



European Commission
Agriculture and
Rural Development

Monitoring and Evaluation
for **CAP post 2013**
Stakeholder **Conference**
Brussels, 20-21 September 2011

BACKGROUND DOCUMENT



Table of content

1. Purpose of the stakeholder conference.....	3
2. Working methods for the conference.....	4
3. General context.....	5
4. General objectives and principles for policy monitoring and evaluation.....	6
5. Monitoring and evaluation in 2007-2013 – Pillar I.....	8
6. Monitoring and evaluation in 2007-2013 – Pillar II.....	10
7. Methodological issues related to the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of the Rural Development Programmes in 2010.....	12
8. Existing sources.....	14
Technical fiche 1: Clearance Audit Trail System (CATS).....	15
Technical fiche 2: Agri-environmental Statistics (AEI).....	17
Technical fiche 3: Farm Accountancy Data Network (FADN).....	19
Technical fiche 4: Farm Structure Survey (FSS).....	21
Technical fiche 5: Eurostat.....	22
Technical fiche 6: Rural Development Indicators.....	24
Technical fiche 7: Integrated Administration and Control System (IACS).....	25
Technical fiche 8: Communications from Member States on Cross compliance and the Farm Advisory System.....	27
Technical fiche 9: Communications from Member States on Direct Payments.....	28
Technical fiche 10: Main existing sources of information on fruit and vegetables.....	29
Technical fiche 11: Main existing sources of information on olive oil and table olives.....	31
Technical fiche 12: Other communication from the Member States on market measures ..	31
9. Existing groups of potential interest for monitoring and evaluation.....	32
10. List of abbreviations.....	35

1. Purpose of the stakeholder conference

Preparation of the post-2013 policy framework is underway. In this context the Commission is placing an increasing emphasis on the demonstration of the achievements of all sectoral policies to the overall EU objectives set out in EU2020, the EU Biodiversity Strategy, and other strategy documents.

Currently, for the 1st Pillar of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), there are regular evaluations and different monitoring mechanisms. For the 2nd Pillar, monitoring and evaluation is implemented through the Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (CMEF). Post-2013, the emphasis on greening within the 1st Pillar, the concern for increasing sustainability within the agricultural sector, and the overall requirement to justify budgetary expenditure imply that further development of monitoring and evaluation will be required for both pillars of the CAP.

There is thus a need for a broader monitoring and evaluation system than the current CMEF, and a need to develop it with wide involvement of stakeholders.

The objective of this first meeting is to bring together stakeholders in the rural development monitoring and evaluation system, with others with wider responsibilities for the 1st Pillar, and for statistics and data collection, to reflect jointly on monitoring and evaluation for the post-2013 CAP.

The expected outcomes are:

- to kick-off a longer-term development process of this system,
- to build a shared understanding around the requirements and expectations for monitoring and evaluating the CAP,
- to develop a common understanding of the elements and tools needed in order to meet these expectations, and
- to establish a basis for further work on developing a monitoring and evaluation system, which responds to the needs of all stakeholders.

The outcomes would be used as an input to the ongoing policy development process. It is intended that this meeting will be the first step in a consultation process which will continue throughout the development of the monitoring and evaluation system for post-2013.

2. Working methods for the conference

We will be working in a highly participative format. Unlike usual conferences, this workshop will not involve presentations but it will focus on strategic questions. This will allow us to engage in creative dialogue. A range of participatory methodologies will be used, offering just enough structure without prescribing the outcome in details. At each step, we will collect the results together. Every session builds on the previous ones and it is therefore highly recommended to be involved for the whole duration of the conference. We will be guided through the process by professional facilitators from inside and outside the European Commission.

Key outcomes will be captured into a report which will be distributed to all participants shortly after the conference.

Interpretation will be provided in the following languages: EN/FR/DE/ES/IT/PL, except during group sessions, where English will be the main working language and only limited individual interpretation could be provided.

The pictures below illustrate this approach which has been used by the Commission in many contexts since some years now.



3. General context

This conference takes place in the context of preparing for the [CAP post 2013](#).

The future CAP is called upon to respond to important economic, environmental and social challenges for agriculture and rural areas and to enhance its contribution to the [Europe 2020 strategy](#) for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, notably in improving resource efficiency.

To this end, the [Communication on the CAP towards 2020](#) set three objectives for the future CAP: viable food production, sustainable management of natural resources and climate action, and balanced territorial development. These objectives are reflected in the inter-institutional and public debate calling for a strong common policy for the sustainable and balanced development of agriculture and rural areas throughout the EU while taking due account of national and regional specificities. The future CAP would thus bring EU added value using a number of complementary instruments in the pursuit of these same objectives.

The European Commission will present in October 2011 legislative proposals, together with an impact assessment, for the CAP in the period 2014-2020. These follow the budget and main policy orientations for all EU spending policies, including the CAP, outlined in the [Commission proposal for the Multiannual Financial Framework \(MFF\) for 2014-2020](#).

It is thus foreseen that the CAP should maintain its two-pillar structure with direct payments greener and better targeted and with rural development included in a Common Strategic Framework with other EU funds. It is proposed to maintain the budget for each pillar in nominal terms at its 2013 level with a clear focus on delivering results on key EU priorities.

This more result oriented policy approach testifies to the need to make the best use of budgetary resources, especially at a time of economic crisis and pressure on public finances. The [Communication on the EU Budget Review](#) already plead for focusing on key policy priorities and for delivering results, especially in the pursuit of the Europe 2020 strategy. The Europe 2020 strategy that currently shapes the EU response to the economic crisis is built around five headline targets, e.g. reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, as well as seven flagship initiatives, e.g. Innovation Union.

In this context, it will be necessary for all future policies that use the EU budget to ensure effective performance measurement by means of indicators linked to policy objectives, setting targets and collecting and processing relevant data. A rigorous monitoring and evaluation framework will be essential for both the effectiveness and credibility of the policy, and will require a thorough assessment of the multiple links between policy intervention and economic, environmental and social outcomes as well as complex data and technical issues.

At the same time, [simplification](#) for beneficiaries and administrations should be sought. In fact, considerable steps have already been taken to simplify the CAP, including notification requirements. Simplification in the monitoring and evaluation context will thus mean making the best use of existing data and [monitoring and evaluation](#) system and building new requirements with simplification in mind.

4. General objectives and principles for policy monitoring and evaluation

Based on work done within DG AGRI and in discussions with Member State representatives in the Evaluation Expert Committee, the following objectives and principles are suggested as a broad foundation on which to design a monitoring and evaluation system for the CAP.

