the Project implementation) = 26000 euro and 2 employee

2017 = 27000 euro and 3 employee

2018 = 30000 euro and 4 employee

2019 = 30500 euro and 3 employee

2020 = 31000 euro and 4 employee

**Agricultural holding x2.** The Project implementation time is 2016. Project activity Investments in processing/marketing of agricultural products (4.2)

Data (a net turnover (= Agricultural output) and an average number of employee in the holding(= Annual Work Unit))

2013 (the last closed year before Project application submission) = 100000 euro and 10 employee

2017 (in the first year after the Project implementation) = 150000 euro and 12 employee

2018 = 200000 euro and 13 employee

2019 = 250000 euro and 14 employee

2020 = 260000 euro and 13 employee

2021 = 270000 euro and 14 employee

**A.** The fiche of the result indicator „Change in agriculture output on supported farms/AWU of the WD: "Draft target indicators fiches for Pillar II and complementary result indicators" does not provide

sufficient information for its calculation. The revision of the fiche is ongoing and soon more guidance will be provided to Member States to calculate the indicator.

However, reading the fiche, it appears that what is requested here is to compare **output per labour unit** of beneficiaries/supported projects with **output per labour unit** of farms which did not receive support.

To ensure the comparability among Member States and farms, the FADN definition of **total output** (SE 131) can be used as the data source and **not** the definition for gross farm income (SE 410), bearing in mind that only the value of output contributes to the construction of SE131, while subsidies intervene later on in the next step of the construction of the income indicators (also see the interpretation of SE 131 in the scheme available at ([http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/rica/annex003\\_en.cfm#ii](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/rica/annex003_en.cfm#ii))).

## 4. ASSESSMENT OF RDP EFFECTS

### 4.1 How to consider contributions of nature conservation measures (Art. 20) when programmed under another Focus Area (FA 4a)?

**Q.** *In the context with the Common Evaluation Questions (Draft working document – Common Evaluation Questions for Rural Development Programmes 2014-2020) and the indicator fiches (Working document – draft target indicator fiches for pillar II, Priorities 1 to 6; see annex) I am not sure whether I have understood the context correctly.*

*In the Austrian programme for rural development project-based nature conservation projects are supported under Article 20 with the focus area 4a. In the Common Evaluation Questions the indicator “% of agricultural land under management contracts supporting biodiversity” is given as target indicator for the focus area 4a (page 7). In the indicator fiches on page 15 the indicator for the focus area 4a is described. In the definition under, relevant measures contributing to target” Article 20 is not mentioned. This means, if I understood correctly, even though in Austria nature conservation measures are targeted under Article 20 with focus area 4a, these measures are **not** incorporated into the target indicator of focus area 4a?*

**A.** We confirm that Article 20 is not incorporated in the calculation of target indicator for the focus area (FA) 4A.

Although DG AGRI Working Document “Draft target indicator fiches for Pillar II (priority 1 – 6)” proposes that measures under Articles 28, 29, 30 and partly 21 (establishment only) of the Regulation (EU) 1305/2014 contribute to the FA 4A, Member States can programme also measures under other Articles, relevant to address the programme area needs and contribute to the achievement of the respective FA objectives.

DG AGRI Working Document “Rural development programming and target setting (version May 2014)” explains how targets shall be set up for each of the FA and provides indicators tables for planning outputs and calculation of targets.

In Annex 1 (Draft Indicator Plan) of this document, table A2 for Priority 4 explains that the target indicator “% of agriculture land under management contracts contributing to biodiversity” for the FA 4A is calculated as a physical total area (hectares). As seen from the table, Article 20 does not count for the calculation of the target as also the output indicator is expressed in “No of projects” or in „Total public expenditure (€)”. Therefore, Article 20 is not incorporated in the calculation of target indicator for FA 4A.

With respect to the Common evaluation questions, you say, correctly, that the target indicator “% of agriculture land under management contracts contributing to biodiversity” is proposed as one of two

indicators to be used to answer the Common evaluation question “To what extent has the RDP intervention contributed to restoring, preserving and enhancing biodiversity?”.

In case you consider that these two indicators are not sufficient to answer the respective common evaluation question and assess effects of nature conservation measures under Article 20 programmed within the intervention logic of the FA 4A, you may collect additional information (depending on the type of operations programmed) and/or set programme specific result indicators which will allow to do so.

#### 4.2 How to monitor, quantify or assess additional contributions to Focus Areas?

**Q.** 1) *Annex I, Part 1, to Regulation 808/2014 - Under point 11. Indicator Plan, c) it needs to be identified, qualitatively, the additional contributions of measures to other Focus Areas.*

*However, it is not entirely clear yet to us how will the RDPs monitor, quantify or assess these additional contributions.*

*Can the Commission confirm that potential additional contributions will be assessed by the evaluators through the complementary result indicators in the enhanced AIRs 2017 & 2019, as well as in the ex post evaluation. Even if this is confirmed we would need additional clarifications.*

2) *According to Annex IV to Reg. 808/2014 the common complementary result indicators relate only to FA 2A, 5A, 5B, 5C & 5D. However, SFC2014 allows to flag additional contributions for all the FA.*

*What will happen if there are additional contributions to FA for which there are no complementary result indicators? Does this mean that those additional contributions will not be measured?*

3) *In its informal replies of 14/01/2015 the Commission insists that there are certain measures with additional contributions to other FA; however, we consider that the justification given in the reply of the Managing Authority and in the description of the measures themselves should be sufficient and no further links would be necessary given that there are no result indicators defined.*

*Is it necessary to justify the additional contribution of a measure to a FA in the text of the measure or is it sufficient to fill-in the SFC table?*

**A.** 1 & 2) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 808/2014 in its Annex I, Part I, point 11 c) (Indicator Plan) requires that, at the stage of the RDP design, for each RDP measure, likely additional contributions (secondary effects) to any focus areas other than those under which they have been programmed are identified ("flagged"). This has to be indicated in a separate structured table (Table 3 "Contributions to other focus areas" in the Annex 2 to the *Working Document "Rural Development Programming and target setting (2014-2020)"* version of May 2014).

