Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs

Published 11 June 2020

Greenhouse gas mitigation practices - Farm Practices Survey England 2020

This release contains the results from the February 2020 Farm Practices Survey which focused on practices relating to greenhouse gas mitigation. The key results for 2020 are given below.

Nutrient Management



57% of holdings have a nutrient management plan.

Anaerobic digestion

6.6% of farmers process waste by anaerobic digestion.

Emissions

66% of farmers are currently taking action to reduce GHG emissions from their farm.

Fertiliser, manure and slurry spreaders

76% of holdings spread manure or slurry on grass or arable land.

Manure and slurry storage

68% of livestock farmers store solid manure in temporary heaps in fields.

Farm health planning and biosecurity

75% of livestock farmers have a Farm Health Plan.

Grassland and grazing



75% of livestock holdings sow some or all of their temporary grassland with a clover mix.

Livestock feeding regimes and breeding practices

71% of holdings with livestock use a ration formulation programme or nutritional advice.

Contents

What you need to know about this release

The Farm Practices Survey (FPS) – Greenhouse Gas Mitigation edition is usually run annually and collects information on a diverse range of topics usually related to the impact of farming practices on the environment. This release contains the results from the February 2020 Farm Practices Survey which focused on practices relating to greenhouse gas mitigation. Note: The results in section 5 to 8 relate to only holdings with livestock

Contact details

Responsible statistician: Sarah Thompson

Team: Farming Statistics - Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.

Email: farming-statistics@defra.gov.uk

Tel: 03000 600 170

National Statistics Status

National Statistics status means that our statistics meet the highest standards of trustworthiness, quality and public value, and it is our responsibility to maintain compliance with these standards.

The continued designation of these statistics as National Statistics was confirmed in 2014 following a full assessment by the UK Statistics Authority against the Code of Practice for Statistics.

Since the last review of these statistics in 2014, we have continued to comply with the Code of Practice for Statistics, and have made improvements including:

- Improvements to the commentary to aid user interpretation
- Providing a helpful summary of the ways in which the results are used by government and other users

For general enquiries about National Statistics, contact the National Statistics Public Enquiry Service:

Tel: 0845 601 3034

Email: info@statistics.gov.uk.

You can find National Statistics on the internet on the Gov.uk website.

Section 1 – Nutrient management

Effective nutrient management provides sufficient nutrients to meet the growth requirements of crops and grassland whilst managing environmental impacts; it can help minimise GHG emissions, reduce the incidence of diffuse water pollution and increase productivity by reducing input costs. Here we consider how farmers manage the application of fertilisers and manures, the use of nutrient management plans and how nutrient requirements are calculated and monitored.

Key findings

- In 2020, 57% of holdings had a nutrient management plan which is almost unchanged from 2019. These holdings accounted for 75% of the farmed area covered by this survey.
- The largest proportion of nutrient management plans were created by farmers themselves either with the help of a professional (44%) or without advice (22%). The remaining 33% were created by an adviser or contractor.
- In 2020, 71% of farmers have a programme of soil testing for nutrient indices and 75% for pH. Of these holdings, almost all were tested on at least some of their fields every five years.
- Some 65% of holdings have a manure management plan for their farm, similar to 64% in 2019.
- 32% of farmers keep track of soil organic matter and 64% of farmers know the soil types for each field on their farm.
- 30% of farms have calculated a whole farm nutrient balance every year.

Figure 1.1: Proportion of holdings with a nutrient management plan: 2009 – 2020



This question was not asked in 2010, therefore results are not available for this year.

The proportion of farms with a nutrient management plan (NMP) was 57% in 2020, almost unchanged from 2019 (see Figure 1.1). In 2020, those holdings with nutrient management plans accounted for 75% of the farmed area covered by this survey.

Around 11% of holdings (accounting for 4% of the farmed area) indicated that a NMP is not applicable. This figure varied by farm type with 31% of pig/poultry farms, 17% of lowland grazing livestock farms and 13% of LFA grazing livestock farms indicating that a NMP was not applicable compared to 4% of cereal farms, 7% of other general cropping farms and 1% of dairy farms.

Figure 1.2: Preparation of nutrient management plans: 2020



In 2020, 22% of those with a nutrient management plan completed the plan on their own without advice, whilst a further 44% created it themselves with the help of an adviser (see Figure 1.2). The remaining 33% had the plan produced by a contractor or adviser.

Of those that sought professional advice, the majority (86%) did so from fertiliser advisers or agronomists (see Table 1.3). Most of those with a nutrient management plan update it every year (73%) and almost all (93%) refer to it at least once each year (see Tables 1.4 and 1.5).

Figure 1.3: Methods used to create nutrient management plans: 2017-2020



PLANET, Muddy Boots, Farmade/Multicrop and Tried & Tested are methods for creating nutrient management plans. PLANET has remained the most popular of these four methods (see Figure 1.3), although in each of the last five years the largest proportion of farmers (31% in 2020) have used other methods not listed on the survey form to create their plans (see Table 1.6). 'Defra recommendations (RB209)' was the most commonly reported source of nutrient recommendations for plans (see Table 1.7).

The percentage of farmers undertaking some form of nutrient testing on soil has remained similar between 2009 and 2020. Results for the past three years can be found in table 1.8. Approximately 65% of farms have a manure management plan in 2020, showing little change over the past 4 years. The majority of farmers (91%) use nutrient recommendations for manure management plans from Defra recommendations (RB209, CoGAP).

Over half of farms (58%) have calculated a whole farm nutrient balance for nitrogen, phosphorus or potassium. In 2020, 30% of farms have calculated the balance every year, 7% every 2 years, and 22% every 3 or more years. When testing for other metals, the majority of farms (73%) have never tested their soils for levels of arsenic, cadmium, chromium, copper, lead or zinc. A further 4% had tested in every field, 20% in some fields and the remaining 3% in one field.

Soil Monitoring looks at the use of soil organic matter and whether this is being recorded. Organic matter helps to retain nutrients and water in soil. Benefits include reduced compaction and surface crusting, plus improved water infiltration into the soil. In 2020, 32% of farmers kept track of soil organic matter on their farm. Of those not keeping track 43% provided the main reason as not important enough to test for (see Table 1.15 and 1.16).

