



8TH MEETING OF THE EXPERT GROUP ON MONITORING AND EVALUATING THE CAP

12 November 2015



1. Adoption of the agenda

The Expert Group on Monitoring and Evaluating the CAP meets for the eighth time in the European Commission's premises in Brussels on 12 November 2015.

Yves Plees (DG AGRI Unit E.4) chairs the meeting, welcomes participants and announces the languages in which the meeting will be held. He informs the audience that at the beginning of point 5, Christophe Derzelle will make a clarification about the data items list for Pillar II operations database. Then Yves Plees introduces the draft agenda and informs about a change of agenda: point 8 becomes point 6 and points 6 & 7 become points 7 & 8 respectively. He also announces several points which will be addressed under AOB.

The draft agenda is adopted by the delegates, and the topics addressed during the meeting follow the order summarised below.

2. Introductory Remarks

Link to the PPT: [Documentation available on CIRCABC and AGRI Europa](#)

Fernando Fonseca (DG AGRI Unit E.4) informs on the documents uploaded so far on the CIRCABC platform and the EUROPA website (e.g. Evaluation guidelines, *Ex post* evaluation guidelines, Folder on Questions and Answers). He informs on the updates of the documents.

Yves Plees announces that:

- The Technical Handbook on the Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework of the CAP 2014 – 2020 has been sent for translation into 5 languages (FR, DE, IT, ES and PL) and will be available in early 2016. It can already be found without annexes on CIRCABC.
- Delegates should fill in and sign the application form for reimbursement of travel expenses and leave it on the table before the coffee break.
- The EC created a folder on CIRCABC with the application form for the travel reimbursement which can be downloaded.

After these explanations, MS raised the following questions:

Availability of Output indicator fiche

Denmark asks if the output indicator fiche are available on CIRCABC, and, if not, when they will be available.

The EC replies that the output indicator fiche for pillar II are available on CIRCABC in the working document 'Rural Development monitoring (2014-2020) - implementation report tables'.

Data Items List for Pillar II Operations Database

Poland asks clarifications about the interpretation of the text marked in red in the document.

The EC replies that the red text in the document will be clarified later by Christophe Derzelle (DG AGRI Unit H.3) under point 5 of the agenda.

3. Overview of data sources available for use on evaluations

Link to PPT: [Data sources for the CAP context indicators 2014-2020](#)

Gesa Wesseler (DG AGRI Unit E.3) explains that the presentation has been prepared by her colleague, Francesca D'Angelo and that she will deviate from the title in the agenda to talk about "Data sources for the CAP Context indicators 2014-2020".

The presentation contains:

- The legal basis for the CAP common context indicators (CCI)
- Where to find the [CCI](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-indicators/index_en.htm) (http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-indicators/index_en.htm)
- The updates of the context indicators published by the Commission
- The EU data sources for different types of indicators
- The main data gaps and problems at EU level

Gesa Wesseler concludes that for context indicator updates, the Commission relies on EU-level data sources, which are not always complete, sometimes not regularly updated and are often not available at regional level and that more data may be available in the Member States. These should be identified now, to be ready in time for the relevant reports.

After the presentation, the MS raised the following comments/questions:

Translation of list of indicators

Germany asks if the list of the CAP context indicators will be translated into other languages than English.

The EC replies that the list mostly contains numbers and will therefore not be translated.

Challenges in data collection and indicator handling for countries with regional RDPs

The United Kingdom, Germany and Spain remind that collecting data or working with indicators at regional level is challenging. United Kingdom asks if, in case a revision of regulation 808/2014 is undertaken there will be a simplification in terms of monitoring and evaluation. Spain requests simplifications for small RDPS to provide answers for indicators.

