



The effective setting-up and functioning of CAP Strategic Plan Monitoring Committees

Issues emerging from four informal discussions, initial recommendations and examples of good practice





- › During first meeting of the Thematic Group on CAP Strategic Plans: Monitoring Committees, participants agreed that four informal themed discussions would be held before the next TG meeting.
 - › Stakeholder engagement - 14 November
 - › Implementation approaches - 23 November
 - › Regional Monitoring Committees - 11 December
 - › Role of National Networks - 12 December

- › Across the four meetings there were 34 participants in total.





- › A review of eight Member States' Rules of Procedure (Austria, Flanders, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Germany, Denmark, Estonia, Spain).
 - › Vary in length from just over a page (EE) to 17 pages (CZ).
 - › Membership varies from 22 persons (BE_Flanders) to 74 (CZ). Average membership across the eight MCs is 40 persons.
 - › Some common content, e.g. five include variations of seven areas for MCs to examine and four areas on which it will issue an opinion.
 - › Some Rules of Procedure have a particular focus, e.g. very detailed code of ethics in CZ.
 - › Both DE and ES describe interactions between regional and national MCs.





Implementation approaches

- › Reduced MC influence on CSP implementation, extent of influence sometimes unknown.
- › Unclear how much integration / exchange between national and regional MCs (Germany).
- › Role confusion, e.g. uncertainty who can propose and approve modifications (Italy).
- › Informal information exchange helps MC members understand others' perspective / role.
- › Project visits alongside MC meetings (Austria, Germany) valued highly.
- › Training needed to enhance new MC members' understanding of role (Poland, Germany, Austria).





Implementation approaches

- › Targets and indicators
 - › MC has important role in holding MA to account e.g. analysing results data and raising urgent issues not addressed in CSPs.
 - › Result data can lack explanation as to why some targets not achieved.
 - › Targets and indicators sometimes chosen to ensure a good end result?
 - › Do indicators show whether a measure's objective is being achieved? (i.e. intervention logic)





Implementation approaches

> Recommendations

- › Feedback needed to show how MC opinions influence MA's decision-making.
- › MCs need to give scrutiny to intervention logic and rigour (Expert TGs?).
- › Visits to projects alongside MC meetings should be encouraged.
- › Information exchange and role clarity enhanced by participating in other MCs.
- › Online portal to enable MC members to access meeting documents / engage in themed discussions.





Stakeholder engagement

- › Most MCs focussed on consultation, information provision and relationship building.
- › Now easier to engage organisations who hold different views (BE_Wallonia).
- › Inclusion of Pillar 1 brings challenges (Italy).
- › MC role is formal decision-making, NRN role is informal stakeholder engagement (Greece).
- › National / regional MCs 'over-subscribed', efforts to keep non-members engaged (Germany).
- › Stakeholder engagement difficult when high staff turnover in key positions (Greece).





Stakeholder engagement

> Recommendations

- > Stakeholder engagement during policy formation enhances ownership; small WGs?
- > Inviting regular feedback (not just mid-term) enhances engagement / motivation.
- > Utilisation of the written procedure is one way of doing this.
- > Ongoing informal stakeholder discussions between MC meetings needed.
- > Ensure small NGOs can easily access information shared at EU level meetings.





Regional Monitoring Committees

- › Implications of change to national implementation system still being understood (e.g. Italy, France, Germany, Spain).
- › Reduced role clarity and flexibility and increased complexity during modification process.
- › Unclear how much integration / information exchange between national and regional stakeholders, mechanism to enable exchange of opinions and ideas is lacking.
- › Regional MAs regret lack of direct contact with the Commission to discuss implementation issues.
- › Desire for procedural clarity to make regional CSP implementation / modification easier.





Regional Monitoring Committees

> Recommendations

- › Role and procedural clarity amongst regional stakeholders needed, e.g. how regional needs addressed in modification process.
- › An EU-wide TWG dedicated to regional implementation could exchange best practice and develop proposals to address specific issues e.g. regional / national integration issues.





National Networks

- › NNs' role as link between stakeholders and MC is highly valued.
- › Some NNs are members of the MC (e.g. Italy, Ireland, Flanders, Latvia) others are not (e.g. Finland, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland).
- › Swedish NN was not a member at first, but recently invited back in informal role. NN will help the MA reach target groups and evaluate progress.
- › In Finland, feedback from MC to NN to guide work plan is yet to be received.
- › Extent to which NN members promote networking elements of CSP over their members' needs is sometimes unknown.





National Networks

> Recommendations

- › While NNs regularly update MC on activities, feedback loop needed from MCs to inform NN's work.
- › NN stakeholders need to know how a discussion will influence decisions.
- › NN's support for field visits which facilitate informal engagement is highly valued, more needed.
- › Important to understand influence of the MA on MC membership.





Examples of good practice

Challenge	Solution being implemented	Member State
Ensure social and economic partners' expectations are understood	A regional MA surveyed partners to ascertain their expectations from the MC's work and how they want to engage with it	Germany
Submission of high number of opinion papers is resource intensive for MA	A platform of 50 environmental NGOs was helped to prepare joint statements during the CAP Strategic Plan preparation process	Germany
National and Regional MCs were over-subscribed following open call for Expressions of Interest	Those who were not selected were invited to organise themselves into groups and for a Monitoring Committee member to represent their views.	Germany
Some NGOs do not have the capacity or interest to actively participate in MC meetings	Knowledge gained from the previous programming period is used to select the most active NGOs; some have been granted voting rights who did not have them previously.	Greece
Unclear / limited integration and information exchange between national and regional levels	An online platform enables protocols and meeting minutes to be uploaded and freely accessed.	Germany
Need for MC members to understand how different measures work in practice	The CAP Network recently helped organise a visit to a farm project alongside an MC meeting which gave 20 members an insight on measures' practical implementation.	Flanders
Insufficient capacity for multiple governance MCs in some smaller MSs	The MC and NN is jointly coordinated by one committee and the same MA staff manage network activities and CAP implementation.	Luxembourg, Wallonia





Questions for further consideration

- › What does a good CAP Strategic Plan governance structure look like?
- › How can the MC best add value to MA decision-making to help CSP implementation?
- › Are there ways that MCs can support harmonisation of regional and national approaches?
- › Further recommendations, and good practice examples?
 - › Feedback loops?
 - › Role clarity?
 - › Target and result scrutiny?

