



**Cynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru
The National Assembly for Wales**

**Y Pwyllgor Cyfrifon Cyhoeddus
The Public Accounts Committee**

**Dydd Mawrth, 2 Rhagfyr 2014
Tuesday, 2 December 2014**

**Cynnwys
Contents**

Cyflwyniadau, Ymddiheuriadau a Dirprwyon
Introductions, Apologies and Substitutions

Papurau i'w Nodi
Papers to Note

Glastir

Cynnig o dan Reol Sefydlog 17.42 i Benderfynu Gwahardd y Cyhoedd o'r Cyfarfod Motion
under Standing Order 17.42 to Resolve to Exclude the Public from the Meeting

Cofnodir y trafodion yn yr iaith y llefarwyd hwy ynddi yn y pwyllgor. Yn ogystal, cynhwysir
trawsgrifiad o'r cyfieithu ar y pryd.

The proceedings are recorded in the language in which they were spoken in the committee. In
addition, a transcription of the simultaneous interpretation is included.

**Aelodau'r pwyllgor yn bresennol
Committee members in attendance**

William Graham	Ceidwadwyr Cymreig Welsh Conservatives
Mike Hedges	Llafur Labour
Alun Ffred Jones	Plaid Cymru The Party of Wales
Sandy Mewies	Llafur Labour

Darren Millar	Ceidwadwyr Cymreig (Cadeirydd y Pwyllgor) Welsh Conservatives (Committee Chair)
Julie Morgan	Llafur Labour
Jenny Rathbone	Llafur Labour
Aled Roberts	Democratiaid Rhyddfrydol Cymru Welsh Liberal Democrats

Eraill yn bresennol
Others in attendance

Gareth Jones	Cyfarwyddwr Cyffredinol, Dyfodol Cynaliadwy, Llywodraeth Cymru Director General, Sustainable Futures, Welsh Government
Andy Phillips	Swyddfa Archwilio Cymru Wales Audit Office
Andrew Slade	Cyfarwyddwr, Amaeth, Bwyd a'r Môr, Llywodraeth Cymru Director, Agriculture, Food & Marine, Welsh Government
Huw Vaughan Thomas	Archwilydd Cyffredinol Cymru Auditor General for Wales

Swyddogion Cynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru yn bresennol
National Assembly for Wales officials in attendance

Leanne Hatcher	Dirprwy Glerc Deputy Clerk
Meriel Singleton	Clerc Clerk
Joanest Varney-Jackson	Uwch-gynghorydd Cyfreithiol Senior Legal Adviser

Dechreuodd y cyfarfod am 09:02.
The meeting began at 09:02.

Cyflwyniadau, Ymddiheuriadau a Dirprwyon
Introductions, Apologies and Substitutions

[1] **Darren Millar:** Good morning, everybody, and welcome to today's meeting of the Public Accounts Committee. I remind Members and witnesses that this meeting is a bilingual meeting, as are all committee meetings in the National Assembly for Wales. Of course, there are headsets available for simultaneous translation from Welsh to English. They can also be used for sound amplification. I encourage people to switch off their mobile phones so that they do not interfere with the broadcasting equipment. I remind everybody that this is a formal public meeting, so they do not need to operate the microphones. In the event of a fire alarm, we should follow the instructions of the ushers who will lead us to the nearest safe place. We have not received any apologies for absence, but I know that a couple of Members are going to be late this morning. We will move straight on to item 2 on our agenda.

09:03

Papurau i'w Nodi Papers to Note

[2] **Darren Millar:** We have had a letter on the health finances session, further to the health finances session that we held with Andrew Goodall, the chief executive of NHS Wales. I will take it that that is noted. There is some interesting information in there regarding how the Welsh Government is intending to hold the health boards to account in terms of its prudent healthcare policy and indeed on how rurality is being catered for in any future allocation of resources. A few Members raised those two issues during the last session. It seems to suggest that further work is being undertaken on the allocation formula, which is expected to kick in or change the formula by December 2015. I will take it that that correspondence is noted.

[3] We have had a letter also from Jane Hutt following on from the evidence session that we held with the children's commissioner. You will remember that we wrote to the Welsh Government suggesting that there needed to be more uniformity in the arrangements in terms of the accountability of the children's commissioner versus the other commissioners. I think that it is fair to say that that is the Welsh Government's ambition as well, looking at the letter, and that the Welsh Government is going to be considering that in the near future. I will take it that that letter is noted.

[4] We have had also a number of letters following on from our session with local government last week, when we were discussing the financial challenges that they are facing over the next few years. Those letters touched on the reserves that are being held by Rhondda Cynon Taf and the Vale of Glamorgan. We have another letter also from the Welsh Local Government Association, which summarises local government's position. I will take it that those are noted.

[5] Finally, we have a letter from the Auditor General for Wales on the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Bill. It would seem that the issues that we have discussed previously as a committee regarding the independence of the auditor general and some of those other matters that were raised by the auditor general have now been resolved. I will take it that that is also noted. Are there any questions on those papers? If there are not, we will move straight into item 3 on our agenda today.

09:05

Glastir

[6] **Darren Millar:** I am very pleased to be able to welcome Gareth Jones, director general of sustainable futures at the Welsh Government—welcome to you, Gareth—and Andrew Slade, director of agriculture, food and marine at the Welsh Government. The auditor general, of course, published a report back in September on the Glastir scheme, which concluded that the design and implementation of Glastir reflect some of the learning from previous agri-environment schemes but that there are also some significant flaws with the scheme. We considered this report back in September as a committee and wanted to give the opportunity to the Welsh Government to respond to the recommendations in the report, which you have done. We are very pleased to have received your response. Naturally, the committee has a number of questions around the report and the implementation of those recommendations as we go forward. We have also received some information as a committee—or, we wrote to the National Farmers Union, the Farmers Union of Wales, the Country Land and Business Association in Wales and Wales Environment Link. We have had a number of papers back from different respondents, which Members might also wish to draw to the table today.

[7] May I start questions by asking you just a little bit about your response? There are a number of recommendations that have not been accepted in full. They appear to have only been accepted in part. Of course, the first recommendation relates very clearly to the fact that some of the support that Glastir will offer to landowners will not necessarily be changing any working practices. Do you want to respond to that point as to why you think that is acceptable, particularly given the aims of Glastir in terms of promoting environmental and sustainable use of land?

