

**Note of Land User Group Meeting - 6 November 2017**  
**Welsh Government Pavilion, Royal Welsh Showground, Builth Wells**

**Attendees**

WG 1 Chair  
CAAV  
FUW  
Wildlife Trust  
TFA  
NFU  
Woodland Trust  
Afonydd Cymru  
NSA  
Game and Wildlife Conservation Trust  
WLGA  
CLA  
RSPB  
Animal Health and Welfare Framework  
Coed Cymru  
NRW 1  
NRW 2  
WG 2  
WG 3  
WG 4  
WG 5  
WG 6  
WG 7

**Apologies**

Confor  
Dwr Cymru  
National trust  
Amaeth Cymru  
Escape Routes

**Introduction**

WG official 1 welcomed members to the 5<sup>th</sup> Land Use Sub-Group meeting.

In his introduction WG official 1 advised there has been a Cabinet reshuffle which has split environment from the Cabinet Secretary's portfolio and now is led by a deputy Minister position. Lesley Griffith's title is now Cabinet Secretary for Energy, Planning and Rural Affairs and Hannah Blythyn AM is Minister for Environment.

Engagement with Defra has improved greatly and WG official 1 and WG official 2 will be taking part in a meeting mid November to discuss frameworks with Defra and other Devolved Administrations. Timing for this work is critical and a large challenge for Welsh Government to administer, and land owners to adjust, therefore it is hoped the framework meeting will provide some clarity.

The attendees were split into two groups and each group attended specific workshop sessions. The group asked some general questions before these sessions:

- A clear definition of the term public goods is needed. This was agreed and a paper will be drafted capturing Welsh Government's thoughts on this. The Group can then feed in as necessary.
- WTO rules in relation to agri-environment payments need clarifying. This was agreed and Jon confirmed he is in correspondence on this issue presently and will update the group when he has further information. There has also been a recent blog on this issue and this will be circulated prior to the next meeting.

**ACTION 1 – Circulate paper on public goods for comment by the Group (WG)**

**ACTION 2 – Circulate blog regarding WTO interpretation**

### **WORKSHOP SESSION 1**

**Group 1 Facilitator – WG official 2**

**Members** – RSPB, WLGA, Coed Cymru, AHWF, NRW 1, NFU, WG, TFA, Woodland Trust

**Blockers to delivery of future public good scheme's – includes tenancy related issues, inconsistent planning issues across Wales, how to turn long term aspirations for public goods into reality**

Group 1 were asked what the impediments to public good schemes were and how could we overcome them. The following comments were received:

- For tenant farmers a major stumbling block is the requirement to use the farm for agricultural purposes only. If future funding is directed to Agri-Environment activities the tenants would need to get permission from the land owner. This runs the risk of the land owner receiving the payment. Another issue is that agri-environment agreements are normally for a minimum of 5 years – the average Farm Business Tenancy is 4 1/2 years – thereby precluding some farmers. Statistics show that 36% of farmers have land that they don't own and 27% of land in Wales is farmed by people who don't own it. This can be more complex with forestry as many owners of this type of land do now live on site and it is over managed by a third party. The Tenant Farmers Association has recently published a release on their website regarding Welsh Government plans and tenant farmers future involvement in them.
- There are fears from some of the Group that some farmers will be able to access services purely based on where their farms are located and others will not and this could act as a post code lottery. Others disagreed as they felt

that some support mechanisms would be appropriate for one area and others may not be, this is a natural state as the landscape of Wales is different.

- Land owner engagement is critical, there needs to be workable mechanisms for all areas with guidance as required, this should not be underestimated. It must be noted that the more bespoke any future support is then the more resource is needed to administer and advise land owners. Schemes need to be as efficient as possible with every penny of the money spent on the land. Land owners need to be consulted throughout the process and ensure there is trust on both sides.
- There needs to be a clear definition for PES schemes and how these can relate to any future support schemes.
- Some members of the Group felt that food should be classed as a public good post Brexit, others felt alternative support such as maintaining the soil to ensure future food production was possible was a more relevant public good.
- Regulating for the minimum standards is a must, particularly in relation to our commitments against the Well-Being of Future Generations Act. Some felt minimum standards should be incentivised.