At the stage of the RDP implementation, in the operations database, and for each individual operation approved, it is necessary to identify the other focus areas to which an operation is expected to make an additional contribution. Please note that in the Annual Implementation Reports (AIRs) [Table B4 "Total public expenditure of the operations which have additional contributions to other focus areas" of the *Working Document "Rural Development Monitoring (2014-2020)-Implementation Report Tables"* version of 2015], the total public expenditure of all the operations having additional contributions to other focus areas needs to be reported.

Identified additional contributions of operations to focus areas 2A, 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D and 6A, flagged at the stage of RDP implementation, will later on be the subject of evaluation (in the enhanced AIRs 2017 and 2019, as well as the *ex post* evaluation).

For those focus areas for which 'common' complementary result indicators are not developed but still significant additional contributions of operations can be expected, the Managing Authorities are encouraged to develop programme-specific result indicators to assess those additional contributions.

Since the evaluation of additional contributions represents a methodological challenge, the European Evaluation Helpdesk for Rural Development is preparing a Thematic Working Group to develop guidance to assist Member States and evaluation stakeholders in assessing additional contributions and using the result indicators (both common and programme-specific) in evaluation. Information on this Thematic Working Group will be provided during the next meeting of the Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP on 17th March 2015.

3) The Member States have to fill-in the SFC table with the additional contributions of measures to other focus areas (Regulation (EU) 808/2014, Annex I, Part I, point 11 c)) and also provide an explanation of those additional contributions in the description of measures.

## 5. EVALUATION PLAN (EP) AND ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (AIR)

### 5.1 How to prepare the assessment of effectiveness and efficiency of area based measures in the evaluation plan for 2014-2020?

**Q.** *Regarding the ongoing process of implementation of the RDP the evaluation plan as a part of the programming document is under the final preparation. Taking into account all the requirements some question has been already risen up. We would like to ask you for your opinion concerning the following issues.*

*Concerning the preparation of the evaluation plan for RDP 2014-2020 regarding the evaluation of the 3E activities (Effectiveness - Efficiency - Economy) and also other elements of evaluation (Relevance, Utility – 5U) we consulted our approach with stakeholders. We encountered the problem of evaluating these aspects regarding to area related measures (such as AECM). Evaluation of the effectiveness and efficiency of area related measures is ensured through the verification of calculated payments per area unit on the basis of additional costs and income foregone compensation (values are enumerated in Annexes of the programming document of RDP CZ) which was part of preparation of the RDP. The amount of payment (= input) is constant for measures/sub-measures/operations/titles and is calculated per area unit (which is also the output).*

*Based on the description mentioned above, we believe that the evaluation of the effectiveness and efficiency of area related measure is ensured through the approved set of conditions per management in combination with relevant payment, which makes it irrelevant for additional evaluation. We would like to kindly ask you for confirmation of the correctness of our approach or for recommendation of the sufficient solution for area related measures to fulfill the requirement for all 3E and 5U evaluation.*

*In our opinion the evaluation of sustainability of area related measure also requires a specific approach. The payment per area unit is output in other words the proportion of the total area (agriculture, forest) in compares to the part under the support is defined as a result. Sustainability is directly related to the mandatory duration of the commitment on specific parcels/land blocks under given conditions. We would like to have some clarification regarding to this issue or could you recommend us some examples of good practice if necessary?*

**A.** *The Evaluation plan is a compulsory part of the rural development programme (Regulation (EU) 1305/2013, Art. 8.1.g). The purpose of the EP is to ensure that sufficient and appropriate evaluation activities are undertaken, and that sufficient and appropriate resources are available, in particular: to provide the information needed for programme steering and to feed the enhanced AIR in 2017; to provide the information needed to demonstrate interim progress to objectives and to feed the enhanced AIR in 2019;*

*The minimum requirements for the Evaluation Plan to be included in 2014-2020 RDPs does not require the descriptions of methodologies, including those assessing effectiveness, efficiency, result and*

impacts of RDP. It only requires an indicative description of the evaluation topics and activities anticipated for the programming period to support effective implementation and achievement of objectives, and to report on programme achievements, including (but not limited to) fulfillment of EU requirements. This includes the assessment of result and impact indicator values and analysis of net effects, thematic issues (including sub-programmes) and cross-cutting issues.

Area based measures, such as agri-environment-climate measures, Natura 2000 and WFD payments, etc. represent very important instruments of rural development policy and therefore it is very important to assess their impacts on rural areas and effectiveness in achieving rural development objectives (Regulation (EU) 1305/2013, Art. 4), objectives linked to rural development priorities and focus areas (Regulation (EU) 1305/2013, Art. 5) and cross cutting priorities on innovation, environment and climate change (Regulation (EU) 1305/2013, Art. 8.1.c(v)).

Experiences from the past evaluations show that this is not an easy task, since the specific character of area based measures. Therefore, although the Evaluation Plan does not require to describe details in this respect, it is vital to start thinking about the evaluation approach and methods already during the programming stage to be able to collect relevant data from early stages of the programme implementation.

With respect to your question regarding the assessment of efficiency, we agree that in case of area based measures, it is difficult if not impossible to do so at output level (whatever payment you decide to distribute, the No of hectares remains the same). However the assessment of efficiency at result and impact level is very important if we want to understand on which expense the observed programme results and impact have been achieved. As in case of effectiveness, we advise you to prepare such an evaluation at early stages of programme implementation, including development of evaluation questions, defining indicators, proposing relevant methods and ensuring proper data collection.

Regarding possible examples we recall on good practice cases published in the guidelines for the *ex post* evaluation of 2007-2013 RDP or on scientific articles, among them: O. Oenema, H.P. Witzke, Z. Klimontc, J.P. Lesschena, G.L. Velthofa, Integrated assessment of promising measures to decrease nitrogen losses from agriculture in EU-27 Integrated assessment of promising measures to decrease nitrogen losses from agriculture in EU-27, 2009 Rainer Marggraf, Comparative assessment of agri-environment programmes in federal states of Germany, 2003 Nick Hanley, Martin Whitby, Ian Simpson, Assessing the success of agri-environmental policy in the UK, 1999.