[8] **Mr Jones:** Thank you, Chair, and thank you for the invitation to come here today. This study has come at a very important time for us in reshaping Glastir for the next rural development plan. So, we very much welcome the report and, indeed, very much welcome the fact that the auditor general has recognised that we have already made significant progress. Actually, since the study began, we have made even further progress. On your question, your question is about maintenance payments as opposed to capital payments in the context of Glastir. It is my view and it is the Government's view that maintenance payments do have an important role to play in the context of all of our objectives here. It is very important to take into account that Glastir, of course, is a multi-annual agreement. So, we are paying for environmental benefits over a long period of time.

[9] There are a number of reasons why I think maintenance payments continue to be important. First, maintenance payments are paid to farmers to ensure that they continue to keep their land in good environmental condition and that they continue to provide good environmental stewardship of their land over a long period of time. Some of these environmental changes take many, many years to come to fruition. Maintenance payments are also paid to farmers where it may look as though very little is changing, but actually their practices are changing. Perhaps I could give you an example, Chair. A maintenance payment may well be paid to a farmer to maintain a hay meadow for example that he might then cut later than he would otherwise have done. In those circumstances, we get not just the environmental benefits of that in terms of pollinators in particular, but the farmer does actually forgo some potential income that he might have got earlier on in the process. The third thing, and I think perhaps the most powerful thing, to say about maintenance payments, is that they provide an incentive for farmers to retain land in high-quality environmental stewardship. At times when commodity prices are particularly good, as we know, we do not want farmers who have high-quality environmental land to be tempted towards intensification of livestock farming, and, when commodity prices are very good, there is always that possibility that farmers will come out of these multi-annual agreements and move back into livestock farming practices. So, it is very difficult to ascertain what the counterfactual would be in these circumstances, but, clearly, maintenance payments do, I think, have a role to play to make sure that we continue to experience the very successful changes that we have seen in terms of Glastir, with getting on to 27% or 28% of the agricultural holdings in Wales in Glastir agreements.

[10] **Darren Millar:** Let me get this right. In theory then, all a landowner needs to do is to threaten to change his working practices and you will give him a grant. Is that right?

[11] **Mr Jones:** No, no.

[12] **Darren Millar:** That is what it sounds like you are suggesting.

[13] **Mr Jones:** No. I am not suggesting that. All I am saying is that we have to accept that part of the Glastir payments are provided to offset income forgone. That has been the case with all of our agri-environment schemes over all the years, in my experience. If we are to continue to have very significant high rates of good quality environmental stewardship in Wales, then we have to pay something for something in terms of the environmental benefit.

[14] **Darren Millar:** But you suggested that one of the reasons why you pay for the maintenance of schemes is because there is a risk of losing those schemes. So, how do you measure the risk of losing good environmental practice by landowners? How do you measure that risk? They would have to threaten it, would they not?

[15] **Mr Jones:** It is very difficult to measure it. I would rather look at it in terms of the benefits that we achieve from it. The benefits that we are achieving from Glastir are very, very clear in terms of new orchards that are being planted, new hedges, et cetera.

[16] **Darren Millar:** But that is a change in practice, is it not, which, of course, the scheme is absolutely designed for—to support some change in improved land management, which leads to better environmental outcomes. However, if they are just maintaining, how do you determine what is at risk of not being done unless you give a Glastir grant?

[17] **Mr Jones:** As I said, it is very difficult to prove the counterfactual here—

[18] **Darren Millar:** So, you cannot demonstrate what proportion it is.

[19] **Mr Jones:** I think what the Wales Audit Office has recognised in its report is that, while there may be a place for maintenance agreements, over time, the risks can be clearly reduced by putting more emphasis on both Glastir Advanced and more emphasis on capital works. Indeed, as you know, that is what we intend to do.

[20] **Darren Millar:** A couple of Members want to come in here: Julie Morgan and then Aled Roberts.

[21] **Julie Morgan:** It was just following up the Chair's question really. I think that you said that environmental changes do take a very long time—many years. How do you actually monitor those changes? I am not clear on how you monitor them and how you actually get the information in.

[22] **Mr Jones:** Andrew might want to come in on some of the detail, but there are a number of ways in which we do monitor progress. First of all, we have contract managers who have very good relations with the farmers that have agreements. The contract managers do not just provide advice at the outset; they also maintain an ongoing relationship. We have inspectors that visit farms to make sure that what has been set out as an objective at the outset is being delivered. We are also going to do some additional work in terms of some evaluation and monitoring with the Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, to see, on a more holistic basis, how much benefit Wales is getting from the scheme.

09:15

[23] **Julie Morgan:** Is that new work that you are planning to do?

[24] **Mr Jones:** Yes.

[25] **Mr Slade:** I was going to say that we are two or three years into what I think around Europe is regarded as a pretty strong set of arrangements on monitoring and evaluation. We have had a lot of people across Europe interested. A Finnish delegation recently talked to us about how we have been developing the scheme and what we intend to get out of it, and the Centre for Ecology and Hydrology in Bangor, as Gareth just mentioned, has done a lot of work to develop the approach. We are going to carry on with that, moving forward.

[26] **Mr Jones:** If I may, Chair, it is also doing some modelling work for us for the new

programme, which will help us better target some of our interventions in the next programme.

[27] **Mr Slade:** We would also, in this process, be working with our statutory advisers and with Natural Resources Wales on this. We have a close working relationship on the ground in terms of what we are delivering.

[28] **Darren Millar:** Aled Roberts is next.

[29] **Aled Roberts:** Hoffwn dynnu'ch sylw at dystiolaeth yr RSPB, sy'n awgrymu bod argymhelliad 1 bron yn union yr un fath ag argymhelliad a gafodd ei dderbyn gan Lywodraeth Cymru yn 2007. Eto, mae eich ymateb chi i'r adroddiad yn cyfaddef mai dim ond 32% o'r rai a oedd yn cymryd rhan yn Tir Gofal a oedd wedi newid eu hymarfer. Yn amlwg, roedd y rhai ohonom a oedd draw yn Techniquet pan roddodd Iolo Williams dystiolaeth yn dweud bod bron i bob mesur o ran bioamrywiaeth yn mynd ar i lawr.

Aled Roberts: Could I draw your attention to the RSPB's evidence, which suggests that recommendation 1 is almost exactly the same as a recommendation accepted by the Welsh Government in 2007. Yet your response to the report admits that only 32% of those who took part in Tir Gofal changed their practices. Evidently, some of us were over in Techniquet when Iolo Williams gave evidence saying that nearly every measure in terms of biodiversity is going down.

