



ENRD webinar

'Preparing the CAP Strategic Plans: Designing Interventions'

Highlights report

This second event in a series on 'Preparing the CAP Strategic Plans (CSPs)' built on the [2 October 2020 webinar](#). Participants discussed the design of different types of CSP interventions supported under Pillar I and Pillar II of the CAP, specifically: Complementary Redistributive Income Support for Sustainability (CRISS); Animal welfare and other management commitments; and LEADER.

A large number of representatives from CAP-related national authorities and the European Commission exchanged on practical aspects of the design of CSP interventions. This included sharing experiences and views and ideas for suitable solutions to overcome obstacles identified.

Participants appreciated the meeting format and suggested that further informal exchanges on the future CSPs and specific interventions which involve Member States (MS) and Commission representatives would be highly welcome.

Event Information

Date: 25 November 2020

Location: Online event

Organisers: ENRD Contact Point

Participants: RDP Managing Authorities, Paying Agencies, national direct payments experts involved in the drafting of CSPs, European Commission representatives.

Outcomes: Exchange of experience, views and concrete ideas regarding the drafting of CSP interventions and main challenges encountered or expected. Identification of possible solutions and workable approaches.

Web page: https://enrd.ec.europa.eu/news-events/events/preparing-cap-strategic-plans-designing-interventions_en

Designing interventions: overall approach from the perspective of the legal proposals

[Gregorio Dávila Díaz](#) from the European Commission's DG AGRI explained the description of interventions requirements of Chapter 5 of the CSP template. For each intervention MS will have to provide: **basic information** related to the territorial scope, related specific objectives, a single output indicator, relevant result indicator(s) and indication of funding source (EAGF or EAFRD); information on the **eligibility conditions needed** to comply with receipt of support, including its targeting (selection criteria, intensity rates, territorial targeting); **financial information** (e.g. form of support, aid intensity, aid calculation method, references to relevant state aids, etc...); definition of **unit amounts and financial allocations**.

The **unit amount is a cornerstone of the new CAP**. This is intended as the amount of public funding planned to be granted for one unit of output (e.g. hectare or project). Unit amounts will serve as benchmarks for performance clearance. Each intervention must foresee the use of at least one unit amount, while the use of different unit amounts is also allowed within the same intervention (an important tool in the targeting of the aid provided). The amount granted for any one output may differ depending for instance on the territory, the severity of constraints, the type of operation to be carried-out, the category of investments, the size of the project, type of beneficiary, etc. The unit amount can also be an 'average', although for area and animal related interventions a 'uniform' amount is expected: in each case the link with the SWOT analysis must be clear and soundly justified, unless it results from a certified aid calculation specifically requested for certain types of interventions.

Main outcomes of group discussions



GROUP 1: Direct Payments (Complementary Redistributive Income Support for Sustainability - CRISS)

Introduced by: [Scherezade Maestre Rodríguez, DG AGRI](#), [Artur Wojciechowski, Ministry of Agriculture, Poland](#), [Artiom Volkov, Ministry of Agriculture, Lithuania](#)

- CRISS consists of an annual de-coupled area based payment that aims to further promote a redistribution of direct payments towards smaller and medium-size farms.
- One of the main considerations related to the design of CRISS is the identification of appropriate indicators to be considered. What databases should be used as a reference? FADN can be misleading as it does not cover small farms. This challenge could be overcome by also relying on other indicators, not just farm size (e.g. farm viability indicators).
- No limits are defined at EU level to allow greater flexibility for MS to adapt the instrument to their needs: but this poses a question of how to define minimum and maximum thresholds while guaranteeing fair redistribution? This sensitive and

political issue requires consultation with stakeholders and social partners. An interesting approach, from Lithuanian experience, is to foresee different tranches, which might allow the variety of potential beneficiaries to be better reflected.

- Uncertainty remains on whether the implementation of CRISS will be mandatory, as proposed by the Commission or on a voluntary basis. If mandatory, most MS will have to implement it for the first time, the current redistributive payment has been implemented in only nine out of the 27 MS. On the other hand, lessons can be learned from the experience of those nine MS (Belgium - Wallonia, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, France, Lithuania, Poland, Portugal, Romania).
- In the past certain MS' Rural Development investments were addressed in particular to small farms. Therefore when designing the CRISS, close coordination between Pillar I and Pillar II instruments will be necessary. CSPs are intended to streamline the implementation of the policy allowing for greater synergies between the two Pillars.



GROUP 2: Management commitments (Animal Welfare)

Introduced by: Christine Falter, DG AGRI, Tiina Malm, Ministry of Agriculture, Finland

- Animal welfare (AW) commitments may last a minimum of one year (according to the legal proposals) and can be management-based and result-based.
- By focusing on the outcomes rather than the prescribed practices, the result-based approach might allow beneficiaries to enjoy greater freedom.
- The implementation of AW commitments will require close cooperation between several key actors, these include: different national authorities, farmers, research institutes, independent evaluators, vets and advisers.
- For the successful implementation of an intervention, farmers must clearly understand the commitments and be supported in their monitoring (also through specific training).
- A key and challenging step in defining the intervention will be identifying the relevant baseline and the related description of the supported commitments which go beyond the minimum mandatory requirements (i.e. the combination of statutory management requirements, national legislation, and "normal practices").
- Some MS believe that the planning of many small interventions will be too difficult given the complexity of the system. A possible solution here is to opt for an integrated approach, designing more ambitious combined CSP intervention packages which address various needs together, however most logically by animal groups (pigs, poultry, cattle).
- AW operations can also be linked to the result indicator on 'limiting antibiotic use' (R.28), if relevant, but there can be also other actions to reduce use of antibiotics, such as investments. For result-based operations, specific indicators to help monitor the intervention should be developed.
- In further supporting the drafting of the CSP, MS would like to be provided with concrete examples of designing results-based interventions (e.g. appropriate indicators for animal welfare, definition of the baseline, performance assessment at farm level, aid calculation etc).



GROUP 3: Cooperation (LEADER)

Introduced by: Karolina Jasinska-Mühleck, DG AGRI, Pierre Poussard, Ministry of Agriculture, France, Andreas Grieß, State Ministry of Rural Development, Saxony, Germany

- LEADER interventions may consist of: i) capacity building and preparatory actions; or ii) implementation of operations (including animation, management, monitoring and evaluation).
- Preparatory support - if this is provided under the current Rural Development Programmes during the transition period (for the preparation of local development strategies), it does not have to be provided under the CSPs.
- The design and delivery mechanisms of the interventions need to be consistent with all the elements of the LEADER method (e.g. bottom-up approach, non-dominance of an interest group, representativeness, etc...). This should enable the interventions to achieve their objectives (e.g. build capacity, stimulate innovation, provide for structural changes in the areas).
- With a single national CSP replacing regional programmes, one of the key challenges for regionalised MS will be to ensure a functional balance between the LEADER bottom-up approach, reflecting the differences of the territories, and some necessary common denominators and minimum quality standards that should apply across all regions.
- Local Development Strategies may extend beyond solely rural areas, however all interventions related to the CAP Specific Objective 8 must clearly target the benefit of rural territories (eligibility condition).
- Result indicators must clearly show LEADER's contribution towards sustainable development. The menu of common indicators proposed allows to account broadly for what will be delivered in terms of job creation, climate action/environmental care, and social inclusion.