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Main differences in evaluation requirements for 2014-2020

What stays the same

Proposals for data collection and management

Will the proposals respond to needs?
The monitoring and evaluation system now covers the whole CAP

(current period: CMEF is only for rural development)

Article 110 of CAP Horizontal Regulation proposal
Intervention logic for the CAP

CAP general objectives

Viable food production
Sustainable management of natural resources and climate action
Balanced territorial development

CAP specific objectives

Pillar I specific objectives
- Maintain market stability
- Meet consumer expectations
- Enhance farm income
- Improve agricultural competitiveness
- Foster innovation
- Provide environmental public goods
- Pursue climate change mitigation and adaptation
- Maintain agricultural diversity across the EU

Pillar II specific objectives
- Promote socioeconomic development of rural areas
- Maintain agricultural diversity across the EU

CSF*: Common Strategic Framework including the EFRD, ESF, CF, EAFRD and EMFF
Impact indicators cover both Pillar 1 and Pillar 2

- Some of more relevance for Pillar 1 (e.g. trade related)
- Some of more relevance for Pillar 2 (e.g. territorial development).
- Existing datasets used where possible (EUROSTAT, Farm Structure Survey, FADN etc)
- Data at EU, national and/or regional level
Result indicators

• At least one per Focus Area (except Priority 1)

• Capture direct effects of interventions (e.g. renewable energy produced)

• Captured through monitoring data (e.g. area managed for biodiversity) OR

• Monitoring data + standard coefficients (e.g. renewable energy produced) OR

• Assessed by evaluators through surveys (e.g. change in output/AWU)
Outputs – establishment of the operations database

- Each approved operation included in operations database (at RDP level)
- Contains key information about the project and beneficiary
- Used to generate aggregate information for the AIRs
- Allows monitoring of progress in implementation
- Will simplify data handling and reporting
- Data also available to evaluators
Target indicators

- **Quantifiable target indicator(s) required for each Focus Area**
- **Quantified targets to be established for all Focus Areas in the RDP**
- **Set at output or result level (Priority 1 = output)**
- **Captured through monitoring data**
- **Progress reported annually in AIR**
Evaluation Plan - A new element

- Submitted with the RDP, approved as part of it
- Sets out the main elements of evaluation throughout the period (topics, timeline, resources, etc)
- Intended to ensure information required on achievements and impacts is obtained at appropriate points
- Minimum requirements to be established in implementing rules
Evaluation Plan - A new element (2)

- *Intention also to provide guidance on the content of EP*
- *Current plan is for RDP to contain "outline" EP with main elements*
- *This would be complemented by an Annual Work Programme making the EP operational, and acting as a flexible management tool for the MA*
No MTE

- Current experience showed MTE timing not helpful:
  - too late for changes in RDP design (most resources already committed)
  - too early to identify concrete achievements.
  - Instead there will be....
Enhanced Annual Implementation Reports (AIRs)

- **2017 and 2019 AIRs will contain additional elements:**
  - In 2017 geared to improving RDP design and implementation
  - In 2019 geared to show RDP achievements

- **Evaluation activities will provide much of this information**

- **EP must ensure that the information will be produced on time**

- **All AIRs are:**
  - submitted by MS
  - subject to admissibility and approval procedures
Information from beneficiaries

- **Article 78 RDR requires RDP beneficiaries to provide data needed for M&E**
- **Mainly through the application forms**
- **Participation in surveys may also be required**
- **Addresses difficulties experienced this period**
Priorities/Focus Areas/Measures

• **2007-2013**: each measure linked to only one Axis
• **2014-2020**: a measure can contribute to more than one Focus Area/Priority
• RDP Intervention logic shows links between measures and Focus Areas
• Reflected in the indicator plan
• More realistic: measures can make multiple contributions (and operations too in some cases, e.g. Priority 4)
• Basic intervention logic developed, but adaptable for each RDP
4. Restoring, preserving and enhancing ecosystems dependent on agriculture and forestry

Focus areas
- 4A Restoring and preserving biodiversity, including in Natura 2000 areas and high nature value farming, and the state of European landscapes.
- 4B Improving water management.
- 4C Improving soil management.