[30] **Mr Jones:** I think the fact is that we are on a journey, Chair. It is true to say that, as far as Tir Gofal was concerned, as the WAO report highlighted, a relatively small number of participants were required to make changes. As far as Glastir was concerned, that improved, as the WAO report acknowledges. In the next stages of Glastir, individual participants will be able to get direct access to Glastir Advanced, rather than go through Glastir Entry, and there will be a greater emphasis on capital works rather than maintenance payments, although I stand by my point about maintenance payments; they do have a role to play. I think it is clear and absolutely right to say that the risk, if you like, of dead weight and of paying money for something that does not change agricultural practice or does not cause farmers to behave in a more environmentally friendly way, is significantly reduced over time. I am not sure that one can ever completely eradicate that risk, but the point is that we are on a very successful journey towards minimising that risk in general.

[31] Your point about biodiversity is a very important one and you will know that, in my department, there is a great deal of work going on elsewhere in terms of trying to improve it. We have been working with the RSPB very closely on things such as the new nature fund to provide opportunities for consortia to come forward with their ideas about how biodiversity can be improved across Wales. Ministers have very recently announced a package of, I think, £5 million to £6 million to contribute to that agenda.

[32] **Mr Slade:** Chair, if I may just add to that—

[33] **Darren Millar:** Very briefly.

[34] **Mr Slade:** The spatial targeting component of Glastir is very significantly increased as compared with Tir Gofal and that is one of the findings to come out of the monitoring work in relation to Tir Gofal. All of the work that has gone into the layering of geographic information systems data, the computer systems that we use, to target species in particular parts of Wales where we are going to have the most impact, is all adding to the strength of the Glastir scheme.

[35] **Aled Roberts:** Pa mor ddibynadwy yw eich gwybodaeth chi? Pan wyf yn cael achosion yn y gogledd, nid yw'r mapiau yr **Aled Roberts:** How reliable is your information? When I get cases in north Wales, even the maps that you base your

ydych chi'n seilio'ch penderfyniadau arnynt decisions on are not correct.
yn gywir, hyd yn oed.

[36] **Mr Slade:** I think that we are pretty confident about the data that we have. They come from a variety of sources. As Gareth has mentioned, we are working with NGOs as well as with our statutory advisers on that. The computer technology that we are using now, drawing on those series of data and the maps associated with them, is pretty sophisticated. Again, it is seen across Europe as among the leaders in terms of the delivery of agri-environment schemes. There is always room for improvement, but I think that, on the whole, we are pretty confident that we have the spatial targeting correct through the scheme.

[37] **Darren Millar:** Alun Ffred is next.

[38] **Alun Ffred Jones:** Diolch yn fawr. **Alun Ffred Jones:** Thank you. In terms of O ran llwyddiant y cynllun, faint o the success of the scheme, how many amaethwyr sydd bellach yn cymryd rhan yn y agriculturists are now taking part in the cynllun? scheme?

[39] **Mr Jones:** We have more farms and more farmland in Wales now taking part in Glastir than have ever taken part in any agri-environment scheme in the past. As far as the entry-level scheme is concerned, there are in excess of 4,000 holdings that are taking part in the scheme, and, as far as Glastir Advanced is concerned, we have around 1,000 holdings that are taking part. Crucially, we now have something like 65% of common land in Wales under a Glastir agreement; that is an enormous step forward compared with the amount of common land that was taking advantage of Tir Gofal. That clearly has a very significant effect on the amount of land across Wales that is now under a Glastir agreement of some sort and therefore providing high levels of good quality environmental stewardship.

[40] **Alun Ffred Jones:** Sut mae'r **Alun Ffred Jones:** How do those figures of ffigurau hynny o 4,000 a 1,000 yn cymharu 4,000 and 1,000 compare with your targets? â'ch targedau chi? Mae adroddiad yr The auditor general's report gives figures that archwilydd yn rhoi ffigurau pur wahanol, hyd are entirely different, as far as I can see, but y gwelaf i, ond efallai mai fi sy'n eu perhaps I am not reading them correctly. So, camddarllen. Felly, sut ydych chi o ran eich how are you doing in terms of your targets? targedau?

[41] **Mr Jones:** Well, it is true to say that we are not reaching the targets that were originally set out for the scheme. Members will know that the original target for Glastir was to try to reach around 14,000 agreements. Over time, it has become clear that that particular target was unlikely to be reached and, in the event, events conspired against that target being reached. In the very early days of Glastir, again, as Members will know, there was a great deal of pressure from farming unions to extend the provisions of Tir Gofal. There was a great deal of pressure from the farming unions to extend Tir Mynydd, which, although not an agri-environment scheme, was a less favoured area scheme—it was a scheme for upland farmers. It is true to say, I think, that the extension of those schemes had a detrimental effect on the take-up of Glastir in the early days.

[42] It is also absolutely right, I think, to say that the markets conspired against the early days of Glastir targets too. Commodity prices, up until around 2007-08, were very poor. I was at a farm only a few weeks ago, and the farmer was telling me that, in his words, it was 'an absolute no-brainer' to get into an agri-environment scheme in those days, because commodity prices were terrible. We could not get good prices, either for our arable crops or for our livestock. Commodity prices from 2008-09 onwards have been extremely favourable. There has been an increase of something like 160% in the price of lamb over that period. So, in the very early days, we both extended legacy schemes and had a market, not just in terms

of commodity prices, but in terms of the value of the euro, which was conspiring against the early take-up of Glastir. Having said that, Chair, I think it is important to note that, in comparing the first, say, three years of Tir Gofal take-up with the first three years of Glastir take-up, there is a very substantial increase, in terms of the early days take-up. When Tir Gofal started, in the first three years, we had up to 777 agreements. In the first three years of Glastir Advanced, we had something like 1,500 agreements. So, I would accept that the targets in the early days were ambitious, shall we say, but, in the context of the market at the time, and in the context of other schemes that we have seen in Wales, Glastir has got to a point now where a very significant amount of holdings are taking advantage of it. There are nearly 4,000 holdings taking advantage of Glastir, very significant amounts of common land, and something like 40% of the farmland of Wales under Glastir agreements.

