



FAME Support Unit

CT07

**Annual stakeholder
meeting report**

Final Version

September 2017

Copyright notice:

© European Union, 2017

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION – Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries

Disclaimer:

The information and views set out in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the Commission. The Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this report. Neither the Commission nor any person acting on the Commission's behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Recommended citation:

EUROPEAN COMMISSION - Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries – Unit D.3 (2017): FAME SU REPORT “CT07 Annual Stakeholder Meeting 2017 report, September 2017”, Brussels

Contact:

FAME Support Unit
Boulevard de la Woluwe 2
B-1150 Brussels
T: +32 2 775 84 44
FAME@fame-emff.eu

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Background.....	1
1.2	Objectives.....	1
1.3	Structure of the report.....	1
2	Implementation of the task.....	2
2.1	Participants.....	2
2.2	Meeting timeline.....	2
2.3	Evaluation results.....	2
3	Findings.....	3
3.1	CMES implementation findings.....	3
3.2	EMFF evaluation findings.....	4
3.3	FAME related findings.....	5
3.4	Lessons learnt.....	6
4	Annexes.....	7
4.1	Annex 1: List of participants.....	7
4.2	Annex 2: Annual stakeholder meeting presentations.....	10
4.3	Annex 3: Evaluation results.....	10

List of Figures

Box 1: CMES implementation findings, main messages.....	4
Box 2: EMFF evaluation findings, main messages.....	5
Box 3: FAME, main messages.....	5
Box 4: Lessons learnt, main messages.....	6
Table 1: Annual stakeholder meeting 2017, evaluation results.....	10

Acronyms

AIR	Annual Implementation Report
AWP	Annual Work Plan
CFP	Common Fishery Policy
CMES	Common Monitoring and Evaluation System
DG MARE	Directorate General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries
EMFF	European Maritime and Fisheries Fund
FAME	Fisheries and Aquaculture Monitoring & Evaluation
FAME SU	FAME Support Unit
IMP	Integrated Maritime Policy
MA	Managing Authority
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MS	Member State
OP	Operational Programme
RI	Result Indicator
SFC	Shared Fund Management Common System
ToR	Terms of Reference

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

According to the FAME Terms of Reference (ToR), annual stakeholder meetings are foreseen to ensure a strengthened communication among the stakeholders involved in Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) e.g. Managing Authorities (MA), the Directorate General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries (DG MARE), evaluators and other experts.

The 2016 annual stakeholder meeting and its workshops demonstrated the importance and the added value of the interaction between the EMFF stakeholders.

In the first seven months of 2017 the FAME Support Unit (FAME SU) worked, inter alia, on two documents:

- A report on the lessons learnt with the Common Monitoring and Evaluation System (CMES) implementation in 2015, 2016 and 2017. This FAME SU report will be used by DG MARE for their respective report to the Council and the Parliament as foreseen in the EMFF regulation 508/2014, Art.107.4; and
- A working paper on EMFF Operational Programme (OP) evaluation on process, effectiveness and impact evaluation aspects (including evaluation questions, judgement criteria, indicators and methodologies).

The annual stakeholder meeting is very well suited for the in-depth and interactive discussion necessary for the finalisation of the two documents. The annual stakeholder meeting 2017 was held on 05.09.2017 in Brussels.

1.2 Objectives

The objectives of the meeting were to:

- Inform the EMFF stakeholders on the structure and state-of-play of the FAME SU CMES report and working paper EMFF evaluation;
- Exchange views on the implementation of the CMES and the EMFF evaluation; and
- Identify priorities for the FAME SU Annual Work Programme (AWP) 2018.

1.3 Structure of the report

This report offers an overview of the methodological provisions and the implementation of the annual stakeholder meeting 2017 (Chapter 2). The outcomes of the meeting are summarised in the form of short statements (Chapter 3) and conclusions and recommendations for the formulation of AWP 2018 are provided (Chapter 4).

2 Implementation of the task

2.1 Participants

The meeting was aimed at MAs and DG MARE staff. 44 persons participated; 35 from 20 different MS, 4 from DG MARE (D.3 and geo-desks) and 7 from FAME SU.

