

Y Pwyllgor Amgylchedd a Chynaliadwyedd

Lleoliad:
Ystafell Bwyllgora 3 – y Senedd

Dyddiad:
Dydd Iau, 23 Ionawr 2014

Amser:
09:15

Cynulliad
Cenedlaethol
Cymru

National
Assembly for
Wales



I gael rhagor o wybodaeth, cysylltwch â:

Alun Davidson
Clerc y Pwyllgor
029 2089 8639
Pwyllgorac@cymru.gov.uk

Agenda

Rhag-gyfarfod anffurfiol (09:15 – 09:30)

1 Cyflwyniad, ymddiheuriadau a dirprwyon

2 Diwygiadau i'r Polisi Amaethyddol Cyffredin – Tystiolaeth gan y Gweinidog Adnoddau Naturiol a Bwyd (09:30 – 10:30) (Tudalennau 1 - 30)

E&S(4)-02-14 papur 1

Alun Davies AC, y Gweinidog Cyfoeth Naturiol a Bwyd
Andrew Slade, Cyfarwyddwr, Amaeth, Bwyd a'r Môr

Egwyl (10.30 – 10.45)

3 Ymateb i'r llyfogydd a'r difrod stormydd diweddar – Tystiolaeth gan y Gweinidog Adnoddau Naturiol a Bwyd (10:45 – 11:30)

(Tudalennau 31 - 41)

Alun Davies AC, y Gweinidog Cyfoeth Naturiol a Bwyd
Andrew Slade, Cyfarwyddwr, Amaeth, Bwyd a'r Môr

4 Rheoli Tir yn Gynaliadwy: Tystiolaeth gan y Diwydiant

Coedwigaeth (11:30 – 12:15) (Tudalennau 42 - 76)

E&S(4)-01-14 papur 2: Coed Cadw

E&S(4)-01-14 papur 3: Confor

E&S(4)-01-14 papur 4: Meithrinfeydd Coedwig Maelor Cyf

Jerry Langford, Cyfarwyddwr Cymru, Coed Cadw

Kath McNulty, Rheolwr Cenedlaethol Cymru, Confor

Mike Harvey, Cyfarwyddwr, Meithrinfeydd Coedwig Maelor Cyf

George McRobbie, Rheolwr Gyfarwyddwr, UPM Tillhill

(Egwyl 12.15 – 13.15)

5 Ymateb i'r llifogydd a'r difrod stormydd diweddar – Tystiolaeth gan Gyfoeth Naturiol Cymru (13:15 – 14:00)

Jeremy Parr, Pennaeth Rheoli Peryglon Gweithredol a Llifogydd

Tim Jones, Cyfarwyddwr Gweithredol – Y Gogledd a'r Canolbarth

6 Papurau i'w nodi

Gohebiaeth gan Gyfoeth Naturiol Cymru yn dilyn y cyfarfod ar 12 Rhagfyr
(Tudalennau 77 - 78)

7 Cynnig o dan Reol Sefydlog 17.42 i benderfynu gwahardd y cyhoedd o'r cyfarfod ar gyfer eitem 8 (14:00 – 14:30)

Sesiwn breifat

8 Dulliau o weithio (14:00 – 14:30)

Y Pwyllgor Amgylchedd a Chynaliadwyedd

E&S(4)-02-14 papur 2

Rhoi Polisi Amaethyddol Cyffredin newidd ar waith

Cwmpas

Mae'r papur tystiolaeth hwn yn hysbysu'r Pwyllgor am Golofn 1 (taliadau uniongyrchol) y Polisi Amaethyddol Cyffredin (PAC) yn bennaf, yn dilyn fy natganiad i'r Cyfarfod Llawn ar 14 Ionawr 2014. Mae'r papur yn cyfeirio'n fyr hefyd at Golofn 2 y Rhaglen Datblygu Gwledig (RhDG) newydd lle bo'n berthnasol i ffermio.

Y sefyllfa ar hyn o bryd

Bydd y newidiadau i'r PAC yn dechrau ar 1 Ionawr 2015 bellach, hynny oherwydd yr amser hir a gymerwyd i gytuno ar y diwygiadau terfynol. Mae fframwaith rheoleiddio Ewrop ar gyfer diwygio'r PAC wedi'i gwblhau heblaw am y rheoliadau gweithredu a'r deddfau dirprwyedig (sy'n pennu'r manylion gweithredol); fe'u disgwylir yn fuan ac yna, gallaf wneud yr holl benderfyniadau sydd eto i'w gwneud mewn pryd ar gyfer cyflwyno'r cynigion llawn ar gyfer Colofn 1 i'r Comisiwn Ewropeaidd erbyn 1 Awst 2014. Byddaf yn ymgynghori ar Golofn 2 ym misoedd Chwefror a Mawrth a chyflwynir y RhDG drafft i'r Comisiwn ym mis Mai.

€2.245bn yw cyfran Cymru o gyllideb PAC 2014-20 y DU ar gyfer Colofn 1 a €335m yw ei chyfran ar gyfer Colofn 2. Mae'n bwysig bod yr un gyfran (8.69%) o Derfyn y DU yn cael ei neilltuo i Golofn 1 Cymru y tro hwn â'r tro cynt er bod gwerth y gyfran honno wedi gostwng 1.6% o'i gymharu â 2013¹ oherwydd y gostyngiad yng nghyllideb y DU. Mae cyllideb Colofn 2 7.8% yn fwy nag yn 2007-13². Caiff newidiadau pellach eu gwneud i'r PAC o 2020 a gallai'r gyllideb grebachu ymhellach. Mae hynny'n ei gwneud yn arbennig o bwysig defnyddio'r diwygiadau ar gyfer 2014-20 i gryfhau'r diwydiant amaeth a'i wneud yn effeithiol a phroffidiol.

Ymgynghori

Dechreuwyd ymgynghori ar Golofn 1 yn Sioe Frenhinol Cymru ym mis Gorffennaf 2013 a daeth i ben ar 30 Tachwedd. Yn ogystal, cynhaliais gyfarfodydd holi ac ateb poblogaidd ledled y wlad yn yr hydref. Roedd yr ymatebwyr yn gefnogol ar y cyfan i'r cynigion er iddynt fynegi pryder y byddai taliadau arwynebedd yn golygu llai o gymorth ariannol. Mae Atodiad A yn crynhoi'r prif bwyntiau.

¹ O'i addasu ar gyfer chwyddiant, dyna leihad o 12.6%.

² O'i addasu ar gyfer chwyddiant, mae'n lleihad o 5.5% Tudalen 1

Cynhaliwyd digwyddiadau ymgynghori ar Golofn 2 yng ngwanwyn 2013 a bydd ymgynghoriad terfynol yn dechrau ym mis Chwefror. Mae grŵp rhanddeiliaid o dan gadeiryddiaeth Peter Davies³ wedi helpu i ddatblygu polisi.

Y Sefyllfa o ran Polisi

Polisi integredig yw'r PAC ac mae'r penderfyniadau ar Golofn 1 wedi cydnabod cwmpas Colofn 2 a'm huchelgais iddi gefnogi'r diwydiant ffermio a busnesau cysylltiedig a diogelu'r amgylchedd naturiol. Rhaid i'r ddwy golofn gefnogi ffermio a rhaid defnyddio'r ddwy ar y cyd. Rwyf am adeiladu ar Cynllun Datblygu Gwledig 2007-13 a defnyddio'r nesaf fel erfyn i ddatblygu ffermio a'r economi wledig ehangach.

Rwyf wedi ystyried adroddiad Kevin Roberts ar gadernid y diwydiant ffermio. Mae angen i ffermydd allu dygymod â phroblemau'n well, boed rheini'n rhai naturiol neu rai a achosir gan y farchnad. Mae ystadegau diweddaraf yr Arolwg o Fusnesau⁴ yn dangos bod gwahaniaeth mawr rhwng y ffermydd mwyaf proffidiol a'r fferm gyffredin. Yr angen hwn i dargedu gwelliannau yn y diwydiant yw un o'm prif resymau dros drosglwyddo 15%, yr uchafswm a ganiateir, o gyllideb Colofn 1 i Golofn 2. Un o brif amcanion y RhDG fydd gwneud y diwydiant yn gadarnach a mwy cystadleuol, i feithrin sgiliau a gwybodaeth ac ychwanegu at werth cynnyrch.

Taliadau Uniongyrchol Colofn 1

Mae gofyn i Gymru o 2015, yn unol â'r rheoliadau, gyflwyno Cynllun Taliadau Sylfaenol (BPS) yn lle'r Cynllun Taliadau Sengl. Rhaid seilio taliadau'r cynllun newydd ar faint o dir sy'n cael ei ffermio. Ceir disgrisiwn ynghylch union siâp y BPS ac ynghylch pa mor gyflym y newidir i system sy'n gwbl seiliedig ar arwynebedd yn lle'r system o hawliau 'hanesyddol' a ddefnyddir ar hyn o bryd yng Nghymru. Bydd y BPS hefyd yn defnyddio 'hawliau' a Chronfa Genedlaethol sy'n rhoi blaenoriaeth i ffermwyr ifanc a ffermwyr newydd. Bydd yn rhaid i bob hawlydd fodloni amodau 'gwyrddu' fydd yn cyfrif am 30% o'u taliadau. Mae gan ffermwyr ifanc cymwys⁵ yr hawl i daliadau BPS ychwanegol. Dim ond 'ffermwyr actif' fydd yn cael hawliau a hawlio taliadau. Bydd taliadau dros €150k y flwyddyn yn cael eu lleihau 5%. Mae cynlluniau dewisol ar gyfer cymorth cysylltiedig, ar gyfer cyflwyno Cynllun Ardal â Chyfyngiadau Naturiol, ar gyfer cynllun symlach ar gyfer ffermydd bach ac i dalu taliadau uwch ar 'hectarau cyntaf' pob hawliad (sy'n pwysoli taliadau ar gyfer ffermydd bach).

Mae Atodiad 2 yn crynhoi fy mhenderfyniadau ynghylch Colofn 1. Cewch benderfyniadau pellach gennyf ar eu manylion yn y gwanwyn pan fydd y deddfau dirprwyedig a'r rheoliadau gweithredu wedi'u cwblhau. Byddant yn ymwneud ag agweddau ar y taliadau

³ Comisiynydd Datblygu Cynaliadwy Cymru.

⁴ <http://www.aber.ac.uk/en/ibers/science-into-practice/fbs/fbs-database/>

⁵ Persons setting up as head of holding for the first time or within the last five years and who are no more than 40 years old. The Welsh Government may apply additional eligibility criteria.

gwyrdd, amodau pellach ar gyfer y taliadau ychwanegol i ffermwyr ifanc a'r Gronfa Genedlaethol a'r diffiniad o 'ffermwyr actif'.

Mae'r paragraffau canlynol ym ymhelaethu ar y prif benderfyniadau yn Atodiad 2.

System dalu

Mae llawer o waith modelu wedi'i wneud a'i rannu â gweithgor rhanddeiliaid sy'n cynnwys undebau ffermwyr. Mae'r FUW, NFU Cymru, CAAV a'r CLA wedi cytuno â'r nod, wrth newid i system arwynebedd, y gwneir hynny mewn ffordd sy'n peri'r newid lleiaf i'r taliadau cyfredol. Fy amcanion eraill yw cydnabod cynhyrchiant amaethyddol y tir, lleihau'r risg o arafu taliadau neu feirniadaeth gan archwilwyr ariannol ac i gwblhau'r newid o fewn cyfnod sy'n rhoi digon o amser i addasu ond sy'n mynnu newid o fewn cyfnod realistig. Mae gwerthoedd yr hawliau 'hanesyddol' pan ystyrir y taliadau a wneir i ffermwyr heddiw fesul hectar yn amrywio'n fawr ac mae hynny'n gwneud y newid hwn yn anoddach – Tabl 1. Ceir ffermydd ym mhob sefyllfa yng Nghymru sydd â hawliau uchel ac isel eu gwerth. Felly mae newid i ddefnyddio nifer fechan o gyfraddau talu cyffredin yn golygu newid go iawn. Mae'r hawliau uchel iawn eu gwerth sydd gan rai ffermwyr ar hyn o bryd yn anghynaliadwy.

