NFYFC AGRI response to Defra’s command paper “Health and Harmony: the future for food, farming and the environment in a Green Brexit”

The NFYFC Agriculture and Rural Issues steering group welcomes the opportunity to respond to Defra’s command paper on the framework for a future British food and farming policy on behalf of its YFC members. NFYFC’s 2016 survey, in response to the EU Referendum, resulted in a position paper based on this feedback and various other engagement events with our YFC members. The next generation’s opinion for a future domestic agricultural policy has obvious significance and our response offers a range of opinions to underpin a robust agricultural industry and rural environment.

Our organisation represents a diverse group of people who share an interest in a vibrant and sustainable countryside. YFC members have a keen interest in future food production, farming and land management, as well as future career opportunities within these and allied industries.

The nature of the organisation’s diversity provides a next generation view, but also recognises the need for an effective transition time. From the original reason for the current Basic Payment Scheme – to ensure affordable food and plentiful supplies – to a new, forward-thinking and fit-for-purpose future policy, we highlight key components. This policy should enable a transition from an existing, known regime to a future independent policy that maintains conditions for essential food production and security. When asked how young farmers would justify their policy recommendations to the public and to farmers, two themes were apparent: food security and farms-as-businesses.

NFYFC supports the NFU stance of food production being of paramount importance, with respect for the environment and public enjoyment of the countryside (noting within reason and not to impair food production). As already suggested, it is important to prioritise components of a policy to achieve the end goal. Food production comes first with sufficient support to incorporate environmental enhancement and climate change considerations. This must be supported by an adequate supply of skilled labour. Our response will incorporate the following themes:

- Moving away from a Common Agricultural Policy (CAP)
- Implementing a new agricultural policy in England
  - public money for public goods
  - enhancing the environment and fulfilling our responsibility to animals
  - supporting rural communities and remote farming
  - changing regulatory culture
  - farming in remote areas and rural resilience
  - risk management and resilience
  - ensuring fairness in the supply chain

- The framework for the new policy
We represent opinions on future targeted support for food production and a sustainable rural environment; aims that we feel need to be supported by risk management and resilience and fairness in the supply chain. Our feedback is based on considerations for negotiating a future farm business environment and culture for young farmers working and living in the countryside. Considerations include: future farming support; skills and training; future farming regulations and education. YFC members have been clear in their priorities for a future agricultural policy:

- Create clarity between government and industry expectations
- Simplicity
- Sustainability
- Innovation
- Skills and training
- Promotion of collaboration and understanding between industry, government and consumers

The transition from a European collaborative food and farming policy to a domestic policy should ensure stability as well as progression and incorporate technological revolution with essential heritage and rural skills to satisfy the tension of productivity, environmental enhancement and climate change mitigation.

We understand the principals set out by Defra for its consultation and those for a future policy. Our response includes constructive suggestions to many of the questions and themes that we feel qualified to contribute on and that are relevant to our membership.

We hope both government and our society will continue to support the challenge - and future opportunities - of producing quality, safe and plentiful food supplies whilst operating within unpredictable weather, environmental and trading conditions. We wish to see vibrant and sustainable rural communities, a countryside enjoyed and respected by all, providing wellbeing and job opportunities.

1 Moving away from the CAP

Next generation farmers have made recommendations for improved circumstances for new entrants and younger farmers. This has been acknowledged by the EU mandatory Young Farmers Payment scheme and now many initiatives exist that were lacking in the past. This is appreciated but there are two vital points for a future policy:

- an agricultural industry that is maintained during a transition period with time for all to adjust to future policies and trade deals. A continued supply of high quality food coupled with robust animal welfare and environmental standards should be maintained for public good
- all active farmers are in need of support during (and beyond) a transition period to ensure that a future farming business culture is developed whilst food production and environmental stewardship is maintained
• redirection of payments and future scheme development should have sufficient analysis to ensure and enhance current and future productivity without creating unrealistic targets or wasting public money on flawed or rushed systems. Young farmer responses for future schemes have included contrasting suggestions for: area based subsidies being reduced or removed and farmers supported instead through grants or loans for farm business investments and moving towards paying farmers based on their farm output or productivity. As with the EU Referendum result, opinions are split and not helped by an unknown future trading regime.

YFC members have highlighted key points for consideration within a new agricultural policy: clearly identified purpose; clarity; simplicity; practical regulation; integration of research and development; education for all; CPD, training and skills and availability of a future workforce.