The EC replies that the question regarding the simplification of the regulation is not for this forum but for the Rural Development Committee (RDC). Because of the budget cuts, it is not likely that more detailed data will be provided by Eurostat at regional levels. Finally, the EC highlights that a Helpdesk publication on proxy indicators ([Working Document Defining Proxy Indicators for Rural Development Programmes, January 2014](#)) provides solutions to identify suitable indicators in case there is no data for CCI at regional level. Moreover, Eurostat is currently developing a new strategy for agricultural statistics to harmonize data under two framework regulations, to be approved in 2018 as the next agricultural census should take place in 2020.

Definition of "regional level"

Germany asks what is meant by regional level in the tables referred to during the presentation: NUTS 2 or district level?

The EC explains that Eurostat data is sometimes available at NUTS 2 level, and sometimes at NUTS 3 level. This is as far as Eurostat goes. In case Member States need more detailed data national information sources will have to be used.

Ownership and accessibility of FADN data

Germany asks whether the EC, which owns the FADN data, could provide it for evaluation purposes at micro level rather than provide highly aggregated data, so evaluators would not have to make individual requests to national or regional authorities to get access to detailed data.

The EC replies that the Commission has provisions by which researchers can ask for micro-data of the FADN, under very well specified conditions. Individual data cannot be published according to data protection rules. The EC does not know what the provisions at national level are, whether micro data can be requested. At EU level it is necessary to justify the demand, state the purpose and a committee will decide if the demand is finally considered justified or not.

4. Presentation of the Member States notifications on greening and monitoring indicators for greening

Link to the PPT: [The payment for agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment – Greening, Update on notifications for greening](#)

Yves Plees passes the floor to Andrea Furlan (DG AGRI D2). He reminds the audience that a similar presentation was given on 25 June and that the current presentation is an update. Andrea Furlan presents the notification forms for the year 2014-2015; the modifications for 2015 of the choices made by MS in 2014 about Ecological Focus Area, as well as the main choices for greening; the approach of the MS on Environmentally Sensitive Permanent Grassland (ESPG); monitoring data for output indicators; the ISAMM form for output indicators.

After the presentation, the MS raised the following comments/questions:

Level of data collection

Spain reiterates the request of its ministry to send information on greening at NUTS 2 level, instead of NUTS 3.

The EC explains that the normal level for data collection is NUTS 3 but, in case MS are facing difficulties, they can send an email to give the information at NUTS 2 level. Overall MS are encouraged to respect the NUTS 3 level in order to have more coherent results across all MS.

Discrimination of organic farms and farms under greening

Austria reminds the Commission that they have sent a question and highlights that there seems to be a contradiction in the EC's explanations concerning the fact that all farms receiving direct payments must fulfil at least one greening criterion and MS have to calculate that in the table. Yet, organic farms do not have to meet the greening obligations. The MS asks if the EC was talking about all the farmers or if the organic farms were not considered.

The EC replies that organic farms are treated as an exemption and are reported as such in the indicators, as a specific set of data on exempted farms is provided. The reply to Austria is under preparation.

Use of information gathered on Pillar I for evaluation in Pillar II

Spain asks if the EC has proposals for using information collected under Pillar I also for other types of analysis, and more specifically for rural development. Germany comments in the same direction asking how monitoring information from Pillar I can be used for Pillar II evaluation, such as the assessment of environmental measures.

The EC confirms that it would make sense for this expert group to dedicate some time on the question how information collected under Pillar I can be used for evaluation in Pillar II. A proposal how this issue could be taken on board will be made for the next meeting.

5. Presentation and discussion of the final draft guidelines of the Thematic Working Group "Assessment of RDP results: how to prepare for reporting on evaluation in 2017"

Before the beginning of the presentation on the TWG, Yves Plees passes the floor to Christophe Derzelle (DG AGRI Unit H3) in order to make a clarification on [Working Document Data item list for Pillar II Operations database \(Outputs and Targets\)](#). Christophe Derzelle reminds that the MS have to flag/monitor all the additional contributions for each operation approved (or type of operation for M10,11...). So if a project has relevance for energy efficiency, for example, this should be flagged. This should be done regardless of table 11.3 in the programme. The actual additional contributions have to be flagged so that the evaluators, when they have to assess it, have access to a complete set of operations. .