Mae gwaith modelu data wedi dangos ei bod yn bwysig rhoi rhostir mewn categori penodol er mwyn lleihau'r newid ariannol i ffermwyr. Y cynnig gwreiddiol oedd neilltuo 287,000 ha yn rhostir gan ddefnyddio map llystyfiant a wnaed ym 1992. Fel ymateb i'r adborth, rwyf wedi newid y cynnig i gyfyngu'r hyn a olygir wrth rhostir i'r tiroedd sydd 400m neu uwch ar fap 1992. Mae hynny'n lleihau'r arwynebedd sy'n rhostir i 157,300 ha, a chaiff y rhan fwyaf o'r tir sy'n weddill ei ailddosbarthu'n Dir dan Anfantais Fawr (Tabl 2). Mae hynny'n cymryd tir pori o ansawdd gwell o'r rhostir (gan leddfu gofidiau llawer o berchenogion tir), yn cyfateb yn well y rhanbarthau tir â'u potensial i gynhyrchu ac yn gosod sail wrthrychol glir i berchenogion tir fydd am apelio yn erbyn y categori rhostir.

Tabl 1: y gwahaniaethau yng ngwerth hawliau fesul hectar ar gyfer rhanbarthau tir gwahanol

| Rhanbarth | # Ffermydd | € yr ha | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|-------------|----------|------------|------------|---------------|
| | | Cyfartaledd | Isaf | Isel | Uchel | Uchaf |
| DA & llawr gwlad | 1,509 | 255 | 6 | 58 | 433 | 2,024 |
| Llawr gwlad | 2,641 | 250 | 2 | 72 | 431 | 12,110 |
| Eraill heb rostir | 1,306 | 242 | 4 | 101 | 381 | 42,943 |
| DA | 2,990 | 225 | 1 | 68 | 393 | 3,967 |
| DA & SDA | 1,967 | 222 | 7 | 89 | 365 | 2,216 |
| SDA | 2,755 | 187 | 7 | 74 | 306 | 2,983 |
| Eraill â rhostir | 1,374 | 155 | 12 | 75 | 294 | 2,707 |
| Rhostir a SDA | 1,506 | 132 | 2 | 61 | 261 | 1,182 |
| Cyfanswm | 16,048 | 196 | 1 | 122 | 245 | 42,943 |

Ffynhonnell: Hawlwyr SPS 2012, pan fo rhostir yn 400m neu uwch ar fap rhostiroedd 1992. Mae'r colofnau 'isel' ac 'uchel' yn dangos gwerthoedd sy'n cynrychioli 90% o'r ffermydd, ac mae 'isaf' ac 'uchaf' yn dangos y gwerthoedd isaf ac uchaf.

Mae'r arwynebedd llai o rostir yn werth rhyw 12% o'r tir yr hawlir SPS arno ar hyn o bryd (Tabl 2). Mae'r gwaith modelu a wnaed ers yr ymgynghoriad gan ddefnyddio data hawlio 2012 yn dangos y byddai model dau ranbarth yn arwain at fwy o newid na model tri ranbarth. Mae lleihau rhostir yn ôl uchder yn golygu y telid yr un gyfradd ar bron i 90% o'r tir ffermio yng Nghymru. Mae hyn wedi'm sbarduno i ailystyried fy nghynnig yn yr ymgynghoriad a phenderfynu cyflwyno yn hytrach system dalu sy'n defnyddio tri ranbarth tir - rhostir; SDA; a DA a llawer gwlad gyda'i gilydd.

Tabl 2: maint y rhanbarthau tir (hectarau), eu cyfran o'r holl dir ffermio yr hawlir arno, y cymarebau talu arfaethedig a'r taliadau blynyddol cronuss yn 2019.

| Nodwedd | Rhanbarth Tir | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|---------|----------------|----------------------------|
| | Rhostir | SDA | DA/llawr gwlad | Cyfanswm |
| Arwynebedd (ha) | 157,300 | 617,700 | 558,000 | 1,333,500 |
| % yr arwynebedd a hawlir | 12 | 46 | 42 | 100 |
| Cymhareb dalu | 1 | 10 | 12 | n/a |
| Cyfraddau talu bras € | 20 | 200 | 240 | 196 (taliad safonol Cymru) |
| Taliad cronuss bras €m y flwyddyn | 3.1 | 123.7 | 134.2 | 261 |

Ffynhonnell: Hawlwyr SPS 2012.

Mae gwaith modelu wedi nodi senarios y cyfraddau talu sy'n ffitio orau o safbwynt ystadegol ar gyfer pob model. Wrth gymharu modelau sy'n defnyddio data hawlio blynyddoedd gwahanol, ceir cyfraddau talu 'gorau' gwahanol iawn. Hynny gan fod nifer

a maint hawliadau yn amrywio o flwyddyn i flwyddyn. Ni fydd yn bosib cyfri'r cyfraddau 'gorau' ar gyfer y Cynllun newydd tan y caiff yr hawliadau cyntaf eu gwneud (2015) ac y bydd maint y galw i'r Gronfa Genedlaethol ac am y taliadau chwyddo i ffermwyr ifanc yn hysbys. Wedi hynny, bydd gwahaniaethau'n parhau o flwyddyn i flwyddyn wrth newid i system sy'n gwbl seiliedig ar daliadau arwynebedd gan y bydd nifer a maint hawliadau'n newid bob blwyddyn, fel ag y maent nawr. Y casgliad felly yw nad oes y fath beth â chyfradd dalu ddelfrydol. Mae'r gwaith modelu'n rhoi syniad pa ranbarthau tir ddylai fod yn y system dalu, a beth ddylai eu gwerthoedd cymharol fod. O fewn y 30 senario sy'n ffitio orau, mae'r cyfraddau talu yn amrywio'n fawr; nid ydym wedi cyfrif hyn yn union ond mae gwahaniaeth o €5 i €10 ym mhob rhanbarth yn nodweddiadol. Ar ôl ystyried y senarios sy'n ffitio orau, rydym wedi penderfynu y byddai cymhareb dalu o 1:10:12 yn cadw cydbwysedd rhesymol rhwng y tri rhanbarth. Pan ddaw 2019, byddai hynny'n rhoi i ni'r cyfraddau talu a'r cyfanswm taliadau bras a welir yn Nhabl 2.

Mae Tabl 3 yn dangos effaith y system tri rhanbarth â'r cyfraddau talu hyn ar y taliadau cyfun i sectorau fferm gwahanol a nifer y ffermydd fyddai'n gweld cynnydd neu ostyngiad yn eu taliadau o fwy neu o lai na €5,000. Mae Tabl 4 yn dangos yr un data ar gyfer y rhanbarthau tir. Mae'r ddau dabl yn dangos data'n seiliedig ar y sefyllfa a ragwelir yn 2019.

Mae'n amlwg y bydd llawer o ffermydd ar eu hennill a llawer eraill ar eu colled a hynny o fewn yr un sector. Rhwng popeth, y sector godro fyddai'n gweld y gostyngiad net a chyfrannol mwyaf, a'r sector defaid fyddai'n gweld y cynnydd mwyaf. Rhagwelir y bydd y sector godro'n derbyn taliadau llai o dan bob model sy'n seiliedig ar arwynebedd, hynny am fod gan ffermydd godro hawliau hanesyddol uwch eu gwerth yn sgil troi cwotâu llaeth yn hawliau hanesyddol ychwanegol. Nid oes gan y ffermydd hyn fel arfer ddigon o arwynebedd o dir i wneud i fyny am y golled. Nodwedd gyffredin arall o'r holl fodelau a archwiliwyd yw y bydd ffermydd bach â llai nag 20 ha yn tueddu i fod ar eu hennill, yn bennaf am nad oes ganddynt fawr o hawliau hanesyddol, os o gwbl, a'u bod felly yn derbyn taliadau SPS bach iawn ar hyn o bryd.

Tabl 3: gwerth taliadau (€m) a nifer y ffermydd fydd yn gweld newid ariannol o fwy neu o lai na €5,000 ar gyfer gwahanol fathau o ffermydd erbyn 2019 o'i gymharu â llinell sylfaen sy'n seiliedig ar y gyllideb.

| | Gwerth (€miliwn) | | Newid (€miliwn) | | | % newid |
|-------------------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|-------|---------|
| | Llin. Sylfaen | Ar sail tir | Ennill | Colli | Net | |
| Cyfanswm | 261.0 | 261.0 | 42.7 | 42.7 | 0.0 | 0.0% |
| Math o fferm | | | | | | |
| Godro | 43.2 | 34.8 | 2.2 | 10.7 | -8.5 | -19.6% |
| Eidion | 35.0 | 34.5 | 5.8 | 6.4 | -0.5 | -1.4% |
| Defaid | 64.3 | 73.2 | 15.7 | 6.9 | 8.8 | 13.7% |
| Defaid ac eidion | 67.0 | 63.1 | 6.8 | 10.7 | -3.8 | -5.7% |
| Eraill mawr | 45.0 | 46.8 | 8.9 | 7.1 | 1.8 | 4.0% |
| Bach | 5.9 | 8.0 | 3.0 | 0.8 | 2.2 | 36.7% |
| Micro | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.5% |
| Nifer y ffermydd | | | | | | |
| | Ennill >€5k | Ennill <€5k | Colli <€5k | Colli >€5k | C'swm | |
| Godro | 157 | 330 | 403 | 604 | 1,494 | |
| Eidion | 423 | 763 | 503 | 347 | 2,036 | |
| Defaid | 908 | 1,383 | 717 | 383 | 3,391 | |
| Defaid ac | | | | | | |
| eidion | 441 | 737 | 708 | 638 | 2,524 | |
| Eraill mawr | 626 | 1,116 | 504 | 372 | 2,618 | |
| Bach | 0 | 2,530 | 546 | 29 | 3,105 | |
| Micro | 0 | 662 | 213 | 5 | 880 | |

Ffynhonnell: Hawlwyr SPS 2012.

Pan ystyrir dosraniad y taliadau o safbwynt rhanbarthau tir, gwelir bod y system a ddewiswyd yn aiddosbarthu arian o lawr gwlad i'r ucheldir (Tabl 4). Rhostir a'r Ardaloedd tan Anfantais Fawr sydd ar eu hennill fwyaf. O'u cyfuno, caiff €126.8m y flwyddyn ei sianelu iddynt (Tabl 2), sy'n fwy na'r €118.4 y flwyddyn y byddai system tri rhanbarth heb gyfyngu rhostir ar sail uchder yn ei roi. Dyma amcangyfrif o ganlyniadau'r system daliadau newydd:

- byddai 10,076 o ffermydd yn cael taliadau uwch⁶ o dan system arwynebedd lwyr o'u cymharu â'r dyraniadau hanesyddol (wedi'u haddasu yn ôl y gyllideb);
- byddai 3,594 yn colli hyd at €5,000 a 2,378 yn colli mwy na €5,000;
- fe welid enillion yn Sir Gaerfyrddin, Gwynedd, Ceredigion, Sir Fynwy ac yn enwedig o ran maint cymharol yr enillion (€4.2m neu 24%), De Cymru a
- gwelid y colledion net mwyaf ym Mhowys o safbwynt ariannol (tua €6.3m) ond o safbwynt cymharol, yn y Fflint a Wrecsam (-12.9%)

⁶ O'r 16,048 o hawlwyrr yn 2012.