Figure 1.4: Reasons preventing monitoring soil organic matter: 2019 – 2020



Table 1.1: Uptake of nutrient management plans: 2018 – 2020 (proportion of holdings and farmed area)

	2018		2019		2020	
	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	%	95% CI
% of holdings						
Yes	56	±2	58	±2	57	±2
No	32	±2	31	±2	32	±2
Not applicable	12	±2	11	±2	11	±1
% of farmed area						
Yes	74	±2	73	±2	75	±2
No	20	±2	20	±2	21	±2
Not applicable	6	±1	6	±2	4	±1

Based on 2,412 responses in 2018, 2,176 in 2019 and 2,340 in 2020 from holdings with a nutrient management plan.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 1.2: Use of advisers/professional advice to create nutrient management plans: 2018 – 2020 (proportion of farmers with nutrient management plans)

	2018		2019		2020	
	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Self-produced plan without professional advice	24	±2	25	±2	22	±2
Self-produced plan with professional advice	43	±3	43	±3	44	±3
Plan produced by an adviser or contractor	33	±3	32	±3	33	±3

Based on 1,563 responses in 2018, 1,445 in 2019 and 1,535 in 2020 from holdings with a nutrient management plan.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 1.3: Use of advisers and contractors for completion of nutrient management plans: 2020

	Those who sought an adviser's help to create the plan themselves [(a)]		Those whose plan was created by an adviser or contractor[(b)]	
Type of adviser	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Fertiliser adviser / agronomist	86	±3	87	±3
Animal nutritionist	7	±2	2	±1
FWAG [(c)]	2	±1	2	±1
Other	9	±2	11	±3

Footnotes:

(a) Based on 698 responses from those who created the nutrient management plan themselves with advice.

(b) Based on 512 responses from those whose nutrient management plan was created by an adviser or contractor.

(c) FWAG: Farming and Wildlife Advisory Group.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 1.4: Frequency with which the nutrient management plan is updated: 2018 – 2020

Frequency of update	2018 % of holdings	2018 95% CI	2019 % of holdings	2019 95% CI	2020 % of holdings	2020 95% CI
Every year	74	±2	76	±2	73	±2
Every 2 years	12	±2	11	±2	12	±2
Every 3 years or longer	14	±2	13	±2	16	±2

Based on 1,564 responses in 2018, 1,444 in 2019 and 1,535 in 2020 from holdings with a nutrient management plan.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 1.5: Frequency with which the nutrient management plan is referred to in a year: 2018 – 2020

Frequency of use per year	2018 % of holdings	2018 95% CI	2019 % of holdings	2019 95% CI	2020 % of holdings	2020 95% CI
More than 10 times	8	±1	8	±1	9	±2
5 to 10 times	20	±2	17	±2	19	±2
Less than 5 times	67	±3	68	±3	64	±3
Never	5	±1	6	±1	7	±1

Based on 1,564 responses in 2018, 1,441 in 2019 and 1,536 in 2020 from holdings with a nutrient management plan.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 1.6: Methods used to create nutrient management plans: 2018 – 2020

Method	2018		2019		2020	
	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
PLANET	23	±2	20	±2	21	±2
Muddy Boots	18	±2	16	±2	20	±2
Farmade / Multicrop	11	±2	9	±2	8	±1
Industry plan – 'Tried and Tested'	16	±2	16	±2	16	±2
Other	30	±3	33	±3	31	±3
Don't know	13	±2	16	±2	15	±2

Based on 1,559 in 2018, 1,438 in 2019 and 1,513 in 2020 from holdings with a nutrient management plan.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 1.7: Sources of nutrient recommendations for nutrient management plans: 2018 – 2020

Source	2018		2019		2020	
	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Defra recommendations / manual (RB209)	67	±3	66	±3	68	±3
An adviser's or industry note	35	±3	32	±3	35	±3
Personal experience	40	±3	41	±3	36	±3
Other	3	±1	3	±1	4	±1
Don't know	3	±1	3	±1	2	±1

Based on 1,563 in 2018, 1,442 in 2019 and 1,535 in 2020 from holdings with a nutrient management plan.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 1.8: Nutrient testing of soil: 2018 – 2020

		2018		2019		2020	
		Proportion	95% CI	Proportion	95% CI	Proportion	95% CI
Testing the nutrient content (indices) of soil	% of holdings	69	±2	70	±2	71	±2
	% of farmed area	83	±2	82	±2	84	±2
Testing the pH of soil	% of holdings	73	±2	74	±2	75	±2
	% of farmed area	86	±2	84	±2	86	±2

Based on responses from holdings considering the questions applicable. Minimum numbers of responses used: 2,280 in 2018, 2,052 in 2019 and 2,196 in 2020.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 1.9: Nutrient testing of soil by proportion of fields: 2020

		All fields		Some fields		None of the fields	
		Proportion	95% CI	Proportion	95% CI	Proportion	95% CI
Testing the nutrient content (indices) of soil at least every 5 years	% of holdings	61	±2	39	±2	0.3	±0.3
	% of farmed area	66	±3	33	±3	0.2	±0.3
Testing the pH of soil at least every 5 years	% of holdings	57	±2	42	±2	0.8	±0.5
	% of farmed area	61	±3	38	±3	0.6	±0.4

Based on responses from holdings with a programme of soil testing for either nutrient indices or pH. Minimum numbers of responses used: 1,705 in 2020.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 1.10: Calculation of whole farm nutrient balance for N (nitrogen) or P (phosphorus) or K (potassium): 2020

Frequency	% of holdings	95% CI
Every year	30	±2
Every 2 years	7	±1
Every 3 years or more	22	±2
Never	42	±2

Based on 2,330 responses in 2020

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 1.11: Testing of soils for levels of Arsenic, Cadmium, Chromium, Copper, Lead or Zinc: 2020

Frequency	% of holdings	95% CI
In every field	4	±1
In some fields	20	±2
In one field	3	±1
Never	73	±2

Based on 2,335 responses in 2020

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 1.12: Nutrient testing of manure: 2019 – 2020

	2019		**2020**	
Methods of testing/assessing/calculating nutrient content of manure	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Sampling and lab analysis	14	±2	14	±2
Sampling and on-farm testing	3	±1	4	±1
Based on published tables	32	±2	36	±2
No testing done	52	±2	49	±2

Based on 1,781 responses in 2019 and 1,886 in 2020 from holdings without a manure management plan.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 1.13: Uptake of manure management plans: 2018 – 2020

	2018		2019		2020	
	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	%	95% CI
% of holdings	63	*±2*	64	*±2*	65	±2
% of farmed area	78	*±2*	77	*±3*	82	±2

Based on 2,091 responses in 2018, 1,901 in 2019 and 2,034 in 2020 from holdings for which the question was applicable.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 1.14: Source of nutrient recommendations for manure management plans: 2018 – 2020

	2018		2019		2020	
	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Defra recommendations / manual (RB209), CoGAP	89	±2	87	±2	91	±2
Other	12	±2	14	±2	10	±2

Based on 1,466 responses in 2018, 1,368 in 2019 and 1,454 in 2020 from holdings with a manure management plan.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 1.15: Soil organic matter and awareness of soil types: 2019 – 2020

	2019		2020	
Methods of testing/assessing/calculating nutrient content of manure	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Holdings keeping track of soil organic matter	38	±3	32	±2
Holdings who know the soil type[(a)] for each field on the farm	73	±3	64	±2

Based on no less than 1,581 in 2019 and 2,167 in 2020.

