

31 May 2023

Final Report Agroforestry T&T 106

Author: Dr Will Simonson, Dr Colin Tosh (Organic Research Centre)

Contributors: Helen Chesshire (The Woodland Trust), Ben Raskin (Soil Association), Stephen Briggs (Abacus Agriculture) and Ian Knight (Abacus Agriculture)

Version: Final (Revised with incorporation of comments)



Report Summary

With rising interest in agroforestry from both policy and practitioner perspectives, the Agroforestry Test project (2020–2023) explored how payment mechanisms and advice/guidance provision could best be designed and structured to incentivise wide-scale uptake of agroforestry under the new Environmental Land Management Scheme (ELMS). The Test was conducted by four organisations who have been at the forefront of agroforestry research and support over the last years: the Organic Research Centre, Soil Association, Woodland Trust and Abacus Agriculture. Working with a Farmer-led Working Group and six clusters of farmers across the country, we travelled from baseline documentary evidence on incentives and barriers to agroforestry uptake, through cluster farmer interviews and regional workshops, to a wider survey of views, to develop key messages and refine them over time. These key messaged are framed as 16 building blocks, addressing four main policy questions:

Payments

- *What* should payments cover in order to encourage uptake of an agroforestry option under ELMS (5 building blocks)
- How should payments be made in order to encourage the uptake of an agroforestry option? (5 building blocks)
 Advice and guidance
- What information do farmers require to encourage them to take up agroforestry and successfully implement it? (3 building blocks)
- *How* should payments be made in order to encourage the uptake of an agroforestry option? (3 building blocks)

Through co-design and validation workshops, farmer interviews, and stakeholder workshops analysing provisional Defra SFI and CS+ agroforestry provision, it was found that a large majority of farmers feel that their existing or planned agroforestry will be facilitated by what Defra have proposed. Defra have accommodated 7 of 10 payment-related building block recommendations. A notable omission is the absence of outcomes-based payment mechanisms.

Farmers were more circumspect in their assessment of proposed Defra advice and guidance provisions, finding that it accommodated 3 of 6 building blocks. Farmers were concerned that provision would be insufficient for complete beginners entering agroforestry. An absence of addressing the importance of local conditions and specificity in advice and guidance was also noted.

Farmers would prefer one-to-one advice and guidance but, in its absence, consistently stress the importance of peer-to-peer interactions in agroforestry learning, and this conclusion is supported in additional analyses of farmer interviews in the Test. It is recommended that Defra focuses on developing an effecting farmer-to-farmer learning facilitation mechanism prior to the release of the agroforestry standard in 2024.

Findings relevant to the Spatial prioritisation and Land management planning policy areas were also uncovered through the course of the farmer and other stakeholder consultations. Regional environmental differences have a strong influence on what type of agroforestry is suitable where and the priority public goods that should be targeted. This needs to be reflected in advice and guidance that is contextualised to the place in question. At farm to landscape scales, land management planning is important to support the delivery of public goods, and map-based planning approaches are considered to be particularly effective.

Definitions and acronyms

Word or Acronym	Description or Definition
ELMS	Environmental Land Management Scheme
SFI	Sustainable Farming Incentive
CS+	Countryside Stewardship Plus
FLWG	Farmer-led Working Group
Agroforestry	Agroforestry is 'farming with trees'. It includes both the integration of trees on farmland and the use of agricultural crops and livestock in woodlands.
Silvoarable	The combination of trees and arable
Silvopasture	The combination of trees and livestock
Silvohorticulture	The combination of trees and horticulture
Silvopoultry	The combination of trees and poultry production
Woodland grazing/wood pasture	A subtype of silvopasture in which livestock are grazed within areas designed as woodland/forestry or landscapes with scattered trees and shrubs.

1. Introduction

The Agroforestry Test project (November 2020 – May 2023) explored the feasibility of mechanisms to support and increase agroforestry uptake in England. Agroforestry has the potential to increase tree cover whilst maintaining agricultural productivity and delivering multiple public goods, but what are the best ways to achieve widespread uptake? The main themes explored in the Test project were **Payment Mechanisms** and the role of **Advice and Guidance** to support a broad-scale adoption of agroforestry across a variety of farming sectors and regions including lowland, upland, livestock, arable and horticulture.