## 5.2 What to report on the evaluation plan in the AIR 2015 and AIR 2016?

**Q.** *Content of the evaluation activities of RDP 2007-2013 in the year 2015 - can MA in annual progress report in 2016 report about activities done under ex post evaluation (e.g. preparation activities, signing of the contract, implemented activities by the end of the year 2015)? YES or should MA still make additional evaluation activities by independent evaluator? A similar question relates to the content of the evaluation activities of RDP 2014-2020 in the year 2015 - what would be the main crucial information that MA should provide in the annual progress report in 2016 (would it be sufficient to report on preparation activities, confirmation of the steering committee, organisational structure of the evaluation unit under MA....) or still other information should be reported?*

**A.** In line with the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 808/2014, Annex II, Point 2 the MA should report on the progress of the Evaluation plan (EP) in AIR. The AIR of 2016 should cover the progress of the EP implementation in 2014 and 2015. Realistically - during first years of the RDP implementation can be expected that the MA focus on the preparing the management structure for the evaluation (setting up the evaluation steering committee, evaluation unit within the MA, communication with data providers etc.), and activities which relate to the setting up M&E system, such as reviewing the evaluation questions, indicators, setting up the data management and collection etc. This covers mainly points b) and c) of the Annex VII of the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 808/2014

(description of the evaluation activities undertaken during the year in relation to section 3 of the evaluation plan; and description of the activities undertaken in relation to the provision and management of data in relation to section 4 of the evaluation plan). In case the modification of the EP took place in 2014 and 2015, the AIR 2016 will also contain the respective information (808/2014, Annex VII, Point 2 a).

As for the programming period of 2007 and 2013 any other additional activities to be conducted by an independent evaluator are not envisioned. Evaluation activities linked to the ex post evaluation of the RDP 2007-2013 conducted in 2014 and 2015 shall be reported in the AIR 2016.

### 5.3 At which stage is the SFC 2014 development? (NEW)

**Q.** *Do you know about the evolution of the development of SFC? In the expert group it was said that a test version would be ready beginning of 2016. I think this is rather late. It would be very practical to be already able to see the tables we will have to fill in, in order to collect the right data now (a.o. for the Leader projects).*

**A.** As regards the SFC2014 development, the AIR monitoring tables are planned to be available in TEST from Q1 2016 in SFC2014. However, further information will continue to be provided in 2015 (including on template tables)

### 5.4 Are there special conditions or a special form for the 2007-2013 AIR? or is it under the same form as the others? (NEW)

**Q.** *We plan a meeting with our MA by the end of September, this will be the occasion for a wrapping up of the 2007-2013 programming period and there is already one question pending about the last of the 2007-2013 AIR:*

*Are there special conditions or a special form for this report? or is it under the same form as the others?  
Could you possibly explore this question?*

**A.** The last Annual Progress Report 2007 2013 will be the same as in previous years; there are no special conditions nor a special form.

## 6. MONITORING

### 6.1 Will the CMEF Technical Handbook contain the final monitoring tables?

**Q.** *Please can you give us few clarifications on monitoring issues (basic questions):*

*- Can we expect that "Technical Handbook of the Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework of the CAP 2014 – 2020" will also contain the final version of Monitoring tables (Table A; B1-B4; C; D; E; F)?*

*- Can you confirm that all monitoring tables will be predefined/generated through SFC and guidance be provided for their technical completion where appropriate? When will this be ready for our use – or in pilot version?*

*- Can you confirm that table A will be submitted three times per year and other tables only once (together with AIRs)?*

**A.** - Yes, the "Technical Handbook" will contain the final version of these tables.

- The objective is to provide final versions and Guidance by June 2015. The development in SFC2014 will follow, exact date remains to be defined.

- As explained in page 3 of the WD, the Table A is submitted 2 times (semester 1 and 2) and then the system would aggregate and make available an annual compilation for the AIR (so 2 submissions). The SFC 2014 module for Table A is already implemented and running (under section monitoring). It has been used in January 2015 by the RDPs which were approved in 2014. As described in the WD, the other tables will be submitted in the AIR.

## 6.2 What should the monitoring reports contain?

**Q.** *I have some questions about the M & E reports, which originated in the preparation of the establishment of our ICT.*

*(Issue 21) Claims may not be included in the reports (see Working Document H3.2, par. 2, point 6: in principle recoveries should not be monitored. To be tackled by the financial execution.). This means that the monitoring data NOT connect to the RDIS table (declaration). Is this correct?*

*(Issue 45) Should the transitional measures only be listed in Table E, or ALSO in table A, B, C, D, and F? We assume that they must come only in Table E. Is this correct?*

*(Issue 54) If there are due obligations, e.g. because applicants cancel their application or if no payment request is sent, therefore, the number of companies assisted and the level of obligations (both committed Expenditure) be adjusted? We assume that this is not the intention. Is that correct?*

*(Issue 53) Are the following interpretations regarding guarantees correct?"Committed expenditure '= amount that RVO.nl guarantees"Realised expenditure '= amount that RVO has paid to the bank"The operation has been completed" when either the entire loan is repaid to the bank or the loan cannot be repaid and RVO.nl paid to the bank.*

*(Issue 59) Are the formats for Tables A, B, C, D, E, F also available in Excel format? Especially if they change it is useful to have the new version in Excel format.*

*Draft data items list (issue 55-57)*

*A number of these data items is not reflected in a report: Additional priorities; Is the company organic? Prio 1; State aid; subprogram. For LEADER projects also the following data items: forest cover; O12; O17; O2; O5; O8.*

*Why are these data items on this list? Is there another report which we have not in the picture yet?2) In the "draft data items" Natura 2000 and LFA questions are resp. "yes / no" and a value list. In Table C the surface is included. I had assumed that if the subsidized area of an applicant lies partly in Natura 2000, and partly not, the corresponding expenditure should be broken down in Table C. Ditto for LFA's. The draft data items 18 and 19 suggest that the corresponding expenditures should be fully included in "Natura 2000". Which interpretation is correct? If my initial assumption is correct, the data items could better be replaced by "amount Natura 2000" + "amount not non-Natura 2000 " et cetera? If the second assumption is correct, this should be better clarified in the working document in the description of Table C? " 3) Draft data items: items in LEADER: 4A, 4B, 4C "Total area (agriculture), value: Ha": Is this in accordance to O5 or O6? O4 can also create a double counting when a holding has several applications (operations).In short, in which cases can avoid double counting of companies or parcels?*

**A.** *(Issue 21) As explained on page 2, in table A (commitments), amounts committed are reported and there is no need to correct afterwards in case of recoveries. In other tables based on completed operations, amounts paid are reported, possible recoveries afterwards are not taken into account.*

*(Issue 45) No, see page 7. In the AIR, ongoing commitments made during the 2007-2013 programming period and supported through 2014-2020 EAFRD and commitments made in 2014/2015 (before the approval of the new RDP) based on the 2007-2013 rules and paid through 2014-2020 EAFRD are*

monitored in the tables A, B, C and D. No specific distinction is foreseen. On top of that they are also reported in table F.

