

2021-2024 Policy/Delivery Co-ordination Group

Wednesday 26 June 2019

Minutes

Attendees

Andrew Watson, Chair (SLURP)
[REDACTED]

Apologies: [REDACTED], David Barnes (ARE: EUEH), [REDACTED], Brian Stevenson (RPID)

[REDACTED]

Welcome and update

1. [REDACTED], welcomed the group. He will chair the group in the absence of [REDACTED], who is in London.
2. [REDACTED] provided an update on what has happened since the inception meeting of 22 May 2019. Three groups are operating - the Simplification Taskforce, this 2021-2024 group, and the Farming and Food Production Future Policy group (FFP-FPG).
3. [REDACTED] provided an update on the work of the Simplification Taskforce. The taskforce will feed recommendations to the 21-24 sub-groups and the FFP-FPG. [REDACTED] The recommendations need to be impact assessed and they are analysing what the internal impacts might be in terms of prioritising recommendations. This work will feed into pilots. [REDACTED] noted it would be useful to directly link our work to simplification. The Simplification Taskforce communication would need to be considered as there has been a series of parliamentary questions asking about it in relation to the 21-24 timeframe.

AP1 – Simplification Taskforce to feed recommendations to sub-groups and share scoring system.

4. [REDACTED] provided an update on the remit of the FFP-FPG that was announced at the Royal Highland Show (RHS). The first meeting is planned for the summer. The intent is for the group to run for roughly a year with the output being consultative policy proposals.
5. [REDACTED] emphasised the link between the three groups and the need to work together in relation to information sharing and work being undertaken by the by the appropriate group (i.e. suggested pilots).
6. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] discussed the appropriateness of membership and how to ensure sustained engagement. [REDACTED] noted

the recent public attitudes work undertaken by RESAS which Mr Ewing said will feed into future policy work. [REDACTED] noted the Social Security Scotland approach to stakeholder engagement as an example. [REDACTED] noted the ARD Stakeholder Group, rural leaders and engagement from members within their existing networks.

7. [REDACTED] noted deliverability issues and capacity and asked that it be included in the final project plan as ISD would need to know about any work by December at the latest in order to allocate resources and funding as appropriate.
8. [REDACTED] noted a dossier of background material will be provided to FFP-FPG including the Stability and Simplicity consultation, Scottish Agriculture Champions report, National Council of Rural Advisers report, CAP Greening Group, etc. [REDACTED] asked if that could be shared with the group.

AP2 – Share FFP-FPG background material dossier with group.

Minutes of previous meeting and action points

9. [REDACTED] asked if everyone was content with the minutes and noted that one action point remained but would be completed by [REDACTED] following the output from the next agenda item, risk register session.
10. [REDACTED] asked that cross compliance and controls are added as they should feature throughout the groups. An email has been sent in relation to this point. It was noted that [REDACTED] is in attendance today from RPID Accreditation and Assurance.
11. [REDACTED] updated on the cabinet paper referred to in the minutes which was now anticipated for submission during early summer recess.

Risk register session

12. [REDACTED] led a risk register session that followed the PESTLE format (political, economic, social, technological, legal, environment). This would determine what risks we would tolerate and what risks we would manage in order to inform resources.
13. Some general themes arising from the session included resourcing (issues of getting involvement in the groups), issues with delay, delivery considerations, governance and scope.
14. It was noted that in terms of governance the work would feed into PAPPB, the scope is 2021-2024 and this is the group for linkage.

15. [REDACTED] reminded the group that the legal frameworks will govern what we can do in this period. [REDACTED] added there was a lack of stakeholder understanding of what our position would be in a no deal scenario.
16. Future funding flows from HM Treasury are unlikely to be ring fenced to agriculture and therefore, like other government departments, funding needs to be evidence based and reflect the public good.
17. [REDACTED] noted the importance of linking with the Bill team.

AP3 – Risk register to be updated.

Project update

18. [REDACTED] provided an update on the draft project plan which has been split into stages. He will liaise with ISD and delivery to include the additional detail required as mentioned by [REDACTED] previously. The intent would be for the Programme Delivery & Project Management sub-group to lead on this work. [REDACTED] offered to assist with resource planning.

