



Key findings from the survey of Managing Authorities regarding the setting up and functioning of CS P Monitoring Committees

2nd TG meeting, 25 January 2024

Alex Papakonstantinou, CAPI CP



Funded by
the European Union





General information:

- › 12 questions to provide a snapshot of MCs state of play; different approaches and issues of concern for MAs;
- › Responses received between July – October 2023;
- › Received 22 responses out of 28 CSPs.





1. Timeframe of establishing CSP MCs in the current programming period (2023-27)

- › All 22 respondents confirmed that their MCs and Rules of Procedure (RoP) had been established
 - › 8 MCs and their RoP approved by end of 2022
 - › 14 MCs and their RoP approved within first months of 2023
- › Regional MCs established in DE, ES, IT





2.a Plans to implement novel approaches for the effective operation of the Monitoring Committee

12 MS replied positively. These included:

- › Transition from RDP to CSP Monitoring Committees
 - › Increased number of members e.g. private sector, Paying Agency, external experts - LU, LT, SK;
 - › Reduced number of members for efficiency - BE-FL, IT.
- › New ways of engaging with stakeholders and MC members
 - › Field visits for networking/informal exchanges - GR, IE, LU;
 - › Thematic working groups - LU, HR;
 - › New formats: “Werkplaatsen” organised by NN - NL, hybrid meetings – LV.





2.b Plans to implement novel approaches for the effective operation of the Monitoring Committee

› Organisational changes

- › Joined/merged operations of RDP and CSP Monitoring Committees to increase work efficiency and reduce bureaucracy – EE, SI;
 - › Coordination between national & regional MCs - ES;
 - › Evaluation after each MC meeting – SE.
-
- › Provide training and/or expertise support to MC members on CSP interventions or MC procedures – GR, IT, RO



3.a. Challenges confronted in the setting up/operation of CSP MCs

- › Including all relevant stakeholders / ensuring balanced composition – AT, CZ, DE, GR, HR, HU, IT, SK
- › Lack of engagement / commitment by MC members – CY, GR, LT, NL, SE, SI
- › Lack of clarity on the scope of MCs / how to put into practice the opinion of MCs – AT, BE-FL, DK, EE, FR
- › Improving coordination between national and regional MCs – DE, ES, IT
- › Dealing with the complexity of CAP topics/requirements – BE-FL, HR, LU
- › Capacity building within the MC – CY, BE-FL
- › National procedures on approving the membership - SI





3.b. Challenges confronted in the setting up/operation of CSP MCs

Practical challenges

- Effective operation of MC compromised by the large number of members (e.g. equally engaging all stakeholders in discussions) – AT, CZ, DE, HU, HR
- Timely engagement with MC members in procedures e.g. CSP modifications, - NL
- Administrative burden for MAs related the organisation and delivery of MC meetings – GR
- Animating members and having focused discussions in MC meetings (e.g. certain members tend to monopolise discussions or focus on topics not related to the consultation) - RO





4. Ensuring the balanced representation of stakeholders

- › Included a balanced mix of actors (public, private, agriculture, environment, social partners, etc.) – AT, BE-FL, DE, FR, GR, IE, LT, LU, SI
- › Expanded the RDP MC – CZ, CY, DK, HR, LT, LV, LU, SI, SK
- › Contacted/consulted with relevant stakeholders to join – AT, ES, CZ, NL
- › Published information about the call and selection process – ES, SI, RO
- › Approved list of applicants through a formal process with public, stakeholders, other interested parties and responsible institutions – CZ, LT, RO
- › Excluded inactive/not so relevant stakeholders – DK, FR





5. Measures taken to encourage effective participation in the process

Promoting interaction

- › Field trips – AT, BE-FL, IE, LU
- › Working groups – CZ, LU, SK
- › Workshops – IE, SE
- › Groups of non-MC members – DE

Organisation

- › Timely share of material – BE-FL, GR, IE
- › Preparatory meetings – FR, NL, SI
- › Budget for travel costs, capacity building, independent research – AT, NL
- › Continuous involvement of stakeholders – ES

Meeting formats /communication

- › Hybrid/online meetings – EE, CZ, GR, HU, IE, LT, SI
- › Online tools/sharing information – CY, FR, GR, LU





6.a. Ways to improve the functioning of CSP MCs

- › Exchange practices and experiences with other MSs – CY, GR
- › Strengthen communication between MA and MC members – HU
- › Gender balance by inviting for a male and a female nominee – IE
- › Diversity of MC members impacts the level/depth of discussions – need for smaller working groups consisting of experts – LU
- › Wide consultation through a regulated process with all members – RO
- › Respond to MC members questions between meetings & ensure access to information/data from the MA – SE
- › MC members to go beyond their narrow interests within the MC – SI





6.b. Issues for discussion

- *How can NNs better support the operation of MCs? - HR*
- *How to ensure MC members providing quality inputs? – LT*
- *How to balance political and technical issues within the MC? – IT*
- *How to ensure balanced MC decisions when different interests are involved? - LT*





Thank you for your attention!