[43] **Alun Ffred Jones:** Mae gennyf jest un cwestiwn arall. O ran effeithlonrwydd y cynllun, faint o arolygwyr sydd gennych chi yn arolygu'r cynllun hwn? Oherwydd, mae dwy gŵyn—un, bod y cynllun yn rhy gaeth, a'r llall ei fod yn rhy llac. Fodd bynnag, faint o arolygwyr sydd gennych yn edrych ar ôl y cynllun hwn, ac yn sicrhau bod y cynllun yn effeithiol? Yr hyn yr ydych yn ei glywed gan ffermwyr, wrth gwrs, fel y clywais i ddoe, ydy bod dau arolygydd yn treulio pum diwrnod ar fferm yn teimlo yn drwm iawn, iawn i rywun sy'n trïo cyflawni ei waith. Felly, faint o arolygwyr sydd gennych chi?

Alun Ffred Jones: I have just one other question. In relation to the efficiency of the scheme, how many inspectors do you have auditing this scheme? Because there are two complaints—one, that the scheme is too restrictive, and the other, that it is too loose. However, how many inspectors do you have looking after this scheme, and ensuring that it is effective? What you hear from farmers, of course, as I heard yesterday, is that two inspectors spending five days on a farm feels very, very heavy-handed to someone who is trying to get on with their work. So, how many inspectors do you have?

[44] **Mr Jones:** I cannot give you the exact numbers of inspectors who are doing Glastir inspections. The number of our inspectors, or our field inspection staff in total, is something like between 40 and 50. We also have a number of commons development officers, as the report makes clear, and, as the report also makes clear, those are going to begin—in fact, have already begun—to be trained and developed to do some broader work, particularly with groups of farmers in Wales. I do not think that I would accept that we adopt a heavy-handed approach to inspection. The vast majority of farmers I talk to are very complimentary about the way in which our inspectors work with them. Looking, for example, at the rates of penalties, across Wales, as a result of the inspections that take place, they are relatively small both in terms of cash and numbers. So, I would not agree that we have a heavy-handed approach. We are trying very hard to work with other agencies, in terms of our inspection effort. The one thing I do not want to see is, one day, one of my inspectors arriving on a farm, and then, the next day, a Natural Resources Wales inspector turning up, and, another day, a health and safety inspector coming there.

[45] **Alun Ffred Jones:** I think that that was the criticism.

[46] **Mr Jones:** And you are right—it does happen. We want to continue to work hard with those other agencies, to make sure that we work together, so that farmers can get on with running their businesses, and farming, and not spend their whole time feeling that they have to account to us for the compliance of their work. Having said that, Chair, the European Union is very stringent in the rules that it applies, and is very, very able to apply significant levels of disallowance—that is, to reduce the amount of cash that comes to Wales as a result of our subsidy payments. Wales has an enviable record in terms of disallowance. Our rates of disallowance, compared with other UK countries, are minuscule, and our rates of disallowance, compared with other European countries, are extremely small indeed.

09:30

[47] **Darren Millar:** Just on co-ordination with inspectorates, you share your programmes with Natural Resources Wales and some of the others, do you?

[48] **Mr Jones:** Yes.

[49] **Darren Millar:** You do, yet this is still a recurring problem with inspectors turning up.

[50] **Mr Jones:** I think this is work in progress, Chair, but Emyr Roberts and I, and other agencies that are involved in inspections are determined to make sure that our inspection regimes are robust, but also that we reduce the burden on farmers who have their businesses to run.

[51] **Darren Millar:** I am going to bring in Jenny Rathbone followed by Sandy Mewies.

[52] **Jenny Rathbone:** We would certainly expect public agents to be joining up the dots and sharing information. There is no particular reason why they should not be. I am just struggling to understand why a rise in commodity prices could be a green light for people to start to pollute again and why, given that all farmers are in receipt of public money, any of them is then actively polluting. How many prosecutions have you had for people who are deliberately polluting?

[53] **Mr Jones:** You put the question quite pejoratively, I think, to make the point. I understand that. I am certainly not suggesting that farmers will take advantage of high commodity prices to purposely pollute again. Indeed, the whole question of agricultural bad practice, if you like, rather than agricultural benefit, is one where I am very clear that, first, we should not be paying for people to, effectively, drag themselves out of bad practice, and, secondly, that regulation is actually the way to deal with people who employ bad practices on their farms. We do have the opportunity to refuse entry to Glastir to farmers who are employing what we consider to be bad practices, and we most certainly would not agree that Glastir payment should be made for bad practice, and nor would the rural development plan regulations allow us to do so. If somebody is purposely polluting, or is polluting as a result of negligence on their farms, then that is something that I think should be dealt with via regulation.

[54] **Jenny Rathbone:** So, how many prosecutions have there been?

[55] **Mr Jones:** I am afraid that I cannot give you that figure. I know that, in terms of our cross-compliance requirements—in other words, the requirements that farmers have to meet to enable them to secure their pillar 1 payments, their direct subsidies—our cross-compliance penalties every year are around £0.5 million across the whole of Wales. In terms of prosecutions, of course, that is the realm of Natural Resources Wales, which is responsible for prosecuting for those bad practices. However, we have levels of penalties that we can apply, and we do apply those penalties.

[56] **Jenny Rathbone:** Could you just put in context this £0.5 million penalty? Is that a large sum or a small sum?

[57] **Mr Jones:** Is it £300 million a year?

[58] **Mr Slade:** Yes, it is the best part of £300 million.

[59] **Mr Jones:** It is, so if we pay out £300 million a year, £0.5 million of that is withheld as a result either of failure to maintain land in good agricultural condition, or of failure to

meet some other cross-compliance requirement.

[60] **Jenny Rathbone:** In terms of endeavouring to meet our European water quality obligations, the NFU is saying that only 15% of water framework directive failures can be attributed to agriculture, and that some of the pollution can be traced back to land in public ownerships and under the management of NRW. Would you be able elucidate whether that is—

[61] **Mr Jones:** I do not have that evidence. It is true to say that there is a mixture of landowners who will be polluting at levels that breach the water framework directive. Glastir, of course, provides an opportunity for the improvement of run-off from farms. I have seen examples where farmers have dug significant ponds to hold run-off so that it is diluted in terms of the diffuse pollution that it provides. However, I do not have the evidence available to say whether or not farmers or public land is responsible, principally, for any breaches of the directive.

[62] **Jenny Rathbone:** It is something that I think probably the public would like to know, but perhaps you could—

[63] **Mr Jones:** Yes, I would like to know, too, because the public land in question is owned by the Welsh Government. It is looked after by Natural Resources Wales, but it is actually our land. So, if that is true, I would be interested to see the evidence. I will certainly talk to the NFU about that.