(a) as described in Appendix 1 of Defra Recommendations/Manual (RB209)

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 1.16: Reasons preventing farmers keeping track of soil organic matter: 2019-2020

	2019		2020	
Methods of testing/assessing/calculating nutrient content of manure	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Too expensive	20	±3	15	±2
Not important enough to test for	39	±3	43	±3
Difficult to interpret results	27	±3	29	±3
Other	27	±3	26	±2

Based on 950 responses in 2019 and 1,386 in 2020 from holdings that do not keep track of soil organic matter

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Section 2 – Anaerobic digestion

Anaerobic digestion is a natural process in which plant and animal materials are broken down by micro-organisms in the absence of oxygen, producing a biogas that can be used to generate electricity and heat. The process allows more efficient capture and treatment of the nutrients and greenhouse gas emissions from animal slurries and manures than can be achieved by spreading directly onto land. The remaining digestate is rich in nutrients and can be used as fertiliser. This section looks at the proportion of farmers who are currently processing any waste or crop feedstocks in this way.

Key findings

- In 2020, 6.6% of farmers said they process waste by anaerobic digestion, an increase from 5.2% in 2019.
- The proportion of farms processing waste by anaerobic digestion varied across farm types with 12% of other crops farms doing so, followed by 11% of pig and poultry farms.
- Crops were the most common material type being processed, with 4.3% of farmers choosing this option. Slurries were the next most popular option processed by 3.8% of farmers.

The majority of farms do not currently process slurries, crops or other feedstocks by anaerobic digestion, with just 6.6% of holdings doing so in 2020 (see Table 2.1). Prior to 2015, the number of farmers processing by anaerobic digestion had remained stable at approximately 1.5% or below.

Table 2.1: Proportion of holdings processing waste by anaerobic digestion: 2018 – 2020

	% of holdings			95% CI
Waste type	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2020**
Slurries	2.9	3.1	3.8	±0.8
Crops	3.6	2.9	4.3	±0.9
Other feedstocks from the holding	0.7	1.0	0.9	±0.4
Other feedstocks from outside the holding	0.9	1.3	1.0	±0.5
Any of the above	5.4	5.2	6.6	±1.1

Based on 2,413 responses in 2018, 2,187 in 2019 and 2,364 in 2020 from all holdings.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Section 3 – Emissions

This section looks at the importance farmers place on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions when making decisions about their farms. It also focuses on the actions that farmers are currently taking to reduce emissions and their motivations for doing so. In contrast we also look at the reasons that prevent farmers from taking action.

Key findings

- The proportion of farmers considering greenhouse gases (GHG) to be either fairly or very important when taking decisions about their land, crops and livestock is 65% in 2020.
- In 2020, 66% of farmers reported that they were currently taking action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from their farm.
- The most common actions taken to reduce GHG emissions on farms were recycling of waste materials from the farm (85%), improving energy efficiency (77%) and improving nitrogen fertiliser application accuracy (69%).
- The most common motivation for taking any action was that it was considered to be good business practice to do so. This has been the case for the past eight years.
- For those not taking action to reduce GHG emissions, the most common reasons given were that it was not necessary because the farm did not produce many emissions and were unsure what to do as there are too many conflicting views on the issue.

Figure 3.1: Importance placed on GHGs by farmers when taking decisions about their land, crops and livestock: 2019 – 2020



The proportion of farmers considering greenhouse gases to be either fairly or very important when taking decisions about their land, crops and livestock is 65% in 2020,

an increase from 55% in 2019 (see Figure 3.1). There were 8% of farms where greenhouse gases were considered to be “not at all important” and 6% that believed that their farm did not produce any GHGs.

In 2020, 66% of farmers said that they were currently taking action to reduce GHG emissions from their farm. Of those taking action (see Figure 3.2 and Table 3.3) the three most common actions are recycling waste materials from the farm (85%), improving energy efficiency (77%) and improving nitrogen fertiliser application accuracy (69%). The largest change in actions seen between 2013 when these questions were first asked and 2020 was an increase in the number of farmers improving efficiency of their manure & slurry management and application. This has risen from 28% of holdings in 2013 to 50% in 2020.

Figure 3.2: Actions taken to reduce GHG emissions from the farm: 2018 - 2020[(a)]



(a) Figures relate only to those holdings currently taking action to reduce GHG emissions from their farm.

For those farmers currently taking action to reduce their farm’s GHG emissions the most common motivation for doing so was that it was considered to be good business practice (selected by 85% of holdings) followed by concern for the environment (selected by 73%) (see Table 3.4).

Figure 3.3: Reasons preventing farmers taking action to reduce GHG emissions: 2020

(a) Unsure what to do - too many conflicting views on the issue

(b) Not necessary - don't believe farm produces many emissions

The reasons that prevent people from taking action to reduce GHG emissions vary depending on whether farmers were currently taking action or not (see Figure 3.3). For those not currently taking action, the most commonly quoted reasons were that farmers did not think it was necessary to do so as the farm did not produce many emissions (42%) and unsure what to do as too many conflicting views on the issue (39%). For those who were already taking action, unsure what to do due to too many conflicting views was the most quoted reason (37%), followed by lack of information (32%) and expense (31%).

