



The Future of the Welsh Uplands after the Common Agricultural Policy:

Stakeholder Policy priorities

Jane Ricketts Hein, Eifiona Thomas Lane and Arfon Williams

May 2017

CYNIDR CONSULTING

adnodd



PRIFYSGOL
BANGOR
UNIVERSITY



yn rhoi
cartref i
fyd natur

giving
nature
a home

Introduction and Context

The triggering of Article 50, beginning Britain's withdrawal from the European Union (EU), gave urgency to pre-existing debates about changes taking place in the Welsh uplands and added a number of extra considerations to the task, not least the re-evaluation of current policies and the opportunities to develop new ones.

Many anxieties have been voiced in the months since the EU Referendum, including:

- the reduction or ending of financial support, currently delivered through the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP);
- the loss of easy access to markets in Europe;
- increased pressure on nature and the wider environment with the removal of EU conservation and environmental laws; and
- the potential for the increasing intensification of farmland if agricultural subsidies are lost and farmers are forced to make more money from their land, and the associated abandonment of 'poorer' areas as efforts are concentrated on areas that could be made more productive.

While policies for the future are being explored, concern has been expressed in some quarters that the opinions, experiences and priorities of farmers and other users of the uplands would be 'drowned out' by other interests. However, Wales is developing its own distinctive legislative 'voice', particularly with the Wellbeing of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 and the Environment (Wales) Act 2016 enshrining sustainability and environmental resilience in law; this provides new opportunities for those working on the land and in associated communities, as well as those with an interest in the sustainable use and management of the uplands, to genuinely contribute to debates about its future.

These factors have created the background for a conference and associated workshop for farmers and others closely involved with the Welsh uplands, the results of which form the basis of this stakeholder voices report on policy priorities for the Welsh uplands.

Key Issues

These are discussed in further detail later, but for convenience are summarised here.

- A clear vision for the Welsh uplands is needed to guide the direction of future policy.
- Long term commitments (possibly measured in decades) would increase stability and enable more stakeholders to engage with the vision for the uplands.
- There is an underlying certainty that continued financial support for the uplands, albeit in an improved form, is essential: a smooth transition to

whatever replaces the Common Agricultural Policy is seen as vital in protecting upland farming and the wider community.

- There is much scope to improve the marketing of existing farmland products from the uplands, specifically red meat.
- With the right support, upland farmers and land managers are also keen to provide a large number of other benefits, including new primary agricultural products, adding value to existing produce, diversifying land uses and providing a range of wider benefits, such as enhancing and maintaining habitats for wildlife, clean water, energy generation and other ecosystem services.
- In order to deliver the many possible benefits afforded by the Welsh uplands, relationships between all the actors and stakeholders must be improved, with genuine co-operation and partnerships being built on mutual trust.
- Policies that are developed to achieve the vision for the uplands should be flexible, farmer- or locally-led and avoid excessive paperwork and bureaucracy.

Conference Aims and Structure

Bangor University, RSPB Cymru and Cynidr Consulting convened a conference on the future of the Welsh uplands on March 15th 2017, at Glasdir Business and Conference Centre, Llanrwst, Conwy. The event was funded by RSPB Cymru and Welsh Government (through the Rural Development Programme 2014-2020, which is financed by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and the Welsh Government).

The aims were to

- examine the possible implications of leaving the EU, the impact of Wales' new environmental and sustainability-focussed legislation, and its policies on upland farming;
- explore key relationships between farming and landscapes, access, the environment, nature and quality food production; and
- offer farmers the opportunity to discuss and contribute to future policy developments for the future of upland farming in Wales.

