



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
EUROSTAT

Directorate E: Sectorial and regional statistics

Luxembourg, 31 January 2014

ESTAT/E1/PDM/ME/RF/ga

DOC. CPSA/716 - Available in EN only
*** Please note that paper copies of the documents will not be provided at the meeting***

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (CPSA)

7-8 NOVEMBER 2013

**STARTING ON 7 NOVEMBER AT 9:00 AM AND PLANNED TO FINISH
ON 8 NOVEMBER AT 1:00 PM**

**MEETING ROOM M6, JEAN MONET BUILDING
KIRCHBERG, LUXEMBOURG**

CHAired BY: MR. DÍAZ MUÑOZ

1.2. MINUTES*

Draft Minutes of the Standing Committee for Agricultural Statistics (CPSA)

7-8 November 2013

Introduction

The meeting was opened by Mr Pedro Díaz Muñoz, Director of Directorate E, who welcomed the participants and informed the CPSA on organisational issues of this meeting.

1. Items for approval / decision

1.1. Adoption of the agenda (Doc. CPSA/702)

The proposed draft agenda was approved.

1.2. Adoption of the minutes of the previous meeting (Doc. CPSA/701)

The draft minutes of the meeting of 6-7 May 2013 were presented for approval. The Spanish delegate asked for correcting the name of the Spanish Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment.

2. Issue for discussion and vote

No items.

3. Issues for discussion and opinion/decision

3.0. New list of characteristics for the sample survey 2016 (Doc. CPSA/703)

Introduction

The Commission has prepared a draft regulation on the list of characteristics for the FSS 2016. A proposal had been sent to the CPSA members in order to assess if a vote in the present CPSA meeting would be positive. The Commission had decided to postpone the vote and instead further discuss the issue.

Discussion

The Chair highlighted the need to take into account new data requests stemming from the revised CAP, consequently new items have been included while old ones are suggested to be dropped. He conceded that it is difficult to assess the change in the burden, but considers that the draft list is well balanced. He informed that there had been a discussion in the Partnership Group in September and that the opinions expressed had been taken into account. A draft Regulation had been prepared for a vote and the views of the Member States were asked in advance. As there was no clear majority to approve the proposed Commission Regulation, it was proposed to continue discussion on the revised list of characteristics. The Chair reminded that it would be a great failure if a change to the FSS 2016 list of characteristics is not achieved.

Eurostat informed the meeting that the vote should not be delayed to May, as timing is important. It would in that case be the new European Parliament that would have the possibility to scrutinize the draft regulation, but the three months period would start only when the new parliament assembles the first time. This would delay everything too much, a decision is needed long before May. The Chair suggested a written consultation instead, reminding also that this will ensure that it is still the CPSA that will have a comitology role.

DG AGRI supported the Chair, reminding the meeting that the FSS feeds not only the new needs of the CAP, but that the agricultural policy also regulates actions in DG ENV, DG CLIMA, DG REGIO, etc., and these actions need statistical data. The decision of the CPSA on this topic will decide on whether information will be available to future policies, not only

in agriculture. There is a need to go faster with this Regulation, as other ministries will take contact to ask for this kind of data.

Eurostat concluded that so far no clear qualified majority was achieved. It was clarified with the legal service on the legal mandate to adapt Annex III with variables that had initially been part of the Survey on Agricultural Production Methods (SAPM), i.e. Annex V of Reg. 1166/2008. Eurostat insisted that as the proposal must be sent to EP before 15 March not to be risking to be delayed until after the EP election. This would mean that the vote should take place before the end of December. From the comments received, Eurostat had identified three main categories of concern. (i) Clarification was given on the issues on common land and LFA, where the principle is that the present or earlier system would continue as before, no changes are suggested as such, just technical adaptations to the list to increase usefulness. (ii) Ecological Focus Areas: percentage bands could be discussed. (iii) On manure, tillage methods, Labour Force, Other Gainful Activities, irrigation: Eurostat does not see much room for changes.

Most participants asking for the floor supported the idea of changing the list of FSS variables for 2016, confirming the new needs that had emerged. They also supported the suggestion to vote for a new version in a written procedure. However, some issues would still need to be clarified or adapted, in order to reduce burden or otherwise simplify work. They related mainly to the RD measures where especially the pure forestry-related measures were identified as possible simplification, the questions on labour force in OGA, soil and manure topics, EFA, energy crops. There were also suggestions to verify the link between the labour force questions and their relation to other labour statistics (definitions, classification, etc.), the possibility of an integrated FADN and FSS, the legal constraints for allowing modular approach, the need to see analyses on SAPM.