Table 3.1: Importance placed on GHGs by farmers when taking decisions about their land, crops and livestock: 2018 – 2020

	% of holdings			95% CI
	2018	**2019**	**2020**	**2020**
Very important	11	13	18	±2
Fairly important	43	42	46	±2
Not very important	30	29	22	±2
Not at all important	8	8	8	±1
Do not believe farm produces GHGs	7	8	6	±1

Based on 2,395 responses in 2018, 2,169 in 2019 and 2,331 in 2020.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 3.2: Belief that reducing GHG emissions from the farm will contribute to improving the overall profitability: 2018 – 2020

	% of holdings			95% CI
	2018	2019	2020	2020
Strongly agree	4	4	6	±1
Agree	44	37	40	±2
Disagree	45	49	45	±2
Strongly disagree	7	9	9	±1

Based on responses from 2,391 in 2018, 2,163 in 2019 and 2,313 in 2020.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 3.3: Actions being taken to reduce GHG emissions from farms: 2018 – 2020

	% of holdings			95% CI
	2018	2019	2020	2020
Taking action[(a)]	58	61	66	±2
Of those taking action, the actions were[(b)]:				
Recycling of waste materials from the farm (e.g. tyres, plastics)	87	89	85	±2
Improving nitrogen fertiliser application accuracy	69	72	69	±2
Improving energy efficiency (e.g. reducing electricity use, using reduced tillage)	75	75	77	±2
Increasing use of clover in grassland	38	38	40	±2
Improving nitrogen feed efficiency, livestock diets	27	27	27	±2
Improving efficiency in manure and slurry management and application	50	57	50	±3
Increasing use of legumes in arable rotation	27	27	26	±2
Other actions	5	8	14	±2

(a) Based on responses from 2,364 holdings in 2018, 2,157 in 2019 and 2,335 in 2020.

(b) Based on responses from 1,485 holdings in 2018, 1,413 in 2019 and 1,640 in 2020 who are taking action to reduce GHG emissions.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 3.4: Main motivations for those taking action to reduce GHG emissions: 2018 – 2020

	% of holdings			95% CI
Motivations	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2020**
Consider it good business practice	83	84	85	±2
Concern for the environment	68	71	73	±2
To improve profitability	53	55	46	±3
Regulation	44	41	35	±2
To meet market demands	20	19	24	±2
Other motivation	3	3	5	±1

Based on 1,485 responses in 2018, 1,408 in 2019 and 1,636 in 2020 from holdings who are taking action to reduce GHG emissions.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 3.5: Reasons preventing farmers from taking action to reduce GHG emissions from their farm: 2020

	For those not taking action[(a)]		**For those already taking action[(b)]**		**For all holdings[(c)]**	
	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Lack of information	35	±4	32	±3	33	±2
Too expensive	12	±2	31	±3	23	±2
Lack of incentive	24	±3	29	±3	27	±2
Already done all they can	13	±3	28	±3	22	±2
Don’t believe farmers can do much	16	±3	5	±1	9	±1
Not necessary – don’t believe farm produces many emissions	42	±4	17	±2	27	±2
Unsure what to do - too many conflicting views on the issue	39	±4	37	±3	38	±2
Other reasons	9	±2	9	±2	9	±1

(a) Based on responses from 688 holdings in 2020 who are not taking action to reduce GHG emissions.

(b) Based on responses from 1,161 holdings in 2020 who are currently taking action to reduce GHG emissions.

(c) Based on responses from 1,853 holdings in 2020 regardless of whether or not they are taking action to reduce GHG emissions.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Section 4 – Fertiliser, manure and slurry spreaders

Calibrating fertiliser, manure and slurry spreaders can help to improve input efficiency and reduce GHG emissions. This section focuses specifically on farmers who spread manure, slurry and fertiliser.

More details on nitrogen fertiliser spreading practices are available in the British Survey of Fertiliser Practice.

Key findings

- Just over three quarters of holdings (76%) spread manure or slurry on their grass or arable land in 2020 and 84% spread fertilisers.
- On 49% of holdings where the farmer spreads at least some manure or slurry themselves, the manure or slurry spreader is never calibrated.

Figure 4.1: Proportion of holdings spreading manure and slurry on grassland and arable land by farm type: 2020



In 2020, 76% of holdings spread manure or slurry on their grass and arable land. There was considerable variation between farm types. Almost all dairy farms spread manures or slurries and these farms are more likely to use contractors to spread at least some of the manure and slurry than other farm types. The majority (60%) of LFA grazing livestock farmers spread manure/slurry themselves only (see Figure 4.1).

Fertiliser was spread either by the farmer or a contractor on 97% of cereal farms, 94% of other cropping farms and 93% of dairy farms. On all three of these farm types the largest proportion of holdings said the fertiliser was spread solely by the farmer, however cereal and other cropping farms were more likely to use a contractor than dairy farms (see Figure 4.2).

Figure 4.2: Proportion of holdings spreading fertiliser on grassland and arable land by farm type: 2020



Table 4.1: Spreading of manure and slurry on grassland or arable land: 2018 – 2020

	2018		2019		2020	
	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Spread by farmer only	37	±2	41	±3	38	±2
Spread by farmer and also contractor	17	±2	14	±2	17	±2
Spread by contractor only	22	±2	23	±2	20	±2
None spread	25	±2	22	±2	24	±2

Based on 2,113 responses in 2018, 1,887 in 2019 and 2,010 in 2020.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 4.2: Spreading of fertiliser on grassland or arable land: 2018 – 2020

	2018		2019		2020	
	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Spread by farmer only	57	±2	59	±3	57	±3
Spread by farmer and also contractor	13	±2	11	±2	11	±1
Spread by contractor only	15	±2	15	±2	16	±2
None spread	15	±2	14	±2	16	±2

Based on 2,121 responses in 2018 and 1,899 in 2019 and 2,028 in 2020.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 4.3: Frequency with which farmers calibrate their manure or slurry spreader(s): 2018 – 2020

Frequency of check	2018		2019		2020	
	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Never	55	±3	47	±4	49	±3
Whenever there is significant change in manure or slurry characteristics	16	±2	22	±3	19	±3
Whenever manure or slurry is tested	1	±1	2	±1	2	±1
Every year	18	±3	19	±3	18	±3
Less often than every year	7	±2	7	±2	8	±2
Other frequency	3	±1	4	±2	3	±1

Based on 980 responses in 2018, 871 in 2019 and 909 in 2020 on holdings where the farmer spreads some or all of the manure/slurry.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Note: The results in section 5 to 8 relate to only holdings with livestock

Section 5 – Manure and slurry storage

The system of manure and slurry management is relevant to the control of environmental risks to water and air. It prevents the loss of ammonia to the air, at the same time retaining the nitrogen for use as an organic fertiliser, reducing the need for manufactured nitrogen fertiliser inputs.