### **ACTION 3 – Circulate the TFA release (WG)**

#### **Group 2 Facilitator – WG official 1**

**Members –** CAAV, FUW, Wildlife Trust, Afonydd Cymru, NSA , GWCT ,CLA , NRW  
2

**Promoting large scale land use change. Includes raising awareness, discussion on what third sector partners and farming unions can do with their members, collaborative management.**

Group 2 were asked how Welsh Government and stakeholders could promote large scale land use change within the agriculture and forestry sector. It was accepted that large scale could mean different things to different people but for this purpose it was looking at large numbers of land owners over large land areas. The comments received are below:

- A cultural change is needed to allow large scale change. This is more likely to work if a bottom up farmer approach is used which also involves the community in any changes. Those on the land will be the best versed in what would work there. An incentive will be required to get all farmers to participate. Some felt a contract basis would work better to ensure long term management.
- Some members of the group felt that land use should be considered in the same way as water catchment areas are set up.

- Need to be sure what is it we want farmers to do, and in some cases, how they do it before having discussions with land owners. This will act as a catalyst for collaboration, along with input from the voluntary sector or independent people employed by the land owners.
- There needs to be options for all land owners, we can't just focus on those in certain areas. Timings need to be carefully considered for the business needs and facilitators are needed to give the correct advice.
- Supermarkets need involvement, they could give a higher price for sustainably produced items such as milk and meat, although this should not be in return for more control over what farmers do.
- Trade-offs need to be considered, where possible we must not pay for one result if it makes another issue worse.

## **Feedback session 1**

### **Group 1**

The Group discussion revealed a number of thoughts we need to revisit in more detail in the future, this includes the definition of a public good, food production, tenancy agreements, budget and legislation.

### **Group 2**

There was a wide ranging discussion with regard to what was meant by large scale, opinions differed and the term is not always about sheer land size. The Group also discussed cultural change and the need to ensure we have the correct results which are attractive to land owners and the environment.

The role of Government going forward will change, the possible large budget loss in the medium term if the UK Government does not cover the loss of CAP in the Welsh Government will mean us all having to make better use of available resources.

## **Workshop Session 2**

### **Group 1 Facilitator – Welsh Government official 2**

**Members** – RSPB, WLGA, Coed Cymru, AHWF, NRW 1, NFU, WG 6, TFA , WG 5, WG 7, Woodland Trust.

**Future certification/assurance schemes. Adapting future replacement of cross compliance controls, sanctions, will this be imposed on all land managers even those who don't claim and what will be supermarket's involvement?**

This session looked at what possible market opportunities there are and how land owners could meet the standard required. Areas of discussion are below:

- Within the forestry sector there are two main standards, the UK Forestry Standard and the Forest Stewardship Council which has voluntary certification. Certification is market driven and is a fairly robust system but it is not clear how this system can be transferred to agricultural produce.
- 50% of current farmers are members of existing assurance schemes but these do not generally generate any extra income. The Group questioned whether a farm assurance system could replace cross compliance and provide additional market opportunities.
- A regulatory baseline must be carefully considered to ensure Welsh farmers were not put at a disadvantage and incentives must be considered to ensure compliance. The Group did not agree that this could be voluntary. Cross border farmers are also an issue. There must be sufficient enforcement to identify and penalise for breaches.
- The Irish Origin Green was seen as an example of an assurance scheme.

## **Group 2 Facilitator – Welsh Government official 1**

**Members** – CAAV, FUW, Wildlife Trust, Afonydd Cymru, NSA, GWCT, CLA, NRW  
2

### **Developing outcome based land management. Empowering land managers to switch from prescriptive to outcome focused farming, supply chain issues, establishing baselines/monitoring/payment methods.**

The Group had a discussion on how we can empower land managers and the discussion points are below:

- Market forces would help, if the price of lamb drops then farmers will be more likely to do other things to gain an income. Farmers are adaptable but they need to be made aware of what they can be doing to make more profit.
- Linkages with other related industries such as water companies and energy companies would be beneficial as there could be alternative non-government funded opportunities. PES schemes need facilitation and a strong regulatory framework.
- Outcomes/results required need to be specific and the land owner needs to see the value to avoid them not understanding their aims.
- Some felt a covenant on the land would ensure land owners managed it correctly and this would allow the long term land use change required. Some felt this could de-value land in the same way as SSSI land classification has.
- Any replacement support needs to be flexible and adapted after a review period (if required).