Tabl 4: gwerth taliadau (€m)a'r newid iddynt erbyn 2019 ar gyfer rhanbarthau tir gwahanol, a nifer y ffermydd fyddai ar eu hennill neu ar eu colled yn ôl cymysgedd/math o ranbarth tir o'i gymharu â llinell sylfaen yn seiliedig ar y gyllideb.

| Cymysgedd tir | Gwerth (€ miliwn) | | Newid (€ miliwn) | | | Newid cymharol |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------|
| | Llin. Sylfaen | Ar sail tir | Ennill | Colli | Net | |
| Llawr gwlad | 38.3 | 36.8 | 5.4 | 6.9 | -1.5 | -3.8% |
| DA | 25.3 | 27.0 | 5.8 | 4.1 | 1.7 | 6.7% |
| SDA | 25.8 | 27.5 | 5.1 | 3.3 | 1.8 | 6.8% |
| DA a Llawr gwlad | 32.0 | 30.1 | 4.2 | 6.1 | -1.9 | -5.8% |
| DA & SDA | 32.4 | 31.7 | 4.7 | 5.4 | -0.8 | -2.4% |
| Eraill heb rostir | 29.5 | 26.9 | 3.0 | 5.6 | -2.6 | -9.0% |
| Rhostir a SDA | 30.8 | 33.5 | 6.8 | 4.1 | 2.7 | 8.8% |
| Eraill â rhostir | 46.9 | 47.5 | 7.7 | 7.1 | 0.6 | 1.2% |
| Nifer y ffermydd | | | | | | |
| | | | Colli | | | |
| | Ennill >€5k | Ennill <€5k | <€5k | Colli >€5k | C'swm | |
| Llawr gwlad | 359 | 1,306 | 563 | 413 | 2,641 | |
| DA | 352 | 1,841 | 547 | 250 | 2,990 | |
| SDA | 263 | 1,536 | 754 | 202 | 2,755 | |
| DA a llawr gwlad | 289 | 610 | 287 | 323 | 1,509 | |
| DA & SDA | 297 | 900 | 451 | 319 | 1,967 | |
| Eraill heb rostir | 199 | 467 | 349 | 291 | 1,306 | |
| Rhostir & SDA | 408 | 519 | 357 | 222 | 1,506 | |
| Eraill â rhostir | 388 | 342 | 286 | 358 | 1,374 | |

Ffynhonnell: Hawlwyr SPS 2012.

Bydd y system newydd wedi'i chyflwyno'n llwyr erbyn 2019. Mae cyfnod pontio o bum mlynedd yn un rhesymol ac yn cadw'r cydbwysedd rhwng newid sy'n digwydd yn ddigon cyflym i fod yn ystyrlon a newid sy'n ddigon araf i'r ffermydd sydd ar eu colled fedru addasu iddo. Fy uchelgais oedd gweld na fyddai ffermydd yn colli mwy na 10% mewn unrhyw flwyddyn yn y cyfnod newid. Mae'r modelau ar gyfer fy nghynnig yn dangos y byddai hynny'n wir ar gyfer 84% o'r hawlwyrr cyfredol. Bydd y gyfran honno'n codi i 89% o hawlwyrr pe bai'r rheini y gellid dadlau sy'n derbyn taliadau bach⁷ yn cael eu tynnu o'r darlun.

Rwyf wedi modelu opsiwn y twnnel a phenderfynu ei wrthod gan y byddai'n golygu y byddai nifer fawr o ffermydd sydd ar hyn o bryd yn derbyn taliadau hael iawn yn dal i gael mwy na'r gyfradd darged yn 2019. Yr un pryd, byddai 10,153 o ffermydd yn derbyn llai na'r gyfradd darged. Mae Atodiad C yn crynhoi'r data hwnnw. Er nad wyf am wneud yn fach o'r anawsterau a wynebid gan unrhyw fusnes sy'n colli cymhorthdal, ni ddaw

⁷ Taliadau bach yw'r rheini sy'n llai na €5,000 dros y cyfnod pontio llawn (colled ar gyfartaledd o lai na €1,000 y flwyddyn).

mantais i'r diwydiant o gael lleiafrif yn parhau i dderbyn lefelau sylweddol uwch o gymhorthdal (a hynny dros lawer o flynyddoedd) tra bo'r mwyafrif yn dal i dderbyn llai na'u hawl. Trwy gwblhau'r newid erbyn 2019, lleiheir y risg y bydd diwygiadau pellach i'r PAC ar ôl 2020 yn newid y system dalu eto, gan adael y rheini sydd heb eu newid i lefelau cymorth is yn agored i ostyngiad sydyn yn eu cymorth. Byddai perygl hefyd y gallai Llywodraeth Cymru gael ei chyhuddo o anghydfurfio â rheolau a safonau archwilio'r cynllun.

Mae fy mhenderfyniadau eraill yn hunanesboniadol ac fe'u disgrifir yn fras yn Ffigur 2. Cafwyd cefnogaeth yn yr ymatebion i'r ymgynghoriad o blaid codi maint yr hawliad lleiaf i bum hectar a gosod cap uwch ar daliadau mawr – bydd hyn yn ychwanegol at y cap o 5% ar daliadau o €150,000 neu fwy sy'n ofynnol gan Ewrop. Bydd yr elfen wyrddu'n cyfrif am 30% o'r cymorth i ffermwyr ac roedd yr ymgynghoriad yn cefnogi mabwysiadu cynigion gwreiddiol y Comisiwn. Rwy'n cydnabod na fyddant yn debygol o ddod â manteision ychwanegol i amgylchedd naturiol Cymru a chydabyddiaeth o hynny yw un o'r rhesymau pam rwyf wedi dewis trosglwyddo 15% o Golofn 1 i Golofn 2 a hefyd rhoi hwb i'r gefnogaeth i wasanaethau bywyd gwyllt ac ecosystem trwy gynlluniau amaeth-amgylcheddol er enghraifft.

Colofn 2 – Y Rhaglen Datblygu Gwledig

Rhaglen 7 mlynedd yw'r RhDG sy'n cael ei noddi gan yr Undeb Ewropeaidd a Llywodraeth Cymru i wneud y sector amaeth a choedwigaeth yn fwy cystadleuol; i ddiogelu a gwella'r amgylchedd gwledig ac i feithrin busnesau gwledig cystadleuol a chynaliadwy a chymunedau ffyniannus. Mae Atodiad D yn crynhoi'r blaenoriaethau rheoliadol a'r meysydd ffocws. Fy amcan ar gyfer y RhDG nesaf yw ei ddefnyddio i sicrhau bod busnesau amaethyddol a gwledig ar ddiwedd cyfnod y rhaglen yn 2020 yn gadarnach ac yn fwy cystadleuol nag yr oeddynt ar ei ddechrau. Hoelir yr amcan hwn yng nghydedd Twf Gwyrdd, gyda'r amcanion o gryfhau agweddau economaidd, cynaliadwyedd a chymdeithas bywyd cefn gwlad Cymru. Y pwyslais yw gweddnewid galluoedd busnes a chymdeithas cefn gwlad Cymru. Yn unol â strategaeth 2020 Ewrop, nod y RhDG fydd sicrhau twf sy'n:

- *ddoeth*, trwy fuddsoddi'n fwy effeithiol mewn addysg, ymchwil ac arloesedd;
- *cynaliadwy*, camau pendant tuag at economi carbon isel; ac yn
- *gynhwysol*, gyda phwyslais cryf ar greu swyddi a lleihau tldi.

Bydd yr ymgynghoriad ym mis Chwefror yn trefnu'r blaenoriaethau o gwmpas y themâu bras hyn er mwyn: rhoi sgiliau a gwybodaeth i bobl; gwneud buddsoddiadau da ar gyfer dyfodol gwell; diogelu ein hasedau naturiol; defnyddio ynni adnewyddadwy; a chryfhau cymunedau.

Mae'r RhDG yn gyfrwng i gadw rheolaeth dynnach ar bolisi a dyna pam rwyf wedi penderfynu trosglwyddo 15% o Golofn 1 a gosod cyfradd ymyrraeth sy'n uwch na'r gofyn yn ôl y rheoliadau er mwyn cynyddu cyfanswm rhaglen y RhDG ar gyfer 2013-20.

Mae'r rhan fwyaf o'r arian a werir o dan Golofn 2 eisoes yn mynd at bobl sydd hefyd yn cael taliadau uniongyrchol y PAC, a bydd hynny'n parhau. Bydd y RhDG yn cynnwys help i ffermwyr ddatblygu'u busnesau a'u sgiliau ariannol a phroffesiynol, gwasanaeth cynghori gwell, buddsoddi ar y fferm (trwy grantiau ac efallai benthyciadau) a chymorth i arallgyfeirio. Bydd yr help i ffermwyr ifanc o dan y RhDG yn ategu'r uchod a chaiff Glastir ei ddiwygio, gan gynnwys elfennau organig, rhostir, tir comin a choetir yn rhan ohono. Cynorthwyr ffermydd yr ucheldir yn arbennig gan fod y cyfleoedd i arallgyfeirio'n brinnach ac nad yw'r farchnad yn cydnabod gwerth gwasanaethau ecosystem.

Fy amcan pennaf fydd sbarduno newid yn y diwydiant amaeth iddo gynyddu cynhyrchiant, ei gryfhau i ddygydd â phroblemau, ychwanegu at werth a chyfleoedd ei gynhyrchion, annog arloesedd a hybu cydweithredu. Byddaf yn neilltuo tua 10% o arian y rhaglen i drosglwyddo gwybodaeth ac arloesedd er mwyn gallu ymgorffori amrywiaeth o sgiliau busnes a phroffesiynol, ac yn ehangu ac yn gwella gwasanaethau cynghori a fydd nawr yn cynnwys iechyd anifeiliaid a phlanhigion ac ynni adnewyddadwy. Bydd mentora a dysgu 'ffermwr gan ffermwr' yn nodwedd ganolog ohono wrth i ni symud yn ein blaenau. Byddwn yn helpu ffermydd bach i gydweithredu â'i gilydd ac yn helpu cadwyni cyflenwi byr a marchnadoedd lleol, gan gynnwys cadwyni cyflenwi ynni adnewyddadwy.

Rydym yn bwriadu defnyddio tua 15% o arian y rhaglen i gynnig cynllun buddsoddi hyblyg a fydd yn darparu grantiau ac o bosibl benthyciadau a nwyddau ariannol eraill at ddibenion amaethyddol a choedwigol ac i helpu arallgyfeirio i weithgareddau anamaethyddol. Cyn y gallwn gynnig buddsoddi, bydd yn rhaid wrth gynllun busnes addas, dadansoddiad hyfforddiant a sgiliau er mwyn sicrhau'r lefelau sgiliau angenrheidiol, strategaeth ymadael os oes angen ac asesiad o werth am arian.

Rwyf ar fin ymgynghori ar newidiadau i Glastir, a fydd yn cynnwys miniogi'r Lefel Sylfaenol, cynllun wedi'i dargedu ar rannau o ffermydd, opsiynau i gryfhau ffermydd yr ucheldir a chynllun cynnal a throi'n organig. Hefyd, rwy'n disgwyl ariannu cynllun i olynu'r Cynllun Cymorth i Newydd-ddyfodiaid trwy'r RhDG, gan gynnig cymorth dechrau busnes i ffermwyr ifanc newydd a ffermwyr ifanc sy'n olynu fel pennaeth daliad. Neilltuir tua 60% o arian y rhaglen ar gyfer cyrsiau tir.