A list of participants can be found in Annex 1.

2.2 Meeting timeline

Methodologically the meeting was split into two sessions:

- A morning session focusing on the CMES implementation; and
- An afternoon session focusing on the working paper on EMFF evaluation.

Both sessions started with a presentation given by FAME SU (available in Annex 2) followed by working groups and finalised by presentations of the working groups results in plenum.

In the morning session participants could comment on all seven CMES elements in a “market place” setting with one poster and one host per CMES element. After that three working groups dealt with the thematic clusters on (i) EMFF intervention logic and common indicators, (ii) Annual Implementation Report (AIR) and Infosys and (iii) evaluation plan, evaluations and performance framework.

The working groups in the afternoon session dealt with (i) OP management and process evaluation, (ii) evaluation of EMFF Art.38 “limitation of the impact of fishing on the marine environment and adaptation of fishing to the protection of species” and (iii) evaluation of EMFF Art.48 “productive investments in aquaculture”.

2.3 Evaluation results

An evaluation sheet was provided to all participants. There participants claimed to be satisfied with the workshop (overall average 3.4/4.0). They also requested that meetings of this type be held more often.

Points of criticism were the limited application of the CMES session to their daily work, and the need to better integrate newcomers not very familiar with terminology and methods.

The detailed evaluation results can be found in Annex 3.

3 Findings

3.1 CMES implementation findings

FAME SU presented the report on the implementation of the CMES. It listed positive and less positive aspects of the seven CMES elements, including conclusions and recommendations for the current and next programming period.

Discussions in the working groups after the presentation highlighted a large number of similar experiences of the MS during OP programming and subsequent implementation. An important observation was that the needs of the MS and the CMES were not always aligned; however the need for a common framework for synthesis and comparison was acknowledged.

Criticisms were expressed about the intervention logic being introduced once at an expert group meeting and reappearing during the insertion of the OP content in the SFC2014. SFC2014 also contained various rigid rules (e.g. connecting result indicators (RI) only to limited Specific Objectives). As a general remark the intervention logic was considered useful but much more input than result-oriented. The link between the intervention logic and the policy goals of e.g. the Common Fishery Policy (CFP) or the Integrated Maritime Policy (IMP), were also considered to be unclear. Therefore, the intervention logic should be more flexible and have a clearer link to policy.

Indicators aim to represent the main characteristics of the fisheries and aquaculture sector, to reflect the goals of the EU policies (CFP, IMP) and to provide a connection with the EU 2020 strategy. However, the RIs were created top-down and do not necessarily cover all the EMFF measures. The focus should be on capturing the results of each operation under a measure, and on demonstrating the contribution to the linked Specific Objective.

Infosys and AIR were considered to be necessary elements but more related to the needs of DG MARE rather than the MS. The MS maintain much more detailed national databases. It was emphasised that the structure and formalisation of Infosys (and subsequently the AIR) provides considerable advantages for aggregation, comparison and cross-tabulation that the more descriptive databases do not have. It should be seen as complementary to the case-specific knowledge of the MAs.

The evaluation plan and the evaluations of the EMFF OP are valuable to the MAs. The inclusion of the evaluation plan in the OP was considered not very useful. The performance review was also considered to be problematic since most OPs will not meet the milestone values.

Box 1: CMES implementation findings, main messages

To Member States:

- *The CMES elements are indispensable for a European fund; national provisions are more customised and they should be complementary;*
- *Infosys can be an advantage for preparing an evaluation and for taking short term decisions due to its formal structure; it can also allow for OP-wide efficiency comparisons not possible with descriptive databases.*
- *Some CMES elements like the evaluation plan can be described in brief in the OP and left at the discretion of the MA.*

To FAME SU:

- *FAME SU should provide working papers for all CMES elements supported by visualisation to comprehend their interdependencies more clear (See working paper on EMFF operation timeline); these materials should be provided early on.*
- *FAME SU should provide for quick solutions (in form of ad-hoc working papers and trainings) for the current implementation period, especially concerning Infosys and AIR.*
- *Preparation for the post-2020 CMES should start early and be constantly communicated to the MS.*

3.2 EMFF evaluation findings

FAME SU presented the status quo on the working paper on EMFF evaluation. The working paper focuses on process evaluation (i.e. how the OP is implemented), effectiveness evaluation at the EMFF Specific Objective level and impact evaluation at the Union Priority level.