AP4 – Revise project plan to take into account ISD timescales.

AP5 – [REDACTED] to assist with resource planning.

Communications plan

19. [REDACTED] provided an update on the draft communications plan. It has an indicative timeline and follows the stages in the project plan. The proposal is to have stakeholder workshops at the end of the year.

AP6 – Email any additions to key stakeholder list and events to [REDACTED].

20. The increased PQ activity around stability and simplicity and this time period was raised as an issue.
21. [REDACTED] noted the need for joined up communications and handling around the Bill. They intended to meet with [REDACTED] in the summer. It was noted that everyone needed to be consistent in communications with their stakeholders.

AP7 – Draft and circulate communications lines.

22. [REDACTED] spoke about a power influence grid to assist with the communications work.
23. [REDACTED] spoke about stakeholder expectations and having plans within the project to engage with stakeholders as part of the policy making process

that also includes stability and simplicity, and the Bill. He asked that we get communication involved now to assist and mentioned [REDACTED] as a key contact.

AP8 – Contact ARE communications [[REDACTED]] to assist with plan.

Thematic sub-groups update

Agriculture Business Development ([REDACTED])

24. Following an internal inception meeting the decision was taken to split the group into two with three members in each. One group would focus on FAS (etc.) and the other would focus on capital grants and start-ups.

Environment ([REDACTED])

25. The first meeting of the group will take place this afternoon (26 June). The remit and terms of reference have been shared with members. The intent would be to keep schemes due to the climate and biodiversity targets but the issue would be the scale of the schemes and how they are delivered. One item to be discussed is the targeting of schemes and adopting a regional approach. They did not think they had RESAS or inspection input on this group, this should be addressed for the next meeting.

Farming Direct Support ([REDACTED])

26. The first meeting of the group will be tomorrow (27 June). [REDACTED] has extracted the relevant parts of the stability and simplicity consultation. There is limited evidence for pillar 1. [REDACTED] noted the cross compliance issue previously raised. This should consider animal health/welfare as well as land based compliance and control.

AP9 – Paper on cross compliance and controls to be created and provided to the group.

Forestry ([REDACTED])

27. The group has not met yet but the amount of change is already thought to be minimal. The only issue is that or the workload to dedicate to each scenario.

Programme Delivery & Project Management ([REDACTED])

28. This group has not yet met. This group will consider any feedback received on the template provided for reporting.

CLLD, LEADER & FPMC ([REDACTED])

29. There was a meeting last week to discuss membership. Next meeting arranged for October and the first report has been completed.

Next steps

30. [REDACTED] noted it would be useful to arrange another sub-group chairs meeting. The first reports from the sub groups are due on 8 July. [REDACTED] emphasised the need for timely returns as there is no scope for slippage within the overall project plan.

AP10 – Arrange sub-group chairs meeting.

31. [REDACTED] has CAP spend maps recently created by RESAS that would be of interest to the groups.

AP11 – RESAS CAP spend maps to be shared.

AOB

32. None.

Future meeting dates

33. Meeting dates as are follows:

- 13 August 2019
- 11 September 2019
- 08 October 2019
- 23 October 2019

Action Points

AP	Description	Owner	Deadline	Status
AP1	Simplification Taskforce to feed recommendations to	[REDACTED]		

	sub-groups and share scoring system.			
AP2	Share FFP-FPG background material dossier with group	[REDACTED]		
AP3	Risk register to be updated	[REDACTED]	04 July	
AP4	Revise project plan to take into account ISD timescales	[REDACTED]		
AP5	[REDACTED] to assist with resource planning	[REDACTED]		
AP6	Email any additions to key stakeholder list and events to [REDACTED]	All		
AP7	Draft and circulate communications lines	[REDACTED]		
AP8	Contact ARE communications [[REDACTED]] to assist with plan	[REDACTED]		
AP9	Paper on cross compliance and controls to be created and provided to the group	[REDACTED]		
AP10	Arrange sub-group chairs meeting	[REDACTED]		
AP11	RESAS CAP spend maps to be shared	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]