Other issues brought up were the need for a better balance between costs and added value of the surveys, as costs are increasing all the time, the need for improved validation rules, the need to cooperate on the methodology to collect the new data. In addition some countries question the legal procedures: first of all the fact that Regulation 1166/2008 is being amended in three different processes, and secondly the question whether variables can be moved from Annex V to Annex III of the regulation.

Conclusion

The Chair concluded that all share the view that the list needs to be changed and the written voting procedure. Eurostat will make efforts to clarify the list, contact some countries, a new list for comments will be transmitted to the CPSA member mid-November, and hopes to send the proposal for vote in a forthcoming period. Eurostat reminded that the questions asked to farmers are not the same as list in Annex III, NSI's are free to formulate them how they want.

3.1. CPSA Seminar follow up actions and future plans *(Doc. CPSA/704)*

The Chair presented the seminar results, but stressed that this summary is not aimed at replacing the actual results of the groups that will be uploaded on Circabc.

Group 1 (Policies: Data needs for the European Agricultural Sector) concluded that there is a need to enhance the use of micro-data; use rather distributions than averages; to follow the supply chain and to keep in mind manifold agriculture (social/environment, business orientation).

Group 2 (Information: Different Spheres of Data Supply) discussed an integrated system of data sources, with a need for making inventories and screening, a gradual development, connecting the available information, considering the trade-offs in the systems, being aware that concept harmonisation is needed, the need for tools to extract data, the adequate handling of big data, and look beyond agriculture for data.

Group 3 (Agriculture: Scope of agriculture) presented ideas about the multi-functionality of agriculture, that professional farmers and households are potentially different universes that might require targeted surveys, and reminded that operational unit definitions differ in the MS.

Group 4 (Means: Changes in Data collection) stressed the need to enhance the use of administrative data, develop the legal and cooperation set up, to keep in mind the required start up investments. It also reiterated that cooperation is a virtuous circle, that work on the quality of basic data must continue, that consistency over time of concepts is necessary and that registers must be always maintained. It concluded that the three most important issues in this area are: “Identifiers”.

The Chair suggested a way forward with the main principle to minimise the actions by utilising the existing ones:

- (i) for an Integrated system of sources, the Work Programme 2015 and beyond (item 3.4 of the CPSA agenda) should be adapted;
- (ii) for improving the use of administrative data, the action plan from the IACS TF (item 3.3) need to be implemented with more methodological work;
- (iii) the issue of different universes of units (big/small) and different information needs might require a reflection from voluntary Member States with Commission support;
- (iv) the cooperation with DG AGRI is needed in discussion about a thinner wall between FADN and Agricultural Statistics.

In the discussion there was a plea from the JRC for a better use of the data collected at great expense. In addition there was an agreement that the results from the seminar need to be better reflected in the 2015 WP and beyond.

The Chair informed that the Partnership Group had suggested organising the seminar next year in a Member State to which Luxembourg replied that it would be ready to organise the first such seminar in collaboration with Eurostat.

3.2. Review of the CAP post 2013

Tassos Haniotis, Director DG AGRI-L, Economic analysis, Perspectives and evaluation, informed the group about the achieved review of the CAP for post 2013. In his presentation, he highlighted the main drivers of the CAP reform and the challenges for agriculture in the coming years. The observed challenges are driving the policy and reform objectives. Special attention was drawn to new greening architecture of the CAP, the new framework of the EU’s rural development policy as well as the new design of direct payments.

3.3. The outcome of TF on linkage administrative data with statistics (Doc. CPSA/705)

Introduction

A Task Force was set up by the CPSA in May 2012 to consider possibilities to use administrative sources, in particular IACS and FADN, for statistical purposes. The Task Force was hosted by AGRI and co-chaired with Eurostat in three meetings: 22 October 2012, 20 February 2013 and 8 October 2013 (with Payment Agencies representatives in the two last meetings). Eurostat has mapped the use of administrative data in agricultural statistics, showing that ca 24% of the FSS data will come from other sources than statistical questionnaires in 2013. As a whole the IACS is the most used source, but also the bovine and other animal registers, organic farming registers and other registers are used quite much. There are still several countries that don’t use any other sources for their data collection.