Figure 1: Process of the Agroforestry ELM Test.

It was conducted by the Organic Research Centre, Soil Association, Woodland Trust and Abacus Agriculture, with steering from a Farmer-led Working Group representing both the farming and forestry sectors (see Appendix 1 for project personnel and FLWG members). The process followed by the project is summarised in Figure 1. The project began by collating and reviewing current information on the barriers and incentives to uptake. This evidence review synthesised learnings from 10 published reports and scientific papers investigating barriers and opportunities in Britain and Europe (Appendix 2). Working with current adopters (farmers who have already established agroforestry systems) as well as those considering agroforestry and those who have rejected it, we used this evidence review as a baseline to explore what farmers need in terms of advice and guidance and payment incentives if they are to plant more trees and include them in their land management

planning. The basis of our engagement with these stakeholders was the establishment of cluster groups, each comprising one monitor farmer and five additional farmers, and each focussing on a specific sub-type of agroforestry: silvoarable, silvohorticulture, silvopoultry, lowland silvopasture, upland silvopasture and woodland grazing/wood pasture (Figure 2, Appendix 3). These regional clusters were also an opportunity to represent different farming conditions and systems across the country.



Figure 2: The six regional clusters established as a forum for consultation in the Agroforestry Test.

The gathering of data from the clusters was achieved by interviewing the cluster farmers and then conducting, in each, a workshop to explore the Test project's policy questions. Five of these workshops were in person, hosted by the monitor farm; the sixth was online due to Covid-19 interruption although featured an on-farm interview with the farm manager (Tim Downes) taken in the days before. At least three team members facilitated each workshop and the total number of stakeholder participants was 96. See Appendix 4 for a calendar of Agroforestry Test activities.

Thematic analysis of the notes taken during the regional workshops was undertaken to pull out the key findings in terms of 16 building blocks for effective agroforestry support under ELMS. These building blocks formed the basis of engagement with the ELMS standards team and their development of proposals for entry-level agroforestry support under SFI and and enhanced offer under local nature recovery (later wrapped into CS+). Working with Defra, the project team organised four co-design workshops and four validation workshops to help develop and get feedback on a draft set of elements being considered. In a final, wider consultation on these proposals and the findings of the Agroforestry Test, a set of interviews were carried out with farmers and an online questionnaire was disseminated. The responses to this consultation have helped to refine the key messages that are described in the next section.

In total the Agroforestry Test project has involved:

- 4 partners and 6 project personnel
- 12 FLWG members
- 36 cluster farmers
- 96 participants in regional workshops
- 72 participants in co-design and validation workshops
- 31 interviews and 22 online questionnaire respondents
- 65 attendees of stakeholder feedback webinars.

Presentations on the project were also made at ORFC 2021 (online workshop), Groundswell, and an AGROMIX (Horizon 2020) policy workshop. Considerable interest in the project has been evident throughout, reflecting the level of interest among farming and forestry actors in the potential for agroforestry to enhance farm businesses and benefit the environment in an era of agricultural transition, economic uncertainty and climate change.

2. Findings

2.1 Building blocks

The evidence review identified 36 different factors incentivising or disincentivising UK farmers to adopt agroforestry; nine of the top 10 of these related to farmer knowledge deficits and economic/financial incentives, or lack of. Other factors – often poorly surveyed in the source literature – related to policy uncertainty, environmental benefits, perceptions about not having enough land or that agroforestry would act against rather than with existing farming practices, and security of tenure (short term tenancies identified as a blocker to adoption). The two areas of payments and knowledge (advice/guidance) were the focus of the Test project activities thereafter and below is a summary of the key findings, including 16 building blocks for agroforestry – 10 relating to payments and 6 relating to advice and guidance (see Appendix 5) – that emerged from the regional workshop discussions. The project also sought to gather information relevant to the spatial prioritization and land management planning policy areas, and findings are summarised in sections 2.4 and 2.5 below.

2.2 Payments

The policy questions relating to payments can be summarised into two:

- *what* should payments cover in order to encourage uptake of an agroforestry option under ELMS. Here we sought to understand what the new system should offer participants and what public funding should pay for and on what basis.
- how should payments be made in order to encourage the uptake of an agroforestry option? Here we sought to understand ways in which the payment mechanism could incentivise rather than disincentivise adoption, by the criteria applied and way in which it is designed and accessed.

