Policy Option Appraisal for delivery of multiple benefits: choosing policy focus

RESAS1.4.2ci: KE1 Select Options with Stakeholders

Authors: Alessandro Gimona and Justin Irvine

Contact: Alessandro Gimona [alessandro.gimona@hutton.ac.uk]

Suggested citation: Gimona A and Irvine J (2017) *Policy Option Appraisal for delivery of multiple benefits: choosing the policy focus,* working document, James Hutton Institute, Aberdeen.





Introduction

This work had been delayed as a result of staff recruitment delaying our stakeholder facilitation. The Staff member has now been recruited and started in October 2016.

The purpose of this deliverable was to decide policy-relevant activities in concert with key stakeholders. This has been done using a range of opportunities, and the results will inform 1.4.2ci (Policy Option Appraisal for delivery of multiple benefits) and 1.4.2cii (Climate adaptation and mitigation impacts on multiple benefits).

Firstly, general discussions at the Ecosystems and Land Use Policy Engagement Group (ELPEG) meetings between April and October confirmed that woodland expansion and the exploration of CAP-related issues are desirable topics to tackle. The focus on woodland expansion, land use change and options for targeting agricultural payments were also supported at the Ecosystems and Land Use Stakeholder Engagement Group (ELSEG) meeting in November 2016.

We then liaised with a number of organisations to refine the topics of investigation.

These included the Cairngorm National Park (CNP) authority, Scottish Environment LINK (an NGO umbrella organisation), ELSEG and, through colleagues working in WP 2.4, the Scottish Government policy team dealing with CAP pillar one payments.

Specific Activities planned

National level

Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) -related options

In collaboration between 1.4.2ci and WP 2.4, we will first explore if the present Ecosystem services models have sufficient thematic and spatial granularity to answer CAP- related questions that require both national coverage but also the ability to assess the consequences for individual holdings. The initial focus in terms of ecosystem services will be on sediment and nutrient retention, followed by Carbon storage and pollination.

In policy terms we will then focus on two threads: Firstly analysing the relationship between current Less Favoured Area payments including (parachute options) and the delivery of key ecosystem services (ESS). The analysis will also draw on the outputs from the Areas of Natural Constraint analysis that looked at an extensive range of alternative payment regionalisation and designation options. This will provide evidence to inform active policy processes before and after-Brexit.

Secondly we will focus on the development of a workflow to analyse the relationship between Pillar 1 direct payments (Basic Payment Schemes and Greening) and ESS with a view to providing information to inform appraisals of the impact of the 2015 reforms and to underpin post-BREXIT deliberations on future agricultural support and environmental.

Expected output:

(i) Assessment of models fitness for purpose; (ii) assessment of each scenario: and (iii) modelled key ESS and their relation with payments.

Habitat Connectivity

We are organising an investigation of opportunities for enhancing the connectivity of semi-natural habitats and alleviating habitat fragmentation throughout Scotland. This is particularly relevant for the Scottish Biodiversity Strategy, and Land Use Strategy given the emphasis on re-establishing national connectivity, while delivering multiple benefits from the landscape.

This activity is in collaboration between 1.4.2 and WP 1.3 and will start with a workshop that will take place in March 2017.

Expected output:

(i) A conceptual roadmap to re-establish connectivity and improve habitat fragmentation; (ii) later: technical analysis and models showing options for areas to prioritise (relevant also to 1.4.2cii).

Regional Level

We agreed with the CNPA to investigate opportunity maps for woodland expansion in the park, with emphasis on trade-offs and synergies between woodland connectivity natural flood prevention, soil erosion and recreation, but with flexibility built in with regard to the final output, depending on CNPA feedback. This activity will be relevant to 1.4.2cii.

Expected Output:

Opportunity maps for woodland expansion in the park, to be discussed and refined with the CNP.

Acknowledgements

This report was funded by the Rural & Environment Science & Analytical Services Division of the Scottish Government. We acknowledge Will Boyd Wallis (CNPA), the members of ELSEG, SE LINK, and Dr Keith Matthews (JHI) for their useful contributions.