Eurostat and DG AGRI have prepared a document on the concepts and definitions in FSS, annual crop stats and IACS. Analyses show there are certain differences between FSS and IACS that reflect high discrepancies in some results (examples: number of farms, agricultural area), so while a full integration of concepts between IACS and agricultural statistics is not possible or even desirable, a deeper alignment of concepts must be pursued and the reasons for the differences should be explained.

The Task Force focussed on three broad areas of the use of administrative data: 1) Access to administrative sources and inter-institutional relations; 2) Statistical methods (linking, etc.); and 3) Quality of data produced using administrative sources, where 3.1) the quality of input administrative data, 3.2) the quality of the process of converting administrative data into statistics and 3.3) the quality of output based entirely or partially on administrative sources were discussed the most.

The conclusions of the TF are: the use of administrative data can reduce burden and increase quality of agricultural statistics, but in order to do this some minimum requirements must be filled: (i) NSI's must have access to IACS, (ii) concepts need to be better harmonised, and (iii) it is necessary explain how concepts differ and their impact on data. Administrative data may be used for: (i) Setting up and maintaining statistical farm registers, (ii) Replacing survey data from statistical questionnaires, and (iii) Validating and checking statistical data. The solutions must take into account differences between countries and must take note that the use of administrative sources is broader than IACS, with many other sources to be considered.

Some short term actions have been identified. (i) Work on concepts and definitions to continue in collaboration between Eurostat and DG AGRI, with support from Member States, perhaps with an expert group with members from 2-3 countries, (ii) the existing overlap between administrative registers and statistical sources, both of units and common variables must be mapped, (iii) the reasons for differences between IACS and agricultural statistics must be assessed, (iv) there will be Eurostat grants to start up or improve, describe best practices and assist other countries, (v) improve the communication and promotion efforts coordinated at EU and country level and collaboration with farmers unions to seek their support to promote national use of administrative sources. In addition, (vi) it should be identified the reasons why did certain countries not use administrative data in FSS 2010 or 2013 and consequently (vii) improve data exchange within national systems, governance issues, organisation of information flows, development of data transmission processes, including IT.

In the long term, it should be developed legislative proposals that provide the necessary alignment of concepts and encourage more explicitly the use of administrative sources and introduce a unique, common identifier in all national systems for 2020 for better linking administrative and statistical systems.

Discussion

The meeting participants welcomed the results of the Task Force, stressing the importance of continuing the work, ensuring that the actions are included both in the short term and long term Work Programmes. Some mentioned that the information on the use of administrative data in their systems was not presented in the right way, as systems were built in specific ways or because the information was used not to feed the data but for other purposes, such data validation. The costs of participating in TF and Expert Group meetings need to be considered, and it would perhaps be better to organise them back-to-back with other meetings.

There were also some warnings of not being too optimistic, as admin data are collected for certain purposes, which means that the population is often skewed with only support receivers or other kinds of units. Under-coverage or under-declaration are other important issue to take into account. Thus the use of admin data should not be the goal, but good use of available data.

Structural issues can explain the failure to use administrative registers by countries, for instance the size. In addition there is a risk that data are lost if surveys are not carried out, as administrative registers don't contain all required information, and they cannot be added due to the high response burden this would entail.

Conclusions

The Commission will, in collaboration with Member States, further analyse the results of the discussion and carry out the actions identified.

3.4. Agricultural statistics work programme

(Doc. CPSA/706)

The chair presented the outline for future developments in agricultural and fisheries statistics with a strategic setting for 2015 and the following years. It covered notably the need for revision of the design and roadmap towards a new legislative framework for agricultural and fisheries statistics for 2020 and onwards. Proposed actions in this field are mainly the launch of discussions with stakeholders (i.e. producers, users of statistics) on the need for new

generation of legal acts and their scope. Specific proposals for those discussions are expected to be on the table for the next CPSA meeting planned end April 2014.