(Issue 54) Yes, please see first question. Except for table A (based on applications approved), these operations would not be filled in the other tables (only reported when last payment made).

(Issue 53) Yes, this corresponds to the approach expressed in the WD.

(Issue 59) They could, in principle, be made available (by June 2015 the earliest).

Draft data items list (issue 55-57)

Please see here below where these data are reported.

- Additional priorities;

See Table B4 for secondary effects. The additional Focus areas will also be there for the RDP concerned.

- Is the company organic?

See Table C, third box

Prio 1; P1 is composed of M01, M02 and M16, any data reported on these measures concern also P1. P1 is also in Table B4 (secondary effects)

State aid;

State aid is integrally part of the monitoring tables like in the indicator plan, no distinction. In Table F (performance framework, they are reported also 'adjustment top ups/state aids)).

Subprogram.

Targets/outputs and expenditure are monitored in the overall tables aggregated for whole RDP.

In accordance with the art. 75 §3 and 4 of the RDR, in 2017 and 2019, in addition, outputs and targets should be provided for the sub-programme separately, using additional templates of tables B and D.

Why are these data items on this list? Is there another report which we have not in the picture yet?

- Please see table B2 for leader, these data are reported there.

In accordance with its bottom-up dimension, LEADER strategy is not known at RDP level. Therefore, LEADER is programmed entirely under Focus Area 6B 'Fostering local development in rural areas', although Leader projects can contribute to different focus areas. During the programming period, LEADER will remain in FA 6B for the management of the RDP (financial plan, Declarations of expenditure, Annual Implementation Report...).

Additionally and without putting into question the programming hierarchy set in the RDP, when the LAG select their operations, it is expected that, for each project selected, the LAG managers identify what is the main objective of the project (by using the list of FA, the project is flagged with the most relevant FA). This is an indicative monitoring information which will allow to constitute a link between the LEADER achievements and the mainstream RDP monitoring.

To monitor the contributions of the LEADER projects to the FAs, 1 indicator per project is collected. The indicator to be collected depends on the main FA the project contributes to. These contributions will be added to the achievements of the mainstream RDP to demonstrate the result of the RDP as a whole.

2) In the "draft data items" Natura 2000 and LFA questions are resp. "yes / no" and a value list. In Table C the surface is included. I had assumed that if the subsidized area of an applicant lies partly in Natura 2000, and partly not, the corresponding expenditure should be broken down in Table C. Ditto for LFA's. The draft data items 18 and 19 suggest that the corresponding expenditures should be fully included in "Natura 2000". Which interpretation is correct? If my initial assumption is correct, the data items could better be replaced by "amount Natura 2000" + "amount not non-Natura 2000" et cetera? If the second



assumption is correct, this should be better clarified in the working document in the description of Table C? "

The second assumption is correct. To ensure simpler monitoring, as suggested in the data item list document, the entire operation (M10 or M15) is recorded under 'YES' if it is implemented in an area which is predominantly under Natura 2000. The entire expenditure of the operation is reported under N2000. We will consider your suggestion for further explanations in the WD.

3) Draft data items: items in LEADER: 4A, 4B, 4C "Total area (agriculture), value: Ha": Is this in accordance to O5 or O6? O4 can also create a double counting when a holding has several applications (operations). In short, in which cases can avoid double counting of companies or parcels?

These data should be collected and compiled by the LAG managers, and it might be complex for them to measure the physical area. Therefore, we propose to keep the 'total area O.4' to make it manageable for them. We will have to bear in mind when we will use the data that, in some case, overestimation is possible.

### **6.3 How do we have to report on data items added , n°23 and 24, in the WD Data item list for pillar II operations database? (NEW)**

#### **Q. Data item list for pillar II operations database**

- Again two data items (nr 23 and 24) have been added. This is very late. Even too late and therefore problematic for the Flemish RDP, because the measures M04 and M06 have already started, the monitoring system has been finalized and the first projects have been submitted.

- How do we have to report on these data items? Have the data items been added to the document "monitoring (2014-2020) – implementation report tables" (version 2015)? We could not find it. Do we have to report on the public expenditure per TF-type? The number of projects per TF-type, the mean size in hectares of the supported farms?

A. We understand that these two data items have been introduced relatively late but would also like to emphasize that this information is important and needed. As explained in the RDC and in the Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluation, this information was collected during the 2007-2013 period and has recently been very helpful to explain how the rural development has supported the dairy sector so far. As you will understand, this type of data will remain very important in the future. We are inviting MS to address pragmatically the issue raised in your comment because the first applications submitted before these changes in the data items list will indeed not have that information. This could be done either by collecting that information afterwards whenever it is possible or by extrapolating it from the next applications.

- Please see updated WD from May 2015 which shows the table to be reported based on the data item list.

### **6.4 How to collect the data for the data item O.20, Table B4 and new breakdown of indicators Table C in the WD Monitoring (2014-2020) – Implementation report tables (2015)? (NEW)**

**Q.** *Data item O.20: number of Leader projects supported: New indicators have been added. The fiche says that "the indicator to be collected depends on the main FA the projects contributes to". In Flanders, the whole Leader measure has been programmed under FA 6B. Does this mean that for each Leader project we have to collect the data "population benefiting from improved services/infrastructure"? This is no problem, since this is foreseen in the monitoring system that had already been finalized. However, the fiche also says to flag the most relevant FA for each project. Is this then the secondary FA? And if so, do we have to collect the indicator for this secondary FA? We do not agree with this practice since the Commission always confirmed that the secondary FA only have to be monitored qualitatively (see*

*working document on programming and target setting – indicator plan tables ("flags"). Moreover, the programme has already started and the monitoring system has been finalized.*

*- Table B4 has been added. Here we are asked to monitor the expenditures for operations that have contributed to secondary FA. Again, we think it is too late to add new monitoring tables. Moreover, this is again a quantitative monitoring of secondary FA, which is in contrast to what is noted in the working document on programming and target setting.*

*- A new breakdown of indicators has been added. In table C, now the expenditure for organic farms under different measures is asked for. It is too late to add these kind of extra indicators and breakdowns, after the programme has started.*

A. Due to its bottom-up dimension, the exact nature of the operations under LEADER is not known at RDP level. Therefore, LEADER is programmed entirely under FA 6B and during the programming period will remain, for the management of the RDP, under that FA.

