

Response ID ANON-AXGD-U3R2-G

Submitted on 2014-02-26 13:04:12.166633

Information about you

Contact details and publishing consent:

Organisation/Group

Organisation/Group name*:

Nourish Scotland

Organisation/Group address:**

54 Manor Place
EDINBURGH

Organisation/Group postcode:**

EH3 7EH

Organisation/Group contact name*:

Tracey Reilly

Organisation/Group contact email*:

tracey@nourishscotland.org.uk

Title*:

N/A

Forename or initials*:

N/A

Surname*:

N/A

Email address*:

na@example.com

Full postal address:**

Postcode:**

N/A

Publish this response

We will share your response internally with other Scottish Government policy teams who may be addressing the issues you discuss. They may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for Scottish Government to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise?

Yes

FOR ORGANISATIONS ONLYPlease indicate which category best describes your organisation. Organisation with primary interest in:(Tick one only)

Community body, community-related charities or local partnership bodies

FOR INDIVIDUALS ONLYPlease indicate which category best describes you. Individual with primary interest in:(Tick one only)

Not Answered

Section 4: Budget for SRDP 2014-2020

Q1. How would you rate your satisfaction with the budget as a whole?

Quite dissatisfied

If you are dissatisfied, please briefly outline your reasons

open text:

We argued strongly for the rate of modulation to be applied at 14% rather than 9%, which would have given a larger budget for broader based rural development

measures, which deliver wider public benefits, such as business development, agro-forestry or protection of the environment, habitat or heritage features and biodiversity. For the same reason, we support the implementation of any measures which would allow the capping of large pillar 1 payments to landowners and the redistribution of these payments to broader SRDP measures.

Section 5: Rural Regional Delivery Partnership for Land Based Investments

Q2. Are you broadly satisfied with the new application and assessment process for land based investments outlined in Section 5?

Quite satisfied

If you are dissatisfied, please briefly outline your reasons.

open text:

Section 6: Future Support for Less Favoured Areas

Q3. Should support for farmers operating in constrained areas be continued through the SRDP ?

No

open text:

Nourish would rather see this delivered through Pillar 1 payments. If it remains in Pillar 2, then the public benefits to be derived from these payments should be clearly articulated.

Section 7: New Entrants Scheme

Q4. How would you rate your satisfaction with the proposals for the New Entrants Scheme?

Quite satisfied

If you are dissatisfied, please briefly outline your reasons

open text:

Nourish welcomes this fund and encourages the Scottish Government, NFUS and others to promote farming and growing as viable and worthwhile career options to a more diverse audience outwith existing farming families, including women and people from ethnic minorities. The Scottish Government, Forestry Commission, large landowners such as RSPB, and local authorities should also encourage new entrants through the creation of new holdings and new forms of landholding (such as community-owned farms and 'incubator' or starter farms. Nourish also recommends its New Farmer Programme as an example of an in-depth training, work experience and business development programme for new growers and farmers. Skills and business development should be an integral element of the New Entrants Scheme.

Section 8: Crofting and Small Farm Support Scheme

Q5. Should the scheme be expanded to provide capital support to small farms?

Yes

Q6. Is a 3 to 50 hectare range appropriate for defining a small land holding?

Yes

Q7. Do you agree with the proposal for grants of £500 to be available to assist the establishment of Grazings Committees?

Yes

If No, please explain why

open text:

Q8. How would you rate your broad satisfaction with the proposals for the Crofters and Smallholders Scheme?

Quite satisfied

If you are dissatisfied, please briefly outline your reasons.

open text:

Nourish welcomes this scheme, and in particular the provision for larger grants (up to £125,000) for small farms working together. Again, this fund could be imaginatively to support shared revenue spending on for example an apprentice or a contracting service shared between a number of farms. We would also like to see money made available for small farmers to buy breed stock.

Section 9: Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme

Q9. How would you rate your broad satisfaction with the proposal for the Agri-Environment-Climate Scheme?

Quite satisfied

If you are dissatisfied, please briefly outline your reasons.

open text:

Nourish welcomes the continued support for organic farming. We would also want 'organic' to add points in assessment of RDP applications under other strands, including woodland, LEADER, and food and drink business applications. We also welcome the increased emphasis on co-operation in developing land management measures and the ability for land managers to access improved advisory services.

Section 10: Forestry Grant Scheme

Q10. It is proposed to support forestry under six main areas as outlined below. Please identify whether you agree with these broad areas.