Several delegates intervened and welcomed the proposed strategy to look to the future of agricultural and fisheries statistics highlighting the need to make clear distinction between short term and medium to long term perspectives. It is therefore important to plan the developments a number of years in advance. Attention should be paid on how legislation on agriculture and fisheries statistics can be made more coherent and simplified. Important issues to be addressed seem notably: (a) Use of administrative data/registers in producing statistics; (b) Scope of agriculture, universe, definition of units; (c) Re-design of the farm structure survey from 2020 onwards, analysis of need for census and feasibility to use unique identification number to cover new needs and to keep burden on respondents reasonable; (d) Linkage between different data flows in agricultural statistics, (for example structure data with production data) (e) Examination of the regional detail needed; (f) The practicability of Geo-referencing in farm structure survey; (g) The setting up of a legal framework extended to some high priority data currently collected on voluntary basis; (h) Coherence of agricultural data to forestry, Land use/land cover, environmental, energy statistics as well as Farm Accounting Data Network (FADN) results.

The chair concluded that several issues raised in the fruitful discussion need to be addressed in an appropriate way avoiding opening too many issues and given the limited resources available. It was decided to start reflections on the future for agricultural and fisheries statistics among the lines described in the proposed document by developing a strategy on how the future of the concerned statistics can be addressed. Eurostat will elaborate a document for discussion at the next CPSA meeting which will outline options for a possible common architecture for agriculture and fisheries statistics as well as the key issues which have to be addressed.

3.5. Implementation of Regulation 1185/2009 concerning statistics on pesticides, as regards transmission format *(Doc. CPSA/707)*

According to Article 3(3) of Regulation 1185/2009 on pesticide statistics Eurostat shall fix the format for transmitting the pesticide data in the regulatory procedure. Two sets of pesticide statistics shall be transmitted to Eurostat at different intervals: The data of placing on the market of pesticides (i.e. sales data) shall be transmitted annually, while the statistics on the agricultural use of pesticides of the 5-year period 2010-2014 shall be transmitted to Eurostat within 12 months of the end of the five year period. Implementing regulation 408/2011 contains the transmission standards for the pesticide sales statistics as Eurostat considered that taking a decision on the transmission format for 2015 already in 2010 on use data would be premature and likely to cause problems. Eurostat is now proposing to adapt the format for the sales statistics and to fix the format for the sales statistics. Some considerations should be taken into account: (i) SDMX is the standard tool for data transmission in the ESS, (ii) Eurostat has developed voluntary eDAMIS web forms for easy transmission of the pesticide sales statistics, but countries can choose to create SDMX files and transmit them through eDAMIS if they so wish, (iii) The pesticide use statistics are too complex for web forms so SDMX files must be used, (iv) Eurostat suggests using for the crops the same codes that are used for crop production statistics. The regulation is planned to be brought for opinion to the ESSC meeting in May 2014.

Several countries asked why the annexes don't mention specifically "active substances" but only "substances", which they consider not appropriate and why the confidentiality flag is not a "c" instead of "yes/no". In addition, an error in the third whereas was pointed out. Countries asked why the draft says that the data shall be provided to the Commission (Eurostat) through the single entry point services or the data should be made available for retrieval by the Commission (Eurostat) by electronic means, as in earlier drafts only the single entry point was mentioned.

Eurostat thanked for identifying the errors that shall be corrected and the comments that will be taken into account when drafting the final version.

3.6. Activities of the working groups in agricultural statistics

(Doc. CPSA/708)

Eurostat presented the outcome and progress made in meetings on agriculture, fisheries as well as land use and land cover statistics since the last CPSA meeting.

The Farm Structure Survey WG was held in June. The main issues discussed were the list of characteristics 2016 – Annex III of Reg 1166/2008 (see item 3.0), the draft Regulation financial framework 2014-2018 (see item 4.1) and the improvements of the validation process for the FSS results.

The Working Group on agri-environmental indicators met in September in a meeting focussing on pesticide statistics only. The meeting discussed (i) the Draft Regulation for amending Commission Regulation (EU) N° 408/2011 (see item 3.5), (ii) the treatment of confidentiality in pesticides sales data that are handled differently in depending on Member State and data source, and the related issues on thresholds – and dominance rules, (iii) the set-up of a Task force on statistical confidentiality for pesticides statistics and (iv) the quality reports for use/sales pesticides data. The CPSA was asked to give its approval on the two last points. No suggestions not to set up a Task Force or to approve the quality reports were brought forward by the CPSA meeting, which means that both proposals were accepted.