Objectives

- Assess the effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of policy interventions. Monitoring and evaluation should show what is achieved by the policy, provide evidence of the impact that policy interventions have on the ground and should show how taxpayers' money is spent. It should demonstrate the contribution of the policy to overall EU objectives. The output of the system is not only important for accountability, but also for information and communication at EU and Member State (MS) level.
- Contribute to better targeted support. The system should allow the progress and impact of interventions to be assessed against their objectives (at EU, MS and programme level as appropriate). The policy framework can then be adjusted as necessary to increase effectiveness. The system should be used as a tool for governance and management, improving the targeting and allocation of financial resources, and allowing comparison of performance.
- Establish common learning processes. Common guidance on monitoring and evaluation should be provided for all actors involved in the monitoring and evaluation process, to develop shared understanding. This should serve as a common reference point for managers and evaluation stakeholders throughout the EU, setting common standards and enabling exchange and learning.

Principles

The process of establishing a new common monitoring and evaluation system for post-2013 is guided by the following seven principles.

- Generation of results which are credible and used. The resources required to establish and implement the common monitoring and evaluation system are only justified if the output is credible, timely and used effectively to improve policy and programme design and implementation. Effective follow up of monitoring information and evaluation results must be ensured, and reflected through appropriate adjustments to implementation at national or programme level, or to the CAP framework. All elements of the system must be useful and have a clear purpose. Results should be communicated widely to increase visibility and understanding of the CAP policy interventions and impacts.
- Shared ownership of the system. All stakeholders in the monitoring and evaluation system should feel responsible for it, and be motivated to contribute to reliable and credible outputs. This implies that the system must be designed with the active participation of the relevant stakeholders (e.g. Member States, evaluators, Commission staff etc.).
- Simplification of the system. The revised system should seek to streamline processes with the aim of reducing the administrative burden for the Member States, programme authorities, beneficiaries and the Commission. Simplification should be based on a careful assessment of what information is needed by whom, for what purpose and at what time,

taking into account the requirements of the overall policy framework and the most appropriate level for action.

- Continuity of the current monitoring and evaluation system. We must learn the lessons emerging from implementation of the current monitoring and evaluation system, building on what has worked, and making use of the monitoring and evaluation capacity already developed. This implies a critical assessment of all elements of the system and its optimization with the aim of keeping or improving the good elements, while ensuring a system adapted to the new policy framework. It should permit both assessment of policy impact over the longer term and ongoing monitoring of the progress of policy implementation.
- Clarity and stability of legal obligations. All elements of the new system must be established in good time prior to implementation. The monitoring requirements, evaluation concepts and methodologies need to be unambiguous and allow for consistent interpretation. While the system itself needs to be as stable as possible during the implementing period, there must be scope for improvement where problems are identified or where external conditions change significantly.
- Ensuring comparability of results and taking account of programme specificities. The comparison and aggregation at EU level of monitoring information and evaluation results is a central mission of the system, closely linked to its objectives, and must be ensured. However, to make it more useful as a management tool to guide programme implementation, the system should also provide flexibility for managing authorities to complement the common framework in order to take account of the specificities of each programme. This will increase the relevance of the system for individual programme and support its ownership by the stakeholders.
- Proportionality of monitoring, evaluation and reporting requirements. For the development of the common core of the system, the utility of information collected should be balanced against the resources required to provide it.

5. Monitoring and evaluation in 2007-2013 – Pillar I

Evaluation:

Evaluation is defined as a '*judgement of interventions according to their results, impacts and needs they aim to satisfy*'. The financial [Regulation](#) (EC, Euratom) No 1605/2002) stipulates in Art. 27(4):

...to improve decision-making, institutions shall undertake both ex ante and ex post evaluations in line with guidance provided by the Commission. Such evaluations shall be applied to all programmes and activities which entail significant spending and evaluation results disseminated to spending, legislative and budgetary authorities."

The implementing Commission [Regulation](#) (EC, Euratom) No 2342/2002 of 23 December 2002 specifies that all programmes or activities where the resources mobilised exceed EUR 5 million shall be the subject of an interim and/or ex post evaluation of the resources allocated and the results obtained in order to verify that they were consistent with the objectives set:

(a) Multi-annual programmes shall be periodically evaluated according to a timetable which enables the findings to be taken into account for any decision on the renewal, modification or suspension of the programme;

(b) Activities financed on an annual basis shall have their results evaluated at least every six years.

Most of the evaluations in the first pillar of the CAP fall under this last category. Evaluations in AGRI are performed by independent evaluators, selected after a call for tenders by DG AGRI. The work of the evaluators is guided by a steering group composed of Commission staff from various DGs. This steering group also assesses the quality of the evaluation. The evaluations and quality assessments are published on the EUROPA website.

Monitoring

Overall, monitoring is covered by the Financial Regulation, Art. 27(3). This requires that: specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timed objectives shall be set for all sectors of activity covered by the budget. Achievement of those objectives shall be monitored by performance indicators for each activity and information shall be provided by the spending authorities to the budgetary authority. Such information, [...] shall be provided **annually** and at the latest in the documents accompanying the preliminary draft budget

Detailed monitoring requirements are laid down in specific legislation, for instance on direct payments

- The monitoring of direct payments is foreseen by Council Regulation (EC) No [73/2009](#) and implementing Commission Regulations (EC) No [1120/2009](#), No [1121/2009](#) and No [1122/2009](#).
- The main sources of information used by the Commission to monitor and evaluate CAP direct payments are the agricultural statistics from the Farm Structure Survey and FADN and the regular communications from the MS.
- The statistics provided by the MS allow to monitor and evaluate farmers' income developments, changes in farm structure, utilisation of agricultural land, etc. The communications provide mainly information about the number of applications and amounts claimed, hectares claimed and determined, animals claimed, etc. In the case of the specific support this information is provided by sector.

- The MS have the obligation to provide the data according to a predefined calendar.
- The data sent to the Commission is provided by the Ministries of Agriculture and the National Paying Agencies. The data is provided to the Commission electronically in two formats depending on the type of communication (AMIS DS or Excel).
- Commission Regulation (EC) No [792/2009](#) lays down detailed rules for MS communication to the Commission.

6. Monitoring and evaluation in 2007-2013 – Pillar II

The Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (CMEF)

For the 2007-2013 programming period, a Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework was established for the first time. This Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (CMEF) is an integral part of the Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005, which aims to harmonise the monitoring and evaluation practices across the Member States so as to achieve robust conclusions for rural policy evaluation on the European scale.

In particular, Regulation [1698/2005](#) provides for the content to be drawn up in cooperation between the Commission and Member States, and that it should consist of:

- a hierarchy of four levels of common indicators (baseline, output, result and impact) which are specified in the implementing regulation;
- scope for Member States to establish other indicators as appropriate for their Rural Development Programmes (RDPs);
- ex-ante, mid-term and ex-post evaluations for all RDPs conducted by independent evaluators, and a system of ongoing evaluation for each RDP, established by the Member State;
- synthesis of ex-ante, mid-term and ex-post evaluations undertaken by the Commission;
- establishment of the European Evaluation Network and the Evaluation Helpdesk to support evaluation of EU Rural Development policy;

In addition, in relation to monitoring, Regulation [1698/2005](#) establishes the need for a Monitoring Committee for each RDP and specifies its responsibilities; provides for Annual Progress Reports (APRs) to be submitted by 30th June each year, specifies their contents and the procedure for admissibility and approval; provides for an annual review meeting and associated responsibilities of the Commission and Member State. A strategic monitoring report at MS level describing progress made in relation to the indicators included in the National Strategic Plan (NSP) is required three times during the programming period.