Below we present the findings relating to these two payments policy questions.

What should payments cover in order to encourage the uptake of an agroforestry option?

The evidence review revealed that the most important economic/financial incentives and disincentives were the following:

- 1. Grants, subsidy, funding opportunities for agroforestry;
- 2. Establishments costs;
- 3. Capital investment requirements;
- 4. Management and maintenance costs; and
- 5. Reduced profitability and loss of yield.

From the regional workshops the following five key elements (building blocks) of agroforestry payment support - in terms of what it should target - were established:

- Support capital costs and shorter-term maintenance costs as this will have the most catalytic effect in terms of achieving widescale uptake of this land management practice (1). Some funding to facilitate knowledge exchange and research/monitoring would also be instrumental in building an effective community of practice in agroforestry in the farming community.
- Be enabling and recognise the longer-term public goods delivery of this land management practice and the possibility of capitalising on carbon and biodiversity markets (2). Support to the start-up and establishment phase is therefore the main priority of public funding.

- Include monitoring of public goods benefits within its design and implementation (7). To do this effectively, there needs to be an adequate budget and standardised monitoring protocols, enabling farmers to collect the necessary data but supporting this through coordinated approaches from local to national level.
- Incorporate both outcomes- and action-based payments (8). A blended approach reflects the realities of high start-up/establishment costs whilst incentivising the implementation of agroforestry in ways that most effectively delivers public goods.
- Reward existing practice (6). Farmers who already have trees in their fields should not be excluded from being able to receive payments through ELM. One way of rewarding these agroforestry pioneers is by offering payments for being demonstration sites within their localities see building block 14.

How should payments be made in order to encourage the uptake of an agroforestry option?

The design of payment schemes, including eligibility criteria, is as important as what it pays for and was a key focus of discussion in the regional workshops. The building blocks that emerged from these discussions were:

- Be flexible to reflect (i) the diversity of potential designs for this land management practice, (ii) the need for adaptation to local conditions, (iii) adaptive management over time and (iv) branching options (3).
- Not imply or require change of land use (4). New trees and wooded areas should be considered as long-term assets on the farm and their longevity is important for the carbon, biodiversity and other public goods benefits, which should be recognised and rewarded. They should not, however, be seen as permanent, closing future options of farmers, whether they are owners or tenants.
- Spread payments over time (5). Regular payments across the establishment phase of an agroforestry project should be offered to support maintenance of the system. This is critical for the eventual achievement of the public goods outcomes.
- Make it as easy as possible for tenant farmers and growers to participate directly or indirectly (through appropriate tenancy length and arrangements) (9).
- Incorporate a tiered system of support allowing for different levels of ambition (10). An uplift in payments would be appropriate when there is evidence of significant public goods outcomes, research and monitoring are embedded in the operation, and/or when there is demonstration of knowledge gained as part of CPD.

Farmers' assessment of the Defra's proposed SFI and CS+ payment structure

Farmer opinion of Defra's proposed payment structure for agroforestry SFI and CS+ was gauged under confidentiality agreements in co-design and validation workshops, interviews and online questionnaires, and stakeholder feedback webinars, held between May 2022 and May 2023. Interviews were structured, well replicated (31 interviews), and analysed quantitatively (see Appendix 6), so are considered a key source of evidence on farmer feedback. The following points reflect feedback from all these consultation activities.

- An overwhelming majority of farmers feel that their existing or planned agroforestry will fit within the proposals of Defra, including stem density upper-limits and activities permissible for payment. Many farmers feeding-back made the understandable caveat that a final decision on adoption would depend on payment rates, which were not provided.
- The minority of farmers that do not feel their actual or planned systems fit within what was outlined, have or plan activities that are more nuanced in their design.

- More farmers plan to, or already implement, silvopastoral than silvoarable agroforestry systems.
- Roughly the same proportion of farmers plan to enter SFI and CS+.
- Many farmers, when asked about how much they expect to be paid for agroforestry, say either they don't know what the payment rate should be or that it will depend on details of specific systems, i.e. they don't think general rates are appropriate.
- Those that offered a payment rate for SFI creation per stem from a range of choices between £5 to £25+ chose £25 with £25+ the second most common choice.
- The equivalent figures for CS+ creation per stem (range offered: £10-50+) were £30, £40, £50, and £50+ at roughly the same frequency.
- Those that offered a payment rate for SFI maintenance per ha (50 stems/ha assumed) from a range of choices between £20 to £60+ chose £60+ with £60 the second most common choice.
- The equivalent figures for CS+ maintenance (50 stems/ha assumed, range offered: £25-£125+) were £125+ with £125 the second most popular choice.

