# From agenda, looking at linkages between the result indicators and the nine specific objectives.

In line with the legal proposal, in particular provisions on content of the CAP Plan, as set out in Article 97, and reflected in the draft CAP Plan template. (For each SO Identify each relevant common indicator).

We have been considering these linkages, and think that it would be useful to develop them together, taking full account of MS views and experience.

An integral part of the intervention logic.

To make best use of time and really allow us to explore how these two key policy elements articulate together, and to cover all the 38 RIs, we propose to work in small mixed groups.

You’ll have picked a square of coloured card on your way in, and the colour you’ve picked determines the random groups.

Some of the more longstanding members of this group will remember working like this in previous years, but we recognise that it may be unfamiliar to more recent arrivals. So I’ll talk us through it before we start, and Hannes, Matteo, Eduardo and I will be circulating around during the exercise on hand if you want to ask anything.

A few key points:

* you set aside your country label for this - it’s all unattributable, it’s an exploration of possibilities.
* It’s not decision making, there is no undertaking that whatever comes out will be transformed into legal text (no intention desire for that) or even guidance –
* designing the intervention logic under the NDM is essentially something for MS, not the Commission, as you have seen with the indicator fiches and links between interventions and indicatòrs, with few exceptions.

First the concept, then the mechanics.

It is a given that everything implemented under each CAP Plan should contribute to AT LEAST one RI, and AT LEAST one objective, in a results oriented policy design there is no place for expenditure that doesn’t contribute to policy objectives.

It is equally possible to contribute to more than one RI, and/or more than one objective. We know that many activities are multi objective, and this is one of the ways in which the new proposal brings the policy closer to reality than previously. (But we are not without experience in this - we have several years of successfully implementing RDP P4s to draw on).

As we started exploring, we realised that there are different types of relationship between RIs and objectives.

* In some cases, every single intervention, and individual operation that contributes to a particular result indicator contributes to the same objective (or objectives) in the same way - a fixed, predictable and constant relationship.
* In other cases, there may be one or more fixed relationships, and others that may or may not exist (for example risk management tools could be expected to always increase resilience, but whether or not there is a contribution to climate change mitigation would depend on the specific conditions of the instrument).
* And a third type of relationship is where an activity must contribute to one or more of a group of objectives, but the relevant linkages can only be identified at the level of individual intervention contributing to the RI, or sometimes, at an even lower level, for individual activities/operations within an operation. An example here could be the provision of advisory services, which must be linked to at least one of the SOs, and where the appropriate linkages can only be defined once the intervention has been designed.

This is what we would like you to think about today.

Each small group (5 or 6) will get a list of 11 or 12 indicators (every indicator will be considered by three of the groups). Every group has a different random set, spanning the range (P1 P2, economic, environmental, social).

We’ll give you a blank table, and a set of different coloured dots.

We’d like you to propose, for your set of indicators, the linkages that you consider most appropriate –

* using GREEN where everything is ALWAYS connected (e.g. the basic payment would Always be expected to contribute to supporting farm income),
* BLUE where there MIGHT be a linkage, depending on the design of the intervention/operation but equally there might not (remembering that everything has to contribute to at least one objective), and
* YELLOW where there is a link to at least one of the highlighted objectives, but the actual link can only be established once the intervention is fully designed, or in some cases, the individual operation is selected (consider for example farm investments - it is a characteristic of the beneficiary that determines whether an operation contributes to generational renewal, not a characteristic of the investment itself).

Sounds complicated, but we’ve prepared an aide mémoire, and we’ll circulate to help.

One final point on substance, before we move to process - the point isn’t to identify every single potential lineage, no matter how small - that way we’d end up with everything linked to everything, and wouldn’t be able to see the wood for the trees in order to set up a strategic intervention logic.

The aim is to identify substantial, significant and probable linkages.

Each CAP plan will be different, and the system is inherently flexible to accommodate this. But experience shows that whilst each is different, there are some general common lines and approaches. That’s what we are seeking here - an indicative set of linkages which could be a helpful starting point and save each team going through the same intellectual process. If we can identify a common basic indicative framework to start from, then MS can concentrate their intellectual energies more on their specificities and fine tuning.

Now to process - Borschette not the easiest, but some groups can stay here, others move outside to the small tables, the sofas, maybe even the interpreters’ booths or the cafeteria.

Once you’ve identified the others in your group (10 diff colours of card) the first thing is to check that you have a common language to communicate in. Doesn’t matter what it is. If not, then we can either do a swop with someone in another group (but it is better to be mixed and avoid two people from one MS in same group) or the interpreters have kindly agreed to help with consecutive translation if necessary.

Once groups are identified, we’ll give each group a blank table, dots and an aide mémoire, and you can then go and find yourselves a space to sit and discuss.

We’ll have approx 40 mins and we will alert you after 30 mins.

Then we’ll ask you all to come back and to copy your conclusions onto the big table (again using the same colour code) - so we’ll get a consolidated version - and we’ll consider the outcome together.

Any questions?

Go.....