Mae LEADER, o fewn y RhDG, yn sbarduno newid a bydd yn gyfrifol am annog arloesedd – yn hwyluso arbrofi a threialu dulliau, prosesau a chynnyrch newydd cyn iddynt fynd ar y farchnad. Rwy'n disgwyl cynnig fframwaith bras o opsiynau thematig, gyda Grwpiau Gweithredu Lleol (GGLI) yn cael dewis mwy nag un opsiwn i adlewyrchu anghenion eu hardal. Drwy hynny, sicrhau bod adnoddau LEADER yn cefnogi'r prif flaenoriaethau heb amharu ar swyddogaeth GGLlau fel erfyn llywodraethu, gan alluogi cymunedau i gyfrannu a symbylu arloesedd ar lawr gwlad.

Rwy'n disgwyl cynnig cronfa ganolog y gall GGLlau a mudiadau cymunedol eraill wneud cais iddi ar gyfer cynnal prosiectau cymunedol sy'n cefnogi gwasanaethau sylfaenol ac adnewyddu pentrefi. Er fy mod am i holl elfennau'r RhDG gael eu mesur yn erbyn Cynllun Gweithredu Trechu Tlodi Lywodraeth Cymru, byddaf am i'r gronfa roi pwyslais neilltuol ar yr amcanion hyn. Bydd LEADER a Datblygu Lleol yn cyfrif gyda'i gilydd am ryw 10% o arian y rhaglen.

Byddaf yn symleiddio'r model darparu er mwyn creu nifer fach o elfennau y bydd ystod eang o fuddiolwyr yn gallu manteisio arny'n nhw. Ei ffocws fydd darparu cymorth sy'n ateb amgylchiadau unigryw'r buddiolwr. Dyma fydd y prif elfennau: mesurau cyfalaf dynol a chymdeithasol; mesurau buddsoddi; mesurau ar sail ardal; a LEADER a datblygu lleol. Bydd pwyslais o'r newydd ar fannau cyswllt hwylus ac ar helpu'r buddiolwr trwy ei ddatblygu yn hytrach na darparu ystod o atebion ar wahân a chymharol tymor byr i ddatrys problemau'r funud. Am y rheswm hwn, caiff pwyntiau cyswllt cyflym eu creu i'r rheini fydd am gymorth y RhDG er mwyn gallu ystyried eu hanghenion yn unol â'r ystod cyfan o gymorth sydd ar gael, yn hytrach na'u hystyried ar wahân fel sydd wedi bod yn digwydd.

Gwneir y gorau o'r arian sydd ar gael ar gyfer darparu cymorth technegol i greu fframwaith cymorth, a fydd fel 'llu maes' i weithio mewn amrywiaeth o feysydd gwledig. Gyda chymorth y Gwasanaeth Cynghori a'r rhwydwaith o Grwpiau Gweithredu Lleol LEADER, bydd yr adnodd hwn yn estyniad i'r cymorth a ddarperir gan y RhDG a'r tu allan iddo i sicrhau canlyniadau gwell i bobl, busnesau a chymunedau cefn gwlad.

Bydd gofyn i arian y RhDG yn y dyfodol gael ei integreiddio a'i alinio mewn ffordd ystyrlon â Cholofn 1 y Polisi Amaethyddol Cyffredin (Taliadau Uniongyrchol i Ffermwyr) a chyda Chronfa Gymdeithasol Ewrop, Cronfa Datblygu Rhanbarthol Ewrop a Chronfa Môr a Physgodfeydd Ewrop er mwyn ychwanegu at eu gwerth a'u heffaith. Bu cydweithio clos â swyddogion sydd wrthi'n datblygu'r cronfeydd eraill a chynhaliwyd digwyddiadau cydymgyngori â'r Cronfeydd Strwythurol. Bydd yr ymgynghoriad yn disgrifio sut y mae'r cronfeydd yn ategu'i gilydd a sut mae'r RhDG yn ychwanegu at werth. Parheir i ddatblygu hyn trwy broses dylunio'r cynllun cyn ei gyflwyno i'r Comisiwn Ewropeaidd.

Casgliad

Amcan cyffredinol diwygio'r PAC yw defnyddio'r ddwy Golofn ar y cyd i roi ffermio yng Nghymru ar seiliau gwell i sicrhau dyfodol proffidiol wrth i gymorth y PAC leihau dros y tymor hir.

Alun Davies AC

Gweinidog Cyfoeth Naturiol a Bwyd

Ymatebion i'r Ymgynghoriad ar Golofn 1

Dechreuodd yr ymgynghoriad ar Golofn 1 yn Sioe Frenhinol Cymru ym mis Gorffennaf 2013, a daeth i ben ar 30 Tachwedd. I gyd-fynd â'r ymgynghoriad, cynhaliodd y Gweinidog Adnoddau Naturiol a Bwyd sesiynau holi ac ateb ledled Cymru, a daeth cryn nifer i'r cyfarfodydd hynny. Dyma fyrdwn yr hyn yr oedd yr ymatebwyr am ei ddweud wrth Lywodraeth Cymru:

- Cytunwyd y dylid pennu cyfraddau talu gwahanol ar gyfer mathau gwahanol o dir, ond nid oedd unrhyw gonsensws ynghylch y cyfraddau hynny nac ychwaith ynghylch a ddylid seilio'r system daliadau ar ddau neu ar dri rhanbarth tir. Roedd gan ffermwyr yr ucheldir a ffermwyr llawr gwlad safbwyntiau gwahanol, gyda'r naill garfan a'r llall yn dadlau y dylid pwysoli'r taliadau o blaid eu hardal hwy.
- Roedd pryder am faint yr ardal o rostir a gynigiwyd yn wreiddiol, am y ffaith bod tir pori wedi'i wella yn cael ei gynnwys ynddi, ac am y gyfradd arfaethedig o €49 yr hectar. Cafwyd ymateb gwell i'r cynnig i adolygu rhostir ar sail ei uchder (er bod rhai amheuon o hyd), a derbyniwyd y byddai hynny'n haws i'w ddeall a'i weinyddu.
- Roedd yr ymatebwyr yn deall y byddai'r gostyngiad yng nghyllideb PAC yr UE yn effeithio ar daliadau yng Nghymru. Roedd pryder y byddai hynny, ynghyd â seilio taliadau ar arwynebedd yn hytrach nag ar y tir sy'n cael ei ffermio, fel y gwnaed yn hanesyddol, yn arwain at ostyngiad sylweddol yn y taliadau tybiannol y bydd llawer yn eu cael ar gyfer pob hectar.
- Roedd awydd amlwg i weld y diwydiant da byw ar yr ucheldir yn cael ei gynnal, a beirniadwyd yr ymyriadau polisi sydd ar waith ar hyn o bryd a'r rheini a welwyd yn y gorffennol. Roedd peth pryder y byddai llai o ffermio stoc ar yr ucheldir yn arwain at sefyllfa lle bydd tir yn cael ei adael yn segur, ac y byddai'n effeithio hefyd ar ffermio stoc ar lawr gwlad. Dadleuai eraill i'r gwrthwyneb, gan ddweud mai ar lawr gwlad yn bennaf y mae'r ffermydd sy'n cynhyrchu fwyaf, ac mai nhw sy'n haeddu cymorth fwyaf, am mai dyma'r busnesau mwyaf hyfyw a phroffidiol. Nid oedd fawr o gefnogaeth o blaid cyflwyno cynllun

cymorth cysylltiedig, ac ni chyflwynwyd unrhyw ddadl argyhoeddiadol o blaid cynllun o'r fath.

- Roedd cryn ddiddordeb yn y modd y bwriedir dyrannu hawliau, a phryder mai dim ond 'ffermwyr actif' fydd yn eu cael.
- Roedd cytundeb mai cynigion gwreiddiol y Comisiwn ar wyrddu yw'r dewis gorau.
- Roedd ymatebwyr o blaid targedu'r cymorth at ffermydd 'go iawn', yn hytrach nag at ffermwyr 'hamdden', ac roedd rhai (ond nid pawb, o bell ffordd) o'r farn mai cynhyrchu bwyd ddylai gael blaenoriaeth a bod y pwyslais ar yr amgylchedd naturiol wedi bod yn llyffethair i ffermydd.
- Roedd awydd i weld ffermwyr ifanc a ffermwyr newydd yn cael eu cefnogi (er bod hynny'n gwrthdaro â'r farn gyffredin bod angen gofalu, wrth newid i daliadau sy'n seiliedig ar arwynebedd, fod y broses honno'n cael ei rheoli mewn ffordd a fydd yn arafu ac yn sicrhau'r gostyngiadau lleiaf posibl i'r ffermwyr hynny a fydd ar eu colled o dan y drefn newydd).
- Roedd cydnabyddiaeth yn y cyfarfodydd fod cyfnod pontio byrrach (tua phum mlynedd) yn synhwyrol, ond nid oedd hynny'n cael ei adlewyrchu i'r un graddau yn yr ymatebion i'r ymgynghoriad.
- Roedd amheuan ynghylch sut yn union y byddai trosglwyddo cyllid i Golofn 2 o fudd i ffermio, a'r dymuniad oedd mai cyfradd fach yn unig o'r cyllid, neu ddim cyllid o gwbl, fyddai'n cael ei drosglwyddo.

Crynodeb o'r penderfyniadau ar Golofn 1

| Y mater dan sylw | Penderfyniad |
|------------------------------|---|
| Pa system daliadau i'w dewis | Cyflwyno model tri rhanbarth, a fydd yn seiliedig ar rostir (400m neu uwch ar fap rhostiroedd 1992), Ardaloedd dan Anfantais Fawr (SDA), ac Ardaloedd dan Anfantais (DA) a llawr gwlad gyda'i gilydd. Pennu cyfraddau talu dangosol o €20 yr hectar ar gyfer rhostir, €200 ar gyfer SDA, a €240 ar gyfer DA/llawr gwlad ar gyfer 2019 – bydd y cyfraddau talu gwirioneddol yn dibynnu ar nifer yr hawliau a ddyrennir yn 2015, ar y gyfran o'r hawliau hynny a gaiff eu defnyddio, ar y galw o'r Gronfa Genedlaethol a'r galw ymhlith ffermwyr ifanc cymwys am daliadau ychwanegol. |
| Hyd y cyfnod pontio | Cwblhau'r gwaith o gyflwyno Cynllun Taliadau Sylfaenol ymhen 5 mlynedd, erbyn 2019. |
| Maint yr hawliad lleiaf | Codi maint yr hawliad lleiaf o 1 ha i 5 ha. |
| Gosod cap ar daliadau | Cyflwyno cap ychwanegol ar unrhyw daliadau o €150,000 neu fwy y flwyddyn o dan y Cynllun Taliadau Sylfaenol, gan ddefnyddio system gapio haenog a fydd yn golygu na fydd unrhyw elfen o hawliad sy'n fwy na €300,000 yn cael ei thalu. Ni fydd Llywodraeth Cymru yn ystyried gwariant ar |

gyflogau wrth gyfrifo faint o arian i'w dynnu o dan y system gapio.

Cynllun Ffermwyr Bach neu Daliadau Aiddosbarthu

Nid fydd Llywodraeth Cymru yn cyflwyno Cynllun Ffermwyr Bach na Thaliadau Aiddosbarthu.

Gwyrddu

Mae Llywodraeth Cymru yn mabwysiadu'r cynigion gwyrddu gwreiddiol sydd yn y Rheoliadau.

Cynllun Taliadau Cysylltiedig

Ni fydd Cynllun Taliadau Cysylltiedig.

