



# Data management for evidence based evaluation of 2014-2020 RDPs: new requirements and use of data collected at EU level

Good Practice Workshop  
Bordeaux

5-6 December 2016

# Content

- *EU legal requirements for data management in 2014-2020 Rural Development Programmes (RDPs)*
- *What has changed since the last programming period?*
- *What has stayed the same?*
- *What is needed for reporting in 2017*
- *Expectations of DG Agriculture and use of data at EU level*

# EU legal requirements for data management in 2014-2020 RDPs

## *Operation database*

- *Art 70 Regulation 1305/2013* – key information (needed for monitoring and evaluation) on operations completed or selected for funding shall be recorded and maintained electronically.
- *Art 66(1)(a) Regulation 1305/2013* – the Managing Authority is responsible for ensuring an appropriate secure electronic system to record information and to monitor progress towards the defined objectives and priorities.

# EU legal requirements for data management in 2014-2020 RDPs

## *Evaluation Plan*

- *Art 56(1) Regulation 1303/2013* – the Managing Authority or the Member State must define an evaluation plan covering one or more programmes.
- *Annex I, part 1, point 9(4) of Regulation 808/2014* – the evaluation plan briefly describes the system to record, maintain, manage and report statistical information on RDP implementation and provision of monitoring data for evaluation. It also identifies data sources to be used, data gaps, potential institutional issues related to data provision and proposed solutions.

# EU legal requirements for data management in 2014-2020 RDPs

## *Beneficiaries and data*

- *Art 14(1)(d) Regulation 808/2014* – the common monitoring and evaluation system includes data collection, storage and transmission.
- *Art 71 Regulation 1305/2013* – beneficiaries of support provide all the information necessary to permit monitoring and evaluation of the programme, in particular in relation to meeting specified objectives and priorities.
- *Art 86 Regulation 1305/2013* – the processing of data must comply with personal data protection rules.

# What has changed since the last programming period?

- There is one Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (CMEF) covering the whole Common Agricultural Policy (pillar I and II).
- Impact indicators cover both pillars of the CAP.
- Managing Authority / Member State must define an Evaluation Plan.
- At least one result indicator has to be defined per Focus Area (except Priority 1) captured through monitoring data / standard coefficients / surveys.
- Each Focus Area needs to have quantifiable target indicators, captured through monitoring data.

# What has changed since the last programming period?

- Good practice to record monitoring data in operational databases from applications for support / payment.
- No midterm evaluation.
- Enhanced annual implementation reports (AIR to be submitted in 2017 and 2019) with a specific Chapter on evaluation activities.
- Better integration of operation databases (SFC2014 and e-Governance).

# What has stayed the same?

- Common Monitoring and Evaluation System (CMES) for all rural development programmes.
- Common indicators.
- Methodological guidance.
- Ex-ante and ex-post evaluations (including net impacts).
- EU level syntheses of RDP evaluations.  
(for example: Synthesis of ex ante evaluations of rural development programmes 2014 – 2020:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/rural-development-reports/ex-ante-rdp-synthesis-2014-2020\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/rural-development-reports/ex-ante-rdp-synthesis-2014-2020_en))

# What is needed for reporting in 2017

- *Table A – non cumulative data*
  - *Art 66 (1)(b) Reg 1305/2013* - data sent twice a year (by 31 January and 31 October)
  - Total committed public expenditure per measure and per focus area

Table A: Committed expenditure															
N.B.: The indicative greying out shows that not all cells are likely to be filled in (depending on intervention logic)*															
	Total public expenditure														
	P2		P3		P4		P5					P6			Total
	2a	2b	3a	3b	4a	4b	4c	5a	5b	5c	5d	5e	6a	6b	
1 (14)															
2 (15)															
3 (16)															
4 (17)															

# What is needed for reporting in 2017

- *Table B*
  - Output indicators per focus area and per measure (realised operations - see pages 5 to 8): [http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/cap-indicators/output/working-document-rd-monitoring-implementation-report-tables\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/cap-indicators/output/working-document-rd-monitoring-implementation-report-tables_en.pdf)
  - Annual data for area-based measures, cumulative for all other measures
  - Special tables for LEADER, Rural Network and Technical assistance
  - Table B4: Total public expenditure of the operations having additional contributions to other focus areas

			output realised (2014-Year N cumul)												Total		
			P2		P3		P4		P5				P6				
			2a	2b	3a	3b	a	b	c	5a	5b	5c	5d	5e		6a	6b
1 (14)	Training/skills acquisition (1.1)	Nr of training operations supported															
		Nr of participants in trainings															
		Nr of training days given															
		Total public expenditure €for training/skills															
	Nr of demonstration operations/information actions supported (1.2)																
	Nr of farm exchanges operations supported (1.3)																
Total public expenditure €(trainings, farm exchanges, demonstration) (1.1 to 1.3)																	