150 delegates, approximately one third of whom were farmers, heard from a variety of speakers, including Kevin Austin (Head of Agriculture Strategy and Policy Unit, Welsh Government) and Professor Peter Midmore (Aberystwyth University), who provided the current policy and economic contexts and possible future scenarios, and Gwyn Jones (European Forum for Nature Conservation and Pastoralism), who described how High Nature Value farming provides a practical opportunity for farmers to remain in their industry. Hefin Jones and Tony Davies (Fairness for the Uplands) highlighted some of the issues facing upland farmers, while Arfon Williams (RSPB Cymru and Wales Environment Link) explained how farming has a vital role in maintaining the uplands for wildlife and providing wider public benefit. Welsh case studies were provided by Sorcha Lewis and Guto Davies who both farm sheep and

cattle, in the Elan Valley, Powys and Ysbyty Ifan, Conwy respectively. The final case study speaker, and one who particularly captured listeners' attention, was Dr Patrick McGurn, who currently manages the AranLIFE Project on the Aran Islands and who also worked on a similar project in the Burren, both of which are agri-environment schemes co-designed by farmers, conservation bodies and statutory authorities in the west of Ireland.

A number of common themes soon became apparent during the presentations, including:

- the need to think carefully about the role of the uplands (farming and food production, tourism and leisure, valuable sites for wildlife, carbon and water storage, social and cultural values);
- the need to value these areas; and,
- on a more practical level, the need for appropriate land management, and the desirability of returning cattle grazing to the higher ground.

The final session of the day was a workshop, where delegates were asked to consider the future of the uplands and put forward their policy priorities. The specific workshop questions that participants were asked to address are given in Appendix A. Delegates formed small discussion groups to allow everyone to express their views on often contentious subjects. Feedback was transcribed and analysed by the conference organisers in order to ascertain the themes, lessons and policy priorities resulting from the workshop.

In the discussion below, groups designated A-F consisted largely of farmers, while groups described as 1-8 were mainly made up of representatives of organisations working in the uplands, for example, agricultural advisers, conservation, farming unions, other upland users, and statutory bodies.

Policy Priorities: Workshop Discussion

Although some concerns and criticisms were voiced, the tone of the session was positive overall, with deliberations coalescing around a number of broad topics. These are presented below, illustrated by some of the relevant comments. All emphases within quotations are included as they were written in the original workshop papers.

Vision and aims: "Who has the VISION for the uplands and what is it?" (C), one of the farmers' groups asked. This challenge was echoed by others, who called for a *clear vision for the uplands* (7,8). This gets straight to the heart of the contested nature of the uplands and their different meanings for different users: these areas are sites for farming, wildlife conservation, leisure and tourism, energy generation, carbon storage, water regulation and are bastions of particular elements of Welsh culture, and they occupy strong places in UK and Welsh consciousness. Who should have a say in creating this vision is explored in more detail under 'Policy

development', but Group C perceived that there are 'gaps in the knowledge of policymakers and the public, depending on their backgrounds and where they live', which would significantly affect the development of any future ambitions.

Long term planning: Closely associated with this is the need for *long term planning*. Almost every group highlighted the dangers of short term policy planning and the need for a longer view. It was felt that 5, and even 10, year policies were too short (A,2,6), especially where improvement in the natural environment was the aim (E). 5-7 year policy cycles were also felt to lead to instability for farmers (1). Group 8 brought these ideas together with their comment, "Do we want to create a viable farming industry less reliant on subsidy? Or is PES [Payment for Ecosystem Services] the way forward? Difficult to look beyond 5 year political terms". Longer-term policies would also help to ensure food security (2) and allow those unable or unwilling to adopt new policies or innovations immediately the chance to catch up (1). With regard to the definition of 'long-term', groups were thinking in 'generational' (B) terms, with policies to increase carbon storage being in place for 20 to 50 years (C). However, a longer period of policy stability does not mean sticking with mistakes or failures; longer cycles would allow for "reflection" (1), "monitoring and mak[ing] changes (if needed)" (6). The latter group illustrated this further, with the suggestion, "Need to look at a BIGGER PICTURE – 50 year view / 50 year funding, a commitment for the next generation – but what if they don't want it? 30 year option?" It would be a bold step to work in these time scales, and may involve the even bolder step suggested by Group A – "De-politicise farming – i.e. do not link schemes with change of government".