This section looks at the types of stores that livestock farmers have, whether or not they are covered, and whether the farmer has any plans to upgrade their current facilities. It also looks at whether the farmer has a slurry separator. Separating the suspended solids from slurry allows the two manure streams to be handled separately. The solid fraction can be stored on a concrete pad or in a field heap, while the liquid fraction can be stored and transported/pumped to fields for land application. Separation can reduce storage space and improve the efficiency with which nitrogen is applied to land which has the potential to reduce emissions.

Key findings

- Temporary heaps remains the most common form of storage for solid manure, with just over two thirds (68%) of the farmers having this kind of store.
- A quarter of farmers (25%) store slurry in a tank, whilst 14% store slurry in lagoons without a strainer.
- In 2020, 16% of livestock farmers with storage facilities intend to enlarge or upgrade their manure or slurry storage compared to 14% in 2019.

Figure 5.1: Proportion of livestock holdings with manure or slurry storage facilities: 2018-2020



The most common storage facility for solid manure continues to be temporary heaps in fields (see Figure 5.1). The most common facilities for slurry storage are tanks (25% of farms) followed by lagoons without a strainer (14%). Slurry in a tank is far more likely to have a cover than any other type of store (see Table 5.2).

In 2020, 16% of livestock farmers planned to make changes to their manure or slurry storage facilities. Of these, 22% planned to make the changes within the next year and a further 43% in the next 1 to 3 years (see Table 5.3).

Figure 5.2: Proportion of holdings with storage facilities for slurry by number of months of storage capacity: 2016-2020



The proportion of holdings that have up to 6 months' storage capacity for slurry has increased slightly to 80%. Almost all of the remaining holdings had between 7 and 12 months capacity with only very few people having more than 12 months storage (see Figure 5.2 and Table 5.4).

Table 5.1: Proportion of holdings with storage facilities for manure and/or slurry: 2018 – 2020 storage

Storage facility	2018		2019		2020	
	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Solid manure stored in heaps on a solid base	57	±3	58	±3	55	±3
Solid manure stored in temporary heaps in fields	67	±3	64	±3	68	±3
Slurry in a tank	24	±3	24	±3	25	±3
Slurry in a lagoon without strainer	16	±2	15	±2	14	±2
Storage with strainer facility	7	±1	6	±1	5	±1
Slurry in another type of store	2	±1	2	±1	3	±1

Based on no fewer than 1,459 responses in 2018, 1,352 in 2019 and 1,445 in 2020 from livestock holdings.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 5.2: Proportion of holdings having storage facilities for manure and/or slurry where the store is covered: 2018 – 2020

Storage facility	2018		2019		2020	
	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Solid manure stored in heaps on a solid base	16	±3	19	±3	16	±3
Solid manure stored in temporary heaps in fields	1	±0	1	±1	1	±1
Slurry in a tank	28	±6	30	±6	24	±5
Slurry in a lagoon without strainer	5	±3	5	±3	3	±3
Storage with strainer facility	3	±3	13	±11	8	±6
Slurry in another type of store	4	±4	5	±5	5	±4

Based on no fewer than 100 responses in 2018, 86 in 2019 and 68 in 2020 from livestock holdings that have the storage facilities in question.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 5.3: Proportion of holdings planning to enlarge, upgrade or reconstruct their manure and slurry storage facilities: 2018 – 2020

	2018		2019		2020	
	% of holding	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Holdings planning to make changes to their current facilities [a]	16	±2	14	±2	16	±2
Of those planning to make changes, the changes will be made: [b]						
In 0 to 6 months	11	±4	9	±4	9	±4
In 7 to 11 months	17	±5	13	±5	14	±4
In 1 to less than 3 years	47	±7	46	±7	43	±6
In 3 to less than 5 years	14	±5	19	±6	17	±5
In 5 years or more	11	±4	12	±5	18	±4

(a) Based on 1,423 in 2018, 1,339 in 2019 and 1,435 in 2020 from livestock holdings that have manure or slurry storage facilities.

(b) Based on 235 responses in 2018, 216 in 2019 and 261 in 2020 from livestock holdings that are planning to make changes.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 5.4: Proportion of holdings with slurry stores by storage capacity: 2018 – 2020

Storage capacity	2018		2019		2020	
	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
1 to 3 months	24	±4	20	±4	19	±4
4 to 6 months	56	±4	57	±4	61	±4
7 to 12 months	19	±3	22	±4	17	±3
Over 12 months	2	±1	1	±1	2	±1

Based on 569 responses in 2018, 518 in 2019 and 525 in 2020 from livestock holdings that have slurry storage facilities.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 5.5: Proportion of holdings that have a slurry separator: 2018 - 2020

	2018		2019		2020	
	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Holdings who have a slurry separator	7	±2	10	±3	9	±2

Based on 578 responses in 2018, 532 in 2019 and 542 in 2020 from livestock holdings.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Section 6 – Farm health planning and biosecurity

Farm health planning is a Defra initiative which benefits farmers by helping to prevent disease and improve the performance of their livestock. This can help to reduce GHG emissions over the course of an animal's lifetime by, for example, reaching finishing weights earlier and achieving higher feed conversion rates. Farm health planning is about farmers working closely with their vets or other advisers to set targets for their animals' health and welfare and take steps to measure, manage and monitor productivity.

Key findings

- The number of livestock farmers with a Farm Health Plan increased to 75% in 2020, compared with 73% in 2019.
- In 2020, over half (61%) of farmers with a FHP used it on a routine basis to inform disease management decisions.
- The number of FHPs completed with the help of a vet or adviser has increased from 84% in 2019 to 91% in 2020.

In 2020, 75% of livestock farms had a Farm Health Plan. This is an increase when compared with 73% in 2019. The majority of livestock farmers (66%) have a written or recorded plan an increase from 63% in 2019. Livestock farmers with a plan that was not recorded (9%) saw a decrease in 2020, from 10% in 2019 (see Figure 6.1). Of those holdings with a FHP in 2020, 91% had created the plan with assistance from a vet or advisor (see Table 6.2). The proportion using a vet or adviser has risen steadily from 60% in 2009 when we first asked the question.