Cynllun AchN

Ni fydd Cynllun AchN

Opsiwn y twnnel – nifer y ffermydd a fydd yn uwch neu'n is na'r cyfraddau talu targed erbyn 2019, yn nhrefn gwerth eu hawliau hanesyddol fesul hectar

| | Taliadau hanesyddol yr hectar mewn € | | | | | Cyfanswm |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| | O dan 100 | 100 i 200 | 200 i 300 | 300 i 400 | O leiaf 400 | |
| y % y bydd ffermydd dros neu o dan y gyfradd darged erbyn 2019 | | | | | | |
| Droستي >50% | 6 | 33 | 46 | 124 | 596 | 805 |
| Droستي 40% i 50% | 1 | 19 | 27 | 279 | 19 | 345 |
| Droستي 30% i 40% | 2 | 34 | 112 | 413 | 0 | 561 |
| Droستي 20% i 30% | 4 | 60 | 411 | 485 | 0 | 960 |
| Droستي 10% i 20% | 13 | 129 | 1,179 | 64 | 0 | 1,385 |
| Droستي <10% | 15 | 248 | 1,576 | 0 | 0 | 1,839 |
| Oddi tani <10% | 22 | 657 | 942 | 0 | 0 | 1,621 |
| Oddi tani 10% i 20% | 45 | 1,810 | 415 | 0 | 0 | 2,270 |
| Oddi tani 20% i 30% | 99 | 2,028 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,127 |
| Oddi tani 30% i 40% | 1,694 | 1,535 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,229 |
| Oddi tani 40% i 50% | 906 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 906 |
| Oddi tani >50% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cyfanswm | 2,807 | 6,553 | 4,708 | 1,365 | 615 | 16,048 |
| Ffermydd lle bydd y newid yn fwy na 5,000 euro | | | | | | |
| Droستي >50% | 3 | 24 | 42 | 95 | 478 | 642 |
| Droستي 40% i 50% | 1 | 16 | 22 | 220 | 12 | 271 |
| Droستي 30% i 40% | 0 | 26 | 78 | 299 | 0 | 403 |
| Droستي 20% i 30% | 3 | 41 | 246 | 278 | 0 | 568 |
| Droستي 10% i 20% | 6 | 53 | 335 | 28 | 0 | 422 |
| Droستي <10% | 2 | 18 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 72 |
| Oddi tani < 10% | 3 | 16 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Oddi tani 10% i 20% | 18 | 298 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 347 |
| Oddi tani 20% i 30% | 63 | 574 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 637 |
| Oddi tani 30% i 40% | 652 | 507 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,159 |
| Oddi tani 40% i 50% | 380 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 380 |
| Oddi tani >50% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cyfanswm | 1,131 | 1,573 | 819 | 920 | 490 | 4,933 |

Ffynhonnell: hawliadau SPS 2012.

Blaenoriaethau'r Rheoliad Datblygu Gwledig a'r meysydd y maent yn canolbwyntio arnynt

| |
|--|
| Blaenoriaeth 1: Meithrin proses o drosglwyddo gwybodaeth ac arloesi ym meysydd amaethyddiaeth a choedwigaeth ac mewn ardaloedd gwledig |
| (a) Meithrin arloesi a'r sylfaen wybodaeth mewn ardaloedd gwledig (b) Cryfhau'r cysylltiadau rhwng amaethyddiaeth a choedwigaeth ac ymchwil ac arloesi (c) Meithrin dysgu gydol oes a hyfforddiant galwedigaethol yn y sector amaethyddiaeth a'r sector coedwigaeth |
| Blaenoriaeth 2: Gwneud pob math o amaethyddiaeth yn fwy cystadleuol a gwneud ffermydd yn fwy hyfyw |
| (a) Hwylus'r broses o ailstrwythuro ffermydd sy'n wynebu problemau strwythurol mawr, yn enwedig ffermydd sy'n chwarae rhan fach yn y farchnad, ffermydd sy'n canolbwyntio ar y farchnad mewn sectorau penodol a ffermydd y mae angen iddynt arallgyfeirio'n amaethyddol (b) Creu cyfleoedd i genhedlaeth newydd yn y sector amaethyddol |
| Blaenoriaeth 3: Hyrwyddo trefniadaeth y gadwyn fwyd a rheoli risg mewn amaethyddiaeth |
| (a) Integreiddio cynhyrchwyr cynradd yn well i'r gadwyn fwyd drwy gynlluniau ansawdd, drwy hyrwyddo mewn marchnadoedd lleol a chylchoedd cyflenwi byr, grwpiau cynhyrchwyr a sefydliadau cydadranol (b) Helpu i reoli risg ar ffermydd |
| Blaenoriaeth 4: Adfer, gwarchod a gwella ecosystemau sy'n dibynnu ar amaethyddiaeth a choedwigaeth |
| (a) Adfer a gwarchod bioamrywiaeth, gan gynnwys mewn ardaloedd Natura 2000 a ffermydd sydd o werth mawr i natur, a chyflwr tirweddau Ewrop (b) Gwella'r dulliau a ddefnyddir i reoli dŵr (c) Gwella dulliau rheoli pridd |
| Blaenoriaeth 5: Hyrwyddo defnydd effeithiol o adnoddau a chefnogi'r symudiad tuag at economi carbon isel sy'n medru gwrthsefyll yr hinsawdd yn y sectorau amaethyddiaeth, bwyd a choedwigaeth |
| (a) Bod y diwydiant amaethyddol yn defnyddio dŵr yn fwy effeithlon (b) Bod y diwydiant amaethyddol a'r diwydiant prosesu bwyd yn defnyddio ynni'n fwy effeithlon (c) Hwyluso cyflenwi a defnyddio ynni adnewyddadwy, isgynhyrchion, gwastraff, gweddillion a deunyddiau crai eraill nad ydynt yn fwyd at |

ddibenion y fio-economi

(d) Lleihau allyriadau nwyon tŷ gwydr ac amonia sy'n deillo o amaethyddiaeth, a gwella ansawdd yr aer

(dd) Meithrin gwaith i ddal a storio carbon ym maes amaethyddiaeth a choedwigaeth

Blaenoriaeth 6: Hyrwyddo cynhwysiant cymdeithasol, lleihau tlodi a datblygu economaidd mewn ardaloedd gwledig

(a) Hwyluso arallgyfeirio, creu a datblygu mentrau bach a chreu swyddi

(b) Meithrin datblygiadau lleol mewn ardaloedd gwledig

(c) Ei gwneud yn haws i bobl gael gafael ar dechnoleg gwybodaeth a chyfathrebu (TGCh) mewn ardaloedd gwledig, a'i gwneud yn haws iddynt ei defnyddio a gwella'i ansawdd

Mae cyfyngiadau ar y ddogfen hon

Eitem 3

Mae cyfyngiadau ar y ddogfen hon

Environment and Sustainability Committee

E&S(4)-02-14 paper 2

Inquiry into Sustainable Land Management : Response from Coed Cadw (The Woodland Trust)

Coed Cadw (The Woodland Trust) welcomes the opportunity to respond to this consultation. Our role is to champion native woodland and trees, working with others to ensure woods and trees are valued and protected. As well as caring for our own woods, we work with other landowners to do the same on their land, and we lobby and campaign for woods and trees in general.

We have 300,000 members and supporters spread throughout the UK and over 1,200 sites in our care covering approximately 23,000 hectares. These include over 130 sites in Wales, with a total area of 2,624 hectares.

Trees and woodlands can help illustrate, and make understandable, the principles of sustainable development. They demonstrate the delivery of multiple benefits across the full range of sustainable development objectives, and this is supported by the availability of an established independent sustainable woodland management standard and audit process.

What do we want sustainable land management in Wales to look like and what outcomes do we want to deliver in the short, medium and longer term?

In relation to trees and woodland we think there are two requirements:-

- a) **The sustainable management of the existing woodland resource for multiple benefits and to ensure future resilience.**

Trees and woodland deliver the full range of sustainable development outcomes. These go far beyond the forests and include positive benefits across the landscape, contributing to farming, water supply, health and recreation, nature conservation, and community quality of life and economic development.

Within the forest, the requirements for the sustainable management of woodland are defined in the standard created by the Forestry Stewardship Council and incorporated by Government into the UK Woodland Assurance Standard (UKWAS)¹. The Woodland Trust's estate is managed in compliance with this Standard, as is the Welsh Government's woodland estate and that of many other organizations and companies.

This Standard provides an example of how sustainable land management can be defined and audited. . For example, it address how timber can be produced on a sustained basis and the need to protect ancient woodland – our most precious resource for woodland wildlife – and move towards the restoration of ancient woodlands that were damaged by conversion to confer plantations.

b) The identification, control and mitigation of threats that could destroy or cause irreversible decline in the resource

We need to ensure our trees and woods, and the wildlife, services and products dependent on them , are resilient enough to cope with the challenges they face in the 21st century.

Our ancient woods are small and fragmented, vulnerable to the effects of surrounding land use such as intensive farming, industry and urban sprawl. They are often isolated, making it harder for wildlife to move across the landscape. Woodland wildlife is also being impoverished by the impact of diffuse pollution, for example leading to soil acidification and nitrogen enrichment.

None of these impacts can be effectively addressed by on-site woodland management measures and more strategic approaches are required including substantive new habitat creation.

Climate change is the biggest generator of uncertainty and disruption – it may alter the natural ranges of our trees, and put them out of step with other species that depend on them. More extreme weather events like flooding and drought will affect vulnerable tree species.

More new pests and diseases are reaching our shores, mainly because of global trade, some – like ash dieback – severely affecting our native trees, and others including Phytophthora ramorum are having serious economic impact by destroying important timber trees. To make things worse, climate change may create more favorable conditions for some pests and diseases.

Direct damage to ancient trees and woodlands continues to arise from new housing and transport schemes. The wildlife that is characteristic of these habitats cannot reliably be translocated or re-established by using biodiversity offsetting to create new habitat elsewhere.

A comprehensive summary of the state of British Woodland was published by the Woodland Trust in 2012. ²

1. What are the barriers preventing us from delivering these outcomes now?

In our view the main barriers to sustainable woodland management include the following issue. These also widely apply to other ecosystems:–

a) the desire for single purpose management, especially over-intensive exploitation

Sustainable management requires a multi-objective approach. For example, the creation of single species plantations managed on a clear-fell and replant cycle for purely economic objectives is not sustainable. Such management creates vulnerabilities to pests and diseases and damages water quality and wildlife habitat. We believe it is important to re-state the commitment to multipurpose forestry laid out in the Woodlands for Wales Strategy first published by the Welsh Government in 2001 and renewed in 2009³ and to re-invigorate the demonstration of this commitment on the Welsh Government forest estate.

Multi objective management is not delivered by crude zoning or prioritization, nor does it justify the marginalization of environmental concerns. We have concerns that the targeting of Glastir grants is failing for these and other reasons.

We think it is important to encourage multi-purpose management of farms whilst acknowledging the vital importance of food production. This will encourage farm business diversification and increase farming resilience.

b) widespread threats to woodland which cannot be addressed by on-site management

Landscape and wildlife is changing in response to drivers such as climate change, the intensification and simplification farming land use, and ubiquitous pollution that has led to rising soil nitrogen levels and acidity. Much of our valued and characteristic wildlife was a product of pre mechanization farming practices within a relatively unpolluted environment. Defining success in terms of a widespread return to or perpetuation of those landscapes and species seems unhelpful.

We need to find a way to work with the forces driving land use. In Wales these are predominantly linked to agricultural practice. However agricultural practice is not just about the techniques and technologies of land management, it is about the social fabric of agricultural and rural communities, the cultural identity created by farming, particularly in upland Wales (i.e. almost all of Wales) and the political impetus such identity creates.

c) superficial attractions of “more management” on one hand and “re-wilding” on the other

We wonder if both sides in the recent “Monbiot v. ‘traditional conservation sector” debate in Wales have missed the point. The traditional conservation sector as Monbiot pointed out, appears wedded to the belief that if only there was more land management for conservation objectives all will be well, whilst Monbiot subscribes to a wilderness myth which is at best insensitive to the social objectives of sustainable development.