# What is needed for reporting in 2017

- *Table C*
  - For certain measures: data broken down by areas facing natural and other specific constraints [ANCs], gender, type of agricultural branch and size

		Cumul 2014-Year N				Total
		non NCA	NCA		Total	
			Mountain	other		
<b>4 (17)</b>	Total public expenditure (4.1 to 4.4)					
<b>6 (19)</b>	Total public expenditure (6.1 to 6.5)					

# What is needed for reporting in 2017

- *Table D*
  - Annual information with approved operations concerning the main performance indicators (5), used for quantifying the target indicators
  - Data sent every year concerning realised projects and its contribution to the progress towards the target indicators

Table D: Progress towards targets					
Approved operations			Realised targets		
FA	Output indicator	Based on approved operations (2014- YEAR N)	Output indicator (based on realised, from tables B)	Target indicator	Based on completed Realised target*
P2 A					
	Nr of agriculture holdings with RDP support for investments in restructuring or modernisation (4.1)			% of agriculture holdings with RDP support for investments in restructuring	
P2 B					
	Nr of agriculture holdings with RDP supported business development plan/investment for young farmers (6.1 or 4.1)			% of agriculture holdings with RDP supported business development plan/investment for young farmers	

# What is needed for reporting in 2017

- *Table E - Transitional measures only*
  - Ongoing commitments from 2007-2013 supported through 2014-2020 RDP, as well as commitments made in 2014, before approval of RDP, based on 2007-2013 rules and supported through 2014-2020 RDP, are monitored in Tables A, B, C and D. No specific distinction is made.
  - This table allows monitoring of public expenditure by (transitional) measure.

Measures under Regulation (EU) No [...][RD]	Codes under Regulation (EU) No [...][RD]	Codes under Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005	Total public expenditure
Article 14	1	331, 111	
Article 15	2	114, 115	
Article 16	3	132, 133	
Article 17	4	216, 121, 125, 123	
Article 18	5	126	
Article 19	6	112, 141, 311, 312, 313	
Article 20	7	321, 322, 323	
Article 21	8	221, 222, 223, 226, 227, 122, 123	

# What is needed for reporting in 2017

- *Table F*
  - Progress towards performance framework indicators.
  - If top-ups have been taken into account in the target setting, an adjustment is necessary.

	Indicators	Realised performance framework indicators (Year N)*	Adjustment top ups	Calculated achievement rate (YEAR N)**	Milestones	Targets 2023
Priority 2	Total Public Expenditure P2 (€)					
	Number of agriculture holdings with RDP support for investment in restructuring or modernisation (2A) + Number of agricultural holdings with RDP supported business development plan/investment for young farmers (2B)					

# Expectations of DG Agriculture and use of data at EU level

- Indicators are a very useful tool for the management of RDPs, especially if they are known as soon as they become available (some at the project's approval). Managing Authorities should use them to improve the performance of the RDP, by adapting the measures according to the targets set.
- Evaluations serve as an important information source to judge the performance of the policy.
- The monitoring and evaluation framework of the CAP 2014–2020 (first and second pillar) is not a mere legal requirement but also a vital contribution to improving future policymaking and to contribute to the objectives of the Europe 2020 strategy.

# Expectations of DG Agriculture and use of data at EU level

- DATA determines the quality of the monitoring and evaluation framework. We need:
  - sufficient data quantity, of high quality, collected in due time and in a cost-effective way.
  - relevant data for the full set of indicators and common evaluation questions (annexes IV and V Reg 808/2014).
  - quality data collected via SFC2014 which allows showing RDP achievements at all territorial levels: regional / national/ EU.
- In 2018, the first report of the European Commission to the European Parliament and to the Council on monitoring and evaluation of the CAP 2014–2020 will focus on policy implementation and first results at EU level.

# Expectations of DG Agriculture and use of data at EU level

## *Discussion topics:*

- *What are the major challenges you face in getting sound data for management and/or evaluation?*
- *How the existing expert groups, e.g. Panta Rhei, can contribute to help you to overcome those challenges?*  
*(Panta Rhei: informal group composed mainly by ICT staff from Member States' paying agencies which aims at sharing information and experiences in order to improve the implementation of the CAP).*
- *SFC reporting: how could the Annual Implementation Report be simplified / improved?*