- Regulation would ensure land owners complied with environmental measures although it's effectiveness could vary if there was no financial sanction. Market access to the EU is a good hook as many farmers will want to export and this could ensure compliance with the regulatory standard.
- The farmers segmentation survey could help understand farmer views, this could be discussed in future meetings.

#### **ACTION 4 – Farmer Segmentation Survey to be discussed at a future meeting (WG)**

##### **Feedback session 2**

##### **Group 1**

Group 1 had a wide ranging discussion which looked at the regulatory floor and general good practice. It was felt cost was a major barrier and uptake for all farmers would be challenging. Group 1 wanted to further discuss the circular economy in future meetings.

##### **Group 2**

Group 2 focussed on outcome based land management, this included the desire for long term agreements and certification schemes.

#### **ACTION 5 – Circular economy to be discussed in future meetings.**

##### **AOB**

The Group asked for some further information on the timescales for this work, this has been noted although until the specifics around the exit deal are settled there is no clear answer to this although a basic timescale could be looked at. The Group wanted to flag that the transition period needs to be considered carefully to allow businesses and communities to adjust.

#### **ACTION 6 – Brief timeline to be considered (WG)**

Jon closed the meeting and thanked the attendees for contributing. The Group were reminded to continue to update the SWOT and Vision document when necessary and to feed any suggestions for future workshops to WG official 3.

|

## **HOMEWORK RESPONSES SUBMITTED BY GROUP MEMBERS OUTSIDE OF THE MEETINGS.**

### **RESPONSES HAVE BEEN SUMMARISED AND NOT ATTRIBUTED TO INDIVIDUALS.**

#### **1. How do we engage land managers with the scale of change needed to meet these goals?**

- This needs to be through developing Market Based Ecosystems (MES) and the increases in renewable generation, habitat changes (tree planting, maintaining wetter upland soils etc). In this way we would help land managers understand the new sustainable focus we want them to take, and real opportunities that will come from the process (in lieu of the inevitable reductions in income post Brexit).
- The engagement needs to underpin and provide a competitive advantage. Wales is now in a unique position within the UK and the rest of the World. The sustainable management of natural resources, as driven by the Environment and Well-Being of Future Generations Acts, provides a perfect 'story' for the further development of the Welsh brand. Provided the brand can be properly evidence-based and audited, it can be used to underpin quality outputs from the agri-food, timber, tourism and environmental sectors, whilst providing a range of cross cutting and multiple benefits to deliver the changes required. This approach could also provide the evidence required to provide access to markets post Brexit once regulation with the EU starts to diverge.
- Engagement must cover a range of mechanism and approaches; one approach will not work for all land managers. Sectoral analysis of the agricultural business in Wales show that numerous approaches are likely to be more successful.

#### **What meaningful methods can we employ to inform the industry about our targets, and how action taken on their land is important in contributing to the big picture?**

- Use MES as part of the mix here. The industry will respond well to a Market Based Ecosystems (MES) approach because it is in their interests – as long as there is confidence in the market.
- Make clear that Wales has 14% woodland/forest cover, (7% broadleaves / 7% conifer), it is the commercial conifer that is the backbone of the forestry GVA figures. Countries who are either self-sufficient in timber, or small exporters, have at least 30%+ commercial forest cover.
- The new ALC maps identifying available agricultural land will help.
- People will accept changes if they feel they have a stake in the outcome. The conversation should be about outlining the challenges and asking farmers and landowners what they can do to deliver against them, not being prescriptive in the way Glastir is.