2. How do we overcome these challenges?

We believe that to create diverse, resilient landscapes that will continue to provide for people and wildlife, we need to four complementary strands of action pursued in combination:

- *Conserve the best.* Ancient woods cover only around 2 per cent of the UK and account for about a fifth of all woodland . There must be no further loss of this most precious resource, so we campaign against development that would destroy or severely damage ancient woodland.
- *Restore degraded habitats.* We work with partners and other landowners to bring ancient woods planted with non-native conifers into programmes of gradual restoration
- *Create new habitat.* . Planting next to and between existing ancient woods and other important habitats buffers them from neighbouring land use, and creates links between them, making landscapes easier for wildlife to move across.
- *Engage with the public and landowners.* Public support is essential and is repeatedly indicated through public opinions and actions. Farmers manage 80% of Wales and their involvement is crucial. We believe a sustained investment in incentivizing and facilitating voluntary action is crucial. We lobby for more native woodland creation, including incentives, and work to advise other landowners. We also provide packs of free trees to communities and schools to create their own hedges and copses.

All four strategies are essential, and are mutually supportive. These principles can equally apply to other habitats. There is a challenge to the environmental sector to invest more in the latter two strategies rather than over rely on legislative and regulatory measures. Whilst the latter are vital they are not sufficient as the persistent downward decline of wildlife has shown.

We need to think of biodiversity as an emergent property of the predominant land use, rather than solely pockets of protected habitat. This means actively engaging with land use and the preoccupations and concerns of those directing that land management. That implies that the conservation of the landscapes of the past cannot define what success will look like in the future.

The precautionary principle is often used as an argument to prevent action whereas it is properly defined as the willingness to take action which could prevent an environmental harm ahead of the acquisition of full evidence. It has three elements, the threat of harm, the uncertainty of incomplete knowledge, and the responsibility to take action. It implies we should proactively seek to change the landscape to build resilience and sustainably deliver ecosystem services. Increased woodland cover is one way of doing this.

We support the sustainable development task given to Natural Resources Wales and the challenge to them to achieve environmental protection whilst delivering social and economic outcomes. We believe it is crucial they demonstrate success in this in their approach to managing the Welsh Government's forestry estate.

3. What are the main policy drivers and how can these be shaped to overcome these challenges?

- A landscape / ecosystem wide approach –we suggest one based on whole river catchments as the management unit. Such an approach necessarily supports co-operation across land ownerships.
- A drive to guarantee space for wildlife. Ie more habitat on the farmed landscape. This requires a reversal of the landscape simplification that has systemically removed small pockets of habitat and unmanaged land from all components of the landscape.
- A definition of success that incorporates sustainability in the face of non-reversible environmental change.
- The introduction of the concept of resilience as an important policy outcome. This requires more risk management, diversification and multi objective land management.
- An agri-environment scheme that works with the forces driving land use decisions, incentivizing voluntary participation and facilitated by a professional field advisory service. We fear that Glastir has succumbed to rule driven process that has marginalized the judgment of professional land managers, including farmers, and does not provide the necessary flexibility for complex multi-objective land management decision making.
- Unlocking the Potential of the Uplands. We think further work is needed on upland policy and we commend the earlier Upland Framework document published by CCW in 2007 ³.
- The SSSI resource. Some 20% of Wales is scheduled as SSSI. SSSIs can only be successful within a wider landscape which is managed in a complementary way. We suggest that farms which include SSSIs should be prioritized for entry into the higher level agri-environment scheme.

4. How we define the key ecosystems and ecosystem services in a way that makes sense for Wales?

We support ecosystem services principle as basis for guiding land management strategies at a landscape scale. This recognised that food production, forestry products, water supply and biodiversity are all ecosystem services, and that multiple ecosystem services need to be delivered from same landscape. Attempts to impose

simplification through prioritising may be counter-productive and lead to damaging outcomes.

Ecosystem services should not be shorthand for maintaining the status quo in current land management. The value of ecosystem services is not necessarily maximised by maintaining the current landscape. In some cases, for example on peat rich soils, carbon storage and water management for instance may well be maximised by maintaining open ground, in others however conversion to woodland may deliver higher levels of ecosystem service benefit.

Mechanism for payments for ecosystems services are already in place. It can reasonably be seen as the role of government at either central or local level to ensure the provision of public goods either through direct or indirect payment or through regulation or fiscal incentive. We accept this mechanism for roads, schools, hospitals, public parks, the police and fire services, dustbin collection, agri-environment schemes and so on. The new generation of public goods linked to the natural environment i.e. ecosystem services, has arisen at a time of fiscal austerity and a particular political philosophy, and this may have given rise to the apparent need to generate 'markets' for these services, rather than accept that they are a public good for which a range of mechanisms, including direct payment by government, is necessary.

5. How we develop a baseline from which to measure progress? This includes how we collect, coordinate and use data to support sustainable land management in Wales.

An example of successful and valuable long term surveillance monitoring is provided by the report on long term ecological change in British Woodland published by English Nature in 2007.⁵ This illustrated the value in being able to return and rigorously resurvey sites where monitoring plots had been established 30 years earlier. We suggest that more of such long term monitoring is established based on sampling that is independent of whatever land or species management initiative is current.

We wonder whether the local Biodiversity Record Centres in Wales can be tasked with responsibility for such a programme, given suitable academic support. It would require a more strategic approach to data gathering than is currently routine.

6. What incentives we can provide land managers to develop sustainable practices, and in particular, any new sources of investment we can attract to support these?

- a) Agri-env scheme that supports habitat maintenance and habitat creation to reverse landscape simplification, but in ways which work with the forces that drive land use. The Pontbren project illustrates how this can be achieved. . Much of this can be

- achieved by a simple small capital grant scheme that would run in parallel with Glastir to support small scale capital works across the farm over a 5 year period,
- b) Within Glastir itself, the desirability to support multiple objectives does not remove the need to give due priority to vital environmental measures and to target grant aid at meeting those vital requirements. We share concerns expressed by Wales Environment Link that Glastir, including Glastir Woodland Management is failing to adequately support the most environmentally necessary activities and risks distributing funding too widely and too thinly. We appreciate that the Welsh Government's view is that Tir Gofal was unsustainably expensive but we do think Tir Gofal achieved some significant successes and it is a pity that it has not been more effectively monitored and assessed.
 - c) Field advisory service. We think there is currently inadequate provision of expert advice and this is much preferable to a reliance on desk based decision making based on scoring schemes and maps. Many organisations who can contribute under a framework managed by Government. The need is for flexibility derived from on-site decision making between the landowner and a suitably experienced adviser.
 - d) Field based facilitators in each river catchment with a vision for improvement, flexibility in approach and able to direct funding at key activities.

7. How we ensure that our sustainable land management policies maintain vibrant rural communities and attract new entrants into the land-based sector?

We think diversification in land management objectives and income sources in both farming and forestry is important. This includes developing mechanisms to reward land managers for delivering the public benefits implicit in non-market ecosystem services including water supply, flood control, carbon emission mitigation and landscape quality and biodiversity. It also includes encouraging business diversification for example into tourism, and renewable energy.

Grants have an important part to play in encouraging this diversification. An example is a farm in Monmouthshire that include SSSI woodland a sheep enterprise and a firewood business. Grant received from NRW is important in enabling conservation management of the SSSI woodland but is matched by income from a small firewood business that this work supplies. The farm has been supported by Tir Gofal and the combination of adjoining farm and woodland under suitable management has delivered very high wildlife interest. The future of this is now threatened by the uncertainty over entry into Glastir advanced.

We would be pleased to facilitate a visit by the Committee to this farm.

8. The most appropriate geographical scale(s) at which we should be delivering sustainable land management policies and practices in Wales?

We suggest that river basins and river catchments offer the most appropriate range of scales and fit with the importance of water management objectives.

9. If there are key actions we can take to deliver short-term ‘quick wins’ and the actions we should be taking for the long-term

We suggest employing experienced land managers as catchment based facilitators. Their task would be to provide the vision, leadership and drive to work with landowners to realise multiple objective catchment improvement plans. They would provide flexible support to landowners to promote take up of Glastir and other existing schemes but would also have funds to direct at their discretion. These roles could be hosted by a variety of organisations and partnerships and we would be interested in participating in a pilot scheme.

1. The UK Woodland Assurance Standard. <http://ukwas.org.uk/about-us/purpose>
2. The State of the UK’s Forests, Woods and Trees: Perspectives from the sector (2011). The Woodland Trust. <http://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/en/about-us/publications/Documents/state-of-the-uks-forest-report-4865.pdf>
3. Woodlands for Wales. The Welsh Assembly Government’s Strategy for Woodlands and Trees (2009). Forestry Commission Wales 2009. [http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/EnglishWfWstrategy.pdf/\\$FILE/EnglishWfWstrategy.pdf](http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/EnglishWfWstrategy.pdf/$FILE/EnglishWfWstrategy.pdf)
4. A Framework To Set Conservation Objectives And Achieve Favourable Condition In Welsh Upland SSSIs. CCW 2007. <http://www.ccg.gov.uk/pdf/Upland%20Framework%201.pdf>
5. Long Term Ecological Change in British Woodland (1971–2001). English Nature in 2007 <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/94019>



Environment and Sustainability Committee

E&S(4)-02-14 paper 3

Inquiry into Sustainable Land Management : Response from Confor

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the consultation.

Unfortunately staff time is very limited, please find below some general ideas, if you would like further detail for any of the points made, please contact Kath McNulty, National Manager for Wales by email:

kath.mcnulty@confor.org.uk

Confor: promoting forestry and wood is a membership organisation that promotes sustainable forestry and low-carbon businesses. Confor represents and supports members by helping build the market for wood and forest products, creating a supportive policy environment, and helping members to become more competitive and successful.

Confor position

The challenge to live more sustainably must involve an increased use of wood and wood products if Wales is to have any hope of meeting its carbon reduction targets. Demand for wood is rising with low carbon building and renewable energy. However, Wales' supply is constrained with approximately 90,000 ha of woodland not being managed. This lack of management has a dramatically damaging effect on biodiversity which benefits from sustainable woodland management. Tackling lack of management would help address supply chain restraints, transform biodiversity and support the development of a low carbon economy using a domestic renewable resource in place of imported wood.

In addition, Wales' timber supply is reducing as the trees harvested today were planted in the 60s and 70s and are not being replaced with species which will yield usable, quality timber in 2050. Land owners must be encouraged to plant conifers, without which the industry will decline over the next 20–40 years as the future crop of timber will simply not be there. The uplands of Wales are well suited to growing conifers, as identified by the Land Use and Climate Change Working Group and have the potential to grow valuable timber and revenue in the future.

The Welsh Government's target – 100,000 ha of new woodland by 2030, is behind schedule. Glastir Woodland Creation has been under-achieving and the grant rates favour the planting of native broadleaves which will sustain heavy damage caused by grey squirrels and will rely on continual public funding for their management.

100,000 ha is a large area of land; for a forestry comparison, Natural Resources Wales manages 127,000 ha (Woodlands for Wales). An ambitious target is useful to focus the mind and drive action, unfortunately 100,000 ha of new woodland by 2030 is unachievable, the Welsh Government has not committed to driving this priority; the planting map has discouraged owners from engaging, the Glastir Woodland Creation grant rates has encouraged the planting of marginal field corners or small woods alone. There is land in upland Wales which would benefit from being planted with productive mixed woodland which would provide green jobs, carbon sequestration, landscape diversity and longer term: recreational opportunities, timber for construction, wood for biomass and an income to the landowner. Confor proposes that at least 60% of new planting is of productive conifers. We now need a more realistic target with a grant scheme which will encourage the planting of larger areas with tree mixes which will yield useable timber in the future as well as refocus our attention to increasing the productive potential of existing woodlands.