2.3 Advice and guidance

The policy questions that we researched relating to advice and guidance can be summarised into two:

- What information do farmers require to encourage them to take up agroforestry and successfully implement it? Here we sought to understand what expert support agroforestry practitioners require, including to plan and record which public goods they will deliver.
- *How* do farmers access information and what does this mean for agroforestry advice and guidance provision under ELMS? Here we sought to understand the delivery of information support and how this can be achieved without bespoke one-to-one advice.

What information do farmers require to be attract them to take up agroforestry and successfully implement it?

The evidence review revealed that the most important farmer knowledge deficits of agroforestry were conceptual knowledge, practical knowledge and economic knowledge. This was further investigated in the regional workshops, from which the following three building blocks were generated:

- Recognise the many different types of information that are relevant to the successful implementation of agroforestry (12). This also has implications for how that wide range of knowledge is accessed by farmers, for it is unrealistic that it can all be gained from the same source (e.g. an individual farm advisor).
- Recognise the low baseline of agroforestry know-how (13) and therefore look at how farmers can be sign-posted to the advice and guidance that they need, whilst being facilitated to adopt relatively simple and adaptable approaches.
- Recognise the importance of locally adapted design (15) reflecting the climate, edaphic and other environmental characteristics of any participating farm.

How do farmers access information and what does this mean for agroforestry advice and guidance provision under ELMS?

From the results of interviews with the cluster farmers, we developed a conceptual model of how farmers learn agroforestry (Figure 3).



Figure 3: A model of how farmers learn agroforestry, from interviews with 36 cluster farmers.

Novice agroforestry farmers use a very broad range of sources and so efforts should be spread across as wide a range of information sources as possible to increase interest in agroforestry. Those working in knowledge exchange can facilitate movement from the novice to expert agroforestry practitioner phase by providing sources of advanced information use (books, internet webpages, sources of person-to-person interaction) within information sources used by novice agroforestry practitioners.

The regional workshops generated three building blocks for the design of agroforestry advice/guidance provision:

- Recognise the various ways farmers access advice and information on agroforestry (11). There is no one-stop-shop for advice provision for agroforestry. A range of advice providers have been and will continue to be important to service the information requirements of farmers adopting agroforestry.
- Encourage farmer-to-farmer knowledge exchange (14) by providing funding for demonstration farms and/or offering learning vouchers or bursaries that flexibly facilitates farmers to choose an information source that suits their needs and preferences.
- Recognise the benefits of local collaboration (16) to achieve cost efficiency, access to required knowledge, and good public goods outcomes.

Farmers' assessment of the Defra's proposed advice and guidance offer

Farmer opinion of Defra's proposed advice and guidance offer for agroforestry SFI and CS+ was gauged during the same activities (see above) in which payment proposals were assessed, with, again, structured farmer interviews (Appendix 6) representing the principle evidence source.

 A substantial majority of farmers feel that agroforestry advice and guidance proposed by Defra will be adequate for their needs. It should, however, be borne in mind that farmers who fed back within our activities are more engaged with and knowledgeable of agroforestry than the general population of English farmers (see Appendix 6).

- Farmers from this relatively knowledgeable and agroforestry-engaged sample were more equivocal when asked if proposed advice and guidance provision would be adequate for complete beginners in agroforestry. Over half indicated that they thought provision was inadequate or were ambivalent about proposed provision.
- Farmers would like one-to-one advice and guidance. In the absence of such provision farmers commonly state that peer-to-peer interactions are key in learning, a conclusion supported by the learning model proposed by this Test and presented above.
- Agroforestry advice and guidance proposed by Defra is likely to be considered inadequate unless Defra provide an efficient mechanism to facilitate peer-to-peer learning.