Relevant measures
- Art. 30 Organic farming
- Art. 31 Natura 2000 and Water framework directive payments
- Art. 23 Afforestation and creation of woodland
- Art. 32 Payments to areas facing natural or other specific constrains
- Art. 24 Establishment of Agroforestry systems
- Art. 36 Co-operation
- Art. 26 Investments improving the resilience and environmental value of forest ecosystems
- Art. 18 Investments in physical assets
- Art. 15 Knowledge transfer and information action
- Art. 25 Prevention and restoration of damage to forest from fire and natural disasters

Output indicators
What stays the same?

- common M&E system for all RDPs
- common indicators
- methodological guidance
- ex ante and ex post evaluations (incl. net impacts)
- EU level syntheses of RDP evaluations
Operations databases
SFC2014
e-Governance
New period:

- RD Art 77 - key information (needed for evaluation and monitoring) on operations completed or selected for funding (including information on each beneficiary) shall be recorded electronically.

- RD Art 73 – appropriate secure IT system to record information for monitoring and evaluation and progress towards the defined objectives and priorities.
Is that new?

The MA shall ensure that there is a system to record and maintain statistical information in computerised form adequate for monitoring and evaluation.

Art 75 of Reg (EC) No 1698/2005
What is an operations database?

- HR, Art 68-78 (IACS) – scope for RD: Measures Art. 22(1)(a) and (b), 29 to 32, 34 and 35
  - => Title II, Chapter IV of Reg (EC) 73/2009

- Reg (EC) 799/2012 (x-Tables) annual accounts for the clearance of accounts of EAGF and EAFRD [...] for monitoring and forecasting purposes

- Other databases for financial management and indicators?
Possible solution (appropriate IT system)?
Questionnaire to RD committee Nov 2010 assessment of national/regional computer management systems (local IT systems)

- 33 questionnaires received:
  - 21 countries
  - 72 programmes

- Category of data managed in the local IT system¹ (e.g. financial plan, monitoring indicators, ...)?

- Is the local IT system used for other EU funds?

¹ local IT system: local computer management system excluding MS Office based data management (e.g. Excel)
## Operations databases

### Data managed in local IT systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of data</th>
<th>MS / Regions (max 33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Financial plan of RD programmes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Financial execution (quarterly declarations of expenditure)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Monitoring indicators</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other official documents (Annual progress report - without indicators, programme modifications, Monitoring committees, Evaluation reports, NSP modifications etc...)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>List of authorities and officials in charge (personal data provided in SFC2007)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Forecast of funding requirements (Article 14 of the Reg. 883/2006)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Accounting information (X-table data) for the clearance of accounts</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data managed in local IT systems

In many cases, data are managed in the same system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS / Regions using the same system for:</th>
<th>MS/Regions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial execution (category 2) and Accounting information (category 7)</td>
<td>17 (max 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial execution (category 2) and Forecast of funding (category 6)</td>
<td>13 (max 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial execution (category 2) and Monitoring indicators (category 3)</td>
<td>10¹ (max 20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ In some questionnaires, it was indicated that integration of monitoring indicators in financial execution had been already planned. However it was impossible to give more precise figures on this future integration.
Is the local IT system used for other EU funds?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS / Regions using the same local IT system(s) for management of EAFRD and EAGF</th>
<th>MS/Regions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial execution (category 2)</td>
<td>15 (max 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring indicators (category 3)</td>
<td>5 (max 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast of funding (category 6)</td>
<td>8 (max 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting information (category 7)</td>
<td>16 (max 23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member states / regions use the same system for at least one category of data for:

- EAFRD and EFF (7 cases)
- EAFRD and structural funds (3 cases)
## Degree of integration with SFC2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of data</th>
<th>Automatic</th>
<th>Semi-automatic</th>
<th>Manual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Financial plan of RD programmes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Financial execution (quarterly declarations of expenditure)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Monitoring indicators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other official documents (Annual progress report - without indicators, programme modifications, Monitoring committees, Evaluation reports, NSP modifications etc...)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>List of authorities and officials in charge (personal data provided in SFC2007)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Forecast of funding requirements (Article 14 of the Reg. 883/2006)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Accounting information (X-table data) for the clearance of accounts (Statel/eDamis)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of data</td>
<td>management system</td>
<td>collection/sending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial plan of RD programmes</td>
<td>MA(50%) PA(50%)</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial execution (quarterly declarations of expenditure)</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring indicators</td>
<td>PA(62%) MA(38%)</td>
<td>MA¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other official documents (Annual progress report - without indicators, programme modifications, Monitoring committees, Evaluation reports, NSP modifications etc...)</td>
<td>MA(75%) PA(25%)</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of authorities and officials in charge (personal data provided in SFC2007)</td>
<td>MA and PA</td>
<td>MA and PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast of funding requirements (Article 14 of the Reg. 883/2006)</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting information (X-table data) for the clearance of accounts</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The indicators are sent by Managing authorities, but in 30% of cases prepared by the Paying agencies.
What is very new in CPR Regulation proposal:

- CPR Art 13-15: Partnership Contract
  - Contribution of CSF funds to the strategy (targets, milestones)

- CPR Art 40: Contribution of the financial instruments to the achievement of the programme indicators
  - Contribution to the Union level instruments
2007 ➔ 2014 : Structured data

**Member States ➔ SFC 2007**
- Documents (PDF, DOC, ZIP, etc)
- Financial tables / Indicators (except targets)

**Member States ➔ SFC 2014**
- Data exchange (legally binding)
- Annexes
  - obligatory (Ex ante evaluation, etc)
  - for information (PDF, DOC, ZIP, etc)
### Ex-Ante Evaluation – Chapter in the RDP

(Exact structure of this chapter is to be defined in the implementing act)

=> e.g., Could be text only

Full Ex-Ante Evaluation to upload in annexes

* Modified since the previous version
Evaluation Plan

(Exact structure of this chapter is to be defined in the implementing act)

=> e.g., Could be broken down into several sub-chapters

* Modified since the previous version
Requirements:

- No duplication of data (structured / in documents)
- Better reporting for users of the MS
- Same structure (template) for all programmes / implementation reports embedded in the system
- Export all data into PDF (/ MS Word / Excel)

⇒ Easier analysis of programmes and implementation reports
State of play & plans for implementation of web-portals (Digital Agenda 2020, Stoiber group)

Objectives:

- Cost & Benefit analysis (5-level INFSO maturity ladder)
- Qualitative checklist on the concepts of e-Gov, IT systems and information obligations

Questionnaire to MS IT experts in 2012
Response rate: 44 RDPs, 25 Member States
- 36 used as source of information (21 MS)
- 16 used for cost & benefit calculations (10 MS)

Current level portal for beneficiaries

- No assessment provided or not implemented: 28%
- Level 1: 22%
- Level 2: 11%
- Level 3: 11%
- Level 4: 8%
- Level 5: 11%
Use of the current systems

How many beneficiaries use the current online applications that are provided to them? (in %)
Rural Development specific issues

- Are databases for area based and investment measures integrated in a common database?
  - Yes: 33%
  - No: 56%
  - Partially: 8%
  - No assessment: 3%

- Are portals for beneficiaries within the 1st and 2nd pillar jointly created?
  - Yes: 44%
  - No: 39%
  - Partially: 11%
  - No assessment: 6%
Quantitative findings

Internal savings for administrations (16 RDPs, 10 MS)
Follow up of the implementation (e.g., Partnership Contract)

Encourage the implementation as a matter of urgency

Dual tracks at Member State / regional level (paper / electronic) should be avoided

Further discussion / exchange of experience:
- RD / AGRI Funds Committees
- Simplification Experts' group
- Panta Rhei group
Possible solution (appropriate IT system)?

- RD Art 73, 77
- HR, Art 68, 69
- IACS
- RD, Art 92
- SFC2014

Monitoring
- Beneficiary
- Paying Agency
- Managing Authority

Electronically recorded
- Application
- Payment claim
- Monitoring

Other measures
- x-Tables / accounting info

Confidential data
...and after SFC: who uses the data?

- Coordination (G.1)
- Finance issues (G.2)
- Monitoring (G.3)
- ENRD Contact Point
- Management
- Monitoring
- Evaluation
- Publicity
- Evaluation Helpdesk
- Evaluation L.4
HR, Art 110: Monitoring and evaluation framework for the whole CAP

- Monitoring
  - Outputs
  - Targets
  - Results

- Results
- Contexts
- Impacts

**Data sources**

- HR, Art 110: Monitoring and evaluation framework for the whole CAP
Why are we changing things?

- *Learn lessons from the CMEF:*
  - build on what is working,
  - adjust what does not work so well
- *Facilitate data collection and management*
- *Simplify and improve quality of monitoring data*
- *Clarify indicators*
- *Improve evaluation methodology*
- *Adjust timing to obtain better results*
Will the new proposals address the weaknesses identified in the CMEF and allow reliable demonstration of RDP achievements?