Woodland Creation:

Yes, should be included

Agroforestry:

Yes, should be included

Tree Health:

No opinion

Woodland Improvement Grant:

Yes, should be included

Process and marketing:

No opinion

Sustainable Management of Forests:

Yes, should be included

Q11. We propose nine woodland creation options with support through standard costs. Please identify whether you think these options should be included (Yes) or excluded (No)

Conifer:

No opinion

Diverse Conifer:

No opinion

Broadleaves:

No opinion

Native Scots Pine:

No opinion

Native Broadleaved W4:

Yes, should be included

Native Broadleaved Other:

Yes, should be included

Native low density:

Yes, should be included

Small or Farm Wood:

No opinion

Northern and Western Isles:

Yes, should be included

Q12. Are there any other woodland types that should be supported? If Yes, please specify

Yes

open text:

Agroforestry, both silvoarable and silvopastoral

Q13. Should the Central Scotland Green Network be allowed an 'Additional Cost Contribution'? If No, please briefly explain your reasons

Yes

open text:

Q14. What is your preferred option for Income Foregone (IF) in SRDP 2014 - 2020? Please click on 'More information' below to view the 3 options

Option 2

Please explain your choice

open text:

Nourish Scotland believes in woods rather than forests and considers the large commercial plantations to be in many cases suboptimal land use, especially where there is no local market for the timber products. These plantations should be supported by low interest or interest-free loans rather than grants unless there are compelling public goods benefits in terms of biodiversity, access, erosion prevention etc - all of which can often be better delivered through agroforestry/continuous cover
similarly Nourish supports a stronger supply chain for venison which should be more closely integrated in land use decision-making

Q15. It is proposed to support woodland creation through other means. Do you agree with the range of 'other support' for woodland creation?

Tree shelters and fencing:

Yes, include

Improved stock for Sitka Spruce:

No opinion

Bracken contribution:

No opinion

Community woodland:

Yes, include

Q16. Should agroforestry be funded through the SRDP 2014-2020?

Yes

Q17. Should tree health be funded through SRDP 2014-2020?

No opinion

Q18. Do you agree with the range of Woodland Improvement Grants?

Long term forest planning - new:

No opinion

Long term forest planning - renewal:

No opinion

Reducing Deer Impact:

No opinion

Woodland Habitats and Species:

Yes

Restructuring Regeneration:

No opinion

Non- Woodland Habitats and Species:

Yes

Natural regeneration:

Yes

Woodlands In and Around Towns:

Yes

Q19. We propose to offer support to forest owners, micro-enterprises and SMEs for investments which enhance forestry potential or relate to processing and marketing, or adding value to forest products. Should these areas be supported through the SRDP?

Small scale premium processing sector:

No opinion

Equipment to increase harvesting in under-managed woods:

No opinion

Equipment to increase capacity for steep ground harvesting:

No opinion

Q20. We propose six Sustainable Management of Forest Options. Do you agree with the range of Sustainable Management of Forest grants?

Native Woodlands:

Yes, should be included

Low Impact Silvicultural Systems (LISS):

Yes, should be included

Public Access:

Yes, should be included

Public Access WIAT ((woods within 1 km of settlements with a population of over 2000 people):

Yes, should be included

Livestock Removal:

No opinion

Woodland Grazing:

Yes, should be included

Q21. How would you rate your broad satisfaction with the proposals for the Forestry Scheme

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

If you are dissatisfied, please briefly outline your reasons.

open text:

Nourish supports agroforestry as bringing multiple benefits (reduction in soil erosion and flood risk; biodiversity; local employment; shade and shelter for animals (and plants) and encourages government to be more ambitious in its aspirations for agroforestry.

Historically, however, there has been a disconnect between providing grants for tree-planting and the environmental or local economic benefits. We have developed an industrial single-purpose forestry sector rather than a managed woodland culture delivering multiple benefits (including amenity, landscape and biodiversity benefits).

Nourish welcomes the provision by the Forestry Commission of 'starter farms' on partially-afforested farms and supports new forms of woodland creation and management which generate local employment including forest crofts; continuous cover management; coppicing, and use of non-timber forest products.

Section 11: Support for Co-operative Action

Q22. How would you rate your broad satisfaction with the proposals for co-operation?

Very satisfied

If you are dissatisfied, please briefly outline your reasons.

open text:

Nourish welcomes the opportunity for landowners to work together, for example on landscape scale biodiversity projects. These are time-consuming projects that require shared efforts to co-ordinate and target actions. We welcome the funding allocated to this.

Section 12: Non-Agricultural Business Support: Small Rural Business Support

Q23. How would you rate your broad satisfaction with the proposals for Small Rural Business Support?

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

If you are dissatisfied, please briefly outline your reasons.

open text:

While Nourish's main focus is on strengthening the local food economy, we see the importance of the wider rural economy in supporting a vibrant and resilient food sector. Consequently, we would have welcomed more money being allocated to this area. Agritourism, village shops, bed and breakfasts, restaurants all

create local employment while also having the potential to support a strong local food culture.

Nourish would encourage the Scottish Government to ensure that the case officers involved in assessing applications understand the value of non-farming businesses to the local economy; and to keep this budget under review during the early stages of implementation.

Section 13: Non-Agricultural Business Support: Food and Drink

Q24. Should the Scottish Government continue to give significant support to the food and drink sector?

Yes

Q25. Should selection criteria such as those listed below apply to the Food and Drink Scheme?

Contribution to the Scottish Government's overall strategies for economic development and the rural economy:

Yes

Making a contribution to national policies for food and drink:

Yes

Assisting the Scottish Government with its wider social policies :

Yes

Supporting export targets for food and drink sectors:

No

Q26. Should steps be taken to streamline processes for food companies including a one stop shop for public support?

Yes

Q27. How would you rate your broad satisfaction with the proposals for Food and Drink support?