2.4 Spatial prioritisation

The spatial prioritisation policy area focuses on mechanisms to identify and agree local priorities within the national framework of public goods delivery. How can priority outcomes in certain areas be encouraged and incentivised? This Test operated in a range of geographic and agro-climatic environments where agroforestry land management interventions can be adopted. Each of these regions and environments create different opportunities and priorities for agroforestry and these were evident in the landscapes visited in the workshop series (see Figure 2). Hence, in the north-west, a principal opportunity for agroforestry is in the creation of wooded boundary or linear features that provide shelter for livestock against extreme weather such as "the beast from the east" and help to enourage more sensitive rotational grazing in smaller, sub-divided fields. In the south-east, the already heavily wooded landscape made in-field tree planting less of a priority but provided ample opportunity to explore the potential for existing farm woodlands to be used for occasional woodland grazing for the benefit of both livestock and ecosystem health. The important of advice and guidance that was bespoke to these regional variations (see building block #15) was emphasised repeatedly in the workshops and interviews. As one farmer put it: "Context is everything. [In terms of] people, place and animals, what works in a Somerset orchard is not the same in Yorkshire."

2.5 Land management planning

The land management planning policy area considers what mechanisms participants use to plan and record which public goods they will deliver. In the course of the Test project we aimed to establish farmer, forester and land manager preferences and opinions for the measurement of public goods from agroforestry. The most important finding was the degree of farmer support for public goods monitoring; farmers were genuinely motivated by the environmental benefits of agroforestry, not just the economic ones. Comments to this effect were captured in all of the six regional workshops. In the wider consultation, we asked for reaction to the proposed ELM actions to develop (1) a checklist and (2) a management plan. Key words to come out of the responses were, in both cases, to keep them *simple, flexible* and *unified*. There was particular support for map-based approaches to land management planning, as perhaps demonstrated by the woodland creation tool developed by the Sylva Foundation, with whom discussions were held during the course of the project. The project team have also been exposed to other map-based tools for agroforestry decision support and system design from the European continent, which look promising approaches within the UK context.

3. Conclusions

The Agroforestry ELM Test spent the first half of its 2½ years developing recommendations for Defra on what farmers want from the payment and advice and guidance mechanisms for Agroforestry in ELM. This was done through an evidence review, farmer interviews, and a series of regional workshops covering all types of agroforestry currently practiced in England. This culminated in the submission of a document recommending 16 payment and advice and guidance "building blocks" to Defra, essentially stating what farmers want from these aspects of ELM agroforestry.

Having considered the evidence we sent them, in May 2022 Defra passed to us a concise summary of their proposed payment structure for SFI and CS+, a list of other activities likely to be valid for payment, and an outline of likely advice and guidance provision in ELM. The remainder of the Test was concerned with assessing farmer opinion on what Defra proposed and feeding back to Defra so that their provisions can be modified accordingly. Feedback activities included a series of online co-creation and validation workshops, interviews and online questionnaires, and online stakeholder workshops.

In this conclusions section we consider whether Defra has been responsive in giving farmers what they have asked for by assessing proposed provision against each of our 16 payment and advice and guidance building blocks.

We conclude that proposed agroforestry SFI and CS+ provisions largely accommodates recommended payment building blocks (Appendix 5) 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, and 10 in that it: 1) Supports capital costs and maintenance costs, 2) Will be enabling and allow land managers to explore additional sources of funding, 3) Will be flexible, 4) Will not require a change of land use, 6) Will spread payments over time, 8) Will reward existing practice, and 10) Will incorporate a tiered system of support.

It currently does not: 5) Include monitoring of public goods and (related) 7) Incorporate *both* outcomes and action-based payments. While the Test understands that work is still underway to 9) Accommodate farm tenancy within provision, this building block is not currently addressed.

In relation to advice and guidance, Defra provision accommodates recommended payment building blocks (Appendix 5) 11, 12 and 14 in that it: 11) Takes into account the different ways farmers access information while learning agroforestry, and 12) Considers the different types of information required during the learning process. Defra has also indicated that it will facilitate some form of 14) Farmer-farmer-interaction.

Farmers are clearly concerned, however, that advice and guidance provision will not 13) meet the needs of complete beginners, and there currently is very little accommodation for localisation in the learning process, building blocks 15 and 16.