Need for continuation of funding / smooth transition: Despite there being many positive ideas and suggestions put forward at the workshop, one of the themes that attracted the most comments deals with the danger of economic uncertainty in the next few years, and the underlying desire – or, in some cases, an assumption – that the broad model of structural support will and must continue, albeit in an 'improved' way. Phrases expressing the challenge of facing the "uncertainty of everything" (1,2,3), financial instability (B), the necessity of a trade deal (C,2) and wariness of "Wales becoming uncompetitive with domestic and international markets" (7), including competition from New Zealand and Australia (B,C,3) show the very real anxieties being felt in many upland areas.

In a partial answer to the earlier theme concerning a vision for the uplands, the workshop participants were clear that *ensuring the future funding of farming in the uplands* ought to be a major policy priority. Suggestions for this included 'ring fencing' money for agriculture and / or rural communities (C,2,8), ensuring the continuity or replacement of existing schemes (3,5,7) and establishing future funding streams (A,3,6). Despite the desire for as much continuity as possible, there was an awareness that there will be changes. However, there was also a strong feeling that these changes should be implemented as smoothly as possible, with a "stable", "orderly *transition*" (A,B,1,3), possibly taking 5-10 years, with a "pause and review

process” built in (2). Alterations in payments, whether increasing or decreasing should be ‘stepped’, in order to reduce the impact on the farms’ viability (A). While re-designing agricultural support, the opportunity should be taken to *move away from the concept of ‘income forgone’* (C,1,2), described by one group as “not [being] allowed to make a living” (F). *Incentives* were seen as a much better way of supporting farmers while encouraging certain, often environmental or nature conservation, behaviours (A,6). The overall aim of continuing to support upland farm businesses is to keep small and family farming in the uplands (6), despite the current pressures on its economic viability (7) and the recognition that creating a profit on such farms without adequate support is a challenge (C).

Marketing: While farmers and other stakeholders discussed a variety of ways in which money is and could find its way to the uplands, there was a very strong underlying desire to supply goods that consumers want. However, the need to *market upland products and services effectively* (A,B,3,7,8) was identified as a major issue. Farmers’ groups, in particular, highlighted a number of specific concerns related to getting higher profiles for their existing products, mainly lambs. While one group discussed the importance of producing for the market - “Produce what market wants – get them aware of what the market wants & get [them] to produce to that” (B) – there was also a strong feeling that better marketing of the products available is necessary. The main issue here is the need for a *market for small lambs* produced by hill ewes (B,D,3). These are necessarily small because of the hardy breeds that have developed to cope with the harsher conditions in the uplands. While the presence of traditional breeds is often a point of interest, they also need to be economically viable. Supermarkets (B,D) and Hybu Cig Cymru / Meat Promotions Wales (B,D,8) came in for particular criticism here. The way that *supermarkets* ‘dictate’ (B) the lamb market and concentrate on certain sizes (D) needs addressing. Given that small lambs are equated with poorer quality in some markets, one group suggested *re-defining ‘quality’*: “Meat quality: can we change the measurements (remove the requirements which count against Welsh lamb etc)” (2). There was also a feeling that *Hybu Cig Cymru should re-focus its efforts*, specifically it is seen as concentrating on lowland, and therefore larger, breeds (B), and failing to promote Welsh lamb effectively enough (8) and in particular to the *home market* (D).

In implementing some of these ideas, there are plenty of *qualities* on which to build campaigns, based on high quality production systems and land management. The wider stakeholder groups, in particular, listed many elements that could be used to promote the Welsh uplands and their products. With regard to lamb, taste and the health qualities of pasture-fed meat was mentioned (B,C,2), with Group 2 asking “Welsh lamb is delicious, why does no one know this?” Animals in the landscape also help with *advertising Wales to the wider world* (C,F,2), as does the environment itself, with its ‘clean, green’ image (B): “Wales – natural advantages, green and pleasant land; loads of public goods to sell; Brand Wales; quality food, quality destination, quality environment” (2). The need for a coherent ‘brand’ for Wales was mentioned, with Visit Wales needing to “fit in with Brand Wales” (2). However, there was a warning about the need for *accurate labelling*: “Welsh must mean Welsh” (B).

