

Facilitating the delivery of landscape scale ecosystem services

How to encourage collaboration between farmers and support them in implementing multi-objective policies

Profiles of approaches to providing farmer advice
and encourage collaboration

Draft – 19 July 2012

Output of a workshop held at The James Hutton Institute, Aberdeen

10 July 2012

Note: The following profiles were developed by Katrin Prager as brief descriptions of the various approaches to providing farmer advice and encouraging collaboration in The Netherlands, Germany, England and Scotland. They are based on the six presentations and discussions at the workshop. The “Profile for a Scottish approach: Workshop participants suggestions” is the summary of 4 breakout groups and their suggestions for ingredients for a successful approach in Scotland.

Feedback is welcome and should be directed to katrin.prager@hutton.ac.uk

Profile 1: Agri-environmental collaboratives in Germany and The Netherlands

Who leads the approach?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Led by local groups who have members from diverse backgrounds • Mainly farmers, also conservationists, municipality, local residents, hunting, forestry, agencies 	
Who is involved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depends on the local context and the issues at hand • municipalities and district government • often links to contacts in province/state government • Link to community residents (e.g. 'expert pensioners', other local groups) • Agency representatives are only marginally involved • Cooperation with researchers, conservation NGOs (e.g. bird watchers), farmer interest groups, local businesses 	
Where does the money come from?	Utilise broad range of sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Province/state/national funding schemes • Membership fees • Donations • EU: Agri-environment schemes, LEADER, direct payments, LIFE • Trusts • Lottery 	
Which level does the approach focus on?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Germany: larger, typically a district (administrative boundary), average 900 km² but groups realise the difficulty of working across catchments due to (agri)cultural differences • Netherlands: smaller (small average farm size), often less than the average of 130 km², often determined by funding requirements and 	
Is the approach delivered via individuals or groups?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on locally initiated groups which have formed from the bottom-up • Partially 'government-sponsored' because groups receive boost when guidelines direct funding via groups 	
Does the approach require a facilitator?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, many groups have a coordinator or facilitator, or they can draw on skilled members with various areas of expertise • Funding for this role is often a struggle and issues of continuity are recognised • If group members take on this role there is a risk of burn out 	
Which policies work for or against the approach?	Positive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific funding directives at state level that recognise groups as key delivery mechanism (e.g. for Natura 2000) • Policies that provide 'institutional' funding for a facilitator/ coordinator e.g. to help with project applications 	Negative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The revision and adjustment of policies keeps groups on alert • Moving targets, e.g. budget cuts of 50% to habitat network funding in the Netherlands
Other preconditions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groups base their work on existing landscape, land use and habitat plans which gives them legitimacy • The commitment of local authorities (municipalities, districts) • Dutch farmers strongly opposed to regulation so they lobbied for self-regulation approaches 	

Profile 2: Integrated Local Delivery (ILD) Framework

Who leads the approach?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specialist advisor initially, then passing on 'the baton' to the local management group but staying in contact Lead in terms of funding: DEFRA and its agencies (Natural England, Environment Agency) 	
Who is involved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area-based (not issue-based) focus Statutory and non-statutory partners that are relevant to the local context, identified in the scoping stage Supports, values and respect local knowledge from the farming/local community An organisation hosting the facilitator (e.g. FWAG in England) 	
Where does the money come from?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For implementation of management activities: group identifies funding opportunities (Rural Development Programme) and match funding For research and evaluation of the approach: Natural England funded CCRI research For wider roll-out: Water Framework Directive catchment pilots 	
Which level does the approach focus on?	The lowest appropriate administrative structure, e.g. parish level in England. Also include districts.	
Is the approach delivered via individuals or groups?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collective response from key stakeholders gathered together around a local management group Facilitator and linking specialist advisor plays crucial role 	
Does the approach require a facilitator?	<p>Yes, specialist facilitation and linking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to develop local management group to take the group through a 6 stage process following 8 key principles identifying management tasks and linking to strategic priorities and associated funding opportunities 	
Which policies work for or against the approach?	<p>Water Framework Directive catchment pilot:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan to roll out the framework through Farming and Integrated Environmental Local Delivery (FIELD) advisors providing specialist facilitation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The multiple, often diverging objectives are making this process necessary in order to translate them into on-the-ground action and delivery
Other preconditions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilises existing strategic & policy frameworks Bespoke process but replicatable framework Embedding in local government administration to ensure the commitment is sustained 	