However, in the monitoring phase, and in order to better capture the contribution of LEADER activities, a pragmatic approach has been developed. Concretely, for each operation selected, we need to know what the purpose of the operation is. We therefore break down the indicator 'number of LEADER operations' and 'total public expenditure' according to a thematic typology. We could have created a new ad-hoc typology for the LEADER operations but we preferred to use the existing list of EU Focus Areas for the Rural Development (as it allows an easier linkage with the overall intervention logic). So for each project selected, the LAG managers have to identify what is the main objective/main theme by using the list of FAs (for instance, if the project is about creating a shop for local products, FA 3A is selected as predominant FA but if it is about a place to socialize, then FA 6B is the most relevant FA)). By doing this, the nature of the operations, which is in any case known, can easily be collected in order to capture what will be effectively implemented.

Moreover, depending on the predominant FA to which the LEADER project contributes, a data item is collected/recorded. If we use the two examples above mentioned, in the first case (shop for local products) we will collect the number of farms concerned (which will sell their products) and in the second case (place to socialize) we will collect the potential population benefiting from the project.

- The first version of March 2014 of the WD 'Data item list' already contained the principle of flagging in the database the secondary effects for each operation. Therefore, such information should become available. Table B4 has been introduced in November 2014 in order to collect in an aggregated way that information.

- This breakdown was present in the data item list version of March 2014; it was therefore known already at that time that the information had to be collected. Afterwards the monitoring tables have been adapted to collect that information.

## **6.5 How to fill code COM 4.1, 4.2, 4.4 and 6.1 on Commission's table C? (NEW)**

**Q.** *On the Commission's table C (see end of text), and with regard to the information broken down by agricultural branch and size, I have the following questions:*

*- With regard to code 4.1 COM (investment on the farm) and 6.1 (Support Activity start for young farmers), the classification of the culture and it's size is related with the the farm itself or with the investment in question?*

*- On the COM 4.2 code (support for investments in processing / marketing and / or development of agricultural products), it makes sense to request information by area?*

- The code COM 4.4 (Support for non-productive investments linked to the achievement of objectives in the fields of agri-environment and climate), it seems to us that does not make sense collect this information, since the investments are not associated with any specific agricultural activity.

However, if it is necessary to ask for this information, I think it will be to ask for information relating to the exploitation, no?

**A.** 1) The classification is related to the farm itself (the farm receiving the support). The purpose is to collect information on who is receiving EAFRD supports and not on the project itself.

2) And 3) Here as well, the purpose is to be able to show how many is invested (including non productive investment) in mountain area compared to other areas.

3) Yes, for these measures M04 and M06 , the seat of the holding receiving the support is expected to be the criteria used to determine the location.

I would like to further precise our replies to questions 2 and 3.

Requesting this information also for measures 4.4 and 4.2 is important because there is a need to monitor, by type of agricultural branch and by size, what has been globally invested through the RD Policy. The emphasis is on 'how much has been injected in a given sector for investment purposes'. In that context, you are perfectly right to underline that the size and the type of agricultural branch should refer to the holding supported regardless of the nature of the operation/investment in question.

Please also ignore the reference made to NCA delimitation, which concerns another section of the Table C.

#### **6.6 When will monitoring Indicator tables or its structures in SFC2014 on 2014 and 2015 for the CAP 2014-2020 be available? (NEW)**

**Q.** *When will be available tables or its structures in the SFC2014 on 2014 and 2015 for the CAP 2014-2020, which are in the Working Document "Rural Development Monitoring (2014-2020) – Implementation report tables"?*

*Will be available some instructions or guidelines about these tables (for example, how to create tables in system; references to documents of indicators: how to fill indicators in tables) and where?*

**A.** As presented during the last RDC of June, the current plan is the following:

By the first quarter of 2016, the Annual Implementation Report SFC 2014 module will be available in TEST mode (MS will be able to see and test it)

By the second quarter of 2016, the Annual Implementation Report SFC 2014 module will be available

In the meantime, further information and support documents will be issued from September 2015, please continue to follow information displayed in the next RDCs.

#### **6.7 Which are the new requirements in the monitoring tables of "type of agricultural branch" and "Size in hectares of holdings"? (NEW)**

**Q. 1.** *A question to the monitoring tables concerning the new requirements of "type of agricultural branch": In the documents of "Data Item List" and of "WD Monitoring" there are more definitions "based on General TF8 (2015/220/EC)". Is it enough to monitor just following branches as described in the document: "TF8: Field crops, Horticulture, Wine, Other permanent crops, Milk, Other grazing livestock, Granivores, Mixed (crops + livestock) and non-farm holdings (food industry...)" or is there a more detailed information necessary as described at the Homepage of FADN (2003/369)[http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/ricaprod/detailtf\\_en.cfm?TF=TF8&Version=11990](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/ricaprod/detailtf_en.cfm?TF=TF8&Version=11990) .*

2. A question to the monitoring tables concerning the new requirements of "Size in hectares of holdings": in the documents there is a definition : "only farm holdings". So there is only a requirement for farm holdings, forestry excluded !?

A. 1) Only these 8 categories + the non farm holding supported (the main categories from the FADN typology which indeed defined sub-categories).

2) yes, only farm holdings, as described in the working documents, only M04 and M06 are concerned by this data (size of the farm holding supported).

**6.8 Do we have to collect only the default indicators (total public expenditure and jobs created) for these focus areas (1A and 6A)? Is there no extra indicator for these focus areas? (NEW)**

Q. I took this table from the working document "Monitoring (2014-2020) – Implementation report tables", version 2015. But also in the document "Data item list for Pillar II operations database APRIL 2015" you can see this table.

