

## 05/04/2022, 3pm: Pathways to Success Sub Group

- **Attendees:** [REDACTED]

### **Actions**

- [REDACTED] to look at data of number of farmers already in stewardship, by further understanding the FBS – LFA Grazing Livestock category and exploring more granular data from RPA. See if we can compare with CS22
- [REDACTED] to ensure the point around CS/SFI improved grassland is fed back to Engagement leads to clarify messaging
- [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to speak with [REDACTED] – re private finance, carbon trading, carbon sequestration. Decide whether we rule in or out and be clear on rationale why we are/aren't including it
- [REDACTED] to circulate the updated version of the project spec, with comments from today and colleagues embedded, to have a final version by the next meeting
- [REDACTED] to explore co-working platforms to work collaboratively on documents
- [REDACTED] to schedule in a meeting focussed on ways of working
- **All** to reflect on the attached principles of co-design

### **Notes**

#### The task and introduction

- [REDACTED] – Good for us to look at our shared expectations on working through the spec. We also want to understand UA requirements from us and start to understand milestones of what Defra's resource requirement could be. We also want to layer some expectations, in terms of funding for producing the guide, who should publish the guide etc.
- [REDACTED] – We know 75% of Moorland is in Stewardship – a lot of that is Commons. Wondered whether how many of the 'home farms' are in stewardship. Can we ask RPA what % of farms? [REDACTED] – FBS sector definition for Uplands is LFA grazing livestock sector. Need to do a bit of work as to what that is, what that covers and whether it can answer that question. [REDACTED] – would be interesting to also get CS22, can we do that comparison?
- [REDACTED] – We have plans in summer to bring a lot of EU agreements into domestic terms – should allow us to build in more flexibility. Plans still emerging – but clearer customer journey this summer onwards
- [REDACTED] – understanding even if they're in the agreements, need to understand whether they're maximising those opportunities. [REDACTED] – good point, that's the 'what if' that this work will identify/explore
- [REDACTED] – if you are in CS you cannot be in SFI for improved grassland, the two are incompatible. We need more honesty that SFI22 is not a way of clawing back some of your BPS if you are on stewardship, as its only if you're on the option for bettering trees – if you're on any normal land management option, you cannot be in SFI22 as well (only Moorland). Needs a lot of comms, general messaging going to farmers is the reason for including the improved grassland standard within SFI is because it's not accessible through CS – most people feel they'll be able to join SFI in addition
- [REDACTED] – 'what if' needs to be about what impact will that have on the productivity side of the business
- [REDACTED] – we see a wider remit in terms of broader aspects of the uplands (as well as upland businesses) – albeit recognising that you can't have anything without viable businesses. Still see an element of private finance as missing in the spec – as its part of the broader changes in the horizon, do we want to build that in? have we not done so due to it being unknown? How shall we handle private finance? If we want the guide to touch on it, we need to build in a workstream/conversation with relevant parts of the department so we can better understand the policy position. [REDACTED] – needs a lot of thought/work, used

the example of BrewDog. Advice to members at the moment is to do nothing, value is going up, don't sell carbon/farms. [REDACTED]– not a concrete action at the moment, as to what this document was originally intended to be – trying to help farmers who may be stuck over the next 18 months

- [REDACTED]– Opportunity as part of biodiversity net gain, to carry out a carbon audit/biodiversity audit on your farm

### The process

- [REDACTED]– **Re viability criteria**, it is about what does success look like – what is success for businesses? Micro-businesses with anything from 0.5-3 FTE involved in the business. View is everyone should be earning the living foundation wage. It's something to aim for as a criteria – a fair minimum of success. FBS does work on standard labour units (SLRs) – more objective data that we could use. Doesn't mean there isn't an alternative logic we could use. We know this is a marginal way of life – just saying in the context of public money for public goods, as a society, we shouldn't be looking to buy public goods at less than the min wage. A holding marker – don't get hung up on it, but can't just say breaking even is satisfactory [REDACTED]– how different is the picture now, how big is that step? [REDACTED]– fundamental question to address early in this guide process

### Ways of Working

- [REDACTED]– **Co-design**. Important to set this work off right.
- [REDACTED]– important to manage each other's expectations in ways of working going forward. What does publication look like? Who holds the pen? Who is going to monitor and control in terms of the guide?
- [REDACTED]– is it overkill to have a **shared document of what our expectations** are for the project, shared position of what we want each other to do? Something which outlines milestones? We are still doing resource planning on this. **What are expectations in terms of publishing and ownership?** Thinking about the trade offs between who publishes. **Editorial considerations to make.** [REDACTED]– pros and cons to each approach we take. UA has done work collectively w/Defra before. If co-badged, would be co-signed off – Ministers as well as UA. Could end up with no pathways to success at the end. We only want to publish if we have something which is positive to tell people. [REDACTED]– in that scenario, we would be using this exercise to test our current offers and see what we could do (stress testing) – all contingent on Ministerial views, but we know they see it as a key issue.
- [REDACTED]– we would want the ability to talk about it to members. Testing these options together with Defra – to ensure iterative policy development gives the best possible outcome for the objects of the policy. Conversations w/Ministers is that they are aligned with the ambition to have thriving upland businesses
- [REDACTED]– if we're entering into co-creation we should be working towards co-publication, co-badge etc.
- [REDACTED]– find more time to work through a shared understanding. Develop the spec into a workplan. Look at those aims and contingencies and then engage Ministers on the thing as a whole to avoid surprises.
- [REDACTED]– important to embed the ways of working into the spec.
- **Key outcome – jointly 'badged' publication**