Keeping Protected Geographical Indicator (PGI) status (B) for Welsh lamb and beef may help with international marketing. The development of more sustainable food certificates was suggested, with the RSPB Conservation Grade badge being mentioned as an example (8). This perhaps ties in with the recent increase in the public's desire to know more about their food. Educating the public and 'selling the story' (3,7,8) was advocated as another potential tool in promoting upland products.

Activities in the uplands: While better support for existing products was seen as vital, discussions also included a wide range of possible opportunities for developing new farming and other outputs from the uplands. These can be broadly divided into food and farming, and a number of wider environmental activities:

- Food and farming: The uplands could still be important locations for food production and farming, with *support provided for new food products*, such as goats' milk specifically for the health market (A), pharmaceutical crops (2) and other *niche and high quality* items (B,4,5). Alternative crops may become viable as the climate changes (2) and vegetable- and fruit-growing may be able to expand (2). Farmers could *add value* to their own products (B,4), including tapping into the ready meal market (B) and selling more lamb as mince, as it is quicker to cook and, therefore, more marketable to time-poor consumers (8). There was also a call for *support for native breeds*, as they have been developed specifically for particular areas, and are an important aspect of farming culture and heritage (B). Related to this is the call for *supporting mixed grazing* (2,4,5), which would be of benefit to a variety of wildlife species, help support biodiversity and give some farmers an additional source of income. Supporting Welsh agriculture through sympathetic *public procurement policies* is another area where policy could help (2,3,5), with one group suggesting that the Welsh Government should lead by example using "Welsh premium products in [the] public sector – schools, prisons, armed forces, gov. canteens" (5).
- Environment-related (Existing schemes): A large number of possibilities also exist which build on the wider upland environment. There appears to be a basic acceptance of *agri-environmental schemes* such as Glastir for example, along with perhaps an assumption that something like it will continue after the Common Agricultural Policy payments cease. While Glastir itself was widely discussed, it came in for much criticism, and was frequently cited as how a policy should not be implemented (as is discussed further below), some groups recognised that it did encourage environmental actions for some (A,C,E), as did other grant schemes (C). An element of Glastir that excited much less interest, especially among the farmers' groups was *woodlands*. One group commented that the "shortfall for woodlands will not be delivered for next x years depending on [species] planted" (C), but it was generally groups without farmers who were keener to see tree planting undertaken (5,7,8). It is crucial, though, that this is done in appropriate areas and not in habitats with existing nature conservation value: "Although an opportunity, it was also flagged up as a challenge. The issue of planting the wrong trees in

the wrong places was mentioned. Tree planting must be sustainable with no planting on improved habitats and near ground nesting birds. A policy suggestion was to undertake compulsory predator control adjacent to conifer blocks that are within vicinity of nesting bird habitat.” (8). Another possible way forward for some upland farms is to become involved in the *tourism* industry (4). How to get a benefit for providing the attractive landscape appreciated by leisure visitors and tourists was seen as a particular problem (F,2). The comment was also made that it is “... difficult to get farmers to ‘buy’ into visitors” (6). Some members of one group suggested that *grouse shooting* could be a boost to tourism, as well as increasing breeding bird numbers and that farmers could get paid for managing such land (8): not all the group agreed with this suggestion.