Current advice and guidance provision indicated by Defra is the most pronounced area of concern among farmers who have fed back to the Test. Farmers would like one-to-one advice and guidance but if they cannot have this, they commonly stress the importance peer-to-peer interactions in learning of agroforestry. While Defra have indicated that farmer-to-farmer learning will be facilitated, clarification on the extent on the nature of this provision would be welcomed. Defra should also consider that much agroforestry is highly adapted to local conditions and this aspect of localism in advice and guidance should be accommodated by Defra.

Clarification of how tenant farmers with short term (less than 10 years) tenancy agreements will be encouraged to take up agroforestry, which to many is a long-term endeavour, is encouraged. Many farmers also feel that planting agroforestry without continuing evidence of providing public goods has the potential to compromise Defra's long terms aim of

encouraging carbon sequestration and biodiversity through in-field tree planting. If Defra does not intend to pursue this form of evidencing, a better justification for not doing so, perhaps on the form of public statements, might appease the farmers who believe it to be important.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Project partners, personnel and Farmer-led Working Group members

Project partners

Organisation	Team member
Organic Research Centre	Dr Will Simonson
	Dr Colin Tosh
Soil Association	Ben Raskin
Woodland Trust	Helen Chesshire
Abacus Agriculture	Stephen Briggs
	lan Knight

Farmer-led Working Group

Name	Organisation/sector
Jenny Phelps	FWAG/Advisory
Simon Lloyd	Royal Forestry Society/Forestry
William Price	CLA/Farming large
Richard Bower	NFU/Farming small
Isobel Wright	Lincoln Uni, Wilder Doddington/Research
Jez Ralph	Timber Strategies/Forestry
Monitor farmers x 6 (see Appendix 3)	

Appendix 2: Sources used in the evidence review

Horne, S. Survey: Weather and soil concerns drive interest in tree planting. Farmers Weekly https://www.fwi.co.uk/business/business-management/survey-weather-and-soil-concerns-drive-interest-for-tree-planting (2020).

The Soil Association. Agroforestry Handbook Readers Survey. (2020).

Knight, I., Smith, J. & Westaway, S. Report on the 2nd RAIN workshop in the United Kingdom (UK). (2018).

Mosquera-Losada, M. R. We have a dream: fostering agricultural transition towards agroforestry. in European Agroforestry Conference-Agroforestry as Sustainable Land Use, 4th (EURAF, 2018).

Mayer, C. Agroforestry: A study of farmer attitudes and perceptions in England (MSc Thesis). (University of Reading., 2012).

Rois-Díaz, M. et al. Farmers' reasoning behind the uptake of agroforestry practices: evidence from multiple case-studies across Europe. Agrofor. Syst. 92, 811–828 (2018).

DEFRA. Agroforestry Review (Draft).

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_dat a/file/868182/FOI2019_03038_Agroforestry_review.pdf (2017).

Smith, J., Westaway, S., Pearce, B. D., Lampkin, N. & Briggs, S. ORC Report: Can agroforestry deliver production and environmental benefits in the next Rural Development Programme? (2013).

Soil Association & Woodland Trust. Agroforestry in England: Benefits, Barriers & Opportunities. https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/media/1700/agroforestry-in-england.pdf (2018).

Doyle, C. J., Thomas, T. & Hislop, M. J. The social implications of agroforestry. in Agroforestry in the UK, Forestry Commission, Bulletin 122 99–106 (Forestry Commission, 2000).

Appendix 3: Cluster group members

East: Silvo-arable			
Monitor Farmer	Stephen Briggs, Whitehall Farm		
Cluster Farmers	George Sly		
	John Pawsey		
	Archie Ruggles-Brise		
	Claire Birch		
	Simon Jones		
SW: Silvo-horticulture			
Monitor Farmer	Rafael Pompa, Dartington Estate		
Cluster Farmers	Helen Jackson-Brown		
	Andy Dibben		
	Sally Westaway		
	John Richards		
	Rebecca Hosking		
Central: Silvo-poultry			
Monitor Farmer	Clare Hill, FAI Farms		
Cluster Farmers	Andrew Woof		
	David & Tom Tame		
	Sam Phillips		
	Julia Gold		
	Tom Willings		
Midlands: Lowland silvopasture			
Monitor Farmer	Tim Downes, The Farm		
Cluster Farmers	Steven Ware		
	Jonathan Lovegrove-Fielden		
	Clive Baylie		
	Daniel Stover		
	Andrew Young		
North: Upland silvopasture			
Monitor Farmer	Nick and Paul Renison, Cannerheugh Farm		
Cluster Farmers	Jenny Bowes		
	Bill Grayson		
	Claire & Simon Bainbridge		
	David Brass		
	Andrew Hewitt		
South-east: Woodland grazing/ wood pasture			
Monitor Farmer	Jason Lavender, High Weald Association		
Cluster Farmers	Andy Bason		
	Polly Dumbreck		
	Mike Tristam		
	Paul Dovey		
	Tony Penrose		

