

INFORMATION FICHE NO 13

COMMON RESULT INDICATORS FOR THE EMFF 2021 – 2027

September 2019

RELEVANT PROVISIONS IN THE DRAFT LEGISLATION

Regulation	Provisions
CPR Proposal	Article 37

This document is based on the text of the adopted EMFF proposal. It is a provisional text, without prejudice to on-going discussions. This series of fiches is intended to guide Member States, explaining and elaborating the text of the proposal.

OBJECTIVE OF THIS FICHE

This fiche provides a detailed list of the proposed common result indicators, and their definitions. These titles and definitions are the product of several rounds of discussions in EMFF expert groups and dedicated workshops. A full description of all aspects of the monitoring and evaluation approach is set out in Information Fiche 11 Version II, and its annexes (June 2019). The indicators presented here replace the earlier versions in Fiche 11.

LEGAL BASIS

Article 37 of the Commission's CPR proposal:

Transmission of data

1. *The managing authority shall electronically transmit to the Commission cumulative data for each programme by 31 January, 31 March, 31 May, 31 July, 30 September and 30 November of each year in accordance with the template set out in Annex VII.*

The first transmission shall be due by 31 January 2022 and the last one by 31 January 2030.

For programmes under Article 4(1)(c)(vii) of the ESF+ Regulation, data shall be transmitted annually by 30 November.

2. *The data shall be broken down for each priority by specific objective and by category of regions, and shall refer to:*

the number of selected operations, their total eligible cost, the contribution from the Funds and the total eligible expenditure declared by the beneficiaries to the managing authority, all broken down by types of intervention;

the values of output and result indicators for selected operations and values achieved by operations.

3. *For financial instruments data shall also be provided on the following:*

- (a) *eligible expenditure by type of financial product;*
- (b) *amount of management costs and fees declared as eligible expenditure;*
- (c) *the amount, by type of financial product, of private and public resources mobilised in addition to the Funds;*
- (d) *interest and other gains generated by support from the Funds to financial instruments referred to in Article 54 and resources returned attributable to support from the Funds as referred to in Article 56.*

4. *The data submitted in accordance with this Article shall be reliable and up-to-date as of the end of the month preceding the month of submission.*

5. *The managing authority shall publish all the data transmitted to the Commission on the website referred to in Article 44(1).*

6. *For programmes supported by the EMFF, the Commission shall adopt an implementing act in accordance with the advisory procedure referred to in Article 109(2) in order to establish the*

template to be used for the implementation of this Article.

Article 39 of the Commission’s CPR proposal:

Evaluations by the Member State

1. *The managing authority shall carry out evaluations of the programme. Each evaluation shall assess the programme’s effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence and EU added value with the aim to improve the quality of the design and implementation of programmes.*
2. *In addition, the managing authority shall carry out an evaluation for each programme to assess its impact by 30 June 2029.*
3. *The managing authority shall entrust evaluations to functionally independent experts.*
4. *The managing authority or the Member State shall ensure the necessary procedures to produce and collect the data necessary for evaluations.*
5. *The managing authority or the Member State shall draw up an evaluation plan. That evaluation plan may cover more than one programme. For the AMIF, the ISF and the BMVI, that plan shall include a mid-term evaluation to be completed by 31 March 2024.*
6. *The managing authority shall submit the evaluation plan to the monitoring committee no later than one year after the approval of the programme.*
7. *The managing authority shall publish all evaluations on the website referred to in Article 44(1).*

Article 40 of the Commission’s CPR proposal:

Evaluation by the Commission

1. *The Commission shall carry out a mid-term evaluation to examine the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence and EU added value of each Fund by the end of 2024. The Commission may make use of all relevant information already available in accordance with Article [128] of the Financial Regulation.*
2. *The Commission shall carry out a retrospective evaluation to examine the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence and EU added value of each Fund by 31 December 2031.*

APPROACH

The objective of the common result indicators is to capture the outputs and results of EMFF investment. They will be used for evaluating the impact of the EU budget on making the sector sustainable, supporting economic growth, improving the social contribution of the sector, and protecting the environment.

The scope of the indicators presented in Table 1 is broad, as illustrated by their detailed definitions in Annex I of this fiche. The indicator titles are intended for inclusion in a delegated act, with the accompanying definitions in a working paper. Every operation, under

both shared and direct management, should be associated with at least one indicator. With this approach, all EMFF investments can be measured, compared, and aggregated across programmes to EU level.

In order to keep the list of indicators concise, each indicator may include several more specific aspects, each representing small areas of expenditure of particular policy interest. The detailed information captured at operation level and reported in Infosys allows common indicator values to be broken down to provide detailed information on individual aspects of the policy. This approach avoids the necessity for programme-specific indicators.

SELECTING APPROPRIATE INDICATORS

At programme level, at least one common result indicator should be selected for each area of support. The choice of indicator(s) is the decision of the Member State. The indicator(s) which best describe the objectives of the programme should be selected. If, for example, the programme prioritises the improvement of environmental or social circumstances, it is unlikely that the volume or value of production will be impacted. In this case, the Member State should not select volume or value but should choose appropriate environmental and social indicators for their areas of support.

MINIMUM BURDEN

Milestones and target values for the indicators selected should be set in the programme. No further calculation or aggregation of indicator values is expected from the Member States for the remainder of the period. To keep administrative burden to a minimum, the indicator values will be automatically calculated by the Commission, based on the Infosys data submitted by the Member State.