The working paper consists of two parts, a short introductory handbook and an extensive toolbox used as reference for the aforementioned three types of evaluation. Participants considered this to be a good approach.

Most MS have not started with the evaluation tasks; especially the rationale for the conduction of a process evaluation seemed to be odd for many MS. Only the Czech Republic had conducted a process evaluation with very satisfying results and encouraged the other MS to follow.

After the presentation, participants worked in smaller groups on process evaluation and effectiveness evaluation based on the examples of the EMFF Art.38 and 48.

The process evaluation group participants expressed the need to explain the difference between effectiveness and efficiency and how these two criteria are addressed differently by both evaluators and auditors. A common ground can be found in the formulation of common criteria.

Process evaluation can also be enhanced by simple methods. For example, the monitoring of some basic metrics like ratio planned/approved over the period, or beneficiary satisfaction (although the fear exists that beneficiaries are already disappointed by the time-consuming selection process). In any case transparency of the process should be in the foreground.

The effectiveness evaluation group participants expressed the need for clarification of some proposed indicators e.g. total investment and absorption rate. They also discussed the reliability of the AIR numbers concerning measure budget estimations.

Participants also discussed further evaluation indicators, e.g. on types of fishing gears and types of aquaculture investments. It was concluded that the working paper was only a starting point to consider additional evaluation indicators relevant to the MS. These could also consider external effects and market outlook.

Box 2: EMFF evaluation findings, main messages

To Member States:

- *The FAME SU working paper on EMFF evaluation is only a starting point; its content is only indicative and should help MAs to develop and refine their evaluation designs.*
- *Approaches and methodological inputs should be proportional to the OP budgets for M&E; qualitative methods can be more appropriate and deliver better results.*
- *Process evaluation is a useful exercise and should be conducted to provide insight for the successful OP implementation. It is the most reasonable evaluation type for 2018.*

To FAME SU:

- *The FAME SU working paper on EMFF evaluation should be disseminated as soon as possible; there is no need for it to be exhaustive and comprehensive since MAs will have to adapt the content to their needs.*
- *The FAME SU working paper on EMFF evaluation provides only general orientation and can be of manageable length and at the same time cover every specific aspect; FAME SU should soon organise trainings in the MS to cover those specific aspects;*
- *Evaluations are sometimes considered to be necessary only to satisfy DG MARE; FAME SU needs to present the added value to the MS.*

3.3 FAME related findings

The annual stakeholder meeting 2017 was the second one, the first was held in September 2016. Participants appreciated the hands-on approach and the technical exchange. The meeting allows the participants to deal in depth with a topic; this is not possible in other formats e.g. the EMFF expert group meetings.

The interactive and peer exchange elements during the meeting should be kept. In future the participants would like to co-define the agenda and to present their work on M&E and the conclusions drawn.

Box 3: FAME, main messages

To Member States:

- *MS are encouraged to bring up issues of interest to them to be addressed in the annual stakeholder meeting 2018.*

FAME SU:

- *The annual stakeholder meetings deal with complex issues; there should be better accommodation of newcomers (terminology, tasks should be better explained).*
- *Ex-post documentation of the meeting is important; MS should be able to access the contents over SharePoint.*

3.4 Lessons learnt

Lessons learnt are messages of more general relevance than the messages of the previous chapters. They are summarised in the box below.