Appendix 4: Calendar of activities

Date	Activity
January 2021	Evidence review
9 February 2021	FLWG meeting
16 June 2021	FLWG meeting
Jun-August 2021	Cluster farmer interviews
12 October 2021	Eastern regional workshop: Silvo-arable
2 November 2021	Northern regional workshop: Upland-silvopasture
10 November 2021	Central regional workshop: Silvo-poultry
23 November 2021	SE regional workshop: Wood pasture and woodland grazing
8 December 2021	SW regional workshop: Silvo-horticulture
7 January 2022	Session at Oxford Real Farming Conference (online)
10 February 2022	Midlands regional workshop: Lowland silvopasture (online)
20 April 2022	Forestry Commission workshop
12 May 20211	FLWG meeting
24 May 2022	Co-design workshop (1)
26 May 2022	Co-design workshop (2)
31 May 2022	Co-design workshop (3)
1 June 2022	Co-design workshop (4)
23 June 2022	Session at Groundswell
28 June 2022	Validation workshop (1)
29 June 2022	Validation workshop (2)
30 June 2022	Validation workshop (3)
1 July 2022	Validation workshop (4)
Oct 2022 – Feb 2023	Wider consultation – stakeholder interviews and online survey
30 January 2023	Presentation at AGROMIX (H2020) policy meeting
9 March 2023	FLWG meeting
21 March 2023	Feedback webinars (am and pm)

Appendix 5: Building blocks

Support for agroforestry should:

1: support capital costs and shorter term maintenance costs as this will have the most catalytic effect in terms of achieving widescale uptake of this land management practice. Some funding to facilitate knowledge exchange and research/monitoring would also be instrumental in building an effective community of practice in agroforestry in the farming community.	2. be an enabling and recognise the longer-term public goods delivery of this land management practice and the possibility of capitalising on carbon and biodiversity markets. Support to the start-up and establishment phase is therefore the main priority of public funding.	3. be flexible to reflect (i) the diversity of potential designs for this land management practice, (ii) the need for adaptation to local conditions, (iii) adaptive management over time and (iv) branching options.	4. not imply or require change of land use. New trees and wooded areas should be considered as long-term assets on the farm and their longevity is important for the carbon, biodiversity and other public goods benefits, which should be recognised and rewarded. They should not, however, be seen as permanent, closing future options of farmers whether owners or tenants.
5. include monitoring of public goods benefits within its design and implementation. To do this effectively, there needs to be an adequate budget and standardised monitoring protocols, enabling farmers to collect the necessary data but supporting this through coordinated approaches from local to national level.	6. spread payments over time. Regular payments across the establishment phase of an agroforestry project should be offered to support maintenance of the system. This is critical for the eventual achievement of the public goods outcomes.	7. incorporate both outcomes- and action- based payments. A blended approach reflects the realities of high start- up/establishment costs whilst incentivising the implementation of agroforestry in ways that most effectively delivers public goods.	8. reward existing practice. Farmers who already have trees in their fields should not be excluded from being able to receive payments through ELM. One way of rewarding these agroforestry pioneers is by offering payments for being demonstration sites within their localities – see building block 14.
9. make it as easy as possible for tenant farmers and growers to participate directly or indirectly (through landlord schemes).	10. incorporate a tiered system of support allowing for different levels of ambition. An uplift in payments would be appropriate when there is evidence of significant public goods outcomes, research and monitoring are embedded in the operation, and/or when there is demonstration of knowledge gained as part of CPD.	11. recognise the various ways farmers access advice and information on agroforestry. There is no one-stop-shop for advice provision for agroforestry. A range of advice providers have been and will continue to be important to service the information requirements of farmers adopting agroforestry.	12. recognise the many different types of information that are relevant to the successful implementation of agroforestry. This also has implications for how that wide range of knowledge is accessed by farmers, for it is unrealistic that it can all be gained from the same source (e.g. an individual farm advisor).
13. recognise the low baseline of agroforestry know-how and therefore look at how farmers can be sign-posted to the advice and guidance that they need, whilst being facilitated to adopt relatively simple and adaptable approaches.	14. encourage farmer- to-farmer knowledge exchange by providing funding for demonstration farms and/or offering learning vouchers or bursaries that flexibly facilitates farmers to choose an information source that suits their needs and preferences.	15. recognise the importance of locally adapted design reflecting the climate, edaphic and other environmental characteristics of any participating farm.	16. recognise the benefits of local collaboration to achieve cost efficiency, access to required knowledge, and good public goods outcomes.

