

2021-2024 Policy/Delivery Co-ordination Group

Wednesday 22 May 2019

Minutes

Attendees

[REDACTED]

David Barnes (ARE: EUEH)

[REDACTED]

Andrew Watson (RPID)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Brian Stevenson (RPID)

[REDACTED]

Welcome and introduction

1. [REDACTED], welcomed everyone to the group and provided the rationale behind its inception – to ensure collaboration between policy and delivery for the 2021-2024 period of stability and simplicity.

Terms of reference

2. The Project Proposal had been circulated for comment and revised prior to the meeting. The group was asked to agree the terms of reference [Paper 1 – Annex A] and a discussion was had about the draft context map [Paper 2] and the overall context in which the group was expected to operate.
3. [REDACTED] described the context as being business as usual with the group expected to deliver the CAP support during the 2021-2024 period that follows the current CAP 2014-2020 programme. The intent is to align with the future programme work to enable a managed transition between the programmes (as work on the current one starts to decrease the work on the future one will increase).
4. It was noted this group would not have responsibility for future pilots. This currently sits with the Rural Policy Steering Group
5. [REDACTED] provided an overview of the future rural policy steering group (inc. ARE, ENFOR, SNH, SF, FD) which is listed as the Deputy Director Group on the context map [Paper 2]. [REDACTED]
6. The Rumbles Group listed on the map will be the Farming and Food Production Group. The intent is for this to be formed in late June. It will involve the Agriculture Champions (etc.) and will be a short-life group designed to test ideas with stakeholders and could include productivity, sustainability and climate. There will be a link to [REDACTED] Bill work.

[REDACTED]

7. [REDACTED] noted the Paying Agency Planning and Performance Board (PAPPB), which he co-Chairs with [REDACTED], is for decisions that require operational governance. [REDACTED] added that policy decisions would feed to the Rural Policy Steering Group while delivery decisions would feed to the PAPPB. [REDACTED] noted the recent directorate change (to create the Agriculture Delivery Directorate and the Sustainable Land Use and Rural Policy Directorate) and the PAPPB would be a useful forum to link the two.
8. [REDACTED] queried the membership of the Agriculture and Rural Development (ARD) Stakeholder Group and the Rural Development Operational Committee (RDOC) and if this was a chance to refresh the groups to make them more forward facing. [REDACTED] noted the RDOC is focused on the current programme. [REDACTED] noted the need to find a balance between the groups looking at the current and future programmes.

AP2 - Circulate the ARD Stakeholder Group membership and terms of reference for consideration of a possible refresh, if appropriate.

Discussion

9. [REDACTED] noted stability and simplicity would require us to keep things similar even if funding changed or there was uncertainty. [REDACTED] made the point it might not be possible for LEADER and technical assistance if funding is via the shared prosperity fund as this could result in changes to targeting. [REDACTED] said we would need to consider the situation scheme by scheme. [REDACTED] made the point that stakeholder engagement would be important to manage expectations about what was possible. [REDACTED] said the focus needs to be on the current programme and stability and simplicity, not future policy but we should be mindful of the [REDACTED] issue.
10. [REDACTED] raised the point about whether the programme will end or be continued. [REDACTED] responded by saying the programme would end as closure procedures are required by the regulations but a new one might be very similar. [REDACTED] asked if we should reframe the new programme or deviate from stability and simplicity due to the climate emergency. [REDACTED] noted the need for the new programme to align with the National Performance Framework and we could use the [REDACTED] Bill to make changes but it would need to follow the Programme for Government. Anything different should be for post-2024 or pilots. [REDACTED] queried the situation if we need to move up a gear based on public concern or a new Minister/Government. [REDACTED]
11. [REDACTED] made the point that small changes for everything is more of an issue than one big change from an IT perspective. We need to have consideration of what comes next and build towards it. There are issues with timing and affordability when you stagger the migration from legacy to new systems. It was agreed that delivery and implementation constraints and

timelines must be recognised and timelines had to include lead-in times for IT delivery, staff and customer comms.

12. [REDACTED] suggested that this group or PAPPB would oversee collated potential changes across all schemes from a list based on delivery and IT considerations to help. [REDACTED] noted the sub-group should also report on what not to do with justification based on a cost, benefit analysis. [REDACTED] pointed out analysis on who wins/loses would be resource heavily if it was required for everything.
13. [REDACTED] noted emergent themes from the future CAP that should be considered. [REDACTED] said we should aim for everything to be CAP compliant to safeguard our work.