Monitoring and evaluation is funded out of Technical Assistance (TA) budgets.

Problems identified

Some problems were identified with the current approach in discussions with National Authorities:

- insufficient policy focus and policy objectives not specific enough at EU level;
- too many indicators and sub-indicators, creating a significant administrative burden for MS and Commission services;
- a focus on outputs and less on outcomes and evaluation;
- the IT choices and systems in place make the data hard to handle, manipulate and exploit;
- numerous errors and mistakes in data submitted;
- the time lag between the selection of operations for funding and reporting of monitoring indicators at EU level is too long;
- not enough timely support for evaluation methodologies;

- lack of evaluation capacity within MS;
- ongoing evaluation insufficiently defined, leading to inconsistent implementation and insufficient support for monitoring and evaluation within MS;
- too many reports required from Member States, with inflexible /inappropriate timing causing additional problems (e.g. Strategic monitoring required before Mid-Term Evaluation results are available, Annual Progress Reports required even prior to start of RDP implementation);
- insufficient involvement of monitoring and evaluation stakeholders in development of the system.

7. Methodological issues related to the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of the Rural Development Programmes in 2010

The European Commission has carried out a thorough analysis of the mid-term evaluation reports of the RDPs, submitted by the end of 2010, in order to draw out indications on the compliance of the MTEs with the CMEF and the practicability of the different approaches taken by the Member States.

- *How did Member States use the set of common indicators and evaluation questions during the MTE?*

The set of **common indicators** (baseline, output, result and impact indicators) has in most cases been used as the main basis to answer the Common Evaluation Questions and measure impacts of the Rural Development Programmes (RDPs). Furthermore, nearly half of the MTEs made use of **programme specific indicators**, which take into account the specificity of the respective programme area.

Common Evaluation Questions were broadly addressed by 88% of the MTEs, although the answers to the horizontal questions were often very brief. Only a small number of MTEs (3 %) have not tackled evaluation questions at all. Programme specific evaluation questions were systematically applied in more than one third of the analysed reports.

While the use and set-up of the common indicators and the prescribed answering of Common Evaluation Questions provide a convincing picture, this alone is no guarantee for harmonised approaches which can enable a European-wide aggregation and comparison of output, result and impact indicator values.

- *Which methods were applied in the MTEs for the assessment of rural development impacts?*

In principle, the choice of what methodologies are applied to generate the expected information is largely left up to the Member States. In practice however, considering the multifaceted requirements of the CMEF, the spectrum of applicable methodologies for the assessment of impacts is limited.

Nearly three quarters of the MTEs have applied a balanced **mix of qualitative and quantitative methods**. Nearly a tenth of the MTEs relied primarily on **qualitative methods** such as focus groups, interviews and case studies. Another tenth of MTE reports were primarily based on **quantitative methods** such as analysis of monitoring data, models, surveys and statistics. Elements of a rigorous evaluation of impacts, with evidence of **counterfactual analysis** and the **netting out** of effects, have been found in at least a quarter of the MTEs.

- *Did the applied methods lead to robust conclusions and recommendations in the MTEs?*

The analysed **conclusions and recommendations** of the MTEs cover in a very detailed manner the axis and measure level, but are vaguer with regard to the overall programme strategy, as well as monitoring and evaluation. In more than three quarters of the MTEs, the evaluator's conclusions and recommendations are clearly based on evidence. In more than a quarter the methods are considered to be very robust, whereas in 16% of the analysed cases, the evidence was not given or lacks clarity.

- *Has the MTE been carried out at the right time?*

The analysis has furthermore shown that the **relationship between programme progress and quality of the MTE** is almost negligible: The progress of the programme (in terms of realized expenditures) has very little influence on the technical quality of the MTEs. It has even less influence on whether the MTE is following the approach of the CMEF. The MTE is an appropriate time to fine-tune the instruments for data collection, storage and processing for the ongoing and the *ex post* evaluation of the RDPs – in case this has not been done already as a result of the *ex ante* evaluation.

8. Existing sources

The purpose of the following technical fiches is to make an overview of all existing potential data sources which can be used either directly for the monitoring or as input to the evaluation, i.e., X-tables (annual clearance of accounts), FADN (Farm Accounting Data Network), Rural Development monitoring indicators, IACS (Integrated Administration and Control System), AEI (Agri-Environmental Indicators data collection system), FSS (Farm structure survey) or other Eurostat surveys. This is not exhaustive, but provides a starting point.

More efficient use of some of these data sources (better e-Governance) could simplify monitoring and evaluation requirements and reduce the administrative burden. In particular double encoding in different systems shall be avoided (overlapping of data sources). This can be only achieved, if the information in one system can be easily completed by data from another system without complex transformation or calculation (interoperability of systems). Another possible simplification would be to include the data needed for M&E in projects applications, payment request forms or project implementation reports when possible (for example, to avoid asking to beneficiaries additional information in separate surveys). Finally, all actors including beneficiaries shall progressively have the possibility to encode / access data online in electronic format to avoid re-encoding from paper application by "data entry agents".

Technical fiche 1: Clearance Audit Trail System (CATS)

Definition

“CATS is a very detailed database of European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF) Guarantee payments (it includes comprehensive annual data relating to payments, beneficiaries, declarations /applications, products, inspections, export refunds and public storage) and was created to assist the Commission services in carrying out audits of agricultural expenditure, and in particular the clearance of accounts. Based on ORACLE, the computerised database became operational in 2000 and is able to receive and process the standard computerised data-files forwarded by Member States in accordance with Commission Regulation (CE) [No 2390/1999](#) of 25 October 1999.”

Description

The CATS database essentially contains the following different data types:

- Detailed payment data, the so called "X-table data" (EAGGF Guarantee data from 2000-2006, European Agricultural Guarantee Fund (EAGF) and European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) data since 2007): for financial year 2010 over 40 million data records and around 8,4 million beneficiaries;
- Reconciliation data: Annual declarations and Monthly declarations (EAGF) / Quarterly declarations (EAFRD) and DIFF X data (difference explanations): 8000 data records for financial year 2010;
- Irregularity data since 2006: for financial year 2010 over 600.000 data records.

X-table data:

X-table data is required according to a yearly updated regulation (for financial year 2011, it is [R825/2010](#)). The auditors of Directorate J (Audit of agricultural expenditure) use CATS to prepare and perform their EAGF/EAFRD expenditure related audits. Once data is loaded into CATS, data can be used by the auditors with “ACL” software, or with “Oracle-SQL” by the more advanced users of the IT audit team. The CATS database is thus primarily and above all an audit tool helping to carry out audits and clearing the accounts. According to an amendment of the "X-table" Regulation, the information stored can also be used in an aggregated form for monitoring and forecasting purposes in the agricultural sector.