Appendix 6: Farmer feedback interviews on proposed agroforestry SFI and CS+ provision by Defra

In 31 interviews held between November 2022 and April 2023 farmers were shown a concise tabular display of agroforestry SFI and CS+ provision (see table below) proposed by Defra and a series of questions on it were asked, along with other relevant questions. Details of stem densities for different agroforestry types and payment schemes were show in the table, along with other activities permissible for payment, and a brief summary of advice and guidance provisions considered likely by Defra.

Interviews were advertised in a "broadcast" manner through social media channels, email groups, and newsletters of relevant organisations. In the advertisement for interviews we emphasised our wish to speak to farmers relatively inexperienced in agroforestry and the sample obtained (see below) had greatest representation of the "beginner" agroforestry level, but probably had considerably more experience and knowledge in agroforestry than the general population of English farmers.

Table: proposed SFI and CS+ agroforestry offer provided by Defra and presented to farmers during interviews.

Agroforestry SFI actions	Agroforestry CS+ actions	
Create and/or maintain an agroforestry system	Create and/or maintain an agroforestry system.	
 Payment rates offered based on tree density bandings: Low density: 5-30 stems/ha silvoarable (SA), 5-20 stems/ha silvopasture (SP) Mid density: 30-60 stems/ha SA, 20-40 stems/ha SP Max density: 60-100 stems/ha SA, 40-60 stems/ha SP. Bonus/payment multiplier for having a mix of tree species. Examples of maintenance include: weed control; canopy management and pruning; replacement of failed trees, and tree protection (e.g. guards, fencing) will be available.	 For agroforestry systems; with tree densities of >100stems/ha SA, and >60 stems/ha for SP; and Located on sensitive ground or with a sensitive feature. Bonus/payment multiplier for having a mix of tree species.	
Complete a management plan. [Note: this will not be assessed by Defra and could be included in the guidance]	Complete a management plan. [Note: this will be assessed by Defra but will be led by practitioner objectives for their system]	
	Adapt an existing agroforestry system for environmental benefits.	

Complete a pest risk assessment, (i.e. deer and squirrel) and access pest management capital items as appropriate.

Training/learning offer (e.g. handbooks, webinars, peer to peer learning) for both new entrants and experienced practitioners.

Findings



Score obtained: 6.2 ± 0.9 (mean $\pm 95\%$ CI, n = 31)

What is your attitude toward integrating trees on your farm and retaining agricultural (arable/pastoral) output?













Given your current knowledge and experience of agroforestry, does the above advice/guidance offer sound adequate to your needs?





Do you believe the above information provision would meet the needs of people entering agroforestry?

SFI agroforestry creation payment. Preferred payment per stem (payment range shown offered to interviewees)



CS+ agroforestry creation payment. Preferred payment per stem (payment range shown offered to interviewees)



SFI agroforestry maintenance payment. Preferred payment, 50 stems/ha assumed (payment range shown offered to interviewees)









Organic Research Centre, Trent Lodge, Stroud Road, Cirencester, Gloucestershire. GL7 6JN 01488 658 298

| <u>hello@organicresearchcentre.com</u> | organicresearchcentre.com

Patrons: The Duchess of Richmond and Gordon, Christopher Bielenberg and Peter & Juliet Kindersley. The Progressive Farming Trust Ltd, trading as the Organic Research Centre, is a charity registered in England and Wales (281276). A company limited by guarantee (1513190). Registered office: Trent Lodge, Stroud Road, Cirencester GL7 6JN