[64] **Jenny Rathbone:** Thank you very much. What the RSPB is saying is that we are not going to meet our environmental objectives with the current Glastir, and what is needed is a sea change in the way that we do things, with much clearer measurable targets. It gives an example in its evidence of the need not just to delay clearing the residue of the harvest, but also to make sure that there is food over the winter et cetera. So, I just wonder whether you could convince us that the RSPB is misunderstanding things.

[65] **Mr Jones:** I would not claim that Glastir is the complete answer to the problem. Certainly, the maintenance of stubble after a cropping is a very important contributor to the maintenance of feed for a number of varieties of birds. There are a lot of examples where diversity of birdlife has clearly improved as a result of Glastir. Is it the complete answer to all of our objectives? No, I do not think that it is. There are a number of other things that we are doing to contribute to that. I mentioned the nature fund earlier, which will be an important contributor. It is something on which we and the RSPB have worked together. I think it requires a multifaceted approach to achieving our target. Glastir is a contributor, but it is not the full monty.

[66] **Jenny Rathbone:** In terms of trying to halt the disappearance of many of our native species of birds, what should Glastir be doing that it is not at the moment, or is this completely down to another aspect of agricultural policy?

[67] **Mr Jones:** I do not think that there are elements of Glastir, particularly, that we should be changing to attack that particular objective. As I say, there are a whole series of other things that we could do, but we have to accept that species-related objectives in the context of an environment that has been very significantly affected by climate change, is something that, arguably, we should be moving away from. We should be moving much further towards protecting catchments and protecting areas of biodiversity, rather than looking at specific species. As climate change takes more and more hold—and this is not just a point about birds, of course—it is true to say that it will have an effect on a number of species that will move north, away from a number of traditional lands.

[68] **Mr Slade:** One of the things that we can do, just to add to what Gareth was saying, is encourage more collaboration between holdings. Indeed, that was one of the points brought out by the WAO in its report. We are trying, both through the redesign of Glastir into the new rural development programme and in relation to the collaboration and co-operation measures—to pick up on Gareth’s point—to take the nature fund model of bringing people together to achieve a particular set of objectives, either around a catchment or for particular habitats, to make it easier for landholders to come together and achieve those objectives in the round.

[69] **Jenny Rathbone:** The RSPB argument is that, if you targeted the scheme better, you would have better outcomes in terms of biodiversity—focusing on the uplands.

[70] **Darren Millar:** Just to help us, could you send us some of your revised targets? Given what the WAO has said about the overambitious targets that were unrealistic et cetera, could you send us some of the revised targets that you expect Glastir to actually achieve? How are you going to monitor delivery against those, whether they are biodiversity targets or otherwise?

[71] **Mr Jones:** We would be delighted to send you a paper, Chair. I think that it is true to say that, as far as the next rural development programme is concerned, as you will know, we are still in the throes of negotiating that with the Commission; we do not yet have a budget, so we do not yet know what will be available. We are also doing that modelling work that I talked about earlier with the Centre for Ecology and Hydrology. That modelling work will help us, we expect, to target future schemes much better.

[72] May I just add one further thing in response to Jenny Rathbone’s question? The Minister has made it clear that the nature fund and the encouragement of farmers and groups of farmers in catchment areas to work together are things that he wants to take further through into the next rural development programme. So, that is what we will seek to do.

[73] **Darren Millar:** I am going to bring in Sandy Mewies, who has been waiting a while, and then I will come back to others.

[74] **Sandy Mewies:** Thank you, Chair. I want to slightly back-pedal a bit and go back to the question of the inspection system. Alun Ffred Jones raised the length of time—five days, he has been told. What is the average length of time for an inspection? I presume that it is decided on the size of the farm. I do not know. That would be an educated guess on my part. What information do they go in with beforehand? So, for example, if there were problems with water pollution, water quality being affected or other problems, would the inspectors find out that information before they go in? When they have been in to do the inspection, they report directly back, presumably, to—I do not know. Is there then a re-inspection at any time to see that things have improved? So, those are around the inspection regime.

[75] Another question that I want to ask, and I do not know the answer to this, is: would one of the pollution aspects that inspectors look at be, for example, slurry lagoons and the way they operate? If that is the case, then, certainly from my experience, when the general public—and we have to think about this, because it is public money after all—has complaints or issues, people tend to go back to the planning system. They would go to the planning system to see what permissions had been given and go straight to the local authority to complain. That is a bit of a gap, as far as I can see, so I just want to know how you bridge it. The public, I do not think, would think, ‘I know where I’ll go to complain about this’. Someone would think, ‘I’ll go to the local authority, and to the planning system’. How does that work?

[76] **Mr Jones:** I will answer as much as I know of the system. Our inspection system is a

risk-based one. So, there is a set of analyses done every year to assess the risks that come out of agreements that are held with farmers. Risk-based systems are partly based on size, but they are partly based on—I think that this picks up one of your questions—any problems we may have had at a farm in previous years. So, if there have been examples of bad practice, and if penalties have been applied and issues raised, then that would be flagged as part of our risk system to ensure that it came up again as something that needed to be inspected. So, we have a risk-based system.

09:45

[77] Inspectors will go out to a farm, and I think that the length of time it takes on a farm is partly due to size, you are right, but it is also partly due to the complexity of the contract. I was at a farm last week, which was only about 600 acres—‘only’ I say; that is about twice the size of an average farm—but it had a very complex Glastir contract, because the farmer was doing an enormous number of capital works, there was a huge number of streamside corridors, some planting and he had field management systems in place. So, for an inspector to spend time on that farm, both talking to the farmer and looking around to make sure that he was doing what he said he would do as part of the contract, would take, I would suspect, several days. It is always a balance here, is it not, between robustness and being burdensome? We want to be robust, but we do not want to be burdensome.

[78] In terms of where people go, people probably go back to the planning system and to the local authority, and say, ‘We’ve got an issue here.’ Incidentally, the question about slurry and the like would principally be one for Natural Resources Wales inspectors to pick up on. They would be the ones with the expertise as to whether or not the practices being followed were sufficiently robust. My divisional officers based in Carmarthen, Llandrindod Wells and Caernarfon have very close working relations with local authority staff. They have close working relationships with the trading standards people and I suspect that, if there were complaints made to local authorities—I cannot give you examples now—about a farm, they would find their way to our divisional officers too.