I see now in the data item list, that for these focus areas (1A and 6A) only the default indicators have to be collected (total public expenditure and jobs created). Is this right? Is there no extra indicator for these focus areas?

A. As regards the data item to monitor contributions of LEADER operations to the main FA, her comment was correct ' I see now in the data item list, that for these focus areas (1A and 6A) only the default indicators have to be collected (total public expenditure and jobs created). Is this right? Is there no extra indicator for these focus areas?. The reply is yes. If a project is mainly about 1A (fostering innovation) or 6A (diversification in rural areas), the data item which will be used will be respectively the 'expenditure' and the 'number of jobs created' (like we do for the other FA, we take a similar item to the target). In this case these items are in any case collected for all LEADER operations, so no need to fill it in twice, in the system the data will be retrieved automatically.

**6.9 How to deal with the fact that the 2016 report cover two years of payment whereas table B3 and E are meant for an annual reporting? ; Is it necessary to assess CRI if no measure is programmed on one or some of the focus area? (NEW)**

Q. Deux questions à te poser sur le monitoring qui me sont venues en essayant de préparer le système de collecte d'informations et de reporting.

Tu peux bien sûr publier ces questions avec les réponses dans le répertoire CIRCA ad-hoc, comme tu l'as déjà fait pour les questions que Linn t'a posées récemment; de cette manière cela pourrait aider les autres E-M également car il s'agit de questions très pratiques.

Tableau B3 : étant donné qu'il s'agit d'un reporting annuel (non cumulatif), comment gérer le fait que le premier rapport à fournir pour 2016 couvrira deux années de paiement (2014 et 2015)?

Pour les MAE par exemple, il y aura paiement de deux campagnes successives, donc paiement de la même mesure sur les mêmes surfaces. Faut-il comptabiliser deux fois les paiements et deux fois les surfaces couvertes par ces paiements?

Idem pour le tableau E – dépenses transitoires, qui doit reprendre des données annuelles uniquement en principe?

Est-il nécessaire d'évaluer les indicateurs de résultats complémentaires associés aux priorités 2A, 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D et 6A si il n'y aucune mesure programmée sur une des ces priorités dans notre programme mais qu'il existe tout de même des contributions additionnelles sur ces priorités.

*Par exemple, nous n'avons programmé aucune mesure sur la P5D, donc pas d'indicateurs cible fixé pour cette priorité. Mais nous avons indiqué une contribution potentielle des investissements soutenus dans le cadre de la mesure 4.1 vers cette priorité. Devons-nous quantifier cette contribution alors que la P5D n'est pas programmée dans le programme ?*

A. On travaille sur l'outil excel et on souhaite avoir quelque chose à partager dans les semaines à venir.

Pour les questions, voici les éléments de réponse en collaboration avec les collègues de l'évaluation:

1) L'objectif est de proposer deux tables B3 dans le AIR 2016 (une pour 2014, l'autre pour 2015). En ce qui concerne le tableau E du AIR 2016, celui-ci couvrirait exceptionnellement les deux années (il s'agit d'argent, ce qui ne représente pas de difficulté majeure pour le cumul).

2) At the stage of the RDP implementation/monitoring, in the operations database, and for each individual operation approved, the MA (or PA) has to identify and report on the other FA to which that operation is expected to make additional contributions, if any (in the third column of Table B4, you have to report the total public expenditure of all the operations which have additional contributions to other FA). Taking your example, if you have not programmed FA 5D but have identified operations programmed under other FA which have additional contributions to FA 5D, you have to quantify and report the corresponding public expenditure in the third column of Table 4B. The MA has the possibility, if it so wishes, to propose a specific result indicator to monitor those additional contributions.

The complementary result indicators have to cover both the operations programmed under those FA and the operations programmed under other FA but which have additional contributions to those FA. Using your example, at the stage of evaluation, the complementary result indicator linked to FA 5D will be calculated/assessed taking into account all the operations which have additional contributions/secondary effects to FA 5D (even though FA 5D has not been programmed).

**6.10 Could you explain if this discrepancy between EU Reg. 220/2015 and the set of codes from the list in the Data Item List (page 3 data item number 23) is intentional? (NEW)**

**Q.** *In the Data Item List, on page 3 data item number 23 mentions EU Reg. 220/2015 on type of agricultural branch. In the Regulation we find a slightly different set of codes from the list in the Data Item List. Could you explain if this discrepancy is intentional and what is the background on this?*

*In more detail:*

*Data Item List: Field crops, Horticulture, Wine, Other permanent crops, Milk, Other grazing livestock, Granivores, Mixed (crops + livestock) and non-farm holdings (food industry...)*

*While Reg. 220/2015 has the following main categories:*

1	Specialist field crops
2	Specialist horticulture
3	Specialist permanent crops
4	Specialist grazing livestock
5	Specialist granivores
6	Mixed cropping
7	Mixed livestock
8	Mixed crops — livestock
9	Non-classified holdings

A. You will find the detailed of the FADN typology used for the CMES on page 5 of the attached document.

Globally, from the same building blocks, FADN has different typologies (the building blocks are aggregated differently) including the one you refer to in your e-mail and the one used in the CMES.

#### 6.11 How to allocate the support funds according to the focus areas in the administration system? (NEW)

*Q. When planning financing for the RDP measures, the support funds for every measure were allocated according to different focus areas. However this allocation was preliminary. The question is how to allocate the support funds according to the focus areas in the administration system? This has to be done already during the administration/evaluation stage of applications, because the national paying agency has to declare funds to the EC according to different focus areas. For example in the case of RDP measure "Agri-environment-climate" one application contributes to different focus areas."*

##### A. monitoring of output and total public expenditure indicators

The goal of the monitoring (output indicators and total public expenditure) is to follow and measure the achievement of the RDP strategy. The RDP strategy is quantified in the Indicator plan. In the RDP, in most of the cases, the sub-measures or the type of operations (for agri-environment-climate) are programmed/attributed to a particular FA in the Indicator Plan. During the monitoring phase, the structure of the RDP Indicator Plan should be followed. The operations/allocations belong either to 1 type of operation or 1 sub-measure. All the operations of that sub-measure or type of operation should be reported in the monitoring tables in the FA where the sub-measure/type of operation has been programmed.