- Payment methods that recognise the ‘many to many’ concept would also help recipients appreciate the contribution to the larger picture – a payment made up of different elements would increase the appreciation of multiple objectives.
- There needs to be a clear ‘road map’ and targets that are achievable, otherwise if targets are perceived unrealistic they will not be taken seriously.
- If you take the WG / NAW aspiration for forestry as a goal, we need a new business model for afforestation that is focussed on the needs of the farmer and builds scale by consolidating outputs across numbers of woodlands/forests which are located on farmland where the highest ecosystem services are achieved through forestry/woodland, including shelterbelts for agricultural productivity and woodland managed for a range of benefits. This model would deliver (i) more woodlands/forests in the ‘right’ place (ii) support the resilience of the farming business by land sharing/sparing maximising ecosystem services and (iii) ensure that the benefits of forestry are accessed by rural communities in the areas where the forests are located. A ‘sheep and trees’ type scheme such as in Scotland or a farm-forestry programme as successfully implemented in Ireland, would aid this.
- A common framework to convey ‘what good looks like’ under SMNR to achieve outcomes will ultimately lead to better outcomes as a mechanism capable of delivering resilient businesses with long term viability. The principles underpinning SMNR should be integrated across the entire regulatory, incentive and guidance framework.
- Agriculture, forestry and rural development policy need to form part of a more integrated approach to managing natural resources. These policies need to be an integral part of the SMNR delivery framework and as such needs to be evidence based so as to enable the development of enhanced resilience, the identification of risks/opportunities and be a part of an iterative process which is adaptable to future challenges such as climate change. Area-based approaches such as the development of Well-being Plans by Public Service Boards will be a critical test of expressing what a truly integrated natural resource based programme of land use, land management and rural development policy could look like.
- The combination of regulatory regimes and inter-operability of sectoral approaches to regulation should ‘add up to the whole’ i.e. the achievement of land management to SMNR principles and provision of well-being benefits. This should provide a level playing field for all land managers so that we are able to more smoothly achieve the outcomes we seek through collaborative behaviour. For example, currently farmers receive payment to manage habitat for lapwing conservation / recovery plans (considered agri-environment measure) yet foresters are expected to manage for dormouse or red squirrel without additional payment (considered part of regulatory floor).
- If this baseline is set too high, there is a danger of creating an “additionality trap” which would leave land managers struggling to achieve compliance whilst preventing both public bodies and the private sector from structuring incentives to achieve the desired outcomes.



- At present, it is unclear within agricultural and rural policies the deviation in regulation that would be required to disadvantage Welsh businesses, landscapes and SMNR.
- Restructuring land use and land management advice around SMNR is challenging and could be perceived as irrelevant rather than a mechanism capable of delivering resilient businesses with long term viability. There are existing sectoral sustainable management frameworks covering management practice standards, animal health and welfare, worker health and safety and environmental best practice (such as the CoGAP, UKFISA & UKFS). These frameworks are variable and, in some circumstances, provide a foundation to embed SMNR and well-being approaches. Sector standards e.g. CoGap and UKFS (Annex 1) could have a significant role to play in demonstrating SMNR and particularly in relation to potential criteria of future international trade deals which are likely to be dependent upon environmental standards.
- Brexit and the likely changes to the budgets and approaches to subsidy, and grant funding of land management, give a unique opportunity to develop common standards and good practice across land management sectors that are universal and are supported by any new outcome-focussed grant scheme. These common land management standards should incentivise all land management sectors to work above legal minimum standards. Taking a forestry approach (UKFS and UKWAS) might result in a further optional certification scheme that is independently audited and allows land managers to demonstrate that they are meeting European and International standards, as well as UK best practice, to support access to overseas markets after Brexit. Developing common land management standards would also allow future grant schemes to be targeted at specific outcomes that are applicable across land management sectors and demonstrably above the legal minimum standards. It would also reduce the potential for cross-sector disparity and disincentives where current standards vary significantly.
- Whilst it is possible to offer incentives and provide support to encourage collaborative behaviour to achieve the sustainable management of natural resources, it is important that a universal regulatory baseline is defined and established at an appropriate level. Potential changes in verification of requirements opens the debate in terms of environmental standards.

### **How can we meaningfully explain the step change needed to realise the scale of change needed?**

- I think that will be self-evident once we are clear on the nature of Brexit, and opportunities MES could offer.
- Be clear that we are addressing the challenge of keeping existing landowners viable and solvent in the early years of change. Perhaps WG support for forestry creation for maybe 8-10 years, after which landowners would have a valuable asset on their land which they could borrow money against for the remaining

years until harvest. With new improved species giving much greater yields we can now look at incomes from forestry starting in year 10-15 (we have example now of landowners receiving income of circa £3-4000/Ha after 15 years).