[79] I do not know what the average length of time of an inspection is. It would be relatively easy for us to work it out, because we know exactly how many inspections we carry out a year and we know exactly how many inspectors we have. So, I could work it out for you, but I do not have that figure. I am happy to let you have a note, Chair.

[80] **Sandy Mewies:** Just to add to that, the inspector is aware, going in, of poor practice or poor maintenance, either from previous inspections or from other sources, and they go back in; if things have not improved, is that the stage when the consequences become more serious for them? What happens next?

[81] **Mr Jones:** The consequences could be a number of different things. I have talked about cross-compliance penalties, the £0.5 million a year that we have penalised farmers for over the last few years. It could go as far as prosecutions, as you say, if there were either animal welfare problems or clear problems with regard to pollution or other nefarious practices. Our inspectors would very clearly know where to take those problems, to make sure that the proper authorities were informed. We do see, sadly, quite a lot of animal welfare problems on farms and we have close links with both the chief veterinary officer’s office in my department and the Animal and Plant Health Agency, which I still remember as the state veterinary service, and they would be informed of any problems on farms.

[82] **Darren Millar:** In terms of the penalties, the number of penalties and the total fines, if you could send us a note on those over the past few years, that would be helpful.

[83] **Mike Hedges:** How do you know that you are not paying farmers for work on things

that they would do anyway without any Glastir payment? How do you know that you are actually getting any benefit from it? How would you know that they are not just leaving land fallow and leaving it to grow as a meadow et cetera, which you were paying them for, that is marginal land that they would have left anyway, because it is uneconomic to farm?

[84] **Mr Jones:** A lot of this comes down to the relationship between the project officer at the outset and the farmer in question. My project officers are very experienced individuals who spend, on average, 6.25 days at the outset having discussions with farmers about their contract and developing a multi-annual agreement with the farmer that looks realistic to the contract manager in terms of things that the farmer has decided to do as a result of Glastir. Does that mean that, in every single case, there are things that we are paying for that would not have otherwise happened? I suspect not, but we have reduced the risk that there are very substantially. Where there are capital works in place, we know that we are paying for the capital works. One could argue that there are a number of those that a farmer would do anyway, but if one goes to look at a set of capital works that a farmer is implementing, certainly to me they do not look like the sorts of things that they would do simply for the benefit of their business. Capital works is a slight misnomer. I am not necessarily talking about bricks and mortar here; capital works are things like tree planting and digging ponds. So, they are things that change the nature of the farm.

[85] **Mike Hedges:** Capital is one-off expenditure; that is a quick and simple definition. May I ask the same question in a different way then? How many applications for land to be left unfarmed have you turned down?

[86] **Mr Jones:** I do not have that figure here, Chair, but—

[87] **Darren Millar:** Will you be able to send us a note?

[88] **Mr Jones:** I can certainly let you have that.

[89] **Darren Millar:** I am going to come to Aled then Alun Ffred.

[90] **Aled Roberts:** Rwy'n trio deall beth rydych wedi ddweud y bore yma ynglŷn â'r ffaith eich bod yn cynnal bob arolwg ar sail y posibilrwydd o risg o gymharu â beth sydd yn yr adroddiad hwn. A gaf eich cyfeirio at baragraff 1.42? Rydych wedi dweud wrth Sandy Mewies eich bod yn derbyn gwybodaeth gan yr holl asiantaethau a'ch bod yn ystyried hynny pan rydych yn gweld lefel risg ar ffermydd. Eto, mae'r Llywodraeth wedi dweud wrth Swyddfa Archwilio Cymru nad oes ganddi fynediad at wybodaeth sydd ar gael am ffermydd unigol sy'n cyfrannu at broblemau ansawdd dŵr, ac mai Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru sydd â'r wybodaeth honno. Mae'r dystiolaeth rydych wedi ei rhoi i Swyddfa Archwilio Cymru yn dweud nad ydych yn derbyn y wybodaeth honno pan rydych yn edrych ar eich arolwg. Os ydych mor ffyddiog eich bod yn cynnal yr asesiad risg cyn bob arolwg, pam bod yn rhaid i Swyddfa Archwilio Cymru roi argymhelliad 2 yn yr adroddiad, sydd yn dweud y dylech

Aled Roberts: I am trying to understand what you said this morning about the fact that you undertake every inspection on the basis of risk compared with what is in this report. May I refer you to paragraph 1.42? You told Sandy Mewies that you receive information from all of these agencies and that you take that into consideration when you assess the risk levels on farms. Yet, the Government has told the Wales Audit Office that it does not have access to information that is available about individual farms that contribute to water quality problems, and that that information rests with NRW. The evidence that you have given to the Wales Audit Office says that you do not receive that information when you are considering your inspection. If you are so confident that you undertake the risk assessment before every inspection, why did the Wales Audit Office make recommendation 2 in the report, saying that you should look at the possibility of developing a risk-based approach?

edrych ar posibilrwydd o ddatblygu dull yn seiliedig ar risg?

[91] **Mr Jones:** Sorry; I was answering a question with regard to how we know about problems on farms. Our risk-based approach is used for all of our subsidy payments. We have a risk system which is used by our inspectors to assess which farms they should visit in terms of all of their common agricultural policy payments; that will include pillar 1 payments and direct subsidies as well.

[92] The point that I was making was that if there was any thought when an inspector visited a farm that there were obviously problems with regard to pollution there, that is something that would be reported to NRW—the competent authority here—and it would be flagged up on our system as something that the inspector had discovered as part of his inspection.

[93] **Aled Roberts:** Ond nid yw'n **Aled Roberts:** However, inspectors are not ofynnol i arolygydd gysylltu efo Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru ynglŷn ag unrhyw awawsterau am ansawdd dŵr ar fferm unigol cyn cynnal yr arolwg. required to contact NRW about any problems in terms of water quality on an individual farm before undertaking an inspection.

[94] **Mr Jones:** If he or she knows about it.

[95] **Aled Roberts:** But there is no protocol or anything that suggests—. Looking from the outset, people would say that NRW is now part of the Welsh Government and yet there is no discussion between one department and the other regarding particular problems.

[96] **Darren Millar:** Is it not possible for NRW to train some of your inspectors in order that they can undertake part of the role, for example?

