



MS questions on indicators Summary of the answers

GREXE, 2 Septembre

*Sophie Helaine, Unit C4
Monitoring and Evaluation*

Introduction

- The latest version of the indicator fiches was circulated to the Council WP end of 2019, covering all indicators of Annex I as well as the new indicators proposed by the Presidency.
- Thank you very much for the comments/questions received.
- The document circulated to the GREXE and to the Council WP (WK 7390/2020) provides all answers to MS questions received between end of 2019 and June 2020.
- This presentation will highlight the main points and cover additional questions received from Spain when relevant for all MS.
- A set of revised fiches will be circulated before the next GREXE.

Social indicators – Checks of a sample of completed projects

- R.31 (Number of jobs) it is proposed to carry out the data collection at the time of project completion; in this case the checks by means of samples of completed projects are not required.
- Regarding R.33 (smart villages), 34 (services), 35 (social inclusion), if there is a difference between the planned figures and the checked figures, MS are simply invited to correct the reported figures.
- R.33: the DE Presidency might propose a simplification of the indicator to ‘Smart transition of the rural economy: Number of supported Smart Village strategies’. Checks would then not be required. The change in title points also at the fact that a Smart Village strategy could include actions not linked to digitalisation.

Social indicators – R.35 Promoting social inclusion

- With the change of label proposed by the FI Presidency to:
 - **R.35 Promoting social inclusion:** Share of rural population covered by supported social inclusion projects
- With the change in calculation method discussed with MS:
 - Reporting the number of participants to the relevant operations instead of reporting the number of persons benefitting from the projects.
 - Without the need to avoid double counting (thus no requirement to personally identify participants)
- Does any difficulty to report this indicator remain?

Livestock indicators – R.13, R.36 and R.38

- Member States are not required to keep track of individual animals
- The double counting is to be checked at the level of the beneficiary (using the unique ID).
- Detailed examples will be presented at the next GREXE

Small farms support scheme

- Introduced by HR Presidency, under Art. 69(2)(aa)
- The output indicator O.23a "Number of small farms receiving installation grants" was added to Annex I by the Presidency for this intervention
- Related result indicator: R.31 Growth and jobs in rural areas
- It cannot be linked to R.9 referring to investments

Training indicators – R.1 and R.24

- Fiches will explicitly refer to the "number of persons", which include forest holders and rural entrepreneurs as well.
- Adding a reference to "social": a reference will be added to the fiche in the definition.
- As regards the title: the new title proposed by the HR Presidency being now more general, adding a reference to 'social' is not necessary

R.1 Enhancing performance through knowledge and innovation: Number of persons benefitting from support for advice, training, knowledge exchange, or participating in EIP operational groups or other cooperation groups/actions.

Modernisation indicator – R.3 Digitising agriculture

- The Commission proposes to simplify the indicator by removing references to Art. 65.
- Remaining Art. 68, 71 and 72 refer to (investment, knowledge or cooperation) projects and, ultimately, farmers receiving support through these projects.
- There is a trade-off between indicators best suited to follow MS progress in CAP plan implementation with limited burden and the informative value of indicators in demonstrating achievement of specific objectives.
- Is this simplification enough?
- Or would a further simplification of R.3, focusing on Art. 68 only, be of a great help to MS?

Coupled support – R.8

- We were asked to explain why only ‘other sectors’ are included in R.8.
- The Commission proposal is to include all the sectors actually covered by Coupled Income Support and not to count for sectoral interventions.
- The proposal to add the number of farms receiving coupled support and the number of producers receiving support under EAFG under other sectoral interventions is surprising as sectoral programs are not targeted to sectors in difficulties. In addition, the support is very different in nature.
- The informative value of R.8 would be increased if the focus on coupled support is kept, if split by sector (as proposed for R.11) and if would relate to the share of coupled support in sector output. What would be your view on the latter?

Better supply chain organization – R.10

- Some MS were afraid of the complexity of the calculation, but it is now clarified in the fiche that only direct participants in the cooperation project are to be accounted.
- Therefore what prevents MSs from reporting on local supply chains and local markets in R.10?
- FYI, cooperatives are also under the scope of the support.