Therefore our response to Defra’s suggested ideas for simplification of the current CAP are as follows:

• develop further simplified packages with clear aims
• only extend an online offer if it is user-friendly, fit-for-purpose and works efficiently to achieve its stated aims and objectives
• create parity and an equal/level playing field for active farmers.

Ideas for improving the current countryside stewardship scheme and its uptake include:

• first, clarify the aims and outcomes of the scheme
• make the application process relevant, simple, clear and easily achievable by an active farmer
• define the public goods benefit and the business benefit to clarify the aims and objectives of the scheme
• determine the balance between food production, environmental enhancement and appropriate financial incentive for adoption - ensure that payment competes with crop gross margin
• schemes should be farmer-led (development and advice) with options for collaboration for all sized cluster groups
• develop a scheme that is more ‘ELS’ than ‘CS’, accessible and workable – re-mapping has distorted the scheme
• use systems that worked well (ELS and CFE) as a base to develop
• recognise other routes of capturing environmental good
• recognise flooding prevention as a necessity for inclusion
• clarify the timescale of existing schemes during the transition period
• clarify the need for us all to contribute to environmental goods – ie a public goods service.
YFC suggestions have included:

- invest and enhance the scheme ensuring clear objectives, marketing and accessibility, with meaningful rewards for providing a public good whilst producing food
- a tiered system or pay-as-you-go scheme
- understand the different soil types/sectors within regions before making a blanket ‘one-size fits-all’ policy
- narrative of farming, food production and the environment is all part of the British brand (incorporating high standards of animal welfare/environment)
- a more streamlined approach for agri-environment schemes/farm assurance
- maintaining livestock on moorland is important to ensure optimum environment
- be aware of the dilemma of productivity vs environment.

**What is the best way of applying reductions to Direct Payments?**

Our considered opinion is to apply a different cap or reduction system to the suggested list of responses. For example, smaller reduction percentages affecting a larger number of active farmers to help all prepare for phasing out of subsidies and transitioning to a new regime. We also propose recognition of change management, future business culture and supply chain training workshops.

We question how this would affect the relatively new Young Farmer Payment scheme and that young farmers who enter into the current Young Farmer Payment scheme should be paid for the full 5 years of that scheme past 2019.

**What conditions should be attached to Direct Payments during the ‘agricultural transition’?**

a) Retain and simplify the current requirements by removing all of the greening rules
b) Retain and simplify cross compliance rules and their enforcement
c) Make payments to current recipients, who are allowed to leave the land, using the payment to help them do so
d) Other -

To answer this question accurately, we request clarity for the aims and objectives of the direct payment system during the transition period. Payments mean different things to different farmers, therefore a ‘one-size-fits-all’ isn’t necessarily appropriate. The suggested responses will deliver different outcomes which can be weighted with equal importance depending on a farmer’s position and short-term or long-term gain for the farmer, business and environment.

Clarifications include:

i) Option C might incentivise a struggling tenant farmer to leave the land, but we question if the payment would be adequate to enable him/her to do so. We also question who would
benefit from the result of vacating the land – landlord, new entrant or existing farming business? The conditions and future benefits of such a proposal would need detail and clarity.

ii   Can environmental schemes be drawn out of current direct payments ie remove greening from BPS and replace with a scheme decoupled from current and transitional BPS? This is a suggestion for introducing a basic, but enhanced countryside stewardship scheme.

iii   confirm if the aims of the question are as follows:
   • driving competitiveness
   • productivity
   • maintaining heritage/rural skills/enhancing environment and countryside?

iv  it is vital not to continue or provide a scheme or policy that could be open to abuse of the aims and objectives of the system

v   it is vital to negate unintended consequences of a new policy but ensure that a new system will help to deliver the agreed intended aims and objectives.

Factors that should drive the profile for reducing Direct Payments during the ‘agricultural transition’ are as follows:

• ensure efficient/safe food production and availability
• maintain current high animal welfare and environmental standards
• highlight the essential part that farmers and landowners play in maintaining the British countryside, producing food and public engagement

We consider that a maximum length should be considered for the agricultural transition period to ensure adequate time for consideration of future policy detail, and more clarity regarding future trade deals for business planning. Whilst young farmers have suggestions for future schemes within a new policy - and have not received the same level of benefits from the current regime - the need for industry stability is recognised to ensure an environment for future success. However, the development and introduction of forward-thinking, beneficial schemes to encourage productivity and environmental enhancement can run in tandem with such a transition period.