In the same context, OLAF and the European Court of Auditors (ECA) have access to CATS according to Article 8(2) of (EC) [No 885/2006](#).

Data categories

X-table data is the underlying accounting information of data transactions in the paying agencies' accounts. Member States have to create computer records for each individual component of the EAGF/EAFRD payments to and receipts from beneficiaries. 69 fields containing financial and analytical information of the payments/receipts are categorised as follows:

F1xx = data relating to payments (paying agency, payment no., type, sanction, amount, date, etc.)

F2xx = data relating to beneficiary (ID code, name, address, NUTS code, etc.)

F3xx = data relating to declaration/application (claim no., date, authorising office, contract no., license, etc.)

F4xx = data relating to security (amount)

F5xx = data relating to product (code, quantity paid/claimed, area paid/claimed, aid rate, etc.)

F6xx = data relating to inspections (type, date, application reduced, reason)

F7xx = data relating to SPS entitlements (amount, area paid/determined/not found, livestock units declared/determined, etc.)

F8xx = data relating to export refunds (code, quantity, unit, customs office, various dates)

Data collection and quality control

Once a year (deadline 01.02.200x following the end of financial year 200x-1), Member States send all required data to the Commission using the STATEL/eDAMIS¹ software installed in each co-ordinating body. Currently the following systematic quality checks on CATS data are undertaken by unit J1 (Coordination of horizontal questions concerning the clearance of accounts):

Before the sending of the data: A program called “WinCheckCsv” has been built in the STATEL/eDAMIS software used by the Member States for sending the data to the Commission. This program refuses non-compliant files. Over the years, the number and severity of the checks has been gradually increasing.

After receiving the data at the Commission, the total amounts by financial year, paying agency and budget item are compared with the annual declarations. The objective of this reconciliation is to ensure that the CATS data is complete (financially speaking) before using it for audit or statistical purposes. Furthermore, a global quality check is undertaken once a year, which is communicated to the Agricultural Funds Committee. It reports (amongst others) on the reconciliation between the X-table data and the annual declarations, the completeness of the data (are all required X-fields available), the unambiguous identification of the beneficiaries, etc..

Data sharing

In general, data owners of the X-table data are the Member States. According to [R885/2006](#) X-table data can only be used by the Commission for the sole purposes of:

- (a) carrying out its functions in the context of the clearance of accounts pursuant to Regulation (EC) [No 1290/2005](#);
- (b) monitoring developments and providing forecasts in the agricultural sector.

The computer information supplied by the MS to the Commission consists of detailed accounting and analytical information, including names and addresses of natural persons or legal persons. This information on natural persons is subject to Regulation (EC) [45/2001](#) of the European Parliament and the Council. The database has therefore been notified to the Data Protection Officer.

¹ Software designed, supported and maintained by EUROSTAT

Technical fiche 2: Agri-environmental Statistics (AEI)

Agri-environmental statistics aim to develop and maintain a system of **Agri-Environmental Indicators (AEIs)** for monitoring the integration of environmental concerns into the CAP, based on the conclusions drawn in the Commission Communication [COM\(2006\)508](#) and the subsequent comments from the Agricultural and Fishery Council. A memorandum of understanding has been drawn up between DG AGRI, DG ENV, JRC, Eurostat, EEA and DG CLIMA, with a long term objective of setting up a data collection system for assessing the impact of agricultural policy decisions on the environment.

A set of 28 agri-environmental indicators has been identified and agreed. These indicators serve to:

- provide information on the farmed environment;
- track the impact of agriculture on the environment;
- assess the impact of agricultural and environmental policies on environmental management of farms;
- inform on agricultural and environmental policy decisions;
- illustrate the agri-environmental relationships to the broader public.

Eurostat coordinates the work within the European Commission and with the European Environmental Agency (EEA) on the development of the 28 AEIs.

While publication of indicator factsheets is planned in the near future, a number of limitations still need to be overcome to arrive at a fully operational set of indicators. Especially, deficiencies in the data availability and the extension of the indicators to the new Member States require further work.

List of agreed agri-environmental indicators			
1	Agri-environmental commitments	14	Risk of land abandonment
2	Agricultural areas under Natura 2000	15	Gross nitrogen balance
3	Farmers' training level and use of environmental farm advisory services	16	Risk of pollution by phosphorus
4	Area under organic farming	17	Pesticide risk
5	Mineral fertiliser consumption	18	Ammonia emissions
6	Consumption of pesticides	19	Greenhouse gas emissions
7	Irrigation	20	Water abstraction
8	Energy use	21	Soil erosion
9	Land use change	22	Genetic diversity
10.1	Cropping patterns	23	High Nature Value farmland
10.2	Livestock patterns	24	Renewable energy production
11.1	Soil cover	25	Population trends of farmland birds
11.2	Tillage practices	26	Soil quality
11.3	Manure storage	27.1	Water quality - Nitrate pollution
12	Intensification/extensification	27.2	Water quality - Pesticide pollution
13	Specialisation	28	Landscape - state and diversity

The Eurostat database currently includes information on farm management (farmers training level; manure storage facilities; consumption estimates of manufactured fertilizers; sales of

pesticides), agricultural production systems (main agricultural land types; major livestock categories; livestock density; irrigable and irrigated areas; irrigation methods; specialized and mixed farming; farm input consumption) and pressures and risks (greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture; gross nutrient balance).

For more information, see

http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/agri_environmental_indicators/introduction

Technical fiche 3: Farm Accountancy Data Network (FADN)

General description, purpose, use of the system, legal basis

The Farm Accountancy Data Network (FADN) is an instrument for evaluating the income of agricultural holdings and the impacts of the Common Agricultural Policy. The [concept](#) of the FADN was launched in 1965, when Council Regulation 79/65 established the [legal basis](#) for the organisation of the network. The most recent basic regulation is Council Regulation (EC) No 1217/2009 of 30 November 2009 setting up a network for the collection of accountancy data on the incomes and business operation of agricultural holdings in the European Community. For all the regulations concerning the FADN please consult: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/en/legis/latest/chap033030.htm>

Method of collection

The FADN consists of an annual survey carried out by the Member States of the European Union. The services responsible in the Union for the operation of the FADN [collect](#) every year accountancy data from a sample of agricultural holdings in the European Union. Deriving from national surveys, the FADN is the only source of microeconomic data that is harmonised, i.e. the bookkeeping principles are the same in all countries. Holdings are selected on the basis of sampling plans established at the level of each region in the EU. The survey does not cover all the agricultural holdings in the Union but only those which due to their size could be considered commercial. The [methodology](#) applied aims to provide representative data along three dimensions: region, economic size and type of farming.