- Environment-related (Payment for Ecosystem Services): There was very wide recognition of the potential of *Payments for Ecosystem Services* (PES). The management of land for ‘public goods and services’, the utilisation of ‘natural capital’ and, specifically, carbon sequestration and the provision of clean water were discussed by most of the groups (A,B,C,D,F,1,2,4,5,7,8), always in positive terms, but often identifying issues that will need to be addressed. Such issues include how can farmers benefit from these services (1,5,7,8)? Who would pay for clean water? Would it be the water companies or the government (C,F)? Payment for carbon sequestration and flood avoidance or reduction would be even more complex. How is carbon capture calculated (F) and how can this be taken into account when measuring a farm’s ‘footprint’ (C) for environmental purposes?
- Environment-related (Energy production): One environmental service that was accepted as having a workable model was *small scale energy production*, particularly hydro schemes that benefitted from the former Feed-in Tariff scheme (C,D,E). Two groups, in particular, wanted to see *Feed-in Tariff schemes re-instated* in some form: one felt that short-term governmental support to establish an energy generation scheme would result in a long-term income stream being created, but warned that business rates are “a challenge” (C). The other group was clear that the “feed-in tariff needs to be re-established to encourage take-up.... If not topping up the tariff, grants [should be] available with set-up sites costs.” (D).
- Environment-related (Biodiversity and land management): Generally, biodiversity was seen as one of the benefits of the uplands, with the stakeholder groups putting ideas forward, such as listing “conservation land management” (6) as an opportunity, and Group 8 stating that “There is an opportunity to develop a policy that safeguards and enhances wildlife, habitats, biodiversity and other public goods and services, such as carbon sequestration, enhancing water quality and flood alleviation. Farmers would be paid to undertake positive environmental work.” Suggestions were made to improve the proficiency of the sector through education (“More ecology needed with agricultural curriculums / education / training...” (6)) and improving its status - a 10-50 year priority should be “Professional, sustainable land use sector with environmental standards second to none!”

(7). An issue at the farm level was also raised, that “Actions for single species are problematic” and that “Habitat management is better” (E).

- Environment-related (Other issues): A number of practical issues remain, particularly at the interface between farming and the environment. These include the optimal levels of land management; the practices that should be encouraged / avoided; when, where and for which species or habitats should activities be concentrated; and these issues must be considered within financially, socially, culturally and environmentally sustainable farms. The *avoidance of land abandonment* was a particular issue with some groups (A,7,8): once land has been allowed to become overgrown and rank, it can be difficult to re-introduce grazing without undertaking mowing or cutting (8), and this may dissuade some farmers from taking up mixed grazing.

However, there was a note of caution with regard to developing new activities in the uplands: it was recognised that these diversification options are not open to all. Some have very limited choices available to them – one group was concerned about members who “can’t plough, re-seed” (F), while another explained that “some farmers are ideally placed to deliver PES i.e. upland farmers who own extensive areas of peatland, water courses, and have renewable opportunities. However, what about farmers who don’t own these natural resources? What if they don’t own any peatland, have limited opportunity to deliver goods in terms of water quality, reducing flooding and storing carbon?” (8). This is a useful reminder that, while there are important opportunities for farmers and other stakeholders in the uplands, these may not be universal and future policies must consider this.

Relationships: The success of most of the policy suggestions discussed above depend to a great extent on excellent communication and the (re-)building of relationships. A great deal of the workshop was taken up with how farmers and a wide variety of other stakeholders can improve such interactions.

- Between the Welsh and UK Governments: There was concern in some groups that following Britain’s withdrawal from the European Union, Wales would not have a *strong enough voice within Britain*. Comments included “UK vs Wales (where does the power lie?)” (2), “How big will Wales’ slice of the cake be? Concerns that the current Conservative Government don’t care about the uplands of Wales” (8), and a stated policy priority was a “Wales appropriate settlement” (4). These also fed into worries that the *Barnett formula* may be used to decide funding levels, and that this would result in significantly smaller payments than those under the CAP (3,7,8).
- Between farmers, other stakeholders and the public: Some groups felt that *farmers did not get the recognition that they ought*, for example, for their “work on land management around water sources” (C). Others felt that there was a need to “highlight all farmers do – land manager – custodians of land” (3) and even change the “perception of farming in general. RE-VALUE the service provided – who should drive this?” (6). More specifically, a greater *understanding of farming and upland areas by Welsh Government personnel*

was seen as desirable (F,7). Additionally, there were calls to raise the *awareness of the general public* of aspects of farming and the benefits they deliver to the uplands (B,1,7).