Figure 6.1: Proportion of livestock holdings with a farm health plan: 2016 – 2020



Of those with a Farm Health Plan in 2020, 91% were using it either routinely or when they could to inform disease management decisions and a further 3% felt that they

should be doing so. The remaining 6% did not feel it was necessary to use the plan (see Figure 6.2).

Figure 6.2: Proportion of livestock holdings using their farm health plan to inform disease management decisions by frequency: 2016-2020



The number of livestock farmers who undertake training for animal health and welfare and disease management either routinely or when they can rose to 65% in 2020, compared with 60% in 2019. A further 10% said that although they did not undertake training they felt that they should and the remaining 25% did not feel training was necessary (see Table 6.4).

Table 6.1: Proportion of livestock holdings with a farm health plan: 2018 – 2020

	% of holdings			95% CI
	2018	**2019**	**2020**	**2020**
Written or recorded plan	63	63	66	±2
Unrecorded plan	12	10	9	±2
No plan	25	27	25	±2

Based on 1,775 in 2018, 1,601 in 2019 and 1,740 in 2020 from livestock holdings.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 6.2: Proportion of holdings who completed their farm health plan with the assistance of a vet or adviser: 2018 – 2020

	% of holdings			95% CI
	2018	2019	2020	2020
Assistance from vet / adviser	79	84	91	±2

Based on 1,374 responses in 2018, 1,248 in 2019 and 1,365 in 2020 from holdings with livestock.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 6.3: Proportion of holdings using their farm health plan to inform disease management decisions by frequency of use: 2018 – 2020

	2018		2019		2020	
Frequency of use	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Use plan routinely	48	±3	55	±3	61	±3
Use plan when possible	38	±3	33	±3	29	±3
Don’t use plan but feel the need to	6	±1	4	±1	3	±1
Don’t feel it’s necessary to use plan	9	±2	7	±2	6	±1

Based on 1,391 responses in 2018, 1,255 in 2019 and 1,378 in 2020 from livestock holdings with a farm health plan.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 6.4: Proportion of holdings undertaking animal health and welfare and disease management training by frequency of training: 2018 – 2020

	2018		2019		2020	
Frequency of training	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Undertake training routinely	17	±2	22	±2	24	±2
Undertake training when possible	40	±3	38	±3	41	±2
Don't undertake training but feel the need to	14	±2	10	±2	10	±2
Don't feel training is necessary	29	±2	30	±3	25	±2

Based on 1,723 responses in 2018, 1,588 in 2019 and 1,709 in 2020 from livestock holdings.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Section 7 – Grassland and grazing

In some situations sowing temporary grassland with a clover mix or high sugar grasses can be a cost effective method of increasing production and improving environmental protection. For example, clover's nitrogen fixing properties (although not suitable for all soil types) can reduce the amount of nitrogen applied and improve grassland yields. High sugar grasses can help to improve the efficiency of animal production (for example, improved milk yields and faster live weight gain) which can in turn reduce GHG emissions.

Land and soil management mitigation methods can help to preserve good soil structure preventing erosion and compaction, both of which can lead to GHG emissions. Mitigation methods relating to this include keeping livestock away from water courses and reducing stocking rates when conditions are excessively wet.

Key findings

- In 2020, 75% of livestock holdings indicated that a proportion of their temporary grassland had been sown with a clover mix: 13% had sown all of their temporary grassland with a clover mix.
- High sugar grasses were sown on 61% of livestock holdings with temporary grassland.
- The most common frequency for reseeding clover or high sugar grass swards in 2020 was 3 to 5 years.
- Approximately 76% of livestock farmers always take action to reduce stocking rates when fields are excessively wet.
- 62% of livestock farmers routinely try to keep livestock out of water courses.

Table 7.1: Proportion of livestock holdings that have sown their temporary grassland with a clover mix by proportion of grassland: 2018 – 2020

	2018		2019		2020	
Proportion of temporary grassland (%)	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
100	29	±3	27	±3	13	±2
81-99	6	±2	6	±2	3	±1
61-80	5	±2	7	±2	7	±2
41-60	8	±2	9	±2	22	±3
21-40	9	±2	10	±2	12	±2
1-20	16	±3	17	±3	17	±3
0	26	±3	25	±3	25	±3

Based on 871 responses in 2018, 817 in 2019 and 878 in 2020 from livestock holdings with temporary grass.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 7.2: Proportion of livestock holdings that have sown their temporary grassland with high sugar grasses by proportion of grassland: 2018 – 2020

	2018		2019		2020	
Proportion of temporary grassland (%)	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
100	18	±3	19	±3	8	±2
81-99	4	±1	6	±2	4	±1
61-80	8	±2	7	±2	4	±1
41-60	11	±2	10	±2	22	±3
21-40	10	±2	9	±2	11	±2
1-20	12	±2	9	±2	11	±2
0	38	±4	41	±4	39	±3

Based on 872 responses in 2018, 814 in 2019 and 875 in 2020 from livestock holdings with temporary grass.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 7.3: Proportion of holdings by the frequency with which holders reseed their clover sward: 2018 – 2020

	2018		2019		2020	
Frequency of reseeding	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
1 to 12 months	1	±1	1	±1	2	±1
1 to 2 years	5	±2	4	±2	7	±2
2 to 3 years	11	±3	8	±2	8	±2
3 to 5 years	34	±4	34	±4	27	±4
5 to 10 years	22	±4	23	±4	24	±4
10 years and over	1	±1	1	±1	1	±1
Never/Do not reseed	26	±4	30	±4	31	±4

Based on 607 responses in 2018, 594 in 2019 and 594 in 2020 from livestock holdings with temporary grass.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 7.4: Proportion of holdings by the frequency with which holders reseed their high sugar grass sward: 2018 – 2020

	2018		2019		2020	
Frequency of reseeding	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
1 to 12 months	1	±1	1	±1	1	±1
1 to 2 years	6	±2	6	±2	6	±2
2 to 3 years	15	±3	12	±3	16	±3
3 to 5 years	33	±4	35	±5	34	±4
5 to 10 years	24	±4	27	±4	22	±4
10 years and over	1	±1	1	±1	1	±1
Never/ Do not reseed	20	±4	19	±4	21	±4

Based on 539 responses in 2018, 492 in 2019 and 513 in 2020 from livestock holdings with temporary grass.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 7.5: Frequency with which livestock holdings take action to reduce stocking rates when fields are excessively wet: 2019 – 2020