Main categories of the data

The aim of the network is to gather accountancy data from farms for the determination of incomes and business analysis of agricultural holdings. Currently, the annual sample covers approximately 80.000 holdings. The information collected for each sample farm, concerns approximately 1000 variables and is transmitted by [Liaison Agencies](#). These variables described in a specific questionnaire called [Farm Return](#) refer to physical and structural data, such as location, crop areas, livestock numbers, labour force, etc. and economic and financial data, such as the value of production of the different crops, stocks, sales and purchases, production costs, assets, liabilities, production quotas and subsidies, including those connected with the application of CAP measures.

The structure of the above mentioned Farm Return is the following:

- **Table A General information:** Identification and classification of the farm
- **Table B Type of occupation:** Breakdown of the farm area: owned, rented or sharecropped
- **Table C Labour:** All labour, paid and unpaid (but excluding labour used on work under contract), which has contributed to work on the farm during the accounting year
- **Table D Number and value of livestock:** Opening and closing valuations (in number and value) and average number of livestock
- **Table E Livestock purchases and sales:** The value of such transactions together with the value of any farmhouse consumption of livestock
- **Table F Costs:** Value of all non-capital inputs used in the production of non-capital products during the accounting year
- **Table G Land and buildings, deadstock and circulating capital:** Includes production, replacement or major repair of any fixed assets by the farms own resources valued on a cost basis
- **Table H Debts:** Opening and closing valuations of short-, medium- and long-term loans

- **Table I Value Added Tax:** The VAT system applying and in certain cases VAT payments and receipts
- **Table J Grants and Subsidies:** Defined as specific payments made directly to the farm business from public funds, excluding those for investment in land, plant, machinery and equipment
- **Table K Production (crops and animal products, livestock excluded):** The area, quantity and value of all crops, animal products and other activities
- **Table L Quotas and other rights:** Quotas and other rights included those acquired free if they can be traded separately from linked land
- **Table M Direct payments for arable crops and beef:** Detailed data concerning CAP arable crops area payments and direct payments for beef
- **Table N Details of purchases and sales of livestock:** Purchases and sales per categories of livestock. The sub-totals of purchases and sales per animal species (equines, cattle...) are registered in table E.

Sharing the data with other bodies

Incorporated into the founding legislation of FADN is a stipulation that all data relating to individual farms received by the Commission are to be treated with utmost confidentiality. Consequently, data at the level of individual farms are normally not released outside the Directorate General for Agriculture of the Commission. Only aggregated results for a group of farms and for farms within regions and Member States are published since, at this level of aggregation, information relating to individual farms cannot be discerned. While the European Commission is the primary user of analyses based on FADN-data, aggregated data can be found in the [Standard Results](#) database.

Technical fiche 4: Farm Structure Survey (FSS)

The structure of agriculture in the Member States of the European Union varies as a function of differences in geology, topography, climate and natural resources, as well as the diversity of regional activities, infrastructure and social customs. The survey on the structure of agricultural holdings, also known as the Farm Structure Survey (FSS), helps assess the agricultural situation across the EU, monitoring trends and transitions in the structure of agricultural holdings, while also playing a key role in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of external developments or policy decisions.

The basic FSS is carried out by all European Union Member States every 10 years (1990, 2000, 2010 etc) in the form of an agricultural census, while intermediate sample surveys are carried out in between. Both form the backbone of the agricultural statistical system.

The Member States collect information from individual agricultural holdings and, observing strict rules of confidentiality, forward the data to Eurostat. The information collected in the FSS covers land use, livestock numbers, rural development, management and farm labour input (including the gender and relationship to the holder of the agricultural holding, as well as the age of the farm holder and farm manager). The survey data are aggregated by different geographic levels (for basic surveys by district level and for all surveys by regions and by Member States). The data can also be arranged by area or economic size class, area status, legal status of the holding, objective zone and farm type.

The basic unit underlying the FSS is the agricultural holding, defined as a single unit, both technically and economically, which has a single management and which undertakes agricultural activities within the economic territory of the EU, either as its primary or secondary activity. The FSS covers all agricultural holdings with exclusion of only the smallest ones which together contribute 2 % or less to the total utilized area excluding common land and 2% or less to the total number of farm livestock units.

The legal basis for the FSS is Regulation [1166/2008](#) of 19 November 2008 on farm structure surveys and the survey on agricultural production methods, which repealed Council Regulation [571/88](#)

For more information, see

[http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Glossary:Farm_structure_survey_\(FSS\)](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Glossary:Farm_structure_survey_(FSS))

Technical fiche 5: Eurostat

Eurostat is the statistical office of the European Union situated in Luxembourg. Its mission is to provide the European Union with a high-quality statistical information service (<http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/eurostat/home>).

In line with the Community legal framework and the European Statistics Code of Practice, Eurostat disseminates on its website European statistics to all interested parties respecting professional independence and in an objective, professional and transparent manner in which all users are treated equitably. The detailed arrangements are governed by the Eurostat protocol on impartial access to Eurostat data for users.

In addition to information on farm structures and agri-environmental interactions explained elsewhere, Eurostat collects statistical information on a wide range of subjects relevant to the monitoring and evaluation of the Common Agricultural Policy. The most relevant database domains are listed below (for the full database, see

http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/statistics/search_database).

Economic accounts for agriculture (EAA): The EAA is a satellite account of the European System of Accounts (ESA), laid down according to Regulation (EC) No. [138/2004](#). It provides detailed information on income in the agricultural sector, in order to analyse the production process of the agricultural industry and the primary income generated by this production. EAA accounts contain data on the value of output (producer prices and basic prices), intermediate consumption, subsidies and taxes, consumption of fixed capital, rent and interests, capital formation etc., both in current and in constant prices. The EAA accounts are also compiled at regional level (NUTS-2), but only in values in current prices. Data are collected by National Statistical Institutes or Ministries of Agriculture while Eurostat is responsible for the EU aggregations.

Structure of agricultural holdings (see also background fiche Farm Structure Survey): The database domain EUROFARM contains information on the structure of agricultural holdings collected through the Farm Structure Survey (FSS), according to Regulation (EC) No. [1166/2008](#). The variables are structured into five groups: general overview; land use; livestock; special interest topics: farm labour force, rural development issues as well as management and practices; structure of agricultural holdings by region and main indicators.

Agricultural prices and price indices: Absolute price statistics for the main agricultural outputs and inputs are used for the purpose of economic analyses (e.g., model calculation; determination of price elasticities) while agricultural price indices (producer price index of agricultural products; purchase price index of agricultural inputs) can reveal trends in the prices of individual agricultural products or product groups. Member States provide Eurostat with annual absolute prices as well as annual/ quarterly price indices series, based on a Gentlemen's agreement (no legal basis). The EU agricultural price indices refer to the Member States (national level) and are not calculated on a regional level.