Please refer to the following documents for additional evidence:

WG Woodland Strategy: Woodlands for Wales
<http://www.forestry.gov.uk/wwstrategy>

Growing a Thousand New Forestry Jobs in Wales

http://www.confor.org.uk/Upload/Documents/24_Growing1000newforestryjobsinWalesEnglishJuly2013.pdf

Centre for Alternative Technology Zero Carbon Britain Report

<http://zerocarbonbritain.com/>



Barriers

Tudalen 54

| <p>What do we want sustainable land management in Wales to look like and what outcomes do we want to deliver in the short, medium and longer term?</p> | <p>What are the barriers preventing us from delivering these outcomes now?</p> | <p>How do we overcome these challenges?</p> | <p>What are the main policy drivers and how can these be shaped to overcome these challenges?</p> |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p>A renewed woodland creation target with appropriate support mechanisms for new woodland of which at least 60% is productive conifers, planted and managed for timber and other products, together with a focus on increasing the productive potential of existing</p> | <p>Barriers to woodland creation in general</p> | | |
| | <p>High value of agricultural land compared to forestry land, maintained artificially high by single farm payment</p> | <p>Reduce the single farm payment or make it conditional on tree planting</p> | <p>Agricultural subsidies</p> |
| | <p>Glastir scheme is limited by the traffic light map</p> | <p>Change the map; presumption should be that landowners can plant trees on their land, some areas may require consultation with WG /NRW if particularly</p> | <p>EU grant schemes have driven forest policy. The WG can use domestic money to initiate priorities.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| <p>woodlands. Pests (grey squirrel and deer) are managed and under control. Disease outbreaks are managed effectively and with a sense of urgency using best research knowledge.</p> <p><u>Outcomes</u></p> <p>Short term</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More existing woodlands are managed - 3,000 ha new woodland are planted per year of which 1,800 ha are productive conifers <p>Medium term</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Timber processing capacity in Wales is increased <p>Long term</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sustainable supply of well managed timber and | | valuable for non-tree habitats | |
| | Scheme administration has created uncertainties and delays, for example insecurity around income foregone payments, down time for the traffic lights map | Empower front line staff to make quick decisions, improve communications with stakeholders | Streamline Glastir administration |
| | Perception by farmers that their woodlands are not worth anything, seen as a waste of land, reluctant to plant additional woodland on productive land | <p>a) Perceptions can be changed through advocacy though this will take a long time.</p> <p>b) farmers keep the single farm payment on the new wood</p> <p>c) use the single farm payment as leverage to “buy” woodland planting</p> | |
| | Barriers to productive conifer woodland creation | | |
| | Glastir mixed woodland grant rate is poor in comparison to rate for “native” broadleaves | Increase the grant rate for mixed woodland to the native broadleaf rate | Glastir; rates can be changed. |
| | Negative perception of conifers by general public, | Changing perceptions is a slow process, initiatives | |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| forest products, - The people of Wales value the forests and the sustainable products they produce. - Increased wealth creation through Welsh wood processing industries based on an expanding resource and timber harvest | politicians and decision makers | such as Grown in Britain, Wood for Good, as well as work by organisations such as Confor, Small Woods Association, Royal Forestry Society all have a role to play. | |
| | Uncertainty about long term wood availability. Over reliance on commodity products. | Encourage innovation by more active WG support of R&D for product development. | |

Additional questions:

How we define the key ecosystems and ecosystem services in a way that makes sense for Wales?

Expanded and managed and productive forest area. Growing timber harvest.

How we develop a baseline from which to measure progress? This includes how we collect, coordinate and use data to support sustainable land management in Wales.

We already have this information.

What incentives we can provide land managers to develop sustainable practices, and in particular, any new sources of investment we can attract to support these?

Improve Glastir as outlined above

How we ensure that our sustainable land management policies maintain vibrant rural communities and attract new entrants into the land-based sector?

By ensuring the land yields products and services capable of creating jobs and increased rural prosperity. Forests and timber are very capable of doing this.

The most appropriate geographical scale(s) at which we should be delivering sustainable land management policies and practices in Wales?

If there are key actions we can take to deliver short-term 'quick wins' and the actions we should be taking for the long-term?

Pro-actively encourage the use of Welsh manufactured timber products in public sector contracts.

good examples of sustainable land management.

Llandegla forest
Farm woodland near Abergele

Confor
6 September 2013

Environment and Sustainability Committee

Inquiry into Sustainable Land Management

Response from Maelor Forest Nurseries Limited

Who we are (Maelor Forest Nurseries Limited).

Maelor Forest Nursery (MFN) produces 20 million saplings for forest planting on an annual basis. The saplings are either for commercial plantations or for the establishment of native woodlands. MFN continuously invests in seed orchards and local provenance seed collections (both broadleaf and conifer) to ensure that our customers are provided with the best genetic material suitable for planting in the UK. Unfortunately due to the low level of planting in Wales (only some 15 to 20% of our output is planted in Wales) we have had to seek alternative markets for our planting stock. We work with universities in Wales on the development of biological controls of pests and disease in trees as an alternative to pesticides

This presentation to the Environment and Sustainability Committee (ESC) is based on our knowledge and experience as part of the land based industries in Wales involved in forestry. We do not attempt to evaluate other land based industries except where it merits comparison.

Our presentation will be referenced in line with the questions raised by the invitation to consult with their relevance to forestry:

What do we want sustainable land management in Wales to look like and what outcomes do we want to deliver in the short, medium and longer term?

We understand sustainable land management to mean “the adoption of land use systems that, through appropriate management practices, enables land users to maximise the economic and social benefits from the land while maintaining or enhancing the ecological support functions of the land resources” (Food and agriculture organisation of the United Nations. (2005)).

When looking at defining ecosystems and ecosystem services with regard to sustainable land management we believe that it is important to look at systems that provide the maximum benefits. Rare ecosystems would be given priority status. However other land uses should be viewed in terms of their social, economic and environmental potential.

The Welsh Government Woodland Strategy promotes a form of sustainable land management through the application of “multi-purpose” forestry. In the most degraded areas of the uplands of Wales i.e. the Severely Disadvantaged Areas (SDA’s) multi-purpose forestry would bring multi-faceted benefits. Through the Woodland Strategy we envisage large areas of over-grazed desolate uplands converted to a rich tapestry of commercial plantations (providing economic sustainability), planted broadleaf riparian areas with open spaces protected from grazers, allowing “re-wilding” through natural regeneration. Such a change in land use we believe will provide the desired outcomes of enhancing the ecological support functions of the land resource as well as maximising the economic and social benefits. The environmental and economic benefits of forestry have received less focus than social benefits in recent years, therefore we will detail these two only below.

Environmental benefits:

Well managed and planned conifer plantations can have a positive effect on biodiversity that is often overlooked “biodiversity within plantations tends to increase over time” (Carnus, JM. (2006) Journal of Forestry). According to evidence presented by Humphrey, J.W., Ferris, F. and Quine, C.P. (eds. (2003). Biodiversity in Britain’s Planted Forests) – “The results from the Biodiversity Assessment Project clearly illustrate that planted woodlands provide a habitat that is suitable for a wide range of different species. A surprisingly high number of Red Data List species (29) were recorded in the upland Sitka spruce stands”. An example of this can be seen when looking at bird life in commercial plantations “an important group of species that depends on young stages of growth includes hen Harrier, black Grouse, short-eared Owl, Nightjar, Woodlark, Tree Pipit, Whinchat, Grasshopper Warbler and lesser Redpoll.” This view is also supported by Cameron who states that “Contrary to the view that conifer plantations are bad for the environment, there is a growing body of research that shows that planted conifer forests are associated with high levels of biodiversity in addition to providing functions such as soil protection and flood control (Cameron , A.D.(2011.)Scottish Forestry)”

The environmental benefit of forestry can also be seen through its potential to act as a carbon sink. The Read report has stated that “Woodland creation (and subsequent management) in the UK can be a cost-effective approach to combating climate change” (Read. D. 2009); according to the Welsh Governments ‘Land Use and Climate Change’ report (2010), “An expansion of woodland over 20 years, by about 100,000ha from the 284,000ha...would create an additional major GHG sink of 1,600 kt CO₂ equivalent annually by 2040, with a net sink of 1,200 kt CO₂ equivalent and an additional fuel wood potential of perhaps 1.4TWh/year by 2030–2040, off-setting emissions of a further 350 kt CO₂ equivalent of fossil fuels.”

Changes in land use from agricultural to forested would also contribute to reducing the total of agriculture's contribution of 11% to Wales' net carbon dioxide emissions.

Economic benefits:

From an economic perspective, the 75% of SDA are used for agricultural purposes. Types of farm vary in range, but over 75% are upland sheep farms. Figures published by Aberystwyth University's Farm Survey, show that without the Single Payment Scheme from the EU, and Tir Mynydd grants from the Welsh Government, these farms would not be profitable, or only marginally profitable – depending on the size of farm. This paints a bleak picture for upland farmers; but we believe their presence in the uplands can be maintained with the help of forestry plantations which bring in a more reliable and higher income which is sustainable economically and which will significantly improve the biodiversity of these land areas, enabling them to pass on more fertile and diverse land to their successors

During the lifecycle of the new crop suggested here for the SDAs, growers will be creating employment beyond their farm, and able to make an income from the two main stages of growth: first and second thinnings being processed for fuel wood and biomass; and good quality timber suitable for selling to sawmills. Introduction of new entrants into the timber processing industry in Wales as investors gain confidence that timber will be available in the longer term to repay the investment.

It has been demonstrated in progeny trials of genotypes from tree improvement programmes, that the same geno-type produces a higher quality of timber if planted in Wales rather than Scotland or N. England (Lee, personal 2013). Wales therefore has an environmental advantage in the growing of quality timber, which should ensure it attracts investment from wood processors. Furthermore Wales is closer to the market than Scotland. This introduction of "new players" into the market would then ensure that timber prices strengthen so that growers both in the public and private sectors earn a sufficient return to maintain and renew their forests, woodlands, and nurseries.

In conclusion therefore we believe multi-purpose forestry offers great potential for employment, carbon sequestration, increased biodiversity, soil remediation and the supply of an increasingly valuable raw material (WWF has recent predicted that the demand for wood products will triple by 2050– that is when trees planted for timber today would be due to be felled).

What are the barriers preventing us from delivering these outcomes now?

Conservation lobby.

Currently the pattern of land use in Wales is resulting in a decline in conifer plantations in the uplands. The area of woodland cover in Wales has declined by 1.7% from 289.000ha in 2000/01 to 284.000ha in 2009/10. The area of conifer in Wales has decreased by 13.000ha, while the area of broadleaf has increased by 8.000 ha. (The Forestry Commission. (2011)). This is contrary to the objectives of the WG Woodland Strategy.

Single interest bodies such as the RSPB and government agencies such as CCW have prevented the planting of the uplands in Wales through powerful lobbying and registering objections to planting schemes. We believe that the reasons put forward against such plantings are often based on misconceptions regarding modern day forestry. These misconceptions stem from a time when mistakes did occur. Lessons have been learnt and continue to be learnt to ensure that the forestry systems of today produce the maximum benefit for both the environment and people of Wales for many years to come. Where problems have been highlighted in the past work has been carried out to focus forest management on practices that resolve these issues. These practices are based on scientific research and are laid out in the forestry practice guides. These guides are updated regularly and incorporate recent advances in the scientific understanding of forestry.