A successful future for farming

All points included below have relevance to the question of how we can improve the take-up of knowledge and advice by farmers and land managers, but in different ways to different farmers and land managers:

• encouraging benchmarking and farmer-to-farmer learning
• working with industry to improve standards and co-ordination
• long-term collaboration
• research should be judged on uptake and impact
• a profitable industry
• better access to skills providers and resources and developing formal incentives to encourage training and career development.

Our rationale is as follows:
• whilst CPD is important, attaching conditions to future grants and loans could negate some sensible business investment (investment that would enhance productivity) with unachievable CPD conditions; therefore we suggest that the two offers are separate
• reform the education system to ensure relevant information is part of the curriculum (all higher education course material should be fit-for-purpose with a strategy for deliverable outcomes)
• provision of effective, affordable training offered by trusted and competent trainers
• provision of an effective system to collate CPD and training requirements (reference to plans for AGRI Progress)
• available labour to enable farmers and land managers to attend training
• farmer to farmer learning from acknowledged opinion formers
• recognition of risk takers, pioneers and leaders in innovation
• include training incentives in future schemes.

The main barriers to new capital investment for boosting profitability and improving animal and plant health on-farm include:
b) uncertainty about the future and where to target new investment
g) other -
• profitability of farming
• awareness and accessibility of training, grants, information
• the marketing of information is key and the offer of blended learning
• sourcing ‘qualified’ temporary staff for managers of a sole business
• cost of regulation, labour and planning

Our following suggestions for the most effective ways to support new entrants and encourage more young people into a career in farming and land management range from education and career information to practical schemes for existing farmers:
• buildings allowance and incentives
• tax breaks for investment
• small grant scheme was effective
• re-introduce capital grant schemes – applications to be accompanied by a business plan
• re-introduce drainage schemes
• education and raising the profile of farmers
• financial loans - similar to student loans - for investing in farm business. The difficulties for young people to establish themselves include acquisition of land, affordable housing, planning regulation
• simplified agri-environment schemes – provision of more effectively-funded and designed schemes to improved uptake and results
• ‘help-to-buy’ scheme (for land)
• more promotion of high welfare production standards to consumers
• more promotion of integration through the supply chain
• more work on farm apprenticeships
• reform BPS and provide parity – all farmers need to be operating on a level playing field
• fairer prices
• encourage a new farming culture: share farming; new business agreements; more dynamic business models and support for an effective, well-funded and managed ‘matching service’ scheme
• a more holistic approach and incentive for support (and public good) of enhancing the countryside and food production
• grading scheme for land within stewardship schemes
• planning regulation and housing systems that result in homes for key rural workers

Does existing tenancy law present barriers to new entrants, productivity and investment?

In answer to the question of whether existing tenancy law presents barriers to new entrants, productivity and investment, we point out that considerable input has already been provided for last year’s Tenancy Reform Industry Group’s (TRIG) recommendation report to government. New entrant considerations included:

• open up and find new ways/business models of accessing land for new entrants such as joint ventures
• government and industry support/financing for the further development of the Land Partnerships Service for provision of an effective service to the farming community to match joint ventures and farming business opportunities. This will benefit not only new entrants but landowners and is a complementary tool for succession
• creation of a business guarantee loan scheme to help new entrants to get started. Not a grant but a loan to be built into business plans and repaid
• clarification and consideration around taxation and APR for those planning to work with new entrants and enter into or help new businesses ventures
• pertinent education and training to ensure business skills for new entrants and young farmers are available and relevant for a future policy
• relevant and accessible knowledge transfer for land owners and land professionals to ensure optimum land use and agreement options are offered.

Agricultural technology and research

From the options below offered for considerations for research topics that industry and government should focus on to drive improvements, we have suggested that we need to maintain our high animal welfare and environmental standards and ensure that future trade agreements do not tarnish this position or jeopardise future trade agreements.

a) Plant and animal breeding and genetics
b) Crop and livestock health and animal welfare  
c) Data driven smart and precision agriculture  
d) Managing resources sustainably, including agro-chemicals  
e) Improving environmental performance, including soil health  
f) Safety and trust in the supply chain  

From an industry perspective, options a, b and f are interlinked and are considered important to maintain and enhance. However, there must of course be viable businesses to optimise technology and research.  