Project management

Consideration of the project timeline and risks

High Level Timeline [Paper 3.1]

14. It was queried if the engagement phase be reduced to save time. [REDACTED] noted there would continue to be regular engagement throughout.
15. The stability and simplicity consultation said there would be further consultation on Pillar 2 and that will need to be considered as part of the engagement.
16. [REDACTED] asked that deliverability be added into the timeline.
17. [REDACTED] noted we could use the stability and simplicity evidence base and engage by stating we could do options a-c or x (etc.).
18. [REDACTED] noted the demand on resources to complete the required impact assessments. [REDACTED] followed up by saying the [REDACTED]. It was noted that consideration of the issues for impact assessments need to be considered at the thematic sub-group stage e.g. options appraisal, equalities.

AP3 - Update the High Level Timeline [Paper 3.1] based on discussions.

Risk Register [Paper 3.2]

19. The draft high level risk register was discussed and suggestions were made for inclusion. This would be updated and done in the “If... then...” style.
20. Comments were sought on the risk register, [REDACTED] suggested running a risk workshop to complete the register and to delegate risks for different individuals to own.

AP4 - Update the Risk Register [Paper 3.2] based on discussions.

AP5 - Arrange a risk workshop to complete the risk register and assign ownership of risks.

Thematic sub-groups

Agree the proposed groups, chairs, remits and issues

Proposed groups and chairs [Paper 4.1]

21. [REDACTED] noted the expectation that these groups are supported by delivery colleagues and will require secretariat and business support. The issue of capacity was noted but these groups will be working on business as usual for the programme during this period.
22. It was agreed that the priority was to ensure that everything is in place for the schemes to run from 2021, secondly to look at improvements and policy changes.
23. [REDACTED] queried the issue of overlap with the Simplification Taskforce sub-groups. [REDACTED] noted the taskforce was in the process of completing its work and there would be a hand-off of recommendations from it to these groups. [REDACTED] added that people from these groups could be enlisted into the thematic sub-groups. [REDACTED] noted the taskforce groups are expected to be finished within weeks and that recommendations for the period would be shared out.
24. [REDACTED] noted the need to prioritise the programme documentation, legislation and team capacity to run the schemes with any improvements secondary.
25. It was agreed a meeting would be set for the proposed sub-group chairs to discuss the scope, provide consistency of approach and manage the handover of any work from the Simplification Taskforce.

AP6 - Arrange a meeting of the proposed sub-group chairs.

26. [REDACTED] reminded the room that the focus is the programme during the period of 2021-2024 and any longer term idea would be handed over to the future policy group to consider. We need to focus on stability and simplicity from the perspective of the customer.
27. There might be a delay to the next CAP so there could be a transition period. The new CAP is unlikely to contradict what we are currently doing based on the information we have.
28. [REDACTED] queried the capacity we had and what should be prioritised (in terms of allocating days). [REDACTED] noted the work was important and a

priority. It would be important to find a balance between the 2021-2024 work and future policy work with issues being handed over as appropriate.

[REDACTED] noted that it was good to have a tight timescale for the work to provide focus and to get things moving.

29. The thematic sub-groups and chairs were agreed:

Thematic Sub-group	Chair
Agriculture Business Development	[REDACTED]
Environment	[REDACTED]
Farming Direct Support	[REDACTED]
Forestry	[REDACTED]
Programme Delivery & Project Management	[REDACTED]
Rural Communities and Wider Rural Economy	[REDACTED]

Issues for consideration [Paper 4.2]

30. Paper 4.2 was briefly discussed but it would be picked up by the thematic sub-groups chairs at their first meeting.

Next steps

AP7 - Arrange next meetings of the co-ordination group.

31. See Action Points.

AOB

32. None.

Action Points

AP	Description	Owner	Deadline	Status
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
AP2	Circulate the ARD Stakeholder Group membership and terms of reference for consideration of a possible refresh, if appropriate.	[REDACTED]	31 May	Complete

AP3	Update the High Level Timeline [Paper 3.1] based on discussions.	[REDACTED]	31 May	Complete
AP4	Update the Risk Register [Paper 3.2] based on discussions.	[REDACTED]	31 May	Complete
AP5	Arrange a risk workshop to complete the risk register and assign ownership of risks.	[REDACTED]	N/A	Arranged for 26 May 2019
AP6	Arrange a meeting of the proposed sub-group chairs.	[REDACTED]	31 May	Complete
AP7	Arrange next meetings of the co-ordination group.	[REDACTED]	31 May	Complete