FWAG = Farming and Wildlife Advisory Group

DEFRA = Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs

WFD = EU Water Framework Directive

Profile 3: Community-led farmer groups within nested catchment planning

Who leads the approach?	Upper Clun Catchment Project: led by the community initiative “Land Life and Livelihoods” (LLL). Driven by tradition, sense of place, landscape and securing livelihoods - upland sheep farmers reliance on grants are increasingly environmentally linked
Who is involved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local farmers, local residents • Shropshire Hills AONB • Environment Agency • Upper Clun Community Wildlife Group <p>But also working with: Trustees of Black Mountain Chapel, Bettws History Group, DEFRA, Natural England, Catchment Sensitive Farming Initiative, Severn Rivers Trust, Newcastle & District Garden Society, Upper Clun Community Wildlife Group, Daysdrove, Newcastle Village Show, Caring for God’s Acre</p>
Where does the money come from?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funded by community grants • Supported by (Shropshire Hills) AONB (staff time) • Run by local volunteers
Which level does the approach focus on?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catchment or sub-catchment, preferably no larger than 100 km², e.g. Upper Clun catchment (covers 3 Clun Forest parishes). • This is the essential building block of <i>integrated</i> catchment management
Is the approach delivered via individuals or groups?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Run as a community initiative in the Clun Forest by local volunteers • Through Farmers’ Dens, workshops and visits, free one to one advice for local farmers provided from invited specialists on all aspects of farming and land management • Farm visits, river and woodland walks, ceilidhs, farm tours, landscape and local history bus tours • Sometimes useful to employ professional help (e.g. a consultant) on an occasional basis to help with writing reports/developing strategy etc • Technical support should be available via national agencies but they may be stretched to provide it when there are many community initiatives. They may also not have the “right” technical skills for the area
Does the approach require a facilitator?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, essential. Having trained facilitators is highly beneficial but also volunteers – e.g. from the steering committee – to develop dialogue within communities.
Which policies work for or against the approach?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National policies tend to be inflexible and not able to be adapted to the special circumstances of small communities. For example, the Environmental Stewardship schemes (ELS and HLS) in England are not targeted.
Other preconditions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charismatic leadership is highly beneficial to drive such initiatives – providing the “fuel”, also support (both technical and financial) and political backing • Observe that there are limits to volunteering! There has to be financial backing for these initiatives to be sustained and achieve real benefits.

DEFRA = Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
 ELS = Entry Level Stewardship
 HLS = Higher Level Stewardship
 AONB = Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

Profile 4: Environment Agency's integrated pilot approach

Who leads the approach?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall: DEFRA and Environment Agency. Aim to establish a strategic framework for managing the water environment. In individual catchments: EA on 10 catchments but also river trusts, water companies, partnerships, wildlife trusts, Regional park, National park, FWAG SW on a further 15 pilot catchments
Who is involved?	<p>All inclusive list of partners (example: Upper Tames Catchment Pilot led by FWAG SW)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Agency, Natural England, DEFRA Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils, Borough/ Town Councils Local business, amenity and interest groups NGOs: CLA, National Farmers Union, CPRE, Agronomists, Land Agents, AONBs, Cotswold Water Park, Save Water Swindon etc
Where does the money come from?	DEFRA through funding catchment pilots related to the Water Framework Directive and linking with WFD funding (EA), Catchment Sensitive Farming, AES (both NE), Green infrastructure (Swindon BC), River Trust and Wildlife Trust.
Which level does the approach focus on?	Catchments (as part of river basins, determined by WFD). DEFRA promoting WFD as designed to improve and integrate the way water bodies are managed throughout Europe.
Is the approach delivered via individuals or groups?	Structured around a 'partnership' of the stakeholders listed above and formed into a Steering group. Local communities will also be contacted, focusing on those who have recorded an interest in water-related issues with the Rural Community Council.
Does the approach require a facilitator?	Yes, to join up the long list of partners and meet with local communities and farmers. Bring local and agency knowledge together in order to produce an integrated Catchment Management Plan
Which policies work for or against the approach?	<p>Supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural Environment White Paper and DEFRA/ Environment Agency's 'Catchment based approach' Water Framework Directive and related policies such as the Catchment Sensitive farming and Soils for Profit.
Other preconditions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus is on WFD Approach enables links to existing strategic & policy frameworks, but not a requirement No clear delivery framework Whole catchment-based approach is being evaluated and has DEFRA ministerial approval