For instance, for the 'agri-environment-climate', type of operation A, B and C are in the RDP programmed under Priority 4 (in the RDP the priority 4 is not broken down by FA), therefore all the applications for these type of operations A, B and C are monitored and reported under Priority 4. For the same measure, the type of operation D is programmed under FA 5 E, therefore all the applications of the type of operation D are reported under FA 5E.

In the LT OUTPUT section of the RDP we have for M10:

96 million € and 231 550 ha under P4

37.9 million € and 173 400 hectares under FA 5D and

7.9 million € + 57 000 hectares in FA 5E

To reach that breakdown, each TO had to be programmed (the output and the total public) under only 1 FA (or P). So each TO considered by the MA and programmed in P4 to arrive all together arrives to the total of 96 million € and 147 000 ha under P4 are monitored under P4. At output level P4 is no break down in the RDP, neither in the monitoring tables (for output and total public expenditure).

Same for FA 5d and 5E

The target monitoring which is a result indicators, here we take into account multiple contributions of 1 operation to possibly different targets (4A, and Ab or 4B and 4C), for that we follow what is in table 11.4. We do not mind here if we double count ; it is the purpose. It is already a kind of evaluation of the effect of the operations. But this is only to quantify the realization of the target.

## 6.12 What should be considered when evaluating the complementary result indicators R2, R13, R14, R15, R18 and R19? (NEW)

**Q.** *Have we understood correctly that when evaluating the complementary result indicators R2 (Change in agricultural output on supported farms), R13 (Increase in efficiency of water use in agriculture in RDP supported projects), R14 (Increase in efficiency of energy use in agriculture and food processing in RDP supported projects), R15 (Renewable energy production from supported projects), R18 (Reduced emissions of methane and nitrous oxide) and R19 (Reduced ammonia emissions), only operations of investment-type should be taken into account by the evaluator?*

**A.** The Working document Complementary result indicator fiches for Pillar II describes the methodology of assessment of result indicators, data required, the point of collection, frequency and means of the data transmission to the Commission. Fiches require evaluators to conduct the survey of all completed operations with respect to focus areas to which complementary result indicators relate to. Fiches do not specify that operations shall relate only to investment-type of operations (related to Articles 17,18,19,20 and 21) , but to all which are implemented within measures programmed under the specific focus area of a given RDP, including area based measures ( e.g. Articles 28,29,30) or so called "soft" measures (e.g. Articles 14, 15, 16). In spite of expecting not very significant effects of operations implemented within area based and soft measures, they should still be taken in consideration when assessing the result indicators which you have mentioned in your question. In addition, if relevant, the secondary effects of operations programmed under other FAs than those linked to P2 and P5 shall also be considered.

## 6.13 How do we have to fill AIR monitoring tables? (NEW)

**Q.** *We have had a look at the draft AIR monitoring tables – the excel working tool.*

*Added to this email, you can find the table (provisionally) filled in for the programme of Flanders. In red, I have added some remarks and questions about items that are not clear. Can you provide us with an answer please?*

*A general question: "Table A": how do we have to fill this in? Yearly, in January and September? Or cumulatively?*

*A general remark: when having filled in the table on the tab "Strategy", in the next tabs all indicated focus areas are given for every submeasure. However, most focus areas are assigned to only one or some submeasures.*

*As regards the committed expenditure: how and where does it have to be submitted?*

**A.** Please find in the excel replies in bold (tables b.1, b.2.1 and table C), for most of your comments you will see that some columns were hidden in one of the template put in CIRCA so it is clearer now what are the differences between some of the rows in table B.1.

As regards the questions here below, the first table A to be submitted by October 2015 should cover beginning of 2014 until end of August 2015. The next one to be submitted in January 2016 will cover September 2015 to December 2015 (non cumulative). Then , it will continue (always non cumulative).

For the strategy in the excel tool (in sfc 2007 also), we stay at the level of measure and FA because information at sub-measures level in the RDP is not exhaustive, it is correct that some sub-measures will not be relevant depending on the FA.

The deadline is by the 31th of October 2015 (only table A), the web form has to be filled in manually in sfc2014 in the monitoring section, you can start Today to use it (see monitoring and then BAIDP Q1 2015).

#### 6.14 How to process the continuous requirements to "Bi-annual indicator data provision" that should be submitted before 31/10? (NEW)

**Q.** *In the Netherlands, we are preparing the "bi-annual indicator data-provision", a report that has to be send to the Commission before 31th of October. We are wondering how to proceed with the commitments from the previous programming period. For instance, for this purpose, in the AIR in the 2007-2013 period we had a separate table G3(2). Are there, besides the information in the Working Document, any guidelines which describe how to deal with the ongoing commitments in the bi-annual report? We assume that only data related to the RDP 2014-2020 budget should be included, but will be sure about that.*

**A.** Only data related to 2014-2020 Fund should be reported in the bi-annual report which includes all the operations committed in 2007-2013 paid (or partially paid) with 2014-2020 Fund. It is not foreseen to distinguish these amounts. The purpose is to have an overview of what is already committed out of the total 2014-2020 envelop.

For instance is a project approved in 2007-2013 is/will be partially paid by 2007-2013 envelop and 2014-2020, the share corresponding to the 2014-2020 should be taken into account in the bi-annual report.

#### 6.15 Do the multi-annual commitments have to be registered annually? (NEW)

**Q.** *In the Working Document (WD), blz. 4, the definition of "committed" for multi-annual commitments is: "...For multi-annual commitments (e.g. M10 Agri-environment-climate), the commitment is defined annually when the annual claimed expenditure is submitted." In this way, cashflow (payments) and commitments are getting mixed. I cannot see a reason why for the multi-annual commitments there must be another process than for the incidental commitments for the other measures. I think, the best way is (in analogy to the other commitments), to register/report the multi-annual commitments only in the year they are committed and than for the whole commitment! As for the commitments from 2007-2013 period continuing in the 2014-2020 period: they should be registered partly in both periods. For example: a contract from 2013-period with two remaining years should be registered and reported for the whole two years in the report we have to submit this week. Is this correct/not correct and maybe you could you explain the reasoning behind the text of the Working Document.*

**A.** What you are describing is an option but we have recommended to apply an approach based on annual claims for the following reason:

as it is not requested to take into account the de-commitments in the table (if there is a de-commitment, we do not have to correct data in the table), if we record from the start the whole 5 years we will significantly over-estimate the amount because of the de-commitment whereas through annual claims we will be closer to the reality.