After these introductory remarks, the MS raised the following comments/questions:

Monitoring and evaluation of secondary effects

Poland, Belgium and Germany have several comments in relation to table 11.3. Poland highlights that it is hard to collect the actual additional contributions for each operation. Germany recommends that given the resource limitation in evaluation it would be more appropriate to monitor secondary effects rather than to evaluate them. Belgium states that the requests from the Commission regarding table 11.3 have changed over time from a qualitative to a more quantitative approach.

The EC replies that table 11.3 is filled in ex ante and has the purpose to look at what could be the potential additional contributions. It is therefore a part of the overall intervention logic of the programme and it will be relevant that evaluators have a look at these ex ante assumptions. However, it is foreseen to collect all the actual additional contributions in order not to miss any significant secondary effects. The EC has made major efforts on the data item list summarizing all the information that needs to be collected. In this document, for each element to be collected, it is stipulated if it applies to all or only a few measures.

Link to the PPT: [Thematic Working Group “Assessment of RDP results: how to prepare for reporting on evaluation in 2017”](#)

Jela Tvrdonova (Evaluation Helpdesk) gives a presentation of the final draft guidelines "[Assessment of RDP results: how to prepare for reporting on evaluation in 2017](#)". First the legal requirements relevant for the AIR are listed as well as the existing guidance for reporting on evaluation in 2017. She provides an overview on the working process of the TWG and explains how the various comments of Expert Group and Sounding Board were addressed in the current draft. Then Jela Tvrdonova presents the structure and the main focus of part 1 and part 2 of the guidelines. She specifies that the guidelines fit with different MS' contexts. Part III of the guidelines contains amongst others also two types of SFC templates. A further template for answering evaluation questions is still under preparation.

After the presentation MS raised the following comments/questions:

Requirement to answer Evaluation Questions already in 2017

Poland asks for the possibility of a simplification with a change in regulation 808/2014 in order not to have to answer all the evaluation questions already in 2017. In case the contribution of a particular

objective to a result indicator is 0, Poland also wonders if it is necessary to still answer to the related evaluation question. Spain asks how the EC will use the information from the AIR and suggests that this should also be explained in the guidelines.

The EC replies that, both simplification but also performance are important for the Commission and that evaluation is a relevant tool to achieve this. While the EC recognizes that it is early to calculate the indicators, it is highlighted that the guidelines present various possibilities on how to answer the evaluation questions, even in case of low uptake. Regarding the further use of the AIR 2017, the EC replies that the Evaluation Helpdesk will synthetize the reports and the respective information will feed into the report that the EC submits to the Council and the Parliament in 2018. The EC emphasises that the main concern of the MS should be to prepare the system, which will be able to answer the evaluation questions over the whole programming period.

User-friendliness of SFC template

Bulgaria asked for the legal basis of the SFC template and considers it to be difficult to use and therefore limiting the performance of the evaluation activities.

The EC replies that the template will be easier to use for the AIR than it was before and that it is a powerful tool in order to generate good overview reports.

The legal basis is Article 2(1) of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 184/2014, according to which the electronic data exchange system (SFC2014) shall contain at least information specified in the models, formats and templates established in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013. This article, in combination with Article 75(5) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 and Article 15 of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 808/2014, provides a clear legal basis to implement the AIR in SFC2014 in a structured way.

Structure and length of the guidelines

Germany and Italy suggest that the guidelines should be briefer and adapted to the SFC structure. Germany suggests to put Annex I, the SFC template, at the beginning of the guidelines, as it is considered as the most essential information. The structure of the guidelines should then follow the template. Germany would also appreciate the opportunity to further discuss the structure of the guidelines and of the template.

The EC suggests that further ways to reduce the document will be explored. The Evaluation Helpdesk adds that the proposed restructuring of the document following the SFC template is an interesting idea that will be further explored once the SFC-template has been finalized.

Content and focus of the guidelines

Portugal reminds that the complexity of the guidelines is linked to its objective to fit different MS situations. Germany requires that the guidelines must clearly distinguish between minimum requirements and what can be done additionally.

Italy notes that the chapter on quality control is too much focused on evaluators and not enough on MA. A part for Managing Authorities should be developed. Italy adds that there is not much link between the annual report and the 2017 report.

The Evaluation Helpdesk states that the guidelines do already distinguish between the minimum requirements and what can be additionally done, but promises that this distinction will be made even more evident in the next version. Also the question how to deal with evaluation in case of low uptake and proportionality are addressed throughout the guidelines but will be highlighted even more.

Missing information: result indicator fiches, executive summary, acronym list

Spain says that the MAs are interested in getting to know the result indicator fiches. Austria would like a summary and a list of abbreviations to be added to the guidelines. Austria furthermore asks a clarification concerning the meaning of the tick-boxes in the table in annex 6.

The Evaluation Helpdesk replies that the result indicator fiches will not be revised and will be provided in a separate document with a methodological complement specifically for the CRI. An executive summary of the guidelines will be developed and a list of acronyms will be included. The Helpdesk also explains that Annex 6 (Collection of data and information for evaluation on beneficiaries through monitoring system) contains examples on how to use the system. The tables with tick-boxes indicate which data can be collected from the operations database.

Reporting about 2014

Finland asks how to report and evaluate about 2014, what to do regarding the spending from the previous programming period (e.g. AE-payment which has used money from the current period)

The EC answers that transition will still be tackled with a reference to that in the guidelines.

Level of evaluation at focus area or measure level

Finland wants to explore if in the current programming period evaluation has to be carried out exclusively at focus area level, rather than at measure level.

The Helpdesk reminds that individual measures and their combination generate effects at the level of focus areas. It is therefore necessary to see how the different measures contribute to the focus areas, if the intervention logic works well and why. However, the requirement for reporting is in fact at focus area level but it does not prevent one from looking at the measure level.

Assessment of National Rural Networks

Finland reminds that the ENRD Contact Point has prepared a document on how to show the added value of rural networks and asks if anything more on this topic is included in the guidelines.

The Helpdesk replies that the common evaluation elements on NRNs provide only a minimal system consisting of three common indicators in the data item list. Member States therefore have the responsibility to further think about how the added value of their rural network and its expected results and impacts can be assessed. It will be necessary to develop appropriate indicators. Specific guidelines on the evaluation of National Rural Networks are currently under preparation by the Evaluation Helpdesk. They will also include a link to the self-assessment material prepared by the ENRD Contact Point.

Dissemination of the guidelines and training

Portugal asks if some kind of training is envisaged regarding the use of the guidelines and furthermore if a translation of the document will become available.

The EC replies that the possibility to have a training must be checked with the Evaluation Helpdesk. Moreover, the EC foresees to translate at least part 1 of the guidelines in approximately 8 languages.

General comments and next steps

Italy reminds that such a background document and also the SFC template should be sent out earlier to Expert Group members in order to allow for proper discussion during the meeting.

The EC acknowledges that the document was sent late and that MS had not sufficient time to fully analyse the draft. The whole guidelines can therefore be commented in written still by the end of November.

6. Presentation and discussion of the draft Annual Work Programme of the Evaluation Helpdesk for 2016

Link to the PPT: [Annual Work Programme 2016](#)

Hannes Wimmer presents the Evaluation Helpdesk's draft Annual Work Programme for 2016. First, the presentation shows how the Evaluation Helpdesk detected the needs to be addressed and what were the emerging topics that arose. Then the individual activities of the Annual Work Programme are explained in more detail.

After the end of the presentation Hannes Wimmer presents to the Expert Group members an evaluation-related query that may trigger further thematic work of the Evaluation Helpdesk, if the question is relevant for more Member States. The question was originally raised by Lithuania: How to deal with the 7 Health Check related evaluation questions that are part of the revised set of evaluation questions for the ex post 2007-2013? Should they be answered even in case no specific Health Check top ups have been applied? The Evaluation Helpdesk's preliminary answered to this that question no. 3, 4, 7, 8, 10 and 11 should be answered even if no top up have been applied. Question no. 6 should be addressed only if a Health Check top up has been applied. However, Lithuania still sees several methodological problems in this respect: how to distinguish between answers among different questions using the same indicator (water quality), how to deal with innovation, etc.

After the presentation, the MS raised the following comments/questions:

Evaluation of cross-cutting topics among ESI funds

Portugal hopes that topics like innovation and environment would be addressed in cooperation with other ESI funds because they are cross-cutting. Portugal, United Kingdom and Italy support the idea to explore synergies with evaluation of cohesion policy and other ESI funds.

Potential topics for Helpdesk thematic work

United Kingdom has a major focus on agri-environment and would welcome best practices on agri-environmental schemes. Italy adds that good practice workshops on topics such as innovation, monitoring tools and climate change are useful and very welcome. Spain underlines that also guidance on new topics such as climate change and innovation would be seen as useful. Furthermore training and explanations about Performance Framework procedures are suggested. Germany would welcome a thematic workshop on Pillar I and II evaluation, primarily focusing on greening and competitiveness. France expresses interest on the evaluation of environmental aspects.

The Evaluation Helpdesk replies that several of the mentioned topics can be addressed within the different formats of activities in the Annual Work Programme of the Evaluation Helpdesk: Good Practice Workshops, Thematic Workshops, ad hoc workshops (for pillar I and pillar II for instance), etc. Not necessarily all the suggested topics are however appropriate for guidance and should be rather covered in smaller formats (workshops, good practices, etc.)

7. ENVIEVAL project - developing a methodological handbook for the evaluation of environmental impacts of RDPs

Link to the PPT: [The ENVIEVAL project, Development and application of new methodological frameworks for the evaluation of environmental impacts of rural development programmes in the EU](#)

Gerald Schwarz (Thünen-Institute of Farm Economics, Germany) presents the scope of the ENVIEVAL project (who they are, background and objectives) and the 4 main components of the approach. Then he presents the results of some case studies showing on which aspects the team focused (testing additional indicators, advanced modelling approaches and counterfactuals methods) and the key issues emerging.

Member States do not raise any question after this presentation.

8. Presentation and discussion of the draft guidelines of the Thematic Working Group "NRN evaluation"

Link to PPT: [Thematic Working Group Guidelines: NRN evaluation in 2014-2020](#)

Jela Tvrdonova (Evaluation Helpdesk) presents the draft guidelines of the Thematic Working Group "Evaluation of National Rural Networks 2014-2020". The purpose of NRN evaluation and its legal backgrounds are presented before the elements are explained in more detail. Then Jela Tvrdonova presents the challenges for 2014-2020 evaluation in correspondence with the existing guidance.

After the presentation, Jela Tvrdonova introduces the group work: 8 groups are formed and asked to reflect on the following three questions:

- To what extent does Part I of the guidelines (for MA and NRN) cover what you need to know for preparing the evaluation of NRN in 2014-2020?
- What experience have you made so far with NRN evaluation? (examples)
- What expectations do you have from a good NRN evaluation? (quality, methods, what kind of conclusions)

Synthetic summary of the answers from the MS to the questions of the interactive session

Topic	Comment
Comments to the entire document	<p>Exhaustive and sufficiently detailed</p> <p>It should be flexible, consider various situations in MS (e.g. with respect to budget and size of the NRN, staff, governance structure – NSU/NRN, data availability, etc.), highlight the situation of regional programmes (in MS with NRNP)</p> <p>Expectations of NSU should also be considered</p> <p>Translation in all languages would be needed</p>
Structure of the guidelines	<p>General introduction</p> <p>Highlight the minimum requirements and optional elements (what is required and what is good practice)</p> <p>SFC template on reporting should be taken into consideration and how to obtain information to insert in SFC (using methods, etc.)</p>

Topic	Comment
	Should be structured differently, according to needs of MA, how SFC is structured, what is needed to fulfil the requirements (method, ToR)
Content introduction	<p>– Definition of NRN&NSU should be clarified, what is the subject of evaluation Links to EIP network Highlight in networking - Evaluation of all networks also outside of beneficiaries NRN evaluation should be linked to other evaluations, e.g. ESI Funds Feedback; what are the real bottlenecks, have the right things been addressed</p>
Content – PART I	<p>Stakeholders Who conducts evaluation; can MA do it? Under which conditions? Bring together MA and relevant stakeholders Engage appropriate range of beneficiaries and meet their needs Is public procurement necessary for ongoing evaluator? Steering Group for evaluation of NRN should be concerned not only with evaluation but also with implementation of recommendations</p> <p>Timetable and process Importance of timetable Explanation what it means to have NRN evaluation as ongoing process Detailed examples of evaluation plans</p> <p>Forms of evaluation External evaluation should be part of programme evaluation Focus on self-assessment should be further strengthened (incl. methods and links to evaluation) How to synthesize results from different Member States?</p> <p>Dissemination Share results of evaluations</p>
Content – PART II	<p>Focus of NRN evaluation Link between network assessment and programme assessment Evaluation should include evaluation of action plan, including implementation Evaluation should focus on assessment of effectiveness (e.g. for dissemination of rural activities, meetings) What are network results and impacts Tackle the real impact of NRN rather than results What are the results of the NRN, efficiency, how contribute to achievement of objectives Evaluation of network should have accompanying nature (what runs well, what does not work, etc.)</p> <p>Development of evaluation elements</p>

Topic	Comment
	<p>How to develop results and impact indicators (which are difficult to formulate, e.g. linking events to impacts!)?</p> <p>Help to develop Evaluation Questions?</p> <p>Evaluation methods</p> <p>Presentation of different evaluation methods (how to consider non- beneficiaries, counterfactuals)</p> <p>Different methods for different set up and size of networks, proportionality</p> <p>How to calculate impact indicators, which methods?</p> <p>Possible topics</p> <p>How to evaluate how relations between stakeholders have improved?</p> <p>Have we reached the right people?</p> <p>What is the benefit of having a network compared to not having one (added value)?</p> <p>How many good or innovative projects have been initiated?</p> <p>Know more about the cost effectiveness of different types of activities, compare at EU level</p> <p>Recommendations for improving networks</p>
Content – PART III	<p>More input on ToR, example of ToR</p> <p>Examples of NRN evaluation from last period, good practices to share</p> <p>Detailed example of evaluation plan</p>

Jela Tvrdonova reminds that written comments to the guidelines can be sent to info@ruralevaluation.eu before 25 November 2015 and that the minutes will show a synthetized version of the outcomes of the group work.

9. First results of the capacity building events organised in the Member States by the Evaluation Helpdesk

Link to the PPT: [First results of the capacity building events organised in the Member States](#)

Jela Tvrdonova (Evaluation Helpdesk) starts a presentation on the first results of the capacity building events organised in the MS. She presents the purpose of the yearly capacity building event and its main characteristics before introducing the topics covered in the single countries. A table is shown with the dates of the yearly capacity building events in the Member States.

Julija Marošek (Evaluation Helpdesk) gives a report about the yearly capacity building event in Slovenia. She shows the three objectives of the event and the five topics addressed. She explains how it is set up before detailing the contents that triggered most discussion. Then she shows a summary of the participants' feedback and the identified needs for further support of Managing Authorities and NRN.

Jela Tvrdonova presents the yearly capacity building event in the Czech Republic. Jela Tvrdonova explains the topic and objectives of the yearly capacity building event in Czech Republic and the context

in which it took place. She explains the method of this interactive event and lists which Common Evaluation Questions have been discussed.

The representatives of the Czech Republic and Slovenia give their feedback on the yearly capacity building event.

The MS made the following comments:

German guidelines for self-assessment

Germany reminds that the German Rural Network has prepared guidelines for self-assessment ([Leitfaden für Selbstevaluierung](#)) that could potentially be also useful for LAGs in Slovenia and other MS.

10. AOB

Blanca Casares (Evaluation Helpdesk) presents the outcomes of the survey “State of play in conducting the ex post evaluation of Rural Development Programmes 2007-2013”, that was carried out by the Evaluation Helpdesk in October 2015. The survey was answered by 77 RDPs from 28 Member States. It includes information on where Member States stand in the process of preparing the ex post evaluation and on which topics they wish further exchange with other Member States. The survey outcomes are summarized in a factsheet ([link to CIRCABC](#)).

Hannes Wimmer reports on the Good Practice Workshop “Assessing Environmental Effects of Rural Development Programmes: Practical solutions for the ex post evaluation 2007-2013,” which took place on October 27-28 in Vilnius Lithuania. The workshop was co-organised by the Evaluation Helpdesk, Baltic Environmental Forum and the Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Lithuania. The aim of the workshop was to facilitate an exchange between Member States with regard to their practical challenges in assessing RDP’s environmental results and impacts in the context of the ex post evaluation. New research experiences (e.g. from the FP7-project Envieval) provided methodological inputs and practical case studies to exemplify potential solutions. The event was well attended by 60 participants, including members of the European Commission, Managing Authorities, evaluators, and academics representing sixteen Member States. The outcomes of the workshop are uploaded on the [Helpdesk website](#). The next Good Practice Workshop will focus on HNV farmland and will take place most probably in Germany in early 2016.

Yves Plees thanks everyone for their participation and closes the meeting.

11. Sources and related meeting documents

All presentations are available on the CIRCABC platform.

#	Document (& Hyperlink)	Remarks
1	8th meeting of the CAPexperts - 12/11/2015	CIRCA-folder containing all presentations of the 8th meeting of the Expert Group.
2	Guidance material related to monitoring and evaluation for the programming period 2014 - 2020	CIRCA-folder with the latest available guidance material.
3	Guidelines for the ex post evaluation of 2007 - 2013 RDPs	CIRCA-folder containing ex post guidelines and CEQs
4	Technical Handbook on the Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework of the CAP 2014 – 2020	EU Commission's general guidance document on monitoring and evaluation.
5	Working Document Data item list for Pillar II Operations database (Outputs and Targets)	EU Commission's Working Document listing the data item linked to output and target indicators for pillar II.
6	Guidelines: Assessment of RDP results: how to prepare for reporting on evaluation in 2017 Part I and II (Draft, 11/2015)	Evaluation Helpdesk's Guidance document on the preparation for reporting on evaluation of the RDP in 2017.
7	Guidelines: Assessment of RDP results: how to prepare for reporting on evaluation in 2017 Part III (Draft, 11/2015)	Evaluation Helpdesk's Guidance document on the preparation for reporting of evaluation of the RDP in 2017. This part contains the annexes of the guidelines.
8	Guidelines: Evaluation of National Rural Networks 2014-2020 Part I (Draft)	Evaluation Helpdesk's Guidance document on NRN evaluation for the programming period 2014-2020.
9	Working Document - Evaluation-related queries November 2015	Evaluation Helpdesk's Working Document compiling a selection of evaluation-related queries raised by the MS in the period from January to November 2015.