- Demonstration of policy in action in the [Upper Conwy Catchment Project](#) – work was initially unpopular with tenants but as work progressed they began to see the benefits in terms of a ‘slowing the flow’ effect, including, for example, less loss of livestock. Establishing strong, working relationships has opened up conversations about improvements for nature and has broken down barriers. In addition, 10 farmers have developed a collective (Fferm Ifan) and are utilising some of the learning from previous projects, showing how practice is being embedded locally.
- Also, learning points from the [‘Living with a Changing Coastline’ project](#)
  - (i) Preparation - stakeholder analysis, staff training, engagement policies (eg dealing with misunderstandings and readiness to ask, listen and act rather than ‘tell’)
  - (ii) Local awareness raising by information giving and receiving, using a variety of media
  - (iii) Communicating with stakeholders - providing access to experts in a variety of ways (clinics, talks, research, workshops)
  - (iv) Wide reaching communication - householder guides, schools programme, children’s activities
  - (v) Build relationships from learning from the past
  - (vi) Identify most important local attributes and identify local vulnerabilities
  - (vii) Understand potential impacts of a range of scenarios (moderate to worst case)
  - (viii) Explore options available within the site limitations
  - (ix) Weigh up benefits and costs of different approaches and develop a local solution
- There needs to be a clear route map of changes needed, consisting of clear measures in achievable steps, a clear sharing of risk and return and a long term commitment to underpin the model. With woodlands and trees for example, farmers often have begun by planting or managing small areas of woodland and built up from there, gaining confidence and skills. This could be accelerated by providing management resources or joint-venture woodland/forestry schemes.
- Providing integration with existing agricultural activities by increasing productivity through, for example, shelter and biosecurity, would be a first step that if replicated across land holdings could deliver considerable impact.
- We need to remove conflicting messages, such as encouraging tree planting through Glastir alongside the removal of trees from Pillar 1 payments and farmers being unable to undertake any woodland management under cross compliance for much of the year, when forestry businesses work all year round.
- Clear outcomes defined, consistently and widely communicated by all.

- All outcomes built in to all delivery frameworks including those which may not normally be considered e.g. planning, public service boards.
- Clearly explain that fundamental choices need to be made and that trying to maintain the current situation is not an option. Funding for innovation measures that can boost SMNR alongside polices to support rural communities.
- Incremental change built into all delivery plans with a clear focus on targets and outcomes.

**Do we have farmer led case studies to demonstrate the potential scale of activity?**

- The Brecon Beacons Mega Catchment proposal is seen to be at the heart of the sorts of changes we could make in Wales to both protect customers' water interests and at the same time, move land management to a more sustainable footing.
- Catchment projects and there are now several SMS projects demonstrating farmers taking on these approaches at scale. What we need to do is better understand and explain the scale required for 'SMNR' actions to be viable. For example, how much of a catchment needs NRM input to deliver meaningful results, plus what is realistic to achieve.
- Pontbren – farmers working collectively to integrate small-scale woodland and hedgerows into their farms.
- First Milk – farmers working collectively with a co-op to delivery nutrient offsetting to provide headroom for discharge from the creamery
- Case studies from SMS schemes.
- There are also many examples of good practice led by other land owners, managers and practitioners. These include charities, community groups, the state and the private sector.

**2. How do we facilitate more collaborative joined up land management?**

- By developing MES approaches supported by a clear, simple and enforced regulatory floor – the simplicity of approach, and focus on sustainability should help.
- Wide ranging inclusivity – land managers are part of local communities
- Early involvement of land managers in design and decision making
- Understand stakeholder needs, aspirations, challenges and communication preferences

- Identify existing networks and leaders with regards levels of influence and interest
- Realistic time and resourcing to build relationships and trust
- Provide accessible, inspiring vision (eg High Peak Moors landscape scale project) backed by sound evidence
- Benchmarking could help drive change
- Deliver early results for shared goals
- Need to raise awareness that many of the factors relating to resilience are achieved at scale across more than one land holding. This is also true of economic activity in forestry, for example. We need better mechanisms for creating cooperation and consolidation where landowners are better off working together. The question then becomes how to manage the cooperation and share the benefits. There are many mechanisms that could do this and examples from other countries.
- We are developing these mechanisms for woodland creation and forestry management at scale that could work in Wales, where for example, contracts could be administered at a 'catchment' or other appropriate level achieving the scale required for viability.
- It might not be necessary for all landowners to be involved or to necessarily be actively involved in actual interactions with other landowners. The WG Segmentation work has indicated that some categories of landowners have a negative attitude to collaboration, but they might be motivated by a financial incentive administered at a catchment. The level at which collaboration is managed is therefore adjustable and could be different across objectives. For example, payments could be consolidated through an intermediary organisation dealing with landowners individually on a financial level, but landowners collaborate directly to exchange knowledge. This approach might also create the scale required for a buyer of PES or a private investor in a woodland creation scheme, allowing each individual landowner to access more as part of a group than they could in isolation, even if they were not necessarily actively collaborating with each other.