Agricultural products: Crop statistics provide detailed information on the area, the yield and the production harvested during the crop year at national level. The information concerns about 200 crop products. National Statistical Institutes or Ministries of Agriculture are responsible for data collection in accordance with Regulation (EC) No. [543/2009](#). Livestock statistics according to Regulation (EC) No. [1165/2008](#) covers cattle, pigs, sheep, goats and buffaloes, broken down into animal categories by age or weight and certain uses. Once a year (November/December survey), relevant livestock statistics are broken down by NUTS-2 level. In addition, data on poultry farming, milk and milk products, meat production and structures of livestock rearing are provided.

Fruit trees and vineyards: Data collected through the orchard surveys carried out by Member States according to Directive [2001/109/EC](#) include areas under certain species of fruit trees (apples, pear, peach, apricot, orange, lemon, small-fruited citrus) by variety, age and density classes in order to determine the production potential of plantations. The vineyard surveys are carried out by Member States according to Regulation (EEC) [No. 357/79](#) to collect data on the area under wine grape varieties (annual intermediate surveys) and all types of vines (10-year basic surveys).

Organic farming: This data collection according to Regulation (EC) [No. 834/2007](#) gives an overview of the uptake of organic farming within the European Union, plus Norway, including the number of registered organic operators, the number of registered operators processing and importing products issued from organic farming, the organic crop area, organic crop production and yields from fully converted areas, organic livestock and production of organic animal products.

Food: From farm to fork statistics: This domain provides access to various sets of statistics related to food products and collected from different statistical sources and covering the food chain "from farm to fork". The domain is structured in 4 main chapters: (1) Food consumption; (2) From production to distribution: organic production, volume of production and trade of quality wines, volume of production and sales of food products, relative price levels of food products, etc.; (3) Inputs to the food chain: volume of agricultural primary production, volume of seeds, consumption of pesticides, main countries from which food products enter the EU territory, etc. (4) Actors involved in the food chain: number of enterprises and agricultural holdings, number of restaurants, etc.. The legal basis for data provision depends on each individual data set.

Land cover and land use, soil, landscape: This domain contains statistical tables on land cover and land use in general. In addition there are tables on visible animal grazing, irrigation, forest species and landscape features. The data have been collected through the LUCAS (Land Use and Cover Area frame) survey, which is a Eurostat data collection included in the Community Statistical Programme 2008-2012. The statistics are presented at NUTS-0, NUTS-1 and NUTS-2 levels.

Regional statistics: Data on agricultural accounts, livestock, areas harvested, yields, production, land use and the production of cows' milk on farms are also provided at regional (NUTS-2) level. In addition, Eurostat collects and presents regional data on, amongst others, demographics, economic accounts, education, employment, migration, land cover and land use.

Technical fiche 6: Rural Development Indicators

The CMEF 2007-2013 indicators database

The common monitoring and evaluation indicators for the 2007-2013 rural development policy programming period are listed in the annex VIII of the commission regulation (EC) n° 1974/2006. They are further developed in the 'Handbook on CMEF'. There are four types of indicators: the baseline, the output, the result and the impact indicators. These indicators are available at programme level, are cumulative and based on realized actions.

The baseline indicators use mainly statistics from available sources (Eurostat, FADN...) to reflect the situation at the beginning of the programming period. They are directly linked to the wider objectives of the programme. They have been defined as much as possible for the year 2006 as a reference.

The output indicators measure activities directly realised within programmes at measure level (i.e.: number of investment projects...). They are collected on an annual basis through the annual progress report.

The result indicators measure direct and immediate effects of the intervention at axe level (i.e.: gross number of direct job created...). They are collected on an annual basis through the annual progress report.

The impact indicators refer to the 'net' benefit of the overall programme beyond the direct effect on its direct beneficiaries. It requires subtracting effects that cannot be attributed to the intervention and taking into account indirect effects. They are linked to the wider policy objectives. There are measured twice in the programming period (mid-term and post evaluations).

A substract is available on the ENRD website: http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/rural-development-policy/programme-implementation/monitoring/en/monitoring_home.cfm

Technical fiche 7: Integrated Administration and Control System (IACS)

Definition

“IACS is the integrated system for the management and control of payments to farmers made by the Member States in application of the Common Agricultural Policy. It provides for a uniform basis for controls and, among other requirements, it covers the administrative and on-the-spot controls of applications and the IT system which supports the national administration in carrying out their functions. The legal requirements concerning IACS are laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No [73/2009](#) establishing common rules for direct support schemes for farmers and in Commission Regulation (EC) No [1122/2009](#) laying down the implementing rules.”

Description

According to the principle of shared management, Member States are obliged to ensure that agricultural payments are carried out and executed correctly, to prevent and deal with irregularities and to recover amounts unduly paid.

IACS covers all direct payments to farmers, such as the single payment scheme (SPS) the single area payments scheme (SAPS), as well as those rural development (EAFRD) measures which are based on the number of hectares or animals held by the farmer. This is for instance agri-environmental measures and less-favoured area payments.

Data categories

In physical terms, IACS consists of a number of computerized and interconnected databases which are used to receive and process aid applications and respective data. Thus it provides for:

- a unique identification system for farmers;
- an identification system covering all agricultural areas called Land Parcel Identification System (LPIS);
- an identification system for payment entitlements;
- a system for identification and registration of animals (in Member States where animal-based measures apply).

The system ensures a unique identification of each farmer as well as of all agricultural parcels of land and, if needed, of animals. The system covers also the processing of the aid applications.

For more detailed information on the categories of data see also the 'List of mandatory communications that MS shall send to the Commission in the framework of the implementation regulations of Regulation (EC) No 73/2009' in Annex.

Data collection and quality control

IACS is operated in the Member States by accredited [paying agencies](#).

The fulfilment of the criteria for aid is assessed through administrative checks and through checks carried out on-the-spot.

The administrative checks consist of a number of cross-checks of information in the farmer's applications. The cross-checks are done automatically within the IACS computerised database linking the different systems.

For the purpose of on-the-spot-checks Member States shall visit the farms chosen either randomly or through risk analysis. However, by mean of available techniques such as aerial or satellite photos of the agricultural parcels it is in many cases possible to measures the size of a parcel and to check the plant cover without going to the field.

The databases have to be regularly updated by the Member States, but historical data for the farmers must also be saved. A substantial part of the system is now paperless and in some Member States farmers can apply for aid on-line. The requirements to the system are regularly updated in order to take new available techniques into account and to simplify the system.

The European Court of Auditors has repeatedly confirmed that, where properly applied, the IACS is an effective control system to limit the risk of irregular expenditure.

Data sharing

Data owners of the IACS computerised databases are the Member States.

Some Member States indicated² that IACS is used for the preparation of Monitoring Indicators, which are part of the Annual Progress Reports of Rural Development Programmes.

IACS is the single system to record the identity of each farmer with regard to all aid applications submitted by the same farmer. This information on natural persons is subject to 'protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data'.

² Assessment of the information systems implemented under the Article 63 of Regulation (EC) No 1974/2006, Rural Development Committee on 19 November 2010.

Technical fiche 8: Communications from Member States on Cross Compliance and the Farm Advisory System

Description of the data for cross compliance

Three types of information are communicated by Member States to the Commission as regards cross compliance.

1. Annual data on controls and sanctions under the cross compliance system

The legal basis is Article 84(1)(e) of Commission Regulation (EC) No [1122/2009](#). The deadline is 15 July each year. The notification is made on the basis of an (Excel) template send to MSs beforehand.

2. Annual data of permanent pastures in relation to the total agricultural area

The legal basis is Article 84(2) of Commission Regulation (EC) No [1122/2009](#). The deadline is 31 October each year. The data is send by the AMIS DS system.

3. Implementation of the Good Agricultural and Environmental Condition (GAEC)

The legal basis is Article 140 of Council Regulation (EC) No [73/2009](#). No deadline foreseen but by nature the requirements are to be applied on a calendar year basis. Any modification of the GAEC shall therefore be communicated to farmers before the 31 December each year. The Commission send a questionnaire to MSs for this purpose and receive the replies by E-mails. A database is being developed by the JRC and the possibility to use it for the notification is under scrutiny.

Description of the data for the Farm Advisory System

Member States have to communicate the way they have implemented the Farm Advisory System (FAS). The legal basis is Article 140 of Council Regulation (EC) No [73/2009](#). No deadline is foreseen and the communications are made on an ad hoc basis. The Commission send a questionnaire to MSs for this purpose and receives the replies by E-mails. A database is being developed by the JRC.

Competent Committees and groups

The legal issues of cross compliance and the FAS are dealt with by the Management Committee for Direct Payments. In the framework of this Committee, an expert group on cross compliance has been set up to deal with the technical issues, including possibly the discussion on data and indicators.

More technical discussions on GAEC with Member States and scientific experts are also held every year in workshops organised by the JRC.

Technical fiche 9: Communications from Member States on Direct Payments

Description

Council Regulation (EC) No [73/2009](#) and implementing Commission Regulations (EC) No [1120/2009](#), No [1121/2009](#) and No [1122/2009](#) establish the communications to be transmitted to the Commission by the Member States.

Each year the Commission prepares a calendar with the communications to be transmitted by the MS and the respective deadlines.

Data collection and quality control

The communications are transmitted either through a functional mailbox (Excel tables) or through IT applications (AMIS DS or ISAMM).

Several controls are carried out following the reception of the communications, regarding:

- the respect of the deadlines
- the completeness and coherence of the information
- the respect of the ceilings

If needed the Commission contact the MS in order to obtain additional clarifications. A consolidated table is then prepared for each communication received

Data sharing

Following internal validation the consolidated tables are published in DG AGRI web page and CIRCA. When communications are received through the IT applications, several Commission services can extract the information via a web interface.

Technical fiche 10: Main existing sources of information on fruit and vegetables

Annual Report on producer organisations, associations of producer organisations and producer groups and operational funds, operational programmes and recognition plans

Main data: number of members, area under fruit and vegetable production, main destinations of the products, value of the marketed production, EU support, expenditures by type of measure.

Legal basis: Article 97(b) of Commission Implementing Regulation (UE) [543/2011](#) and Annex XIV.

Frequency: Annual. Data are sent on 15 November and refer to the previous calendar year.

Transmission: data are submitted by email in Excel. From November 2011, data is to be transmitted in Excel via ISAMM (Information System for Agricultural Management and Monitoring).

Competent authorities: Ministries of Agriculture or Paying Agencies, depending on the MS.

Evaluation of national strategies for sustainable operational programmes in the fruit and vegetables sector (2012)

Aim: assessing the progress made towards achieving the objectives set for the operational programmes, as well as efficiency and effectiveness in relation to those objectives (see Art. 125(1) of Reg. [543/2011](#)), in order to draw lessons useful in improving the quality of future national strategies, and in particular at identifying possible shortcomings in the definition of objectives, targets or measures eligible for support, or needs for defining new instruments. Monitoring and evaluation of the National Strategy must be carried out by the Member States by using relevant indicators among the common performance indicators and, where appropriate, additional indicators specified in the National Strategy (see Art. 127(1) of Reg. [543/2011](#)).

Legal basis: Article 127(4), subparagraph 2, of Commission Implementing Regulation (UE) [543/2011](#).

Transmission: documents will be transmitted (most probably in word or pdf format) via ISAMM (Information System for Agricultural Management and Monitoring).

Producer prices of fruit and vegetables in the internal market Prices for F&V

Main data: average recorded prices for fruit and vegetables traded on the representative markets.

Products are divided in two categories: obligatory (part A of Annex XV to Reg. [543/2011](#)) and voluntary (part B of Annex XV).

Legal basis: Article 98 of Commission Implementing Regulation (UE) [543/2011](#) and Annex XV.

Frequency: daily data, submitted weekly.

Transmission: data are sent by the MS via AMIS, which generates pdf documents.

Competent authorities: Ministries of Agriculture.

Annual monitoring report on the implementation of the School Fruit Scheme during a school year

Main data: number of participating children, number of participating schools, list of products and quantities distributed, target group, frequency and duration of distribution, list of accompanying measures.

Legal basis: Article 12(1) of Commission Regulation (EC) No [288/2009](#).

Frequency: Annual. Data are sent by 30 November and refer to the previous school year.

Transmission: data are submitted by email in Excel or Word format.

Competent authorities: Competent authorities for the implementation of the School Fruit Scheme, normally Ministries of Agriculture or Paying Agencies.

Evaluation of the implementation of the national/regional School Fruit Schemes

Aim: assessing the effectiveness of the Scheme in terms of improvement of the eating habits (higher consumption and better knowledge on the benefits of fruit and vegetables). The impact of a parental contribution on the effectiveness of the Scheme should be also assessed, if relevant.

The evaluation should be carried out by the Member States by using relevant indicators contained in DG AGRI Guidelines.

Legal basis: Article 12(2), of Commission Regulation (EC) No [288/2009](#).

Frequency: The evaluation is carried out on a regular basis. A report is sent to the Commission every five years. The first report is due by end of February 2012.

Transmission: the evaluation report will be transmitted most probably in Word or PDF format, via email or mail.

Technical fiche 11: Main existing sources of information on olive oil and table olives

Data available and sources:

National administrations (via ISAMM):

- Estimated production.
- Market price.

IOC:

- Community oil balances (production, exchanges, consumption, stocks): information received from each Member State and gathered by the IOC.
- International Olive Council.

Technical fiche 12: Other communication from the Member States on market measures

Member states communicate to the Commission different types of information related to the market measures. This information comprise for example:

- private storage of butter; pork meat;
- import and export certificates for cereals, alcohol, dairy products, beef meat, rice;
- monitoring of market prices for cereals and rice;
- import rights for cereals, fruits and vegetables.

MS notify DG AGRI concerning prices for milk and milk products on weekly or monthly basis (depending on the price). MS notify also the volume of milk production in relation with milk quotas once a year and the uptake of the school milk scheme. The means of transmission is via ISAMM and email (Excel files).

