



## AGENDA

- Report from the 42nd Conference of Directors of EU Paying Agencies held in Estonia – Mr. Ahti Bleive (EE)
- Report from the Learning Network – Mr. Anders Egonson (SWE)
- “ECA response to proposals for a reformed CAP: from Briefing Paper to Opinion” – Mr. Peter Welch, Ms. Charlotta Torneling (ECA)
- The CAP post 2020 – the future of Food and Farming – Ms. Christina Borchmann (EC)
- Update on the Single Audit approach - Ms. Christina Borchmann (EC)
- Update on the activities of unit D3 – Mr. Owen Jones (EC)
- Implementation of the regulation regarding the active farmer test – Mr. Michal Cooper (UK)
- Opportunities for the future based upon the collective approach in NL – Mr. Arie van der Greft (NL)

## AGENDA

- Workshop 1 “IT tools for automation in Non-IACS based measures”

Chairman: Mr. Pedro Ribeiro (PT), Mr. Atanas Atanassov (BG), Ms. Mariell Jõesalu (EE)

“IT tools for automation in Non-IACS based measures”, Estonia

“Constitution of the IFAP team”, Portugal

- Workshop 2 “Reasonableness of cost and simplified cost options”

Chairman: Ms. Giedrė Puidokienė (LT), Ms. Desislava Trifonova (BG), Ms. Eva Roselieb (AU)

“Reasonableness of cost and simplified cost options”, Lithuania

- Workshop 3 “Practical use of the Monitoring approach”

Chairman Mr. Larry Cashman, Ms. Rositsa Ivanova (BG), Mr. Stanislav Rosnev (BG)

“Practical use of the Monitoring approach - Questionnaire summary and results”, Bulgaria & Ireland

### Workshop 1 “IT tools for automation in Non-IACS based measures”

#### Challenges:

- Individual approach is often needed for RD measures
- Unique decision/design - to use automatization and exchange information between different databases

#### Conclusions:

- Simplified rules are key for automation
- Stable long-term legislation
- Cooperation from other government bodies and agencies

Estonia have a great successes in automated controls in control phase and Portugal, also.

## Workshop 2 “Reasonableness of cost and simplified cost options”

### **Outcome on SCO**

- Most used type of SCO – standard scale of unit costs
- Challenges in setting up SCO
  - costly to implement
  - hard to summarize the incoming information
  - administration burden
- Validation of SCO

## Workshop 2 “Reasonableness of cost and simplified cost options”

### **Outcome on RoC**

- Sources used to determine RoC
  - data based on historical information
  - Internet
  - commercial offers
  - wide range of other sources
- Challenges faced in setting up RoC
  - identify reliable sources of information
  - involving the producers/suppliers
- Financial corrections – is there a way to be avoided?

## Workshop 2 “Reasonableness of cost and simplified cost options”

### **Conclusions**

- Financial corrections – is there a way to be avoided?
  - commercial offers need to be comparable
  - if reimbursed not at the lowest price, there should be a proof of estimation
  - connection between the beneficiary and any one of the three suppliers
- SCO and RoC are useful tools that lead to savings

## Workshop 3 “Practical use of the Monitoring approach”

### **Question:**

1. How do we manage challenges in implementing monitoring?

### **Conclusions:**

- \* Challenges as outlined do exist.
- \* MS do have concerns regarding cost, expertise, timing and implementation process
- \* But above all MS are concerned regarding the unknown – need better understanding of where Monitoring is going.

### Workshop 3 “Practical use of the Monitoring approach”

**Question:**

2. How do we manage the limitations of monitoring?

**Conclusions:**

- \* Accept of existence of limitations and work within same.
- \* Identify which areas are suitable for monitoring and start with same.
- \* Prove the concept and use this as a foundation to expand use of monitoring.
- \* This will then identify areas where monitoring will not work and allow exploration of alternate methodology – LPIS, GeoTag, etc.

### Workshop 3 “Practical use of the Monitoring approach”

**Question:**

3. How do we define best approach to implementing Tolerance Levels, Status Levels and Periods of Operating?

**Conclusions:**

- \* Too many variables in play – Start with broad bands as a baseline and don't worry (at this point) on improving level of assurance.
- \* If level of assurance in monitoring area is at 80% then this is accepted – as a base for year one.
- \* Need for pilot – Business case should be submitted outlining requirement and deliverables from same.

### Workshop 3 “Practical use of the Monitoring approach”

#### Question:

4. How do we manage large volumes of Red and Yellow / Orange Flags?

#### Conclusions :

\* Red is Red = one notification to farmer – if no action = cut payment

\* Yellow/Orange - Sample and transition period for rest – if after 1 year there is no action then cut payment and retrospect.

\* Pilot is needed for the level of Sample – area, number of parcels, payment????

### Workshop 3 “Practical use of the Monitoring approach”

#### Question:

5. At what volume threshold does monitoring become non-viable?

#### Conclusions:

\* Cost is important – Monitoring must be cost efficient.

\* If costs are greater than current system then monitoring is not viable.

\* If decision is taken not to FV due to increasing costs then possible reputational risk for MS and EU.

### Workshop 3 “Practical use of the Monitoring approach”

**Question:**

6. How do we reduce the costs and administrative burden resultant from monitoring.

**Conclusions:**

- \* MS and Commission /JRC work together, share experiences and algorithms from pilots, common approach and methodology – delivering a single algorithm/software for use by all.
- \* Transition period for yellow /orange parcels.
- \* Involve farmers – Email, SMS, Text, etc. (cost efficient) buy in from farmer from shown benefits.