**How do we encourage all land managers in for example, a water catchment, to undertake a joined up approach?**

- MES based incentives which supported by a clear regulatory floor which is enforced – and seen to be enforced. These 'carrot and stick' incentives should help highlight to land managers why they should support such an approach.
- Positive engagement needs to be rewarded by an advantage for example better economic bottom line where 'win wins' can be undertaken or through market reward such as Brand Wales and market access.
- Development of earned recognition with a suitable framework for standards

- Learn from other countries and specific projects and approaches, including those that failed, to ensure that Wales builds on success and learning from across the UK and elsewhere rather than repeating others mistakes.

### **What barriers need to be broken down to encourage land managers to collaborate?**

#### **Administration**

- With or without Glastir funding the planning and consent process is slow and frustrating. The Branching out report by CC.E&RA committee recognised many of the problems and we support the recommendations which the land use group could endorse.
- Defined structure for decision making, accountability and shared agreed time line for milestones
- Simplicity, flexibility and efficiency
- Brokered, personal service – eg Glastir Commons development officers
- The contribution of WG to collaborative schemes might not necessarily be all financial, tax incentives or guarantees for loans and investment models might be more effective.

#### **Trust (between neighbours / government)**

- A huge obstacle to afforestation is public opinion. WG needs to engage much better with local communities and PSB's to make the argument in favour.
- Good practice is outlined in the Sustainable Intensification Research Platform's [Science, Policy and Practice note 6: Farmer Collaboration and Engagement \(2017\)](#)
- Trust lowers the cost of economic transactions. Trusted intermediaries that act in the best interests of a wider consolidated group might be the best way to build trust, so avoiding an agency relationship of needing to act in the best interests of individual landowners, but acting for a group as a whole which is paid to deliver public benefit as part of a clear set of outputs. This could deliver trust and accountability at the right level, which we feel is essential for the concept of landscape scale SMNR to work.
- Government has a key part in facilitating this through long term commitments to support landowners to change. A key positive lesson from the RHI scheme is that the 25 year commitment has stimulated significant private investment, due to raising confidence amongst the beneficiaries that investment will be paid over the medium term. We need more consistency like this supporting supply chains. What has worked well to stimulate investment in farm forestry in Ireland for example has been the state forestry company Coillte paying farmers an annual amount after year 20 for plantations, up to clearfell. This has provided a degree of confidence to the farmers in growing the trees, through the annualisation of the

yield class. Who takes the risk in forestry in the forestry 20 years is a key question.

## **Regulation.**

- This is a cultural change issue at its heart, which the EU current subsidy regime has unfortunately led us to. By changing the funding focus and regime, much of the culture will change (slowly).
- Need leadership from WG and civil servants to drive change, both to persuade existing landowners to take the plunge and to allow the regulatory process to enable change to happen instead of preventing it.
- Compatibility with existing RDP programmes
- A clear well enforced regulatory baseline is essential to build a platform for incentives to work such as giving potential PES buyers confidence that they are not paying for something that should be provided for under regulation. This should be NRW's first priority.
- EIA is massively complex and costly even if result is that EIA is not needed. Issues compounded by a regulator that is requiring a level of information and detail with applications that seem more to do with proving no impact rather than embracing the benefits change could bring.
- During consultation over land use, emotion can overtake fact leading to significant financial / time costs. WG needs to take a stronger position in removing administrative blockers, and promoting / backing up positive land use change.
- We need to develop a universal regulatory floor that applies across land management sectors and ensures that land managers and owners are regulated fairly and consistently to meet legal obligations and incentivised to meet good practice by future support mechanisms and market opportunities.

## **3. How do we engage people with a more outcome based management approach?**

- MES approaches are by definition Outcome based – but we need to develop and apply them first.
- The potential changes that are required to meet international obligations are likely to result in significant changes in current land use and management. Communicating this not only to land managers but to as wide an audience as possible is essential to manage potential negative public reactions and criticism to change.