## 6.16 Specific questions on monitoring

Questions	Replies
<b>NRN Monitoring</b>	
<p>There are two main groups of indicators, one for communication tools and one for thematic and analytical exchanges. How to figure out in which group different activities should be reported.</p> <p>Please clarify the difference between:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of events organized by NRN</li> <li>2. Consultations with stakeholders (e.g. between MA and NRN stakeholders on program modifications...)</li> <li>3. Others (trainings, web forum...)</li> </ol> <p>If a thematic working group, for example, arrange a seminar concerning possibilities to get support for cooperation within the rural development program, is that 1. an event, 2. a consultation or 3. others?</p> <p>Is it a correct interpretation that activities reported under Consultations with stakeholders should always involve MA or politicians and always address program modifications or evaluations? And that meetings with the thematic working groups (when they plan their communication tools and consultations with stakeholders) should be reported under Others?</p>	<p>If a thematic working group, for example, arrange a seminar concerning possibilities to get support for cooperation within the rural development program, is that 1. an event, 2. a consultation or 3. others? <u>In this case, it should be seen as an event.</u></p> <p>Is it a correct interpretation that activities reported under Consultations with stakeholders should always involve MA or politicians and always address program modifications or evaluations? <u>Not necessarily, there is no need to be so restrictive.</u></p> <p>And that meetings with the thematic working groups (when they plan their communication tools and consultations with stakeholders) should be reported under Others? <u>A priori no, only the main activities of the thematic working groups would be monitored. For instance, the meeting preparing the launch of a consultation would not be counted but the consultation yes.</u></p>
<p>What should be reported under consultations. It is the separation between event and consultation ? Could you please give some examples?</p>	<p>Globally, under consultation it was meant questionnaires, surveys, set of specific interviews...with a main finality of consulting stakeholders on a specific topic. In general, events – even if there are playing a role in the ongoing exchange/dialogue/consultation of the stakeholders – would remained to be monitored as event.</p> <p>However, it might be that 1 event is particularly designed to consult the stakeholders on a particular topic as a main finality and therefore be counted both as 1 event and 1 consultation activity.</p>

Monitoring of multi-annual measures	
<p><b>Indicator O.5 Total area- measures 10.1, 11, 13</b></p> <p>Definition: 'area after on the spot checks having received payments. For multi annual commitments implemented through annual payments intermediate completion is considered on an annual basis when the claim is paid. In principle recoveries should not be monitored.'</p> <p>Question:</p> <p>Should the <b>indicator O.5</b> be handled in the same way as <b>F508B area covered by payment made</b> in the accounting information (which is reported when the advance is made), except for the last sentence about recoveries?</p> <p>If it is not the same instruction for O.5 as for F508B, please explain how we should handle areas in the case of advance payments, followed by balance payments? The advance payment could be done in one calendar year and the balance payment in another calendar year.</p> <p>Also (depending on national budgetary resources and the performance of our system) it is possibly that in one year (N) for the same beneficiary to be paid in January-February the rest for the claim year N-1 and in October – December the whole amount claimed for year N. Thus, in year N we will have 2 payments for the same beneficiary. In this case, I suppose that in B3 the area and beneficiaries will be counted once and both payments.</p>	<p>It is proposed to report only the operations once the balance is made (when the advance is given, nothing is reported and when the balance is done, the full amount and the area is reported) which means that yes, operations implemented in year N could likely be reported in year N+1. This way there is a direct link between the total area and the total expenditure</p> <p>.</p> <p>It is what we mean implicitly when, in the WD on monitoring, we say that <i>'the data collection is made when annual payment are made after administrative checks and on the spot checks'</i>.</p> <p>In the special case of the same area being paid twice (the balance of last year and the full payment of year N) during the same year . The Physical area would count only once the ha, the total public expenditure will count the both payments and the total area would count the ha twice to ensure a correct ration € spent / ha supported.</p>
<p><u>M10 and Transitional measure 214</u>: I am only commenting the monitoring dimension of this question. For pragmatic reason, we would suggest to consider <u>new</u>, all the 'old' commitments once they have been</p>	<p>We are only commenting the monitoring dimension of this question. For pragmatic reason, we would suggest to consider <u>new</u>, all the 'old' commitments once they have been through the adaptation/acceptance of the revision clause.</p>

through the adaptation/acceptance of the revision clause.	
<b>M04</b>	
<p>For <u>sub-measure 4.1</u> we have 2 output indicators, one is O3 no. of operation, which is the number of approved projects and O4 Number of holdings. The scope of O4 is to?</p> <p>A) Avoid double counting (for sure in 7 years we will have the case that the same holding will be supported twice, 2 projects for the same beneficiary). In this case we will have 1000 operation and 700 holdings supported</p> <p>B) To fully capture the impact of the measure in the case of collective beneficiaries like cooperatives (in this case if we finance a cooperative which has 5 holdings as members we will have 1 operation and 5 holdings)</p> <p>C) To exclude the collective beneficiaries (we will count only the individual holdings) we will have 700 operation and 600 holdings.</p>	<p>We do not want to exclude collective beneficiaries but for simplification, we think that the nbr of holding counted should be 1 (it is 1 beneficiary group of different holdings so, we report 1).</p> <p>As mentioned in the target fiche (because the O.4 is also used for the target in the case of 4.1 (2A): 'Same beneficiary supported for several and different operations (several and different applications) is counted several time.'. This is proposed for simplification purposes. As a consequence of this simplification, there is not real differences between number of holdings and number of operations in the example mentioned.</p>

## **European Evaluation Helpdesk**

Boulevard Saint-Michel 77-79

B - 1040 BRUSSELS

T: +32 2 737 51 30

Email: [info@ruralevaluation.eu](mailto:info@ruralevaluation.eu)

<http://enrd.ec.europa.eu>