The Crop Statistics Working Group met back-to-back to the Task Force in October 2013. The meeting discussed (i) preliminary conclusions of the Annual crop statistics Task Force meeting held on the previous day (simplification of the voluntary data collection, composition of aggregates, streamlining the data flow and some special cases), (ii) Orchard survey 2012, (iii) Draft of the 2nd Quality Report for the Annual Crop Statistics (2014 reporting round) and (iv) plan for the preparations of the vineyard structural statistics collection in 2015. Eurostat reminded that the 2015 collection on structural statistics on vineyards is based on (Regulation 1337/201) where it is stated (Art 3(4)) that the primary data source is the vineyard register. However, if needed this data could be supplemented by data from other sources. Eurostat will analyse the specific needs, level of detail and collection methods for structural data on orchards and vineyards with the view to the surveys beyond 2020 in a broader context.

The Working Group on Fisheries statistics met in October 2013. The main issues discussed were (i) the latest developments on the CFP and the Data Collection – Multi-Annual Programme (DC-MAP) 2014-2020 which finally is fixed for next three years 2014 to 2016, (ii) the 2013 quality report to the European Parliament and the Council on landings statistics was presented before its submission to the Commission for approval (iii) compliance and in particular the non-respect of deadlines or sub-optimal data quality and (iv) catch data collection redesign.

3.7. Progress report on land rents and prices

(Doc. CPSA/709)

Introduction

Eurostat informed the SCAS members on the latest developments regarding the data collection for agricultural land prices and rents and provision based on a common target methodology. The presentation dealt with three main issues:

- situation of data sets at the time of the meeting,
- situation of both the on-going grant developments and the envisaged grant agreements on land prices and rents, and
- outcome of the circular note on a possible ESS agreement, sent by Eurostat in September 2013.

Regarding the situation in Member States not under the grant agreement, eight countries have transmitted figures and one has announced them. Out of eight Member States beneficiaries of the 2011 grant agreement, six have already transmitted data and two have announced them. Finally for 2013 grant agreements, six countries applied, of which two have already transmitted figures. The deadline for grant application was the end of September 2013. The evaluation of the six applications is being finalised and feedback will be provided to all the countries concerned. The CPSA will be informed in due course.

As regards the circular note on a possible ESS agreement, 13 Member States and 2 Non-member States replied. Out of these fifteen, 9 were in favour, 2 not in favour and 4 expressed reserves. Several reasons for the positions taken were provided and explained by Eurostat in the meeting.

After recognising Eurostat's efforts, the representative of DG-AGRI recalled the repeated appeals previously made to the SCAS highlighting the utmost importance of these data for the decision-making, in particular bearing in mind the new CAP, and as a base-line for policy assessment. He asked about the availability of data in Eurobase, drawing attention to the fact that the latest data published were for 2009, even taking into account the difficulties involved in achieving an average price for countries. In the view of DG-AGRI, no other arrangement than a legal act would work.

Summary discussion (ten interventions from MS)

Several Member States explained their position, especially when they were not in favour of the proposed agreement. Some Member States promised to continue sending data while the discussion continued, however another stated that data might no longer be provided unless a legal base was put in place. Certain Member States announced methodological developments at the national level and discussed the pertinence of data sources, in particular FADN for rent data. Some Member States stated that the methodology was not mature and should be discussed further in the corresponding Working Party.

After the round of interventions, Eurostat expressed disappointment about the reaction to the proposed agreement. It was clear that the data were sensitive and a careful approach would be needed, but the continuing discussion on a gentlemen's agreement after five years was surprising. Concerning the framework of having more formal agreement, what Eurostat is proposing is a more formal step, but it should be decided whether the SCAS wants to go to this formal agreement or to the Council and Parliament. Concerning FADN, even though it is a useful instrument, it is not sufficiently representative for certain countries. The DG-AGRI representative insisted on the urgent need for these figures. If progress could not be made by the May 2014 meeting of the CPSA, DG-AGRI would have to devise another mechanism to get this information.

Conclusion

The Chair warned against "playing ping-pong", even though progress had been made in the domain to obtain the information. The SCAS should accept that the project is important and this progress achieved has to be continued, so he encouraged Member States to submit data. The ESS agreement is an important instrument that is foreseen and included in the Regulations, but if there is not complete agreement, it does not make sense that only some of the countries sign this agreement. In this case, the only resort would be a legal act covering agricultural price statistics, including land prices and rents. Finally, there was a mandate for Eurostat to report back to the Working Party to be held in December 2013.