Upon submission of Infosys, three automatically completed tables will be returned to the Member State in the format set out in Annex VII of the CPR (Table 1 on financial data, Table 3 on output indicators, and Table 6 on result indicators). The data in the tables will be checked to remove errors and instances of double counting, and aggregated to the level of specific objective. The Member State should then verify and deliver the tables provided through the SFC interface to meet the reporting obligations of Article 37 of the CPR.

The lowest administrative burden can be achieved by configuring the IT system of the Managing Authority to generate reports in the Infosys format on demand. Submission of the Infosys report will automatically prepare the data to be reported under Article 37 of the CPR.

NOMENCLATURE

The use of percentages, and terms such as “increase in X” or “decrease in Y” are avoided to reduce errors. Beneficiaries should report actual values. When aggregated to the level of indicators at MS or EU level by the Commission, the values relate to the results achieved by beneficiaries with EMFF financing, and can be isolated for analysis and evaluation and contrast with other non-EMFF beneficiaries also effected by external changes.

The term “entities” has a broad application including businesses, NGOs and public bodies. The term “actions” is used to distinguish cases where a single operation consists of multiple actions. For example one operation involving the construction of six fish passes along the course of a river may count as six actions (output = 1, result = 6).

DIRECT AND INDIRECT MANAGEMENT

The midterm evaluation of direct management under the EMFF 2014-2020 recommended the development of an indicator system to facilitate more robust reporting of impacts. The approach proposed is to use the same common result indicators in Table 1 as employed by the Member States for reporting under shared management. Support under direct management differs in some aspects to support under shared management. Examples include support to advisory councils, RFMOs, the production of scientific advice, and the support for bringing new companies and products to market. These aspects are to be captured by the additional two indicators for direct management (Indicators number 22 and 23).

Table 1: Common Result Indicators

No	Common result indicator	Unit	This indicator includes...(examples)
Economic sustainability			
1.	Volume of (landings/aquaculture production/processing)	Tonnes	All three sectors. Chose the relevant sector in Infosys. Volume maintained is captured in Infosys by selecting this indicator.
2.	Production capacity (aquaculture/processing)	Tonnes/annum	Installation of/access to new capacity to produce or process.
3.	Value of (landings/aquaculture production/processing)	EUR	All three sectors. Chose the relevant sector in Infosys
4.	Businesses created	Number	Start-ups and new businesses
5.	Businesses with higher turnover	Number	Any business supported by the EMFF
6.	Innovations enabled	Number	Innovations in any sector
7.	Entities benefitting from promotion and information activities	Number	Businesses, NGOs, Public bodies...
Environmental sustainability			
8.	Volume of unwanted catch	Tonnes	Actions to improve selectivity of fishing
9.	Capacity of vessels withdrawn	GT kW	Capacity of vessels withdrawn from the fleet temporarily or permanently in Gross tonnes or Kilowatt
10	Area addressed by operations protecting , conserving, and restoring biodiversity and ecosystems	km ²	Natura 2000 and other protected habitats and zones in marine, rivers and riparian zones.
11	Actions addressing nature restoration, conservation, protection of ecosystems, biodiversity, health and welfare	Number	Information campaigns, studies and planning for nature and conservation. Temporary cessation and other conservation measures under Article 7 of the CFP. Actions addressing both public and animal health , and animal welfare .
12	Entities improving resource efficiency in production and/or processing	Number	Conversion to renewable energy or increasing efficiency through reduced water use, insulation or reuse of material previously considered waste

No	Common result indicator	Unit	This indicator includes...(examples)
13	Energy consumption (on board a vessel/in aquaculture/in processing) leading to CO ₂ emissions reduction	litres/ hour kWh/ tonne	Engine modernisation and replacements . Other measures to reduce fuel consumption. CO ₂ emissions are estimated based on the characteristics of the engine.
Social sustainability			
14	Entities increasing social sustainability	Number	Actions related to improving gender equality, employment of long-term unemployed, people with disabilities.
15	Cooperation activities between stakeholders	Number	Financing of operations which develop partnerships between companies, NGOs, scientific bodies or others.
16	Jobs created (FTE)	Number	Employment of staff due to EMFF investment.
17	Jobs maintained (FTE)	Number	Retention of staff due to EMFF investment.
18	Persons benefitting	Number	Persons benefitting from training , installation of new equipment , provision of improved services . Compensation for cessation.
Governance of the Common Fisheries Policy			
19	Effectiveness of the system for “collection, management and use of data” in the required quality	3= high, 2=med, 1= low	The quality of the national data collection programme as assessed by STECF, and the improvement achieved.
20	Fishing vessels where control means are installed	Number	Installation of equipment for control purposes on fishing vessels
21	Actions to improve governance capacity	Number	Operations related to control other than on fishing vessels. Data collection operations other than improving effectiveness. Example: New IT system or equipment for control / data collection . Data collection survey activities at sea. Under direct management; Support for advisory councils, RFMOs, EFCA, scientific advice, monitoring and evaluation support
Indicators uniquely for direct management			
22	Datasets and advice made available	Number	Scientific advice from STECF and ICES. Opinions produced by advisory councils. Datasets and reports published on Emodnet and Eumofa.
23	Investment induced	EUR	Investments induced or triggered following the provision of start-up support for new businesses.