Box 4: Lessons learnt, main messages

- *The annual stakeholder meeting is a valuable element of the FAME AWP. MS should be involved early on topics and discussions.*
- *Involvement of the MAs in the preparation of the agendas as well as in debriefing of FAME SU activities should be systematic and well documented.*
- *FAME should pay attention to the proportionality of the EMFF and its CMES; if lengthy working papers are necessary to explain the CMES, this is an indication that the latter is overly complex.*

4 Annexes

4.1 Annex 1: List of participants

Participants List			
CORE TASK 07 FAME Annual Stakeholders Meeting			
05.09.2017			
Surname	Name	MS	Organisation name
ADAMOVA	Monika		DG MARE
ATZORI	Simone	MT	Funds and Programmes Division, Ministry for European Affairs and Equality
BARTISIUS	Darius	LT	The Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Lithuania, Fisheries department
BLANCQUAERT	Peter	BE	Flemish Government, Department of agriculture and fisheries
BUCCI	Valerio	IT	Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry Policies
CAILLART	Benoit		FAME SU
CAR BLAŽEVIĆ	Mirica	HR	Ministry of Agriculture, Directorate of Fisheries, Service for Monitoring EU funds and Control
CUMPANASOIU	Ciceronis	RO	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
DAHL KRISTENSEN	Louise	DK	Danish Agrifish Agency
DANEELS	Cécile	FR	Fisheries and Aquaculture Department
DIACONEASA	Eduard	RO	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
DUBBELDAM	Catharina	NL	Rijksdienst voor Ondernemend Nederland RVO.nl
GARDNER BLASCO	Megan		FAME SU

GIGANTE	Carmela	IT	Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry Policies
GYÖRGY	Ágnes Irma	HU	Research Institute of Agricultural Economics
HAMZA	Christine		FAME SU
KNUTH-WINTERFELDT	Anne-Marie	DK	Danish Agrifish Agency
KOHOUTKOVA	Věra	CZ	Ministry of Agriculture - Management Authority for Fisheries
KUBLINA	Edite	LV	Ministry of Agriculture
KYRIACOU	Yiannos	CY	Department of Fisheries and Marine Research
LEWITA	Helena	PL	Ministry of Maritime Economy and Inland Navigation
MADRILES HELM	Anna		FAME SU
MANICOLO	Natalie	MT	EMFF Managing Authority, Funds and Programmes Division (MEAE)
MARTIN	Gerhard	DE	Ministerium für Landwirtschaft und Umwelt
MAZURKIEWICZ	Jan	PL	Ministry of Maritime Economy and Inland Navigation
MIHALFFY	Szilvia		FAME SU
NIPPEN	Damien	DE	Bundesministerium für Ernährung und Landwirtschaft
PAPP	Juhani	EE	Ministry of Rural Affairs
RESCH	Andreas		FAME SU

RODRIGUES	Maria	PT	Autoridade de Gestão Mar 2020 (Managing Authority FEAMP PT)
SALZ	Pavel		FAME SU
SANOPOULOS	Angelos		FAME SU
SAULAMO	Kari	FI	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
SCHMÜDDERICH	Suitbert		FAME SU
SEDENKO	Ana	LT	The Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries Department
SEMMELODT	Anja		DG MARE
SERANGELI	Claudio		FAME SU
TRÖLTZSCH	Constanze		FAME SU
VAHALA	Milan	CZ	Ministry of Agriculture
VAN NIEROP	Berlinda	NL	Rijksdienst voor Ondernemend Nederland rvo.nl
VERCRUYSSSE	Jean-Pierre		DG MARE
VESERS	Raimonds		DG MARE
VEVERIS	Armands	LV	Institute of Agrarian Resources and Economics
VILLA	Héctor	ES	General Directorate of Fishing Planning, General Secretariat for Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Food and Environment
ZINKO	Barbara	SI	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food

4.2 Annex 2: Annual stakeholder meeting presentations



CT07_ASM_ppt_EMFCT07_ASM_ppt_CME
F_evaluation_2017-0S_Report_2017-09.ppt

4.3 Annex 3: Evaluation results

The table below shows the scores for each section of the evaluation survey among the participants (23 replies received).

Table 1: Annual stakeholder meeting 2017, evaluation results

Section	Score
FAME SU presentation on CMES	3,4/4,0
CMES working groups	3,6/4,0
FAME SU presentation on working paper EMFF evaluation	3,4/4,0
EMFF evaluation working groups	3,3/4,0
Overall impression	3,5/4,0

Source: FAME SU, 2017