3.8. Timeliness and compliance assessment

(Doc. CPSA/710)

Eurostat presented an overview of the current state of regulatory compliance by Member State, describing the progress made since the last CPSA meeting and outlining a number of persistent incompliance issues. The importance of respecting transmission deadlines was stressed, as the statistics published on Eurostat's dissemination database rely almost entirely on the data reported by Member States. It is therefore crucial to get data in a timely and complete manner, in order to be able to fulfil user needs and to produce analytical publications. Member States were reminded about Eurostat's approach to deal with non-compliance and requested to propose remedial actions for outstanding data submission (delays and gaps) and to provide their opinion on the way compliance criteria (availability, completeness, timeliness and quality) are measured. Eurostat presented as well the on-going work of an internal taskforce which aims to review the monitoring method and to improve transparency, objectivity and the reliability of the compliances evaluation exercise.

Concerning the on-going work of the task force, DE pointed out that too elaborated theoretical concepts are not feasible in practice. Furthermore overemphasizing punctuality in

evaluation of compliance makes not much sense as data might be sent at the deadlines but followed by a number of revisions afterwards. However, DE encouraged Eurostat to continue to report on eventual outstanding or incomplete data deliveries, by providing an overview together with the actions taken so far as a basis for constructive discussions (e.g. about the reasons behind) in CPSA, WG and so on. For those data collections where incompliance problems appear more often (Structure of Hatcheries and Milk), Eurostat should rather re-exam the structure of its supply tables.

DG AGRI referred to the usefulness of the compliance document and asked whether an automation of updating the evaluation exists.

EE and SE suggested associating the datasets to the names of the respective WebForms together with the deadlines, on the evaluation sheet.

BE expressed the opinion that the compliance overview provided so far is a valuable instrument, whereas the review of the monitoring method is considered useful for Eurostat to analyse whether there are general problems connected to the single datasets.

CZ underlined the importance of the compliance evaluation document and encouraged Eurostat to submit it also to the ESS comity.

Eurostat promised, for the next assessment exercise, to list the names of WebForm together with deadlines on the evaluation overview. To DG AGRI's request Eurostat responded that a report on timeliness of data transmissions could easily be drawn from eDAMIS but there are currently no tools available which automatically generate information about completeness or quality of the received data files.

The chair highlighted that Eurostat will continue to address outstanding or incomplete data deliveries to the CPSA and take actions regarding the analysis of "problematic" datasets.

4. Issues mainly for discussion and information

4.1. Financial framework for farm structure surveys for the period 2014 to 2018 (Doc. CPSA/711)

Eurostat inform the CPSA that the proposal for a Regulation of the Council and of the EP amending Regulation (EC) N° 1166/20087 on farm structure surveys and the survey on agricultural production methods as regards the financial framework for the period 2014 to 2018 had been discussed by the ESSC in September, and had received an positive opinion. It had been transmitted to the European Parliament and Council the week of the CPSA meeting and was expected to be discussed in December in Council, and in parallel in the EP.

4.2. State of art implications Lisbon Treaty

Eurostat informed the CPSA about the effects of PRAC - Lisbon treaty on the legislation for agricultural and fisheries statistics; the on-going discussion in the Council and in the EP concerning the Omnibus I draft Regulation and proposed strategy to align the FSS legislation. The group was, informed that the discussion on the submitted draft legislation "Omnibus I" was well advanced in Council and EP and conclusive text expected to be finalised and published before the end of the year. It was explained as well that the FSS alignment is covered by another draft Commission Regulation in a broader context of PRAC alignment.

4.3. Developments at international level

Eurostat gave an overview of progress made on cooperation with international organisations such as the UN and FAO, especially concerning the improvement of the coordination of data collection activities and methodological developments.

Eurostat has planned, at the end of November, a study visit of 2 weeks at FAO. The purpose of the visit is to explore the areas where cooperation could progress further with a focus on short and middle term actions for reducing burden and improving data quality. After the

visit, a protocol for further cooperation could be agreed as well as concrete actions for the short and middle term.

A grant agreement on the inventory and mapping of agricultural data flows sent to Eurostat and international organisations is about to be signed between Eurostat and 4 EU countries (AT, HU, LT, LV). The outcome of this work should, in the next 2 years, give more visibility on multiple reporting of similar data and may be used as another input to reduce burden linked to data transmissions.