CLA = Country Land and Business Association

AONB = Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

WFD = Water Framework Directive

NE = Natural England

FWAG SW = Farming and Wildlife Advisory Group Southwest

CPRE = Council for the Protection of rural England

CSF = Catchment Sensitive Farming.

EA = Environment Agency

AONB = Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

Profile 5: Collaborative agri-environment schemes (cAES)

Who leads the approach?	The agency administering agri-environment schemes
Who is involved?	All relevant stakeholders, in whatever way appropriate. Agreements are location specific. HR8 agreements, for example, include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farmer graziers, farmer non-graziers, non-farmer “rights holders”, landlords, Court Leet, members of the public, Grazing Conservation Trusts
Where does the money come from?	Costs met by Government/Natural England from AES budget (as part of Rural Development Programme) e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option HR8 within ESS Higher Level Stewardship “supplement for group action” (£10/ha/yr) Option UX1
Which level does the approach focus on?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both contiguous large blocks of common land and small fields in a fragmented landscape Best based on local ecological “maps”. Landscape blueprints are needed.
Is the approach delivered via individuals or groups?	Individuals, whose management actions are coordinated by a facilitator. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collective agreement with individual responsibility and accountability to Natural England for delivery of the options chosen for their part of the commons (HR8 on common land) Conservation Grazing Trust responsible for all management decisions and for management agreements under ESS and covering SSSI (HR8 on fragmented land)
Does the approach require a facilitator?	Yes. Currently, the role of facilitator is filled by e.g. National Park Officers, Linking Environment and Farming (LEAF), Natural England Project Officers, Lawyers, Land agents, Local Commons Associations (LCAs)
Which policies work for or against the approach?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural Environment White Paper ‘The Natural Choice: Securing the Value of Nature’ 2011; Lawton et al. report 2010 DEFRA’s Biodiversity 2020: A Strategy for England’s Wildlife and Ecosystems Services Current EU regulations allow AES payments to cover farmers’ arrangement (transaction) costs (Art 39 of 2005 Rural Development Regulation)
Other preconditions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Necessity to clear up the legal aspects of collaboration (individual and collective liabilities and benefits) Funding scheme should include a collaborative bonus payment (more than just the transaction costs) and an amalgamation bonus

AES = Agri-environment scheme

DEFRA = Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs

Profile 6: Current approach to providing agri-environment advice in Scotland

Who leads the approach?	No consistent approach. Typically based around projects. SNH is funding conservation projects on farms; SEPA is funding catchment approaches (e.g. Diffuse pollution priority catchments)
Who is involved?	Depending on project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agri-environment advisors, some of which are former FWAG advisors • Farmers, crofters, estate owners • SNH, SEPA • National Trust for Scotland, RSPB • ARC; LARG (Amphibian Reptile Group); Forestry Commission • Deer management group, gamekeepers
Where does the money come from?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From Scottish Rural Development Programme (e.g. framed under RP08 and RP10, Rural Priorities, Rural Stewardship Scheme) through SNH, SEPA • SAF for advisory work and training
Which level does the approach focus on?	Depending on project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ranges from catchments, some landscape scale to farm scale (neighbouring farms, individual farms, crofting areas)
Is the approach delivered via individuals or groups?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typically addressing individual farmers and other land managers • Advisors coordinate activities on neighbouring farms • In some cases via deer management groups, sheep management groups, Crofters Commission
Does the approach require a facilitator?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, if coordinated management is aimed for • Current projects very often have an independent advisor (funded by the leading agency, e.g. SEPA-appointed priority catchment officers/coordinators)
Which policies work for or against the approach?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRDP contains elements that help funding individual projects • conflict with SAF and RP funding prevented use of SAF to deliver quick, targeted actions
Other preconditions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent network of independent agri-environment advisors (former FWAG advisors) • Good working relationship between SNH, SEPA, advisors • For SEPA catchment coordinator support – must be a designated priority area