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

If you are dissatisfied, please briefly outline your reasons.

open text:

Nourish welcomes the availability of this support to small businesses and social enterprises.

Nourish suggests that in assessing applications priority should be given to proposals which:

- Produce healthy foods, low in sugar and high in fibre
- Use organic ingredients and produce organic food with minimal additives
- Use Scottish ingredients
- Demonstrate best practice in resource use efficiency
- Demonstrate investment in staff skills or enhanced employability

Section 14: LEADER

Q28. How would you rate your broad satisfaction with the proposals for LEADER?

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

If you are dissatisfied, please briefly outline your reasons.

open text:

Nourish welcomes the scope within this budget to support short supply chains between rural and urban areas. We would hope to see LEADER funding used imaginatively and strategically – for example:

- To create a network of on-farm education centres to support work done by RHET, Soil Association and others to link children and young people from urban schools to farmers and growers in their region
- To raise the skills of staff in the public kitchen to use fresh, seasonal Scottish produce in preparing healthier but still affordable food for example for children, older people and hospital patients
- Investment in short supply chains linking producers in rural areas with demand in both rural and urban areas.

This sort of joined-up approach will require a degree of co-ordination between local action groups which Nourish recognises also have many other demands on their budgets.

Section 15: Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Fund (KTIF)

Q29. Do you agree with the range of options listed below which are being included within the KTIF scheme?

Skills development:

Yes

Vocational training:

Yes

Monitor farms:

Yes

Setting up an EIP network:

Yes

Q30. How would you rate your broad satisfaction with the proposals for KTIF?

Quite satisfied

If you are dissatisfied, please briefly outline your reasons.

open text:

Nourish welcomes the doubling of this fund from the current £5m and would encourage an emphasis on dissemination of organic and agro-ecological practice and research and on agroforestry.

Section 16: Advisory Service

Q31. How would you rate your broad satisfaction with the proposals for the Advisory Service?

Quite satisfied

If you are dissatisfied, please briefly outline your reasons

open text:

Nourish welcomes the establishment of this service which has significant potential to improve the production of public goods from farming and proposes that any farm or business receiving support under the RDP should be required to undertake a carbon audit and develop a carbon reduction and resource use efficiency/waste reduction plan, which should be provided free of charge by the advisory service.

It is essential that the advisory service is fully committed to government principles of sustainable development, climate change mitigation and adaptation and should be helping farmers in Scotland reduce their reliance on imported soya and more generally on GM feed.

The advisory service should have a clear mission statement and a system of governance and accountability which includes civil society and environmental organisations as it will play a key role in the greening of Scotland's food and farming system

Section 17: Scottish Rural Network

Q32. Do you think the tasks set out below are the most appropriate ways for the SRN to add value to the implementation of the SRDP?

SRN website:

Yes, should be included

Gathering of good programme examples:

Yes, should be included

Disseminating information to the public:

Yes, should be included

Organisation of events:

Yes, should be included

Are there other activities or services you would like to see the Scottish Rural Network provide? Please specify

open text:

Support for landscape level co-operation between farmers and communities (such as Tweed Forum)

Q33. Do you agree with the proposal to establish thematic working groups as an approach to supporting the Rural Development Programme priorities?

No opinion

If No, please explain your reasons

open text:

Q34. How would you rate your broad satisfaction with the proposals for the Scottish Rural Network?

Quite satisfied

If you are dissatisfied, please briefly outline your reasons.

open text:

Section 18: Communications

Q35. How would you rate your broad satisfaction with the proposals for communicating the new Scotland Rural Development Programme?

Quite satisfied

If you are dissatisfied, please briefly outline your reasons.

open text:

It's important this time round that we communicate the aims of the programme not just the grant mechanisms

Section 19: Monitoring and Evaluation

Q36. Information used to monitor and evaluate the SRDP will be gathered from a mixture of data sources. Three key data sources required to capture monitoring and evaluation data are summarised in 'More information' below. We would welcome feedback on the approach outlined.

open text:

Q37. Are there any other data sources which could inform the impact of the programme?

No

If Yes, please specify

open text:

Q38. The Scottish Government has identified a number of gaps in the indicator requirements and has set out plans for addressing these gaps, outlined in 'More information' below. We would welcome feedback on the proposed approach to filling the gaps in the data (including other data sources) required by the European Commission.

open text:

Q39. Are there any other gaps that you wish to make us aware of?

No

If yes, please specify

open text:

Q40. Are there any other data sources which could help us fill the data gaps?

No

If Yes, please specify

open text:

Section 20: Impact Assessments

Q41. We would welcome comments on the BRIA

open text:

Q42. We would welcome comments on the EQIA

open text:

Section 21: Other Comments

If you have any further comments, please write them in the box below

open text:

Nourish generally supports the changes proposed to the Scottish Rural Development Programme, although we would have liked to see the programme allocated greater funds. We would also welcome a greater recognition of the fact that this funding is not just for farmers but is used to deliver a broad range of public goods. We do welcome the potential for support to be given to the organic farming sector, agro-forestry and community woodlands, and a greater emphasis on advisory services.