



Liberté • Égalité • Fraternité
RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE

MINISTÈRE
DE L'AGRICULTURE
DE L'AGROALIMENTAIRE
ET DE LA FORÊT

EAFRD contributions to the EU 2020 strategy

agriculture
.gouv.fr
alimentation
.gouv.fr





MINISTÈRE
DE L'AGRICULTURE
DE L'AGROALIMENTAIRE
ET DE LA FORÊT

State of play in France... the context

- Programmation of EAFRD 2014-2020 in France faces two challenges :
 - - at EU level – the « funds system » is perceived as much more complex then it once was – a multi-layered binding regulatory system
 - - at national level – regionalization – meaning turning regional councils into managing authorities adds an element of complexity to an already complex system (29 programmes, 28 MA)
 - -regarding Strategy 2020 it is perceived as an attractive packaging with multi-level implications





MINISTÈRE
DE L'AGRICULTURE
DE L'AGROALIMENTAIRE
ET DE LA FORÊT

EU 2020 in this context

This new organisation is a challenge for the whole stakeholders in France.

We must bear in mind that if we have achieved decentralization at national level , in the Commission's mind there is one Member State only responsible for EU funds.

Hence the role of general coordinator for the National level.

The National level retains a permanent role of public policy oversight and coordination especially as regard the strategic commitments made by Member State France.

This is particularly true regarding the implementation of the national reform programme, and EU 2020 objectives.





MINISTÈRE
DE L'AGRICULTURE
DE L'AGROALIMENTAIRE
ET DE LA FORÊT

EU 2020 in this context

There is one pivotal instrument for the implementation of this strategy : the Partnership Agreement

EU 2020 objectives have been translated into national objectives through the Partnership agreement

With 3 key issues :

- competitiveness of the economy and employment.**
- managing the transition to sustainable energy and management of natural resources**
- achieve equal opportunities between territories**
[cross-cutting issue]





MINISTÈRE
DE L'AGRICULTURE
DE L'AGROALIMENTAIRE
ET DE LA FORÊT

EU 2020 in this context

As a consequence the Partnership agreement states that :

1 - ESI funds in France are distributed in a balanced way between the 3 pillars of EU 2020 :- « smart growth » (thematic objectives 1, 2 and 3), sustainable (thematic objectives 4, 5 and 6) and inclusive (thematic objectives 8, 9 et 10)

2 - ERDF specifically on thematic objectives 1

3 – EAFRD on thematic objectives 1,2,3,4, 5 and 6

Which gives the managing authorities plenty of flexibility to express and fulfill the needs of there territories as regard EU 2020.





MINISTÈRE
DE L'AGRICULTURE
DE L'AGROALIMENTAIRE
ET DE LA FORÊT

What lessons from the Programmes under scrutiny ?

While examining the programmes and especially the swot analysis, the Commission was very mindful of the way the MA have taken into account crosscutting and horizontal priorities of EU 2020 strategy and EAFRD

It appears clearly when reading the first feed-back on the RDPs made by DGAGRI

By default reading of what should have been in the RDPs

At times the Commission is more managerial stating that « the MA should be careful that the RDPs should be in line with EU strategy 2020. »





MINISTÈRE
DE L'AGRICULTURE
DE L'AGROALIMENTAIRE
ET DE LA FORÊT

What lessons from the Programmes under scrutiny ?

« you should make a better link between climatic change and carbon capture and storage and better stress the potential constraints/pressures in connection with climatic change risks and adaptation strategies »

« The development of national and regional forestry and sustainable forest management plans, under rural development plans, will enable the MA to achieve its stated goals and objectives regarding EU 2020 strategy for biodiversity. »





Liberté • Égalité • Fraternité
RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE

MINISTÈRE
DE L'AGRICULTURE
DE L'AGROALIMENTAIRE
ET DE LA FORÊT

As a conclusion...

To be « in line with EU strategy 2020 » is only the first part of the job.

The issue at stake now is how we manage a real monitoring of the Strategy : the monitoring and evaluation system through the indicator plan makes the connection between focus areas / priorities and thematic objectives so that it should be easy to add up the figures...

We have all the feeling that this quantified approach falls short of the reality





RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE

MINISTÈRE
DE L'AGRICULTURE
DE L'AGROALIMENTAIRE
ET DE LA FORÊT

As a conclusion...

But apart from these figures are we able to have a clear idea of the results and impacts ?

Apart from results and impacts, a strategy is coherent and relevant at a given time (from its conception), but is it still relevant throughout a period of 6 years ?

Moreover, discussing and building up a strategy remains a very theoretical step, implementing a strategy requires political decision – but political science shows that rationality is not a key input for policy making