One of the problem areas between forestry and conservation has been on the peatbogs of the uplands. Planting areas where peat depth is greater than 30cm has been shown to result in a net loss of carbon and as such are not suitable for planting ((Cannell, M.G.R et al. (1993)) There is also a biodiversity argument for not planting deep peat areas as “blanket peat lands contain some globally rare plant species (egg, *Scirpus cespitosus*, *Erica tetralix*, *Calluna vulgaris*, *Eriophorum vaginatum* and *Molinia caerulea*)” (S.J. Ramchunder, L.E. Brown and J. Holden. (2009)). However it has been shown that “much of the deep peat in Wales is part of a mosaic of soil types rather than being in large blocks.” (Vanguelova, E, et al. (2012)). Site specific

analysis is required if this mosaic to be taken into account when planting applications are approved or rejected.

Establishment of unsustainable broadleaf woodlands drawing resources away from the establishment of sustainable woodlands.

Much of Wales's broadleaf woodlands is in the private sector and is unmanaged. This position will be made worse with WG subsidising further broadleaf woodland establishment. With a few exceptions (Birch and Sycamore), you cannot produce quality timber by growing broadleaves on marginal land in the uplands. The uplands are where tree planting should take place, not on ground where it is viable for agriculture. The current Glastir funding supports the planting of broadleaves with very little financial support for economically sustainable conifers.

Low timber prices dissuading investment in forestry.

Compared to timber prices in Scotland (where the forest industry is flourishing) prices in Wales are depressed. This in our view is due to the combination of two factors:-

1. Failing to achieve the critical mass necessary to attract new entrants. Post war planting by the FC attracted timber processors who were keen to exploit the timber made available. To encourage investment by the processors the FC produced timber production forecasts which it assured processors that it would maintain. However, at the time of planting these plantations the FC fully intended that it would make a significant profit (in cash terms) from timber sales. The private sector through fiscal incentives then invested in significant plantations through the 1970's and 80's. However the level of planting was not maintained so as to achieve the critical mass necessary to attract "new entrants" to the market. Consequently this private sector planting has brought a "surplus" of timber to the market in the short term but without longer term supplies; hence existing processors are in a position to exploit this short term abundance without the fear of "new entrants" (who would need the longer term supplies to recover their investment on entering the market).

2. Unfortunately in recent years the FCW has not generated profits. This we believe is a function of both price and lack of entrepreneurial management. Whilst the initial investment by the public sector in attracting processors to Wales was very welcome; to continue with a production forecast marketing strategy now that there is such a short term surplus of timber does not make commercial sense. Effectively the state is subsidising the processors at the expense of the growers. The effect is to suppress prices thus disengaging the private sector growers from the market resulting in lack of resources for woodland management and incentives for commercial woodland creation.

How do we overcome these challenges?

Conservation lobby.

1. Policy on land-use has to be evidence based. Objections to commercial forestry varying from false perceptions of bio-diversity to misunderstanding on modern forest practice in relation to acidification of water supplies have in the past blocked economically viable and environmentally sustainable planting schemes being established.

2. Currently Glastir granted planting schemes have to follow a “guidance map” showing a “traffic light” system for areas in Wales that can be planted. Given the evidence referred to above of the “mosaic” like nature of these deep peat areas, we believe individual sites should be considered on their merits and the use of the “guidance map” discontinued. Areas of deep peat within an otherwise viable planting area should clearly be left unplanted with peat free areas being planted.

Establishment of unsustainable broadleaf woodlands drawing resources away from the establishment of sustainable woodlands.

Multi-purpose forestry which we advocate will only be sustainable in any true sense if it is also economically sustainable. Without continued subsidy broadleaf planting in the woodlands will result in nothing but unmanaged scrub. Whilst private charities may evoke public support for donations which ensure such plantings are managed, we do not think this is a route government should follow. With properly managed schemes following UKWAS guidelines, forestry can deliver on recreation and biodiversity without being a

constant drain on the public purse. Furthermore commercial forestry provides much more employment.

1. We strongly recommend that any grant aid for new forest plantings should be based on commercially viable plantations. The initial grant aid being a kick start that will eventually reduce government subsidies and generate revenues to the public purse.

2. Rather than financing the creation of new broadleaf woodlands the government, in our view, would achieve better value by funding the management of existing broadleaf woodlands. As the RSPB's "State of Nature" report highlights; the lack of woodland management is a major cause in the decrease in population of many of our woodland birds.

Low timber prices dissuading investment in forestry.

1. We believe that rather than subsidising existing unsustainable land use the government should fund land-use change. It needs to be recognised that farmers will not voluntarily change their practices unless they are incentivised. A sufficient incentive that would create a minimum level of 2000ha of productive woodland on an annual basis should be sufficient to attract new processor investment over time.
2. Separate the "regulatory" function from the "commercial" function with regard to the management of WG woodlands. The culture required to ensure a good "public service" spirit is entirely different from that required to ensure the success of an enterprise. Do not mix the two. Give the managers of the WG estate clear guidance and encouragement to maximise the income from the public estate ensuring that it is on a sustainable basis and complies with UKWAS. Consider a different management model for the public sector forests.

Illustration of barriers preventing delivery of outcomes referred to in our written submission:-

1. Conservation lobby.

In 2012 the RSPB published a report “Review of biodiversity impacts of practices typically undertaken in **certified forests** in Britain and Ireland.” The report has not been “peer reviewed”. The executive summary of the report states “There was a consistent message from studies across a number of plant and animal groups that many specialist species of open habitats that were afforested are lost and replaced by generalist or widespread forest species. For most groups this resulted in fewer species than the original habitats.” This is opinion based on studies on forest plantings that **were not certified** i.e. pre-certification. FSC practices would never allow the habitats referenced in these studies to be planted. This is recognised further in the executive summary “Most studies of afforestation were carried out prior to the introduction of forest certification standards and afforestation carried out under the current standards is less likely to occur on habitats of high conservation value”; but fails completely to make the point that land considered suitable for afforestation under FSC would be **only** that which has low conservation value. This clearly (afforesting high value conservation habitats) was and is not “practices typically undertaken in certified forests in Britain and Ireland”!!

In our view the above is clearly an example of the miss-use of science.

The sponsor of the report is “Ace UK” which represents a section of the Nordic wood products industry. A video on Ace UK’s web-site claims “North European forests are a vital resource for biodiversity, but also for the economy. Responsibly managed, the forests are a renewable resource’ and ‘Responsibly managed forestry and biodiversity are intricately linked and need to be protected to ensure a healthy ecosystem’. Clearly then “Nordic plc’s” forest industry is good for biodiversity but not the establishment of a rival “Wales plc’s”!?!

In 2006 a World Wildlife report on illegal logging found that 88% of illegal imports of Russian round wood (some 6.4million m3 RWE) into the EU was through the Nordic countries; much of it re-exported as wood products to the UK.

2. Low timber prices dissuading investment in forestry.

Please refer to the attached table (Appendix1). In 2011-12 the FCW lost £2.4million on harvesting £13.4million sales of timber. Either there is gross mismanagement in the harvesting operations or the price obtained is too low (which has an inference for the £100million valuation of the WG’s biological asset stated in FCW’s balance sheet-an item which generates losses we would treat as a liability not an asset).

Softwood Production

| | | Wales | Scotland | England |
|---|-------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Public Sector | | | | |
| (Forestry Statistics 2012) | | | | |
| 2011-2012 Timber Sales £ million | | 13.4 | 58.9 | 33.4 |
| 2011-2012 Harvesting & haulage costs £ million | | 9.5 | 22.3 | 12 |
| Softwood removal - 000's tonnes | | 689 | 2566 | 1185 |
| Price per tonne | | £19.45 | £22.95 | £28.19 |
| Harvesting and haulage per tonne | | £13.79 | £8.69 | £10.13 |
| (NB:this is calculated on tonnes sold but standing sales do not incurr these costs- not able to find a breakdown of sales between them) | | | | |
| Net earnings per tonne | | £5.66 | £14.26 | £18.06 |
| Standing Volumes 000 m3:- | | | | |
| (National Forest Inventory Report 2012) | | | | |
| | Public | 18868 | 79559 | 26148 |
| | Private | 17720 | 132827 | 60621 |
| | Public >20cm dbh | 6117 | 40317 | 18784 |
| | Private >20cm dbh | 14688 | 92052 | 53133 |
| Private sector softwood removal - 000's tonnes | | 501 | 3746 | 735 |
| Public sector % of softwood removal | | 58% | 41% | 62% |
| Public sector % of standing volumes > 20cm dbh | | 29% | 30% | 26% |
| Woodland creation for 5 years to 2012 - 000's ha | | | | |
| (Forestry Statistics 2012) | | | | |
| | Public | 0 | 3.7 | 0.1 |
| | Private | 1.6 | 20.7 | 12.4 |
| | Total | 1.6 | 24.4 | 12.5 |
| FCW last trading year:- | | £ 000's | | |
| Timber sales (FC Statistics 2012) | | 13,400 | | |
| Book value of timber sold (Annual Report 2011-2012) | | 6,042 | | |
| Harvesting and haulage costs (FC Statistics 2012) | | 9,500 | | |
| Gross loss before overheads and interest charges | | -2,142 | | |
| NB:-e-timber sales average prices 1 April 2012 to 31 March 2013 | price £/m3 | 9.01 | 10.9 | 20.16 |
| Average price from size class sold with greatest volume | 0.5 to 0.599m3 | 7.95 | 14.04 | 15.99 |

Mae cyfyngiadau ar y ddogfen hon

Eitem 6a



Alun Davidson
Clerk, Environment and Sustainability Committee,
National Assembly for Wales
Cardiff Bay
Cardiff
CF99 1NA

13 January 2014

Dear Alun,

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE – 12 DECEMBER 2013

I am responding to comments made by Gareth Clubb of Friends of the Earth at the Committee meeting on 12 December 2013 (p22, col 140, of draft transcript). The draft transcript quotes him saying:

'[NRW] in its current form is not competent [to take into account economic and social considerations]. There is no expertise in terms of economics or sociology. There is no single individual employed at present by NRW, as far as I know, who has the specific expertise to be able to provide advice in those areas. So the question could arise as to whether this is a bid to expand the NRW empire It is not the role of NRW to give an opinion that would include economic and social issues.'

The purpose of Natural Resources Wales is set out in the establishment order (The Natural Resources Body for Wales (Establishment) Order 2012). It states the purpose of Natural Resources Wales is to ensure that the environment and natural resources of Wales are:

- (a) sustainably maintained;
- (b) sustainably enhanced; and
- (c) sustainably used.

(2) In this article -

- (a) "sustainably" ("yn gynaliadwy") means -
 - (i) with a view to benefiting, and
 - (ii) in a manner designed to benefit, the people, environment and economy of Wales in the present and in the future;
- (b) "environment" ("amgylchedd") includes, without limitation, living organisms and ecosystems.

The statutory purpose of Natural Resources Wales, therefore requires a balance to be struck and not to ascribe weight to any aspect (e.g. the environment or the economy) in preference to another. Indeed, the basis upon which the provision is drafted requires the environment and any natural resources to be sustainably

used, enhanced and maintained. This requires a judgement to be reached (for example on individual planning applications) on whether those objectives are met.

In response to the statement: "There is no expertise in terms of economics or sociology. There is no single individual employed at present by NRW, as far as I know, who has the specific expertise to be able to provide advice in those areas", we currently employ a senior economist, an economist, and a sociologist. We also procure specialist advice in these fields from University experts and consultants as and when required.

I would be grateful if you could draw this matter to the Committee's attention.

Yours sincerely,



EMYR ROBERTS

Prif Weithredwr, Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru
Chief Executive, Natural Resources Wales

emyr.roberts@cyfoethnaturiolcymru.gov.uk

Natural Resources Wales,
Ty Cambria, Newport Road, Cardiff CF24 0TP

Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru
Ty Cambria, Heol Casnewydd, Caerdydd CF24 0TP