Additionally, Eurostat informed on the ICAS VI conference in Rio de Janeiro, stating that Eurostat co-organised part of the conference, and chaired two of the sessions. Three CPSA member organisations were also represented at the conference and gave presentations there. Eurostat considered the conference well organised with good presentations covering several areas. They showed that Eurostat and MS could learn from other countries and regions, there is a clear risk that Europe could lag behind. On the other hand, the model for the future FSS with modules and satellites were mentioned in the conference by many participants as a good tool for future developments. Still, European problems are small in relation to what e.g. Africa experiences. Eurostat also presented the last news on implementing the Global Strategy of Agricultural Statistics. The link to the conference website with the presentations and articles is: <http://eventos.ibge.gov.br/en/icas2013/programa-da-conferencia/programa-detalhado>.

4.4. Financial decision 2014

The CPSA was informed on the proposals of financing of cooperation between Commission and Member States in agricultural and fisheries domains in 2014. It was explained that the financial decision has been prepared but still waiting for approval. Planned grants for 2014 cover: (a) pilot data collection on eggs for consumption; (b) further investigation on data validation in animal production statistics in the framework of VIP validation project; (c) investigations through pilot studies for improving and further development of agro-environmental statistics and (d) use of administrative data sources and pilot studies in the framework of the administrative data sources – statistics linkage.

4.5. ESSC meeting *(Docs. CPSA/712 and CPSA 713)*

The chair informed the group on the outcome of the latest ESSC meeting which took place in September 2013 and introduced a draft document on internal rules of procedure for director Groups. CPSA members were asked to provide eventual comments on this draft proposal for internal rules of director Groups and further discussion on this document is planned at the next CPSA meeting.

4.6. Report of the last CPSA Partnership Group meeting *(Doc. CPSA/714)*

The outcome of the meeting of the CPSA Partnership group held on 12th September 2013 will be presented. Minutes of this Partnership group will be made available in CIRCABC after approval by the participants of the CPSA partnership group. It was decided as well that Barbara Kutin-Slatnar would be replaced by Theodora Smerdzhieva as from 1 January 2014. The chair thanked Barbara for her very cooperative and active support to the CPSA partnership group over the last years.

4.7. Meeting schedule 2014 *(Doc. CPSA/715)*

Eurostat presented the updated dates of meetings of the CPSA, Working Groups and Task Forces for 2014. The meeting plan would be made available in CIRCABC and delegates were reminded to inform Eurostat in time of changes in delegates appointed for the meetings as well as eventual requests for interpretation request to be made available in the meetings. The latter requests have to be addressed at least 6 months before the planned concerned meetings to Eurostat, Directorate E.

5. Any other business

5.1. **Data requirements for GHG emissions: coordination with DG**

There have been repeated requests from members of the CPSA to know more about how the GHG emission data collection might potentially affect the agricultural statistics. The impact can be quite big, especially as the IPCC guidelines go into very detailed reporting requirements, and they have not been set up taking existing statistical frameworks into consideration. Eurostat has therefore taken up this issue in the hearing with DG CLIMA and in a follow-up meeting with experts from DG CLIMA and JRC.

Needs arising under Decision 529/2013 (Land cover, land use, forestry, LULUCF): Agriculture straddles both “agricultural sector” and LULUCF as part of the emissions – especially from livestock – are considered coming of agriculture, on the other hand especially cropland and grazing land management related emissions are part of LULUCF. Member States need baseline data for 1990 and 2005 for the mandatory activities afforestation, reforestation, deforestation and forest management. Reporting on cropland and grazing land is new for the period 2013-2020. The first report is due in 2015, starting with 2013.

Overview of needs arising under the Mechanism for Monitoring and Reporting (MMR), Reg. 525/2013: MMR covers all GHG reporting including LULUCF. The EEA is working on this for CLIMA. A review team of international experts checks the countries’ data; they decide when the data are final (acceptable). The team compares the data with international databases (FAO, not Eurostat). Countries can insist on using their own data or Eurostat data. Not all national compilers are aware of which data at the FAO are acceptable and which are not. Eurostat is trying to improve collaboration with FAO, to avoid overlapping activities and to ensure comparable data. The international reviewers had suggested that the EU bring together the two groups, compilers and statisticians, and to use the ESTAT data to check the activity data in MMR. Conclusion: the emission compilers and statisticians should be brought together to promote collaboration and increase quality. The case of fertiliser statistics where national discussion groups had been set up to improve data availability and quality, with good results could be a good example.