- Farmers: Challenges were also issued to and by the farmers themselves. One farmer group recognised that the “*farming mindset* will have to change” (A), while another commented that “farmers need to “practice what we preach” with regard to sustainable / environmentally-friendly farming” (B). Other groups felt that an element of feeling entitled to subsidies exists among some farmers (7). Stakeholder groups generally felt that getting farmers to change farming styles, for example from ‘traditional’ to high nature value (HNV) farming (1) or embracing innovation and taking up opportunities (3) could be difficult. However, positive attitudes were also expressed. One group described how the “positive attitude, belief, skills, knowledge, ‘can do attitude’” of farmers and stakeholders in the uplands is an opportunity for the future (2), while another felt that the strength of the Fferm Ifan case study (as described in Guto Davies’ presentation) was the enthusiasm of the individuals involved (A). One stakeholder group laid out in detail ways of *enthusing farmers to make positive changes*: “Inform farmers and land managers of the alternative uses of land beyond livestock production. Explain what PES actually entails. What is considered good practice? Unless farmers are aware of this land use management will not change. Utilize Farming Connect and use examples of HNV farms as demonstration sites. Being able to hypothesise outcomes is essential e.g. “if you were to do this...this would happen....”” (8).
- Co-operation, collaboration and partnerships: There was a strong recognition of the need for individuals and organisations to *work together* to ensure the future of the uplands (B,C,D,E,F,2,3,4,5,6,7,8). This acknowledgement comes against a background which contains a degree of suspicion and the distinct feeling of a lack of self-determination in earlier schemes, particularly expressed by Group F, who asked “Shouldn’t we decide what’s best on OUR farms?” and “Should we be dictated to?” This highlights the need for equality in partnerships (7), transparency and openness (8) and genuine agreement and collaboration, rather than a ‘top-down’ approach (2,4,6). This leaves the question, who should be involved in these partnerships? Several groups thought that a post-CAP future provides an opportunity for the “farming community to work it out together” (C) and an “opportunity to bring farmers together” (3). However, a number of others recognised the different skills and expertise that different organisations bring and advocated bringing more ‘voices’ in (B,6,7), but ensuring that farmers play a key role in decision-making (1,2,5), including “joint responsibility for outcomes and understanding why / if not achieved” (7). A couple of warnings about co-operative working were recorded. Firstly, there was a concern about “forced collaboration vs genuine willingness to co-operate” (4) and secondly, there was an acknowledgment that “collaboration could mean compromise (however, 80% success is better than no action or activity)” (7). Hence, while the need for co-operative and partnership working was widely recognised, farmers and other stakeholders

may need assistance in *developing their capacity* to do so and thus ensure a “united voice for the uplands” (D).

- Trust: Given the background described above, most of the stakeholder groups were well aware of the need to improve relationships and in particular *develop trust* between those involved with the uplands (1,3,4,6,7). A breakdown in trust was blamed for preventing the undertaking of conservation activities on some farms (4), while the case studies illustrated what could be achieved where trust exists (3). There is, though, some urgency in this task: “need to start process of ‘trust’ in next 2 years (not after exiting EU)” (1). Relationships between farmers and upland stakeholders must be improved before high quality decisions can be made, to ensure that any vision developed takes all the relevant actors with it.