	2019		2020	
Frequency	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Always	75	±3	76	±2
Some of the time	22	±2	22	±2
Never	3	±1	2	±1

Based on 1,439 responses in 2019 and 1,598 in 2020 from holdings with livestock.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 7.6: Frequency with which livestock holdings take action to keep livestock out of water courses: 2019 – 2020

	2019		2020	
Frequency	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Routinely	61	±3	62	±3
Some of the time	29	±3	28	±2
Never	9	±2	9	±2

Based on 1,332 responses in 2019 and 1,433 in 2020 from holdings with livestock.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Section 8 – Livestock feeding regimes and breeding practices

Cattle and sheep breeding practices are another area which can contribute to herd and flock productivity and efficiency which in turn can reduce GHG emissions. A Profitable Lifetime Index (PLI) is a scoring system to identify cattle with the best 'genetic merit' used when choosing bulls to breed with dairy cattle. The PLI uses a combination of attributes including life expectancy, health, fertility and milk production. Estimated Breeding Values (EBV) estimate the genetic worth of animals using desirable traits such as meat production. In addition to playing an important role in productivity and efficiency, livestock feeding practices such as intake and type of feed, can have an impact on GHG emissions.

Key findings

- In 2020, 71% of livestock holdings used a ration formulation programme or nutritional advice.
- Whole-crop silage and maize were the most common alternative forages (other than grazed or conserved grass) offered to cattle and sheep by 13% and 11% of farmers respectively.
- In 2020, 26% of holdings breeding dairy cows always used bulls with a high Profitable Lifetime Index (PLI).
- Bulls and rams with high Estimated Breeding Values (EBV) were always used by 18% of holdings breeding beef cattle and 8% of those breeding lambs in 2020.

In 2020 over half (53%) of livestock holdings used a ration formulation programme or expert nutritional advice when planning the feeding regime of their cattle and sheep at least some of the time and a further 18% do so rarely (see Figure 8.1).

Figure 8.1: Proportion of holdings using a ration formulation program or expert nutritional advice when planning livestock feeding regimes: 2016-2020



A quarter (24%) of farmers offered alternative forages (other than grazed or conserved grass) to their cattle and sheep in 2020. This figure varies depending on farm type and dairy farmers are most likely to offer their livestock alternative forages (see Figure 8.2).

Figure 8.2: Proportion of holdings offering alternative forage crops to cattle and sheep by farm type: 2020[(a)]



(a) For holdings with cattle and/or sheep

The most common of these forage crops were whole-crop silage and maize which were offered by 13% and 11% of farmers respectively.

Figure 8.3: Proportion of holdings using bulls with a high PLI when breeding dairy cows by frequency of use: 2016-2020 [(a)]



(a) For holdings with dairy cattle

In 2020, 26% of livestock holdings always used bulls with a high Profitable Lifetime Index (PLI) when breeding dairy cows. This was an increase from 19% in 2019.

Figure 8.4: Proportion of holdings using bulls with high EBVs when breeding beef cattle by frequency of use: 2016-2020



(a) For holdings with beef cattle

Estimated Breeding Values (EBV) estimate the genetic worth of animals using desirable traits such as meat production. Just under half (47%) of holdings used bulls with a high EBV at least some of the time when breeding beef cattle in 2020 (see Figure 8.4). The equivalent proportion of holdings using rams with a high EBV at least some of the time when breeding lambs was 37% (see Figure 8.5).

Figure 8.5: Proportion of holdings using rams with high EBVs when breeding lambs by frequency of use: 2016-2020 [(a)]



(a) For holdings with lambs

In addition to the proportion of holdings using bulls and rams with high EBVs (see Table 8.4 and 8.5) the proportion of beef cattle and lambs that this figure relates to has also been calculated (see Tables 8.6 and 8.7). By using responses from the 2019 June survey we are able to give an indication of the proportion of animals that are covered by this practice. In 2020, the holdings using bulls and rams with high EBVs at least some of the time accounted for 60% of beef cattle and 46% of lambs at June 2019.

Table 8.1: Proportion of holdings using a ration formulation programme when planning cattle and sheep feeding regimes by frequency of use: 2018 – 2020

	2018		**2019**		**2020**	
Frequency of use	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Always	21	±2	21	±2	20	±2
Most of the time	16	±2	13	±2	15	±2
Some of the time	20	±2	19	±2	18	±2
Rarely	15	±2	18	±2	18	±2
Never	27	±3	29	±3	29	±2

Based on 1,566 responses in 2018, 1,435 in 2019 and 1,552 in 2020 from holdings with cattle or sheep.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 8.2: Proportion of holdings offering alternative forages to cattle and sheep: 2019 – 2020

	2019		2020	
Alternative forage crop	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Whole-crop silage	15	± 2	13	±2
Maize	11	±1	11	±1
Red clover	6	±1	6	±1
Lucerne	2	±1	2	±1
Triticale	1	±0	1	±0
Any of the above	25	±2	24	±2
None of these	75	±2	76	±2

Based on 1,403 responses in 2019 and 1,538 in 2020 from holdings with cattle and sheep.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 8.3: Proportion of holdings using bulls with a high Profitable Lifetime Index (PLI) when breeding dairy cows by frequency of use: 2018 – 2020

	2018		2019		2020	
Frequency of use	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI	% of holdings	95% CI
Always	26	±4	19	±3	26	±3
Most of the time	19	±3	19	±3	18	±3
Some of the time	15	±3	13	±3	12	±3
Rarely	3	±1	3	±1	5	±2
Never	37	±4	46	±4	39	±4

Based on 520 responses in 2018, 543 in 2019 and 518 in 2020 from holdings with cattle or sheep.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 8.4: Proportion of holdings using bulls with a high Estimated Breeding Value (EBV) when breeding beef cattle by frequency of use: 2018 – 2020

Frequency of use	2018 % of holdings	2018 95% CI	2019 % of holdings	2019 95% CI	2020 % of holdings	2020 95% CI
Always	21	±3	19	±3	18	±2
Most of the time	16	±2	14	±2	17	±2
Some of the time	16	±2	15	±2	12	±2
Rarely	7	±2	7	±2	8	±2
Never	40	±3	45	±3	45	±3

Based on 983 responses in 2018, 1,031 in 2019 and 1,102 in 2020 from holdings with beef cattle.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 8.5: Proportion of holdings using rams with a high Estimated Breeding Value (EBV) when breeding lambs by frequency of use: 2018 – 2020

Frequency of use	2018 % of holdings	2018 95% CI	2019 % of holdings	2019 95% CI	2020 % of holdings	2020 95% CI
Always	11	±2	10	±2	8	±2
Most of the time	10	±2	11	±2	11	±2
Some of the time	20	±3	19	±3	18	±3
Rarely	12	±2	12	±3	15	±3
Never	47	±4	49	±4	48	±4

Based on 756 in 2018, 769 in 2019 and 830 in 2020 from holdings with lambs.