From a government perspective c, d and e are considered to be main drivers, but also interlinked with option f (which includes future work and power for the Groceries Code Adjudicator) to ensure fairness, sustainability and trust in the supply chain.)  

We ask for clarification of the definition of point e)  

How can industry and government put farmers in the driving seat to ensure that agricultural R&D delivers what they need? Our three options are listed by order of importance:  

b) Bringing groups of farms together in research syndicates to deliver practical solutions  
d) Giving the farming industry a greater say in setting the strategic direction for research funding  

E) Other  
• provision of a fund/system for research ideas from farmers  
• a better co-ordinated system to determine future research projects  
• collaborative approach model.  

What are the main barriers to adopting new technology and ideas on-farm, and how can we overcome them?  

• policy/trade agreement uncertainty  
• support for ‘risk-taking’ and ‘early adopters’ and actively encouraging innovation/trials  
• more information and training regarding the benefits of producer groups  
• finance  
• time  
• market price volatility  
• former legislative changes – will this be the same under a new domestic policy?  
• clear future policy.
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Labour: a skilled workforce

Our considerations of priority skills gaps across UK agriculture are as follows:

- physical fitness, common sense, appropriate work ethic as well as appropriate skills and training relevant to a particular sector or business. Skilled operatives with knowledge of the industry from livestock management to machinery operators. An holistic understanding of the diverse demands of the agriculture and horticulture industries.
- operational business skills (understanding customers, market research and innovation)
- business administration skills (legal and financial aspect of business operations) and technical skills.

What can industry do to help make agriculture and land management a great career choice?

- include food and farming as a core subject within education. Education at the earliest point possible demonstrating that agriculture is a vibrant, varied, healthy and interesting career (contributing to public good) and has wide-reaching and varied career options.
- gain collaborative traction within industry regarding awareness of careers and signposting (within Agri-Progress plans). The plans for Agri-Progress are progressive and needed, but any new scheme must be sufficiently resourced to be effective.
- pilot national schemes should be adequately resourced both financially and with adequate personnel to ensure recognition and effectiveness.

How can government support industry to build the resilience of the agricultural sector to meet labour demand?

Government must enable those who pay the apprenticeship levy access to suitable apprenticeship schemes that are actually applicable to sector. Government must also address the serious issues in production horticulture regarding seasonal and temporary labour. This would be easily resolved with a short-term workers scheme for workers outside the EU.

A high percentage of respondents from the NFYFC Brexit survey stated they aimed to employ people for their future businesses, but nearly half thought they would have difficulties.

2 Implementing a new agricultural policy in England

Public money for public goods

NFYFC reiterates that food production is of paramount importance, with respect for the environment and public enjoyment of the countryside. Reasonable public access should not impair food production or environmental enhancement. As already suggested, the clarity and priority of objectives for a future policy are essential. It is important to balance the emphasis on the various public goods; that payments provide a fair reward for lost business income and for us to see more detail on how the measures suggested to achieve them will work in practice.
Food production comes first with sufficient support to incorporate environmental enhancement and climate change considerations. UK food production, incorporating rural employment, stewardship of the countryside and food security, contribute to public goods. This public good must be supported by promotion of associated careers available within the range of land-based sectors that support the environment. Public access should also be supported by helpful information to enhance understanding, education and respect for the countryside and its purpose.

Enhancing our environment and fulfilling our responsibility to animals

NFYFC agrees that the current environmental and animal and plant health and animal welfare standards are key components for a future policy. A higher percentage of members chose to maintain current animal welfare and environmental standards than to enhance them. The reasons provided by respondents for their choices were market oriented; maintaining consumer confidence and protecting the industry’s reputation from the actions of any irresponsible or accidental incidents. However, there was also some frustration that environmental regulations did not always seem to be fit for purpose.

Supporting rural communities and remote farming

We consider the three most important issues to support farming, land management and rural communities in the uplands are broadband coverage and affordable housing. Support for mental health services has also been highlighted. Issues of importance to a rural and farming community are highlighted within the NFYFC AGRI manifesto points. Suggestions for government to address the challenges faced by rural communities and businesses post-EU Exit include:

- need for upland environment scheme and support
- effective planning regulation and broadband implementation
- need to understand the co-dependence of industries ie farming/tourism, key workers/housing, health and nutrition/farming/tourism, education/housing/broadband coverage/business/transport. Businesses can be run remotely but are dependent on connection.
  Established rural businesses contribute to an influx of inhabitants using local services, proving an input to the rural economy, creating provision of job and career opportunities.

