



Group 3

Strengthening the operation of Monitoring Committees

1)

What should a well-integrated and coherent approach to the effective operation of Monitoring Committees in regionalised countries look like?

DE - **need for informal exchanges in between MC meeting** (both National & Regional)

DE - (perceived) increased complexity of CAP implementation (e.g. ECO Schemes, GAEC) reduced the possibility for informal exchanges of those involved in MCs at all levels

DE - MA does its best to ensure information flows between National and Regional are effective. A member of each Regional MC is on the National MC. The National MC (MA) is represented on each Regional MC

DE - **basic National-Regional MCs structure** is fit for purpose

DE - Developing the info flows between National and Regional MCs is still ongoing

DE - Thematic groups included input from National and Regional level. OK, but **more integration of all the practitioners is required**. This type of activity is taking too long to set up.

FR - There is a Steering group which exists [among other things?] to improve operation of National and Regional MCs

FR - online ways developed and now operational to share info between National and Regional MCs

FR, IT (same as DE) - Regional MC represented in National MC and vice versa

IT - It would be good if there was a **better clarity of roles** between National and Regional MCs. Resources are limited, therefore efficient working practices are needed

DE - thematic groups at regional level is important

2)

How can National Networks (members and their support units) strengthen the operation of Monitoring Committees?

SE - NN no longer a member of the MC (It did used to be). There are still close working links between the MA and the NN on a lot of topics and types of activities.

FR - The NN is not formally a member of the National MC. Individual organisation's representatives can be members of both the national MC and NN

FR - there could usefully be stronger links between the MC(s) and the NN

In principle, MA(s) are keen to use NNs for informal MC members meetings and to disseminate info. Additional resource needed

DE - NN participates in National and Regional MCs.

FR - Governance of National MC is defined and quite separate to the NN. MC role is primarily 'institutional' (e.g. not usually very practical and/or informal things, e.g. field visits)

AT - NN is a member of the MC

AT NN is used to facilitate MA Thematic Groups on different topics (MC members can be members of the thematic groups)

AT (and several other MS) - NN is explicitly used by MA to **share information** to a range of stakeholders and the wider agricultural community

DE - Draft annual NN work programme is shared with the MC and MC can suggest changes /improvements

3)

How can Monitoring Committees more effectively influence CSP Implementation?

DE, AT - It is increasingly difficult to improve (through MCs and in other ways) CSP implementation due to increased complexity and bureaucracy

AT - Thematic Groups operate. NN facilitates these groups. TG Topics and members are decided by the MC

Observation - In practice, there are no major changes being made to CSPs, only very minor ones. So improving policy implementation is going to be limited and slow.

Typically (based on the EU Regulation), MC conclusions are just an opinion. So their rights are reduced. There are various feedback mechanisms; including, in principle, at least what actions have been taken as a result of MC recommendations). Such feedback is extremely important!

AT - now 50 organisations involved in MC. It is therefore very **difficult to effectively engage all the stakeholders**

Different MS take different approaches. In contrast to AT, in SE the number of members of the MC has reduced from over 40 to 18

IT - It would be useful to have more informal feedback and informal exchanges with MC members.