

# The CAP Strategic Plans beyond 2020: assessing the architecture and governance issues in order to achieve the EU-wide objectives

Emil ERJAVEC  
Biotechnical Faculty University of Ljubljana

# Methodology

## Meta-analysis:

- i.e. an in-depth review of primary and secondary resources
  - mostly statements by lobby groups, MS representatives...
  - ... not a research topic (multi-disciplinary knowledge required)

## Questionnaire:

- data-gathering to additionally explore opinions of:
  - SCA members, EU farmers and environmental organisations, researchers dealing with the CAP

## EBDM theoretical framework:

- qualitative assessment based on the **Evidence based decision-making** (EBDM) theoretical framework.

# Evidence Based Policy-Making (EBPM)

## CAP Strategic planning:

- based on the theoretical concepts of **policy cycle** and **EBPM**
- policymaking should be based on **objective scientific evidence**
- to apply the abstract way of thinking to complex political realities

## Difficult to put in practice (Cairney, 2016):

- **incomplete information** and conflicting policy goals, routine is present, specific internal rules of the game, uncertainty
- reliance on **coalitions, lobbying**, manipulation, specific framing...

## The limits of EBPM:

- must be taken into account to avoid a large **expectations-reality gap** (realities involve not only rational but also emotional logic).
- ... **accept the reality of complex decision-making**, rational and irrational shortcuts as practice...

# General Assessment of SP

## Step in the right direction

- the foundation of **modern public policy** governance.
- greater acceptance of the **legitimacy** of these policies.

## SP draws on RD policy governance system

- ... some prospects for **simplification**,...
- ... but, all the **shortcomings** of the previous arrangements

## Risks:

- the **administrative burden** of planning for MSs
- and **lowering standards** or 'race to the bottom' for the EU.

## EU Level: Accountability Gap

### Limited accountability at the EU level

- The proposal does not frame the proposed **CAP specific objectives** in a **results-oriented** manner. Examples:
  - environmental objectives are not directly linked to legislation
  - the proposal is not clear on to the method of quantifying the baseline situation
  - what is the base for quantification of other specific objectives?
  - the proposed exemption of background documents and analyses envisaged in the Strategic plans from the evaluation process.

### Restrictive design of measures

- MSs can only choose **measures** and adapt them.
  - ... some measures are **compulsory**.
  - limited room for specific national design of policies

## EU Level: Accountability Gap

### Limited compelling incentives for MS

- The SP process is left to MSs, without **guarantees** that the performance at the EU level will be measurable
- National priorities emerge from **SWOT** analyses and may not necessarily reflect the EU-level priorities.
- The **approval** of SPs is the only mechanism in the EC's power ...

### To empower the EC for qualitative assessment of SP

- SP should contain a satisfactory and balanced level of consultation between **stakeholders** & involvement of other **public authorities**.
- The EC: should be **well-equipped** to assess SPs.
- The **adoption procedure** should be more formalized, with the stakeholders' opinions at national level taken into account.

## MS Level: Flexibility and Quality

### Main risks: capacity of actors in MSs

- Past CAP based on a '**measure by measure**' approach:
  - MSs have little experience in strategic programming and implementation.
- SP may result in substantial **administrative burden** for MSs.
  - The section on simplification is empty and left completely to MSs.
- Developing capacities will be a major **challenge** for all MSs;
  - especially for small ones and those acceding the EU after 2004.
- Without **upgraded human capacity** :
  - we can expect considerable differences between MSs.
- This could cause falling **standards** in individual MS:
  - ... but also weakening of the common policy!

# MS Level: Flexibility and Quality

## Proposal:

- SPs to be accompanied by **safeguards** (at the EU and MS level)
  - ensuring effective engagement with civil society
  - plans for human capacity upgrading

## Serious investments:

- in personnel, processes, analytical support and inclusive preparation of SP is needed.
- An enlarged “**technical assistance**” budget could be used to improve the depth and quality of data collection and analysis.
  - This budget should be extended to Pillar 1.



# Monitoring and Quality

2021-2027 is a period of learning:

- The **monitoring** and **evaluation** procedures need to be defined more precisely and their quality improved.
- Importance of strengthening the **data sources** related to analyses of needs
  - MSs & EU bodies (JRC, EEA, Eurostat) have a role to play here

Scientific and technical evidence

- EC and MSs to be required:
  - to provide reputable and independent **scientific and technical evidence** to support their choices.
- Establishment of a **common platform**:
  - with open access to strategic plans, progress, evaluation reports.

# Amendments to the Regulation I

1. Strengthening the principle of 'no backsliding'
  - with the requirement to maintain share of support for climate and environmental objectives (art. 92).
2. To include quantified objectives of the SPs
  - resulting from environmental legislation and commitments.
  - Better demarcation of Common and MS objectives.
3. Strengthen the stakeholder consultation process
  - with more binding requirements (Annex III).
4. Include the criterion (Article 106):
  - *"ambition and reachability of national targets in line with needs and the consistent use of intervention logic on the basis of available data".*

## Amendments to the Regulation II

5. Strengthen the Governance & Coordination System section of SP
  - with the contents of Annex III or alternatively include the annexes for evaluation
6. In the Simplification section specify the reasons and relevance of the EU objectives.
7. Add Annexes specifying plans for the training
  - and education of **civil servants** and **stakeholders** for the implementation of the Strategic Plans should be mandatory.
8. Inclusion of impact and contextual indicators
  - in the reporting and monitoring system,
  - and reporting on their changes.

## Amendments to the Regulation III

9. A quantitative and qualitative **public assessment** of independent experts and groups
  - at the EU and national level should be an obligatory part of the SP.
10. Strengthening of technical assistance
  - A share of technical assistance funding should be devoted to data gathering and specific analyses of needs.

## Final remarks

2021-2027 a 'deployment' period for CAP SPs:

- ... no major adjustment of the measures, nor particularly improved results can be expected (😊).
- A more **long-term view** should be taken, stressing the importance of **collective learning** and system building.

Political decisions about new delivery model:

- What is the new delivery model expected to achieve in the **political sense**?
- If the objective is more flexibility and political responsibility:
  - it should enable transparency, stakeholder involvement and positive competition between countries.

SPs should be seen as a step towards  
strengthened capability  
and accountability in the longer run.

Thank you for your attention!

Correspondence: [emil.erjavec@bf.uni-lj.si](mailto:emil.erjavec@bf.uni-lj.si)