Support should deliver the following benefits: tourism, well-being, health, employment, sustainability, food production, habitat support, biodiversity, environmental enhancement, all of which contribute to public good and sustainable rural communities.

For an effective rural economy and growth:

- farming should be maintained
- there should be increased diversification opportunities
• an upland environment scheme
• improve planning obstacles
• instigate a help-to-buy scheme (for land as well as houses)

Changing regulatory culture

Views have ranged from the need for a crisis reserve to be implemented if subsidies are removed - highlighting to the public the precarious nature of food production and need for support needed in case of major weather and disease incidents - to a fair price being paid for the food produced.

Climate change mitigation is a subject for continued research, but not specific only to agriculture. Soil health is an obvious necessity for food production and our environmental record and policies have already contributed to biodiversity and improved water quality. It is necessary to reiterate the importance of productivity within food production and the balancing act between this and enhancing natural resources.

Improved productivity and competitiveness, protection of crops, tree, plant and bee health and preserving rural resilience, traditional farming and landscapes in the uplands are of the utmost importance and carry equal weighting for public good.

Outcomes would be best achieved by incentivising action across a number of farms or other land parcels in a future environmental land management system.

We consider that a suite of options to suit different regional and soil types would help to incentivise action. These would include outcomes from the following themes:
• flood mitigation and cultural heritage option (due to our land make-up)
• soils, woodlands and forestry options

What role should outcome based payments have in a new environmental land management system? How can farmers and land managers work together or with third parties to deliver environmental outcomes?

The reasons provided by young farmers for their choices regarding maintaining good environmental standards were market oriented; maintaining consumer confidence in environmental standards and outcomes. There was also some frustration that environmental regulations did not always seem to be fit for purpose. Suggestions include: a more streamlined approach for agri-environment schemes and farm assurance; a tiered system or pay as you go to attract and then enhance the service. As previously highlighted, there should be regional considerations, in particular, special consideration for uplands to ensure parity between sustainable farming practice that significantly contributes to areas of outstanding beauty.

A new approach to a environmental land management system that balances national and local priorities for environmental outcomes could include regional based policies collaboratively
designed and delivered with agreed targets, outcomes and necessary support, advice and possibly training. Suggestions also include:

- a more streamlined approach for agri-environment schemes and farm assurance
- a tiered system or pay as you go for agri-environment schemes
- payment to be made on a quarterly or monthly basis to help cash flow and establish trust between agencies and recipients
- a clear understanding of the different soil types, regional geographic and sector differences before designing a new scheme
- introduction of food and farming as a core subject
- consideration for uplands and less favoured areas.

**Suggestions for farmers and land managers to work together or with third parties to deliver environmental outcomes include the following:**

- change the penalty system and create a scheme with advisory conditions with a time frame for completion, similar to those for farm assurance or your car MOT. Letters to be sent first, with the final action being a fine.
- payments or incentives for roadside hedgerow and tree-planting.
- support for tree planting especially those species of trees in decline.
- making fields ‘square’ then take an overall % of the farm left for wildlife/environmental enhancement. Field corners instead of 3/4m grass strips which are challenging. Farmers are already doing this in some cases, but if not a grass strip they are not being rewarded for it.
- capitalise on the collective skills and knowledge of farmers regarding an understanding of managing the countryside.
- make the documents simpler so farmers can complete without having to outsource.
- improve the inspection system - if farmers are already demonstrating environmental work under farm assurance, there could be practical integration of systems to negate duplication of inspections and enhance knowledge transfer.
- offer an incentive for land owners/farmers for the upkeep of public footpaths.
- incentives for improving soil quality:
  - min-till farming method only works on certain farms/soil types and farmers should be able to farm the land as they wish.
  - support for the cost of min-till machinery.
- enable farms to improve their soil quality by improved drainage.
  - most farms are working with old drainage systems and the cost of new drainage is high, not only for hiring construction companies to lay new drains but also having to take the field out of production for 8-12 months whilst work takes place.
  - support for drainage is crucial.
  - incentivise a market for the long-term regarding soil quality and organic matter.
NFYFC reiterates support for maintaining animal welfare standards as a public good for ensuring its