Units (1)

- It is not possible to change the unit of reporting for performance clearance if the article describing the intervention in the legal text specifies the Unit (e.g. ha for AECM).
- The change in the legal text of Art. 65 proposed by the HR Presidency allows for other units than ha to be reported, it is wanted for forestry commitments
- In addition, we acknowledge that for investments notably (including on forestry), using specific Units (such as ha, LU) could offer more possibilities to use Simplified Cost Options. For investments, the legal text is not prescriptive.
- Thus 'other units' can be used to report O.18, O.19, O.20 and O.21 (investments). It is also the case for O.8 (risk management) and O.17 (genetic resources).

Units (2)

- However,
- We need to ensure also a common reporting to allow for aggregating results. E.g. would MS use unit amounts per LU or ha (rather than per operation) for investments under O.18, O.19, O.20 and O.21 for performance clearance, MS would need to report also the number of operations in the aggregate, so that an EU figure of the number of supported investment operations could be monitored.
- In addition, the unit needs to be meaningful.

Water quantity – R.22

- R.22 Sustainable water use is defined as follows: Share of irrigable land under supported commitments to improve water balance.
- The suggestion by several MS to change the name of the indicator from the share of irrigable land to the share of agricultural land is meaningful.
- We will inform the DE Presidency of this MS's suggestion.

Natura 2000

- R.28 - Supporting Natura 2000:
 - Several MS asked for a split between agriculture and forestry: the fiche was modified accordingly
 - The indicator cannot focus on the specific income support under Art.67, it is meant to measure management commitments above baseline in Natura area
 - Art 67 is covered by R.4 (as it is income support) and R.7 (as it supports areas in need).
- C.19 – Farming in Natura 2000 areas:
 - The “share of UAA under Natura 2000” will include a distinction between UAA with and without natural grasslands.

ANC - How to manage degressivity?

- It is not because 2 unit amounts happen to be the same value under an intervention for 2 different categories (e.g. mountain areas and other areas), that the reporting can be merged.
- Interventions for Mountain areas and other areas need to be described distinctively in the CAP plan (even if the actual amount is the same) and distinctively reported
- The latest changes in the legal text proposed by the Presidency would give the possibility to MSs to use average unit amounts for the category (for the different unit amounts of each tranche of hectare, due to degressivity).

Reporting on forestry (1)

- **Environment/climate commitments going beyond mandatory requirements on forest land**, included when afforestation took place on agricultural land, shall be reported under O.14
- The hectares under support for maintenance in the year following the establishment shall be reported under R.25 or R.26 (which could be merged)
- Interventions on forest land shall not be included in R.14 (even if afforestation took place on UAA)

Reporting on forestry (2)

- **Investments** support aimed at the afforestation of agricultural and non-ag. area of the farm shall be reported under **O.20** (Number of supported non-productive investments) or under **O.21** (Number of off-farm productive investments). Both can be used depending on the previous purpose (leisure, environment, production) of the forest and on the final purpose.
- All area-related investments in afforestation shall be recorded under **R.17 (Afforested land)**, independently from who is the beneficiary;
- All investments in forests are reported under **R.17a (Investment support to the forest sector)**
- All investments in afforestation realised by farmers are also accounted in **R.23 (ENV/CLIMA investments)**

Other issues

- **Cooperation - Art 71**, the interventions of promotion and information actions by POs financed under Art.71 can be linked to R.10 - Better supply chain organisation
- **C.27 – Gross fixed capital formation in agriculture**: References to Value Added at Factor Costs will be added in the fiche.
- **C.41 – Renewable energy**: The Commission wants to keep the indicated data source for C.41 (MS progress reports RED I Directive), because it reports only renewable energy produced respecting the sustainability criteria. Any additional source can be mentioned by MS in the SWOT too.

Thank you



© European Union 2020

Unless otherwise noted the reuse of this presentation is authorised under the [CC BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license. For any use or reproduction of elements that are not owned by the EU, permission may need to be sought directly from the respective right holders.

Slide xx: **element concerned**, source: e.g. [Fotolia.com](https://www.fotolia.com/); Slide xx: **element concerned**, source: e.g. [iStock.com](https://www.istock.com/)