Specific issues on Agriculture inventory/accounting: Good collaboration already in place with Eurostat and other EC services. Much of the data needed were already collected in the SAPM of 2010, admittedly the variables could have been even better formulated. The most important information relates to grazing (time, hours per day, common land, etc.), grass yields and cuts, manure management systems, animal characterisation, feed mixes, fertilisers, rice cultivation. FAO has recently launched a database on GHG emissions, using their own data for calculating the emission per country. The work is based on Tier 1. JRC suggested that Eurostat could build its own GHG database. However, the EU covers countries with a Tier 3 approach, while FAO only uses Tier 1 – this would mean big problems to keep track of data. In any case, EEA is responsible for EU level data collection except for those related to LULUCF.

Specific issues on forest statistics (definitions, other): Eurostat will have a TF to review the two IIEAF tables on forest area and wood stocks on 13-14 November. The FAO definitions are the starting point, though they are not always used by the MS. Eurostat wants to have detailed annual estimates of the real changes, not the smoothed 5-yearly data provided to FAO or the smoothed changes required by LULUCF that needs to look at the changes, but also needs baseline data, as most MS also. CLIMA supports data harmonisation and transformations based on the existing definitions, including for data for biomass and bioenergy.

LUCAS, 2015 (and further) soil carbon needs as well as other LU/LC data: 2012 results were published last week for aggregated data. Some inconsistencies were found with the 2009 data, which are being resolved. LUCAS is not appropriate for monitoring changes at lower regional scales. Some types of LC could be turned into parameters, e.g. wetlands, because of the fluctuation of the water level, for example in wet forests. CLIMA intends to

provide funds to LUCAS 2015. Their special interest is in soils, where an EU baseline is needed for LULUCF (and for some MS as a last resort).

Meeting participants reported on the UN working groups on improving GHG emissions, stressing that Eurostat needs to continue working with CLIMA. The costs for improving GHG emissions can be very high, but data remain still quite uncertain despite efforts.

There were some comments on LUCAS. Some countries want to discuss the issue again in the CPSA and were not happy with soil tests to be included in LUCAS 2015.

Eurostat confirmed that there are no plans to calculate GHG emissions in Eurostat, this is a task for the EEA. A good dialogue is needed between statisticians and compliers, the CPSA must see how support this. Eurostat reminded that LUCAS was discussed in the May CPSA meeting, and that the LUCAS strategy now to be presented to the ESSC has been presented earlier in CPSA and Dimesa. The soil samples are not done by Eurostat, but by the JRC, Eurostat just includes a part on this topic in the contracts. National soil samples would be OK, if the sampling follows the LUCAS methodology.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

BE	Institut National de Statistique
BG	Ministry of Agriculture and Food
CZ	Czech Statistical Office
DK	Statistics Denmark
DE	Statistisches Bundesamt, Zweigstelle Bonn Statistisches Amt für Hamburg und Schleswig-Holstein Bundesministerium für Ernährung, Landwirtschaft und Verbraucherschutz (BMELV)
IE	Central Statistical Office of Ireland
EL	Hellenic Statistical Authority (EL.STAT.)
EE	Statistical Office of Estonia Ministry of Agriculture
ES	Instituto Nacional de Estadística Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente
FR	Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la pêche
IS	Statistics Iceland
HR	Central Bureau of Statistics of the Republic of Croatia
IT	ISTAT
CY	Excused
LV	Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia
LT	Statistics Lithuania
LU	STATEC Service d'Economie Rurale
MT	National Statistics Office
HU	Hungarian Central Statistical Office Ministry of Rural Development
NL	Statistics Netherlands Ministry of Economic Affairs
NO	Statistics Norway
AT	Statistik Österreich Bundesministerium für Land- und Forstwirtschaft, Umwelt und Wasserwirtschaft
PL	Central Statistical Office
PT	Instituto Nacional de Estatística
RO	National Institute of Statistics
SK	Excused
SI	Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia
FI	Information Centre of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
SE	Statistics Sweden Jordbruksverket (Swedish Board of Agriculture)
CH	Excused
UK	DEFRA
TR	Turkish Statistical Institute
AL	INSTAT Institute of Statistics, Albania
BA	BHAS - Agency for Statistics of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FIS)
KS	Kosovo Agency of Statistics
MK	Excused
ME	Statistical Office of Montenegro (MONSTAT)
RS	Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia