



**Outcomes: Coordination committee – 5<sup>th</sup> meeting**

09 December 2010



*Connecting Rural Europe*

**5<sup>th</sup> Coordination Committee Meeting, Brussels, 9<sup>th</sup> December 2010**

**Agenda Item**

**Introduction**

The participants were welcomed and the process surrounding the EC communication on the future of the CAP post-2013 was reviewed.

The consultation regarding the impact assessment on the "Common Agricultural Policy towards 2020" is currently open and MAs, NRNs and other organisations are invited to express their opinion to help develop this analysis. It was underlined that all relevant documents for consultation can be accessed via the following link: [http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/consultation/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/consultation/index_en.htm). The consultation process closes on the 25<sup>th</sup> January 2011. It is intended to organise a specific Coordination committee meeting on, probably, the 11<sup>th</sup> February 2011 to further discuss the CAP reform process and scenarios.

**Note:** Various members expressed views about the future of the CAP and it was explained that they should express these through the consultation process.

**Agenda Item**

**Progress review of thematic activities**

Presentation Link:

[http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/events-and-meetings/committees/coordination-committee/en/5th\\_cc\\_meeting\\_en.cfm](http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/events-and-meetings/committees/coordination-committee/en/5th_cc_meeting_en.cfm)

Overview of the TWGs 1, 2 and 3 final outputs – outcomes from the first EN RD TWGs

Rob Peters, Pierre Bascou, Martin Scheele, DG AGRI

Presentation Link:

[http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/events-and-meetings/committees/coordination-committee/en/5th\\_cc\\_meeting\\_en.cfm](http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/events-and-meetings/committees/coordination-committee/en/5th_cc_meeting_en.cfm)

Brief progress review of TWG4

Josefine Loriz-Hoffmann, DG AGRI

Discussion Points

The following main points were made during the discussion.

- *RDP Administration costs and 'control'*: No quantified estimate of the cost of administering the RDPs will be made by TWG4. DG AGRI has commissioned a separate study which will estimate the administration and management costs of three RD measures.
- Assessing the achievement of objectives is important, over and above the necessary control function. The achievement of objectives is primarily measured through the operation of the CMEF, but it is recognised that only in certain cases can individual operations be assessed against stated objectives as, very often, several measures contribute to a single objective.
- There is some perception that control mechanisms are onerous and stifle innovation. Notwithstanding this, it is broadly considered that the level of sanctions is modest and not considered to be a major problem

by the EC. It is recognised that detailed record keeping and the need for on-the-spot controls is resource consuming.

- Coordination between funds, both currently and in the future, was raised and recognised as an important issue. Coordination is being examined by TWG4 but it is not planned to have any 'early' results regarding this particular topic. In general TWG4 has found no evidence of any systematic disfunctioning of coordination between funds.
- Multi-functionality of agriculture is important for the first as well as the second pillar of the CAP. This point was illustrated strongly in the work of TWG2 which found agriculture to have a very strong multiplier effect and, to an extent, to drive other sectors regardless of the differing role of agriculture in different regions.
- Public goods (PG). Concern was raised that it is private owners of resources who are being asked to provide PG. It was explained that the rationale is that PG interventions are introduced where the market does not provide a solution and that support can include investment aid.
- There is no definitive 'list' of the RDP measures which provide PG in the scope of the EAFRD. Rather, different measures across all four axes, both individually and in combination, can provide and/or contribute to the provision of PG. There is even an argument to question the validity of any measure that does not have, at least some PG element in it.
- It was broadly agreed that while farmers are used to providing private [market] goods, they now need to consider PG,. Public intervention can create a visible demand to the private actors for these PG.
- Regarding renewable energy and water resources, it was recognised that these goods have a PG dimension particularly in terms of preserving their long term availability.
- Completion of the work of TWGs 1,2&3. it was confirmed that the main analytical phase is completed and that the first three TWGs are now in the dissemination and communication phase. Relevant outputs of these TWGs are also being taken into account in the work of TWG4.

#### Action Points

The presentation of these reports is considered as the formal submission of the results of the activities of the TWG 1, TWG 2 and TWG 3 to the Coordination Committee, as planned in Article 3.3 of the Commission Decision 168/2008.

#### Presentation Link:

[http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/events-and-meetings/committees/coordination-committee/en/5th\\_cc\\_meeting\\_en.cfm](http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/events-and-meetings/committees/coordination-committee/en/5th_cc_meeting_en.cfm)

**Leader Focus Groups:** Main operational results of the Leader FGs and LSC

[Ave Bremse, Estonian NRN, LSC representative in CC](#)

#### Discussion Points

The following main points were made during the discussion.

- The importance of the results of the three Focus Groups (FG) was underlined and the need to take their results into consideration was raised in the light of the report recently published by the Court of Auditors on Leader+. It was noted that the FG had not explicitly reviewed Local Development Strategies (which were an element

	<p>criticised by the above report).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The FGs identified the main issues related to leader implementation and their reports will be used to inform any modifications made to Leader regulations/guidance (at least at the EU level and, it is expected, at MS / RDP level as well).</li> <li>• The importance of continuing the work of the FGs was stressed, aiming, on one hand, at enhancing the results of this programming period through, for example, the further analysis of the implementation of small projects and, on the other hand, at feeding the results into the development of an improved model of Leader implementation for the next programming period.</li> </ul>
<p>Action Points</p>	<p>Launch of new Focus Groups to be considered for future EN RD activities.</p>
<p>Presentation Link:  <a href="http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/events-and-meetings/committees/coordination-committee/en/5th_cc_meeting_en.cfm">http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/events-and-meetings/committees/coordination-committee/en/5th_cc_meeting_en.cfm</a></p>	<p><b>Joint NRN thematic initiatives:</b></p> <p>Results of the NRN initiatives on Social farming and Forestry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <a href="#">Nele Vanslebrouck, Flemish NRN</a></li> <li>- <a href="#">Riccardo Passero, Italian NRN</a></li> </ul>
<p>Discussion Points</p>	<p>The following main points were made during the discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was underlined that the thematic initiatives started as pilot activities aiming to stimulate cooperation among NRNs about topics with a high level of interest and a European dimension – and can continue to be developed at national and regional levels.</li> <li>• A suggestion was made to launch an initiative to analyse the rural development activities implemented in rural areas across Europe in these fields.</li> </ul>
<p>Action Points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The social farming initiative has reached its final phase and the final report should be released by the end of the year (2010). It is under consideration that certain aspects of this topic will continue to be analysed within the framework of the rural entrepreneurship initiative.</li> <li>• The report of the forestry initiative has already been released. Work on the sub-topics already selected by the NRNs will continue in the coming months at least by the NRNs</li> </ul>
<p>Presentation Link:  <a href="http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/events-and-meetings/committees/coordination-committee/en/5th_cc_meeting_en.cfm">http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/events-and-meetings/committees/coordination-committee/en/5th_cc_meeting_en.cfm</a></p>	<p><b>Seminar on “Semi-subsistence farming” – Sibiu:</b></p> <p>Brief overview of results and outcomes</p> <p><a href="#">Gaëlle Lhermitte, DG AGRI</a></p> <p>To note: due to time constrain this presentation was not made on the spot, but is available from the website.</p>
<p><b>Agenda Item</b></p>	<p><b>Coming activities of the EN RD – Focus on events and communication tools</b></p>
<p>Presentation link:  <a href="http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/events-and-meetings/committees/coordination-">http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/events-and-meetings/committees/coordination-</a></p>	<p>Introduction: overview of coming events and communications tools</p>

[committee/en/5th\\_cc\\_meeting\\_en.cfm](http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/events-and-meetings/committees/coordination-committee/en/5th_cc_meeting_en.cfm)

Adrian Neal, EN RD CP

Discussion Points

The following main points were made during the discussion:

- There is a need to enhance linkages with the NRN self-assessment tool kit.
- A suggestion was made to enhance the support to NRNs in their efforts to build or develop their websites and provide small-scale interactive platforms/collaboration tools at national level. The need to integrate communication tools to avoid any overlapping and/or duplication (e.g. TNC cooperation offers) was also highlighted.
- The importance of encouraging EN RD stakeholders to use discussion fora was highlighted. This could include social media such as Facebook (e.g. Farmville) and Twitter, although the core for a for EN RD should remain the forum of "My ENRD".
- Interaction with CC members and information flows should be increased to develop the content available through the EN RD website. Thus, NRNs were encouraged to allocate adequate resource to support communication flows with the EN RD.

Action Points

Multiplying effect and efficient relaying of information should be enhanced throughout the network, using all communication tools in reinforced synergy (online communication tools but *also* offline, i.e. publications, participation in events, etc.).

**Agenda Item**

**Priorities for the future**

Presentation link:

[http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/events-and-meetings/committees/coordination-committee/en/5th\\_cc\\_meeting\\_en.cfm](http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/events-and-meetings/committees/coordination-committee/en/5th_cc_meeting_en.cfm)

Introduction and initial proposals as regards knowledge development, knowledge sharing and exchanges and cooperation

DG AGRI

Discussion Points

Following an overview of the possible thematic focus and networking priorities for the EN RD, the following suggestions were made during the discussion:

- To expand the environmental services thematic focus to cover all public goods.
- To expand the thematic focus on innovation and farm restructuring to include public goods.
- To further support and contribute to the post-2013 programmes.

Concerns were raised over the transitional period between RD programmes and the need to consider transitional measures for the 2014-2015 period was recognised.

Action Points

CC members are invited to send their ideas and suggestions for the fourth year of activity of the EN RD [July 2011 – June 2012] in the My EN RD forum, which has been set up for this purpose.