Policy development: Finally, when drafting new agricultural, rural and environmental policies, the messages from the workshop were simple. New schemes must be *flexible* (B,E,1,2,6,8), avoiding the ‘one size fits all’ approach (F,1,6). One suggestion was an “overarching scheme with bolt-ons – tailored to [the] farm” (3), while another group endorsed working to the “spirit of the directives (not [the] letter of the law)” (2). “Scope for reviewing and continuation...” (6) was a further recommendation. These suggestions tie in strongly with the desire to consult farmers and utilise the knowledge they have built up about their own farms, while also recognising the expertise of external advisers. However, one group warned that farmers, stakeholders and policymakers may “not [have] the flexibility we think we are going to have” (2) when Britain leaves the EU. A second desirable feature of new policies should be the *reduction of the burden of paperwork and bureaucracy* (B,C,F,1,4,6), although some felt that the complexity of existing paperwork may be more of a barrier to engagement with agri-environment schemes than simply the amount required (1). There was support for outcome-focussed schemes in a couple of groups (B,3,4), but more specific issues related to the need for longer time periods to fulfil scheme requirements (B,C). A member of one farmer-led group, for instance, pointed out that they have 2 people doing the work of 4, so staff shortages have an effect on the amount of additional work that can be undertaken (C). Lastly, policies affecting farmers should be *farmer- or at least locally-led* (B,C,E,1,3,4,5,6), with comments being put forward such as “Local solutions to local problems” (4), “Learn lessons from ‘bottom-up’” (5) and “Local knowledge is vital and needs to be considered” (6). Taken in conjunction with the comment about insufficient farm labour (and therefore pressures on farmers’ time), the desire for a greater input into policy means that methods of achieving this will have to be given attention: how can farmers and stakeholders be helped to *increase their capacity to organise themselves* and contribute to policy?

Lessons from all the case study presentations (Elan Valley, Ysbyty Ifan and the Burren / AranLIFE Projects) were discussed, but the *Burren Project* and its subsequent adaptation to the Aran Islands in Ireland and other areas was particularly felt to represent a potential way forward, especially among farmers’ groups (A,B,C,D,3,6). It was cited as a positive example of the need to “start with the basics

– access / water...” (6), the importance of collaboration and co-operation (B,C,D,6), trust of farmers (3), and a farmer-led project (6) that tackled needs at the farm level (D) and within specific areas (B) and worked on verified outcomes rather than “prescriptive bureaucracy” (3) – farmers were ‘encouraged to do things well rather than fined for not doing them’ (6). It was also appreciated that the model could, and has been, adapted for use in other areas of Ireland and, more recently, Spain (A).

Next Steps

This report, describing the results of a stakeholder workshop discussing policy priorities for the future of the Welsh uplands, will be presented to the Cabinet Secretary for Environment and Rural Affairs in the Welsh Government for consideration, with a request for a response on how the Welsh Government might address the key issues identified. The report and the Cabinet Secretary’s response will be forwarded to all the workshop participants who supplied an email address, and will be available to all on the RSPB Cymru and Bangor University websites.

The results will also be shared with interested parties and organisers of similar events in other parts of the United Kingdom and Ireland with the aim of comparing policy priorities and working together to ensure that representation is made to as many governmental representatives as possible. Finally, the discussions will form the basis of a number of papers and presentations at academic and practitioner events, in order to add to the wider understanding of rural, agricultural and environmental issues following the end of the CAP in its current form.

Jane Ricketts Hein (Cynidr Consulting),

Eifiona Thomas Lane (Bangor University),

Arfon Williams (RSPB Cymru)

Appendix A:

Workshop Questions For Discussion

1. List the challenges and opportunities for the Welsh uplands.
 2. What should government policy priorities be in the short (up to 2yrs), middle (2-10yrs) and longer term (10-50 years) specifically for the Welsh uplands?
Please explain your reasoning.
 - a. 0-2yrs
 - b. 2-10yrs
 - c. 10-50yrs
 3. What have the case studies seen today shown?
 4. What factors have helped or prevented you from undertaking environmental and / or nature conservation based activities?
 5. How can farmers work together to tackle a challenging future e.g. to deliver food / recreation / energy / land management and conservation?
-

Cover photograph: © Sorcha Lewis

Contact:

Dr Jane Ricketts Hein: jrickettshein@gmail.com

Dr Eifiona Thomas Lane: eifiona.thomaslane@bangor.ac.uk

Mr. Arfon Williams: Arfon.Williams@rspb.org.uk

CYNIDR CONSULTING

adnodd



PRIFYSGOL
BANGOR
UNIVERSITY



yn rhoi
cartref i
fyd natur

giving
nature
a home

Funded by RSPB Cymru and through the 'Welsh Government Rural Communities - Rural Development Programme 2014-2020' (from the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and the Welsh Government).

