

Tools for needs assessment, identification and prioritisation in the CAP Strategic Plans

OBJECTIVES AND CHALLENGES

Member States are required by Reg. 2115/2021 (Art. 108) to identify, assess and prioritise the needs that should be addressed within the CAP Strategic Plans. Diverse approaches and prioritisation criteria were used by Member States to conduct this task. The **hurdle of this task** relates mainly to the coherent identification of very diverse needs over the entire national territory and to the prioritisation of needs when several stakeholders are involved and might have divergent views. The task might be **more complex in regionalised countries**, where several regional authorities have their say about the needs.

MAIN TOOLS ADOPTED: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES



Multicriteria analysis (ES)

The tool provides an efficient approach to **guide policy choices and prioritise policy options**. The tool, which is based on the involvement of different stakeholders, public authorities (e.g., regional authorities), and experts, **relies on a set of pre-defined criteria and a scoring system**. The tool has been adopted particularly for the needs' prioritisation but has the potential to be used for other policy choices, such as interventions setting.



It is a relatively simple technique that enables prioritisation based on the input of a potentially large and diversified range of stakeholders, and can be easily adapted in other contexts.



It has a limited capacity to reflect the diversity of inputs in a heterogeneous territory, for example when many different regions are involved. It can be negatively impacted by subjective bias. Results from different multicriteria settings might differ.



Cumulative voting (IT, LT)

This tool consists of a voting aggregation technique to assess the prioritisation of the **identified needs and support the decision-making process** in the CSP drafting process. The tool helps formulate a shared consensus on the level of importance of each need and determine homogeneous groups of needs by the importance of intervention. It allows stakeholders to **prioritise various intervention areas** by allocating a fixed number of points across different options, thus reflecting the relative importance they assign to each area. This tool was also used to facilitate participation in needs assessment in a regionalised country. Besides, assigning weights to different groups of stakeholders can increase the level of accuracy.



It allows for the aggregation of preferences from several regions and diverse stakeholder groups, and it is easy to adopt. It ensures a participatory co-governance approach to policy.



Prioritisation is weaker when inputs are too divergent and cannot account for multiple objectives at once (trade-offs), whereas the final output might not reflect all aggregated local inputs. Participants may need prior training to understand the exercise.



Consultation forums (SE)

Consultative forums are a way to work with stakeholders, aiming to collect a wide range of views on various aspects of the strategic plans. They are used to acquire knowledge and perspectives from stakeholders on specific matters, to **increase the quality of decisions** made by strengthening dialogue, making use of expertise, collecting a broader range of perspectives, and increasing the number of involved stakeholders. The forums cover topics such as general strategy, SWOT analysis, needs assessment, and draft interventions. Most forums are conducted online, with participants given options to comment by speaking, writing, or sending comments within a given time frame. This tool aims to **collect a wide range of views on various aspects** of the CAP reform.



It allows for reaching a broad range of stakeholders in a cost-effective way at multiple stages of the plans' design process, in order to disseminate draft outputs from the preparation of the plans and gather a feedback.



Limited clarity in the selection process and lack of a co-creative approach. It is mostly a top-down, one-way feedback mechanism with limited potential to generate consensus or agreement over complex issues.