A range of monitoring information is collected from Member States (principally Ministries of Agriculture) concerning the meat sector. This includes weekly reporting of market prices, provided mostly through new-IDES software, yearly reporting of systems used for keeping laying hens, and less frequent reporting on the structure of the honey sector and voluntary labelling within the beef sector.

9. Existing groups of potential interest for monitoring and evaluation

First Pillar

Ad hoc expert group on ISAMM:

Task: to ensure the role of project owner for ISAMM (Information System for Agricultural Market Management and Monitoring) via the exchange of information, experiences and good practices for implementation, simplification and informatisation of the mechanism for support of the management of the CAP. Frequency: 2 meetings per year.

Management Committee on the Common Organisation of Agricultural Markets (single CMO committee on horizontal questions):

Task: to collect opinion of Member States in the context of the comitology procedure, to ensure the coherence of the single Common Market Organisation (CMO) and to monitor the application of the single CMO implementing legislation and policy in general; to manage the application of existing horizontal regulations, in trade mechanisms field concerning in particular export refunds, intervention, licences, private storage etc. Frequency: one meeting per month.

Besides there are also Management committees for a few specific sectors and issues (e.g. Fruits and Vegetables, Wines...).

Management Committee for Direct Payments

Task: The Commission is assisted by the Direct Payments Management Committee (DPMC) in the implementation of direct payments. This Committee is composed of representatives of the Member States and meets usually on a monthly (every two months) basis.

In this Committee, the Commission and the Member States discuss the implementation of the several direct support schemes and discuss and adopt legislation for direct support schemes. This Committee is frequently informed about the communications to be transmitted by the Member States to the Commission.

Committee on the Agricultural Funds

Task: This committee, composed of representatives from Member States, is kept informed regularly of the financial implementation of the EAGF and the EAFRD, and has a management role for the EAGF.

Expert groups

There are also expert groups which generally meet twice a year, and bring together experts on specific topics such as market forecasting, or particular technical issues such as carcass classification or water content of poultry meat. There are 2 statistical groups a year on milk.

The list of all committees and their links to basic legal acts is available from:

<http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regcomitology/index.cfm?do=List.list>

Rural Development

Rural Development Committee (RDC)

The Commission is assisted by the Rural Development Committee in the implementation of the second pillar of the CAP. The RDC is composed of the representatives of the Member States, and is meeting on a monthly basis. It has advisory, management and regulatory roles.

This committee has been involved and consulted during the design and the implementation of the CMEF. As regards evaluation, this committee is regularly informed on the main developments. As regards monitoring, the committee has been notably consulted to establish the common template monitoring tables and their guidelines.

European Network for Rural Development (ENRD)

A European Network for Rural Development for the networking of national networks, organisations and administrations active in the field of rural development at Community level is in place. Through its various activities, the ENRD engages stakeholders in an efficient and effective delivery of EU rural development policy.

The ENRD carries out its work programmes on the basis of various groups:

- the Coordination Committee of the ENRD, gathering representatives of the National Authorities, of the National Rural Networks and of European Organisations active in the field of rural development, and dealing with the overall strategy and work programme of the ENRD;
- the Leader subcommittee, also grouping National authorities, National Rural Networks and NGOs, but dealing with the implementation of the Leader Axis;
- some Thematic Working Groups, which are formal expert groups set up to analyse and make recommendations on special topics (e.g. How to target territorial specificities in RDPs? What are public goods in agriculture and how can they be enhanced? What are the links between agriculture and rural development? What works well and less well in the delivery mechanisms of the RDPs? ...);
- some Focus Groups, composed of a mix of Local Action Groups representatives, National Rural Networks, NGOs, and Managing Authorities. So far these Focus Groups have been working on specific issues related to the implementation of the Leader Axis (e.g. how to facilitate transnational cooperation, how to stimulate innovation through Leader, how to improve the Local Development Strategies, etc...);
- the group of National Rural Networks, to better coordinate their activities at EU level and ensure the practical and thematic exchange of experiences between them.

The ENRD is also specifically ensuring the publication of physical and financial data from the RDPs, based on the annual progress reports. These can be found on the ENRD website at: http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/rural-development-policy/programme-implementation/monitoring/en/monitoring_home.cfm.

The ENRD is supported by an external contractor, the "Contact Point of the ENRD", which ensures the delivery of all services and communication tools for the network activities.

Evaluation Expert Network (EEN) and the Evaluation Expert Committee

The European Evaluation Network for Rural Development provides support for improving the quality and efficiency of evaluation of Rural Development Programmes in Member States of the European Union in the period 2007-2013.

This network supports and follows the implementation of the 2007-2013 rural development evaluation (i.e. working papers, working groups...). The outcomes of the network are available on the [EEN website](#).

An Evaluation expert committee follows the work of the Evaluation Expert Network. It consists of two representatives from each national competent authority. The group's mission is to assist the Commission in the preparation and implementation of European Network activities by: (a) advising the Commission on the annual work programme of the Evaluation

Expert Network, (b) contributing to the choice and coordination of evaluation thematic work, (c) monitoring the implementation of ongoing evaluation.

The Evaluation Expert Network is supported by an external contractor, the "Evaluation Helpdesk". Its tasks are closely related to the implementation of the Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (CMEF), and comprise specifically to provide know-how to rural development evaluation stakeholders in relation to programme evaluation; to deliver expertise on evaluation methods and tools and related aspects, develop guidance and explanatory texts and papers, and; to provide support to DG Agriculture and Rural Development and to the Member States in dealing with technical questions and evaluation reports.

Common to CAP

NGO Advisory Groups

Consultations with those NGOs who have an interest in or a contribution to make regarding agricultural and rural development policy are organised by DG AGRI, notably through the regular meetings of advisory groups.

In particular an enlarged advisory group has been regularly involved in the development process of the CAP-post 2013.

Sectoral advisory groups meet two to three times a year, bringing together representatives of stakeholder organisations such as producers, cooperatives, processors and trade associations. These address monitoring issues, and provide advice on policy and the regulatory framework.

10. List of abbreviations

AEI	Agri-Environmental Indicators
APR	Annual Progress Reports
CAP	Common Agriculture Policy
CATS	Clearance Audit Trail System
CMEF	Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework
CMO	Common Market Organisation
DG	Directorate General
DPMC	Direct Payments Management Committee
EAA	Economic Accounts for Agriculture
EAFRD	European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development
EAGF	European Agricultural Guarantee Fund
EAGGF	European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund
EAS	European System of Accounts
ECA	European Court of Auditors
EEA	European Environmental Agency
FADN	Farm Accountancy Data Network
FSS	Farm Structure Survey
IACS	Integrated Administration and Control System
JRC	Joint Research Centre
MS	Member States
NSP	National Strategic Plan
RD	Rural Development
RDC	Rural Development Committee
RDP	Rural Development Programmes
TA	Technical Assistance