[97] **Mr Jones:** We have looked at the possibility of not just what I mentioned earlier, which is joint inspections, but having a sort of joint inspectorate, if you like—a joint inspection force—with NRW. It is probably a little bit early in the evolution of NRW for us to implement that too quickly, but it is certainly something that I think we should look at. The implication in your question is that there needs to be complexity of communication between two organisations, whereas actually, if we are all trying to achieve the same objectives, which we clearly are, which is good-quality land management in Wales, we could do that by even closer working together. That could even go as far as some sort of joint inspectorate.

[98] **Aled Roberts:** Ond, os ydych yn **Aled Roberts:** But, if you are saying that it is dweud ei bod yn rhy fuan i symud at arolygiaeth ar y cyd, hwyrach y dylech drosglwyddo gwybodaeth cyn ichi gyrraedd y sefyllfa honno. too soon to move to a joint inspectorate, perhaps you should transfer information before you have reached that situation.

[99] **Mr Jones:** There is transfer of information between the two. I hope that I made clear earlier that if a problem is discovered by an inspector on a farm, that information would be passed to NRW if it was felt that there was a need, for example, for further action or prosecution.

[100] **Aled Roberts:** Jest un cwestiwn olaf. **Aled Roberts:** Just one final question.

[101] **Darren Millar:** Time is against us; so, be very brief.

[102] **Aled Roberts:** Pam ydych ond wedi **Aled Roberts:** Why have you only accepted

derbyn argymhelliad 5 mewn egwyddor, ynglŷn â thargedau? Yr ydych wedi cyfaddef bod eich targedau gwreiddiol yn rhy uchelgeisiol. Mae tystiolaeth yr NFU yn dweud: recommendation 5 in principle in terms of targets? You have admitted that your original targets are too ambitious. Evidence from the NFU says:

[103] ‘Previous forecasting by Welsh Government of scheme uptake has been woeful and if this approach is adopted—’

[104] mae’n sôn am dargedau— it is talking about targets—

[105] ‘we foresee a significant allocation of much needed RDP resource ring-fenced and held within the budget for landbased measures and not utilised elsewhere.’

[106] Maen nhw’n dweud eich bod chi yn ‘woeful’. They say that you are ‘woeful’.

[107] **Mr Jones:** I picked up on that. I have already said that I think that the original targets were ambitious, possibly even unrealistic, in the context of what was happening at the time. Certain policy decisions were taken that made it nigh on impossible to achieve those targets, and there have been wider economic issues, as I have made clear. I think that the point about future targets is twofold. First, we have to do better. Some of the modelling work that we are doing and the eventual budget that we managed to negotiate with the Commission will both contribute to that. Secondly, there is an issue about agreeing targets with the Commission. Although one can modify those targets as part of the plan as one moves through it, it is quite difficult to do with the Commission. The Commission is not terribly understanding, usually, of things like policy changes—Governments’ policy changes—or indeed changes in market conditions, all of which could have an effect on targets. However, you are right; we need to do better in terms of our targetry, both in terms of the overall numbers and in terms of precisely where we should be putting our resources so that we get the most bang for our buck in terms of environmental benefit.

[108] **Darren Millar:** You are going to send us a note of your targets in any case, are you not, and what you are expecting to achieve in the future?

[109] **Mr Jones:** We are, indeed.

[110] **Darren Millar:** We will have to move on. Very briefly, Alun Ffred, and then I will come to Jenny.

[111] **Alun Ffred Jones:** Gan gyfeirio at y trydydd argymhelliad, sy’n sôn am yr anhawster i bobl wrth wneud ceisiadau i fod yn rhan o gynllun, efo’r cynlluniau coetiroedd a choedlannau, mae’r ffigurau yn isel iawn o dan rai o’r penawdau, ac un feirniadaeth yw eu bod yn gorgymhlethu’r sefyllfa. Yng nghanolbarth Cymru, mae gennym y cynllun Pontbren, sydd wedi derbyn cymeradwyaeth ryngwladol. Y feirniadaeth yw nad ydym wedi manteisio ar symrlwydd, ar un ystyr, y cynllun hwnnw, a’i drosglwyddo i Glastir. Sut ydych yn ymateb i’r feirniadaeth honno? **Alun Ffred Jones:** Referring to the third recommendation, which refers to difficulties for people in making applications to be part of the scheme, with these forestry schemes, the figures are very low under some of the headings, and one of the criticisms is that they are over-complicating the situation. In mid Wales, we have the Pontbren project, which has received praise internationally. The criticism is that we have not taken advantage of the simplicity, in one sense, of that scheme and transferred it to Glastir. How do you respond to that criticism?

10:00

[112] **Mr Jones:** I think that it is a fair criticism that we, at the outset, made it rather complex for people to apply for Glastir. I have spent time sitting with a contract manager and a cartographer, and I have spoken to farmers about the experience that they have had. Even from a relative layman's perspective, I have found it quite complex for people to go through the application process.

[113] Again, there is a balance in all of this. We have to get sufficient sign-up by the farmer, sufficient buy-in by the farmer, and sufficient rigour in the process to be able to demonstrate to the Commission that we are getting real environmental benefit from the money that is being paid out. Otherwise, as I have said before, there can be very significant penalties. Having said that, I am all in favour of simplicity. If one looks at the recent Glastir Organic online application process that farmers went through—and 580-odd of them went through very successfully earlier this year—I think that that is an example of how you can make something simple and digital at the same time, and therefore efficient, by really bearing down on the complexity that has the potential to weave itself into the system. I was absolutely delighted to see 99.75% of applications for Glastir Organic done online. That is an extraordinary achievement from a complete zero base, particularly when you take into account that only 5% of those farmers who applied for Glastir Organic had to seek some sort of digital assistance from our divisional officers and from our staff.

[114] Just to return to your general point, I would absolutely agree that we need to continue to bear down on complexity. We need to make this process of application as simple and as un-complex as possible, while still understanding that we do have a set of pretty complex regulations that have to be adhered to if we are not to be severely penalised by the European Commission.

[115] **Darren Millar:** May I just pick up on this issue of online applications? The NFU has suggested that the application window of around a month is insufficient, particularly for farmers who might need to get some third-party support in developing their application. Obviously, you are wanting to make a transition so that everything is done online, but of course in some parts of Wales we have significant notspots, which are a problem. How are you going to ensure that everyone who could participate does not have a barrier created as a result of online application processes? I will then bring Jenny in.