FWAG = Farming and Wildlife Advisory Group

SEPA = Scottish Environment Protection Agency

SNH = Scottish Natural Heritage

SRDP = Scottish Rural Development Programme

SAF = Species Action Framework

ARC = Amphibian and Reptile Conservation (a trust)

RP = Rural Priorities

Profile for a Scottish approach: Workshop participants suggestions

Who should lead the approach?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depends on problem/issue, context and scale • Multiple models of advice (e.g. for crofting, estates) • Flexible mechanisms (e.g. machinery rings) and responsive delivery 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent trusted organisation (e.g. farmer organisation); limited role for agencies • Resistant to capture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government, through agencies, if SRDP funding
Who should be involved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depends on problem/issue • Local interests groups and consider national ambitions • Build on locally existing structure(s) 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>All relevant</u> stakeholders • All holders of statutory rights • Agencies, SAC, planners • Like LEADER? Linking community councils 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • as few as possible (to be able to reach a consensus and deliver) • Land owners, parish councils • Those that can remove bureaucratic hurdles
Where should the money come from?	<p>Utilise broad range of sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government: EU (LIFE, Structural funds), SG (SRDP), local authorities • private PES, income tax, renewable energy funding • philanthropy funds 	Realistically, there is only SRDP (because it's about public goods)
Which level should the approach focus on?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sense of place is important, locally relevant, e.g. parish, river • Community councils 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The issue determines the scale • The scale which allows the collect consistent data
Should the approach be delivered via individuals or a group structure?	<p>Opinions ranged from</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depends on objectives; should be flexible • Both (to build social capital and be inclusive) • We can't rely on individuals – better find hook to get local groups, industry partners, crofting groups etc. involved • Individuals (are easier to target than defining what group structure to use) 	
Does the approach require a facilitator?	<p>Yes, and they should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • respected, trustworthy and trusting individual with continuity in the area • Independent 'saint', a 'people person', enthusiastic • Contact person for farmers, with technical know-how and charisma • With knowledge of various environmental issues and policy areas • perhaps better to have administrator to be the networker? 	
Which policies would work for or against the approach?	<p>Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agglomeration bonus for coordinated agri-environmental management (increases success rate of application) • Art 36* (funding for advice) • Priority zoning to be introduced 	<p>Negative (relating to current policies):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • every individual needs to apply • Payments calculated on the basis of loss of income rather than payments for benefits • Tracking £ and counting rather than measuring outcomes
Other preconditions or requirements?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scientific and technical know-how needed • Legal and cultural issues need to be considered • Facilitator needs to be paid to keep continuity • Avoid double funding/ duplication by agency • 'Singing from same hymn sheet', integrated rather than silo thinking • We need a willingness to take risks 	

* of the proposed Rural Development Regulation which is currently being revised as part of the Common Agricultural Policy reform

SG = Scottish Government

SRDP = Scottish Rural Development Programme

SAC = Scottish Agricultural College

PES = Payments for Ecosystem Services (schemes)

LEADER, LIFE = European funding tools

Note: Where there was agreement amongst breakout groups, responses are collated in one cell. Where there was disagreement, the contrasting opinions are represented in two cells side by side. With the exception of the policy column which has the supportive policy aspects on the left and the hampering aspects on the right.