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 8.6: Proportion of beef cattle on holdings using bulls with a high Estimated Breeding Value (EBV) by frequency of use: 2018 – 2020

	2018		2019		2020	
Frequency of use	% of beef cattle	95% CI	% of beef cattle	95% CI	% of beef cattle	95% CI
Always	24	±4	25	±4	28	±4
Most of the time	17	±3	15	±3	19	±3
Some of the time	20	±4	17	±3	14	±3
Rarely	8	±2	6	±2	8	±2
Never	32	±4	37	±4	32	±4
Based on 983 responses in 2018, 1,031 in 2019 and 1,102 in 2020 from holdings						

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Table 8.7: Proportion of lambs on holdings using rams with a high Estimated Breeding Value (EBV) by frequency of use: 2018 - 2020

	2018		2019		2020	
Frequency of use	% of lambs	95% CI	% of lambs	95% CI	% of lambs	95% CI
Always	15	±5	12	±4	11	±3
Most of the time	14	±4	15	±4	14	±4
Some of the time	23	±4	24	±4	21	±4
Rarely	12	±4	10	±3	13	±3
Never	37	±5	39	±5	41	±5
Based on 756 responses in 2018, 769 in 2019 and 830 in 2020 from holdings with lambs.						

Source: Farm Practices Survey – Greenhouse gas mitigation

Survey Methodology

Survey content

The Farm Practices Survey (FPS) – Greenhouse Gas Mitigation edition is usually run annually and collects information on a diverse range of topics usually related to the impact of farming practices on the environment. Each year, stakeholders are invited to request new questions to help inform policy decisions and provide evidence on progress towards agricultural and environmental sustainability.

This release includes the results from the FPS run in February 2020. The survey largely focused on practices relating to greenhouse gas mitigation, similar in content to FPS surveys run in February over the previous nine years. Topics covered include nutrient and manure management, anaerobic digestion, emissions, fertiliser, manure and slurry spreaders and storage, farm health planning, grassland and grazing and livestock breeding and feeding practices. Where comparisons with earlier years are possible, the results are displayed alongside those from previous years.

The results provided in this release are based on questions sent to approximately 7,000 holdings in England. These holdings were targeted by farm type and size to ensure a representative sample. The survey was voluntary and the response rate was approximately 35%. Thank you to all of the farmers who completed a survey form.

Thresholds were applied to ensure that very small holdings with little agricultural activity were not included in the survey. To be included in the main sample, holdings had to have at least 50 cattle, 100 sheep, 100 pigs, 1,000 poultry or 20 hectares of arable crops or orchards. Therefore, all results given in this statistical release reflect almost 60 thousand holdings that exceed these thresholds out of the total English population of almost 106 thousand commercial holdings.

A breakdown of the number of holdings within the population and the sample are shown below.

Farm type	Number of eligible holdings in England	Number of holdings sampled	Response rate (%)
Cereals	15,204	1,481	42
Other crops	6,114	997	37
Pigs & poultry	3,487	546	26
Dairy	5,770	986	34
Grazing livestock (LFA)	8,218	864	34
Grazing livestock (lowland)	15,554	1,483	30
Mixed	5,434	646	38
All Farms	59,781	7,003	35

Data analysis

Results have been analysed using a standard methodology for stratified random surveys to produce national estimates. With this method, all of the data are weighted according to the inverse sampling fraction.

Accuracy and reliability of the results

We show 95% confidence intervals against the results. These show the range of values that may apply to the figures. They mean that we are 95% confident that this range contains the true value. They are calculated as the standard errors (se) multiplied by 1.96 to give the 95% confidence interval (95% CI). The standard errors only give an indication of the sampling error. They do not reflect any other sources of survey errors, such as non-response bias.

Definitions

Where reference is made to the *type of farm* in this document, this refers to the 'robust type', which is a standardised farm classification system. *Farm sizes* are based on the estimated labour requirements for the holding, rather than its land area. The farm size bands used within the detailed results tables which accompany this publication are shown in the table below. Standard Labour Requirement (SLR) is defined as the theoretical number of workers required each year to run a holding, based on its cropping and livestock activities.

Farm size	Definition
Small	Less than 2 SLR
Medium	2 to less than 3 SLR
Large	3 or more SLR

Availability of results

This release contains headline results for each section. The full breakdown of results, by region, farm type and farm size can be found at the Farm Practices Survey.

Other Defra statistical notices can be viewed on the Defra website.

Data uses

The Farm Practices survey is used to investigate the impact of farming on the environment and to provide up-to-date agri-environment information on current issues to help inform policy decisions. The survey has a wide customer base both internal and external to Defra including Natural England, English Heritage, ADAS, the Environment Agency and the NFU.

Data from the Farm Practices Survey are used in Defra's greenhouse gas (GHG) indicator framework. The framework, initially developed as part of the 2012 review of progress in reducing GHG emissions from English agriculture, consists of ten key indicators covering farmer attitudes and knowledge, the uptake of mitigation methods and the GHG emission intensity of production (GHG produced per tonne of crop or litre of milk or kilogramme of meat produced) in key agricultural sectors. Information from the survey also feeds into the Defra publication, Agricultural Statistics and Climate Change which provides background context to the current understanding of agriculture and GHG emissions.

In partnership with the Devolved Administrations, the Government invested over £12 million, over a four and a half year period, on the development of an improved GHG inventory to strengthen understanding of on farm emissions. Information from the Farm Practices Survey fed into this project which should enable greater precision in reporting GHG emissions from the sector, so that, going forward, changes made to farming practices to reduce GHG emissions will be properly recognised in the inventory.

Additional information

For more information on how the data was collected you can view the questions asked on our survey form in Annex I over the page.

Finally we are keen to hear your thoughts on this statistical release. If you found the data useful or if you have any other comments please let us know. You can contact us via the phone number on the front page or alternatively email us at farming-statistics@defra.gov.uk.