[116] **Mr Jones:** We can look at the length of the application window within the contexts of the rules that are set for us by the European Commission, Chair. I do sympathise greatly with those who are digitally excluded, for whatever reason. It may be because of a lack of broadband coverage—as you will know, the Welsh Government is doing a great deal to roll out broadband across Wales—but it could be as a result of simply being of a generation or of a nature that they do not want to get involved in online applications. It is those people who are digitally excluded, for whatever reason, that I think that we, as a Government, have a responsibility to help. We have a great record, I think, in my department of providing help with on-farm farm liaison officers, with events at local communities, and with individual divisional officers who are providing help and guidance to people. I most certainly will want to see that continuing.

[117] We have very aspirational targets in terms of online applications, even for our pillar 1 schemes, and even for our direct subsidies, over the next few years. To enable us to achieve the targets that we are setting ourselves, and that Ministers are expecting us to reach, we will have to provide a lot of assistance to people, and I am absolutely committed to doing that.

[118] **Darren Millar:** Okay. You will be able to send us a note giving an overview of the precise steps that you are taking in response to the point on online applications, and the shift

that is going to be required by some, will you?

[119] **Mr Jones:** This really is an enormous shift. However, I think that the experience that we have had with Glastir Organic is a great start, and very encouraging.

[120] **Mr Slade:** I think that the industry would say that this is a very good example of where we have worked in partnership to develop something that will be of use to everybody. Rural Payments Wales is seeing stakeholders every six weeks, to pick up feedback from the process. Just on application windows, I have been running schemes—as Gareth has—for a number of years, and although it is important that you get the application window right, you always get a rush right at the very end, even if you have had a very long application window.

[121] **Darren Millar:** I think that tax returns are exactly the same, are they not? Jenny Rathbone has a question.

[122] **Jenny Rathbone:** Just going back to the European Commission's desire to ensure that money is used to implement change and improvement in environmental practice, the RSPB is arguing that more than 80% of farmers in Wales will receive green payments for continuing existing practices, which is Mike Hedges's point. The RSPB argues that pillar 1 greening could have achieved broad-brush environmental enhancements, including water improvement. I wonder whether you could just explain to us why you did not implement that.

[123] **Darren Millar:** In answering that, perhaps you can also tell us how you ensure that the scheme costs are minimal. We noticed that you were not able to disaggregate the costs of administrating Glastir from the wider CAP management costs, which is a bit of a concern really.

[124] **Mr Slade:** I will do greening, and Gareth will pick up on the administration side. I think that it is fair to say that the greening component of the new common agricultural policy looks very odd in the context of Wales. It was not designed with permanent grassland-based agriculture, such as our own, in mind; it was devised, I think, predominantly, with the plains of northern and eastern parts of the European Union in mind, where you can drive for miles and not see any hedgerows, trees, or anything else that would encourage biodiversity. So, the actual impact of the greening component of the EU deal on Wales is very minimal overall. Nevertheless, we have to put in place a load of administrative procedures to deal with the arable sector, particularly in relation to Pembrokeshire, Carmarthen, and up around Anglesey. We still need to put those measures in place.

[125] You are asking a fundamental question about what was the purpose of greening within this latest CAP reform. We are trying to give farmers as much optionality within the arrangements that we are offering; that is part of a wider debate about how you secure environmental benefits through the first pillar of the CAP, moving forward. We think that, in the context of Wales, much greater environmental benefit can be secured through pillar 2, through the new rural development programme.

[126] **Jenny Rathbone:** Well, we will keep going on this issue.

[127] **Mr Jones:** Shall I pick up your point, Chair, about costs?

[128] **Darren Millar:** Yes, please.

[129] **Mr Jones:** The first thing to say is that I want my departments to be learning organisations, and, therefore, they need to be able to benchmark themselves against others, to ensure that they are delivering an efficient service, as well as delivering what I believe is a very effective one. I suppose that there are three principal elements to the administrative costs

of delivering Glastir. The first element is the contract managers, and we know how much they cost, and we know that they are providing a more efficient service than was being delivered under Tir Gofal, but we know how much they cost us. The second element is IT systems, and we know how much they cost—we know how much the element of Glastir costs of our total IT system. The third element, which is the one I suspect you are referring to, is multiskilled teams—MSTs, as we describe them—which I suspect is relatively small, compared to the other two elements, in terms of Glastir itself.

[130] However, you are right to say that, at the moment, we cannot disaggregate the costs of Glastir from the multiskilled teams, compared to the cost of everything else that they do, in terms of common agricultural policy payments—both pillar 1 and pillar 2. I was head of the department when we introduced multiskilled teams, back in the early 2000s. I still believe that it is absolutely the right thing to do, because it provides a variety of functions and varied jobs for people. It is more efficient, because it smoothes out the peaks and troughs in people's work and it gives people the opportunity to have better relationships with our stakeholders, with farming communities, because they are not just dealing with their pillar 1 payments—if a farmer rings up with an issue on his farm, he can talk to an individual who can talk to him about either his pillar 1 payment or his pillar 2 payments.

[131] Having said that, I think that the Wales Audit Office has a point here in terms of our being able to better benchmark our efficiency in running agri-environment schemes compared with others. I am pretty confident that we will come out well here compared with others who deliver it, but I have asked the teams to do some work on trying to apportion the amount of time and effort that goes into Glastir, compared with the other work that they do within those multiskilled teams. That will take us some time to do. I do not want us to go down the full time-recording process, because I think that that is costly and it is demotivating for staff to have to do that, but there is, I think, some halfway point to which we can come to try to apportion our costs. I would be happy to let you have a note on that once we have come up with some figures.

[132] **Darren Millar:** That is very useful indeed. Thank you very much. That brings us to the end of our oral evidence session. You have agreed to provide us with some additional information and the clerks will be in touch with you about that. Obviously, you will get a copy of the transcript of today's proceedings as well, so, if there are any factual inaccuracies in it, feel free to get in touch and we will make the necessary amendments. Thank you, Gareth Jones and Andrew Slade for your attendance today. We look forward to receiving the additional information.

10:12

**Cynnig o dan Reol Sefydlog 17.42 i Benderfynu Gwahardd y Cyhoedd o'r
Cyfarfod
Motion under Standing Order 17.42 to Resolve to Exclude the Public from the
Meeting**

[133] **Darren Millar:** I move that

the committee resolves to exclude the public from the remainder of the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 17.42(vi) and (vii).

[134] Does any Member object? I can see that there are no objections, so we will move into private session.

Derbyniwyd y cynnig.

Motion agreed.

*Daeth rhan gyhoeddus y cyfarfod i ben am 10:12.
The public part of the meeting ended at 10:12.*