- Using the new ways of working set out in the Environment Act and Well-being of Future Generations Act for groups of land managers to develop own solutions
- Set out a clear, universal regulatory floor that applies across land-use sectors and helps land owners and managers to understand the legal requirements and best practice standards, and how these fit in to and support any future outcome-based management approaches, such as targeted outcomes for grant funding.

### **What training / tools will be needed, and who is best to deliver them?**

- MES as a process needs to be developed. First need to set and enforce a regulatory floor 'above' which the market place can work, once properly incentivised. At that point the training and tools needed will become clearer than they are today.
- The new ALC maps identifying available agricultural land will help identify areas for suitable / different ventures.
- Learning points from the ['Living with a Changing Coastline' project](#)
- Providing different ways for people to express their ideas – introverts as well as extroverts
- Importance of neutral facilitators and venues
- Events timing - accessible to widest possible group of people
- Providing expertise to move from 'blue sky thinking' to reality
- Using outcomes to inform decisions or being clear about why not
- Maintain on-going dialogue with stakeholders and support local champions
- Avoid mixed messages, long periods of indecision, patchy communication, confusion amongst staff
- With regards to a substantial increase in trees on farms, part of this is well within the farmers capability to manage, but there will need to be some provision for direct management if farmers do not wish to do this and investment in processing and consolidation activity. Knowledge dissemination programmes can be developed through Coed Cymru and Farming Connect. Outcomes at a catchment scale might require some form of external certification to gain the confidence of buyers. We are developing options for this where trees are concerned.
- Development of a culture within land management that accepts that CPD is the norm and recognition that undertaking this training has advantages for the business either through earned recognition or access to markets of funding.

- Needs to be delivered by those with the knowledge and experience to do so. There is also a key role for the land-use sectors and government to support knowledge transfer and learning from best practice.



## ANNEX 1 UKFS

The UK Forest Standard was first introduced in 1998 and is based upon the principles of Sustainable Forest Management (*“forest resources and forest lands should be sustainably managed to meet the social, economic, ecological, cultural and spiritual needs of present and future generations”* UNCED 1992). which was first defined in 1992. The standard sets out the legal requirements (legal minimum standards) and good forestry practice requirements (best practice above legal minimum standards) for forest management in the UK. The UKFS was developed by the relevant forest authorities in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland with representation from the wider forest sector and a full public consultation, it is endorsed by UK and devolved administrations and applies to all forest and woodland in the UK. The UKFS is the basis of forestry practice for the independent UK Woodland Assurance Standard (UKWAS) (developed in 1999), which is used for voluntary independent certification to FSC and/or PEFC international standards. It can also be used for assessing compliance as part of an environmental management system such as ISO 14001.

The UKFS is based on applying criteria agreed at international and European levels to forest management in the UK. The main purpose of the UKFS is to demonstrate that these agreements are applied in an appropriate way to the management of UK forests and woodlands. The main legal drivers in the UK are the Forestry Act (which controls felling and thinning) and EIA (Forestry) regulations (which apply to new planting, deforestation, quarrying and roads). By meeting the requirements of the UKFS, forest and woodland owners, managers and practitioners can demonstrate that forestry operations and activities are both legal and sustainable. The main bodies responsible for the regulation and monitoring of the UKFS are the Forestry Commission in England and Scotland, Natural Resources Wales, and the Forest Service in Northern Ireland (the ‘forestry authorities’).

The UKFS Requirements are divided into legal requirements and good forestry practice requirements.

### Legal requirements

Statutory requirements of EU and UK legislation, including legislation applicable in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, that has the most direct bearing on the management of forests and woodlands. Contravention of these requirements could lead directly to prosecution.

### Good forestry practice requirements

Further requirements of sustainable forest management, linked to internationally agreed criteria and commitments, to meet UK and country policy. They complete the framework for the exercise of the regulatory powers of the forestry authorities in the UK and for the payment of grants.

The UKFS is used in conjunction with legal requirements such as felling licences and EIA (forestry) determinations for activities such as new planting or deforestation and national woodland and forest polices to support grant schemes. Grant schemes have then used UKFS good forest practice as standards for different grant applications to incentivise good practice beyond the legal minimum.

