

Rural Development Policy – Performance Review 2019

Unit F1 Consistency of Rural Development

DG Agriculture and Rural Development European Commission

Agriculture and Rural Development



Content

- Technical clarification
 - To peak or not to peak
- Performance Review
 - Letter from the DG
 - RDP version as basis for the PR
 - Timeline
 - Overall process
 - Decision tree
- AIR
 - Modifications
 - Availability





Performance Review To peak or not to peak Only for Area Based Measures

- As provided by art 6(2) of REG. 215/2014, the same methodology shall apply for checking achievements of milestones/targets in 2018 and 2023 :
- "...of the milestones value <u>by the end of 2018</u> or of the target value <u>by</u> <u>the end of 2023</u>"
- The milestones and targets are considered achieved even if they are reached before 2018/2023.

To peak in both cases

NB : SFC2014 WILL compute the peak.





Letter – steps of cooperation between MS and COM services

For a successful performance review exercise our mutual goal is to ensure

- AIR data is correct
- Decisions on achievement of milestones to be adopted in timely manner

We encourage

- *information exchange between MS and COM services before formal submission*
- Upload data to SFC as early as possible, before the monitoring committee (MC)
- Discuss the accuracy of performance data in the MC
- Regionalised MS: submit AIRs of all RDPs within two to three days for more efficient assessment and decision adoption per MS





AIR and Performance Review – RDP version

- *Member States were encouraged to submit requests for milestone revisions before the end of 2018.*
- The latest adopted version of RDP by the time of submission of the AIR 2018 will be the basis for the assessment the achievement of milestones as well as implementation progress in general.





Performance Review Decision

- "The Commission shall within 2 months of the receipt of the <u>respective</u> Annual Implementation Reports in the year 2019 adopt a decision ... to determine ... the programmes and priorities which have achieved their milestones..."
- Respective : The 2 months deadline applies separately for each RDP and its respective AIR.
- The Commission intends to prepare a decisions per Member State
- When not possible several separate decisions need to be adopted for the Commission to be able to respect the deadline and in order not to prejudice the Member State concerned. (Therefore: encouragement to submit all AIRs of regionalized MS within 2 to 3 days)





Performance Review Overall Process





Performance Review - Decision tree

Assessing the achievement of milestones for 1 Priority





AIR TEMPLATE – MODIFICATIONS

- Re-activated Enhanced version
 - Section 6 : Sub-Programmes
 - Section 7 : Progress Towards achieving Objectives
 - Section 8 : Actions to take into account (Partnership, Promotion of equality, Sustainable development),
- New Section 9: Progress made in ensuring integrated approach to use EAFRD and Other Union Financial Instruments
- Section 10: Financial Instruments Amended
- Section 11 (...): Adapted to the possibility to count 2018 expenditure paid in 2019





AIR TEMPLATE – new table Section 11

Priority	Realised performance indicators		Adjustment Top ups	
	2018	Paid in 2019 but related to operations implemented in 2018 (*)	2018	Paid in 2019 but related to operations implemented in 2018 (*)
P2 – Total Public Expenditure		2010()		
P3 – Total Public Expenditure				
P4 – Total Public Expenditure				
P5 – Total Public Expenditure				
P6 – Total Public Expenditure				

(*) Provided that the Realized Total Public Expenditure is entered into the Common Monitoring and Evaluation System (Art 5(2) of Reg(EU) No 215/2014.





SFC-template for Section 7 of the AIR in 2019, ref.: Reg. (EU) No 808/2014, Annex VII:

- Following the feedback from the Member States, the structure of the SFC section to report the evaluation findings (chapter 7) in 2019 has been <u>simplified</u>.
- It will provide more flexibility to the Managing Authorities on how to structure their replies to the Common and Programme Specific Evaluation Questions and to explain the methodology used.
- Summary tables of quantified common and additional indicators, supporting evaluation findings, are included at the end of the section.





SFC Section 7 for reporting evaluation findings in 2019

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION No 1 (FA 1A)

COMMON EVALUATION QUESTION No 1 "TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THE RDP INTERVENTIONS SUPPORTED INNOVATION, COOPERATION AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE KNOWLEDGE BASE IN RURAL AREAS?"

Answer to evaluation question

[A maximum of 17,500 characters = approx. 5 pages]





SFC Chapter 7 for reporting evaluation findings in 2019

TABLE OF CAP IMPACT INDICATORS¹²

Name of common impact indicator	Indicator Unit = same as corresponding context indicators	Updated indicator value	RDP contribution 13	Comment
1. Agricultural entrepreneurial income	EUR (in real terms) / AWU (non-salaried)			
2. Agricultural factor income	EUR (in real terms) / AWU			
3. Total factor productivity in agriculture	Index			





AIR AVAILABILITY

• Two Steps:

• Step 1 : READY BY MID-APRIL

- SECTION 6 DESCRIPTION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF SUB-PROGRAMMES,
- Section 8 Implementation of actions to take into account the Principles set out in Article 5, 7 and 8 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013
- Section 9 Progress Made in Insuring Integrated Approach to Use EAFRD AND Other Union Financial Instruments
- Section 11 Encoding Tables for Common and Programme-Specific Indicators and Quantified Target Values

• Step 2 : READY BY EARLY JUNE

- Section 7- Assessment of the Information and Progress Towards Achieving The Objectives of the Programme
- SECTION 10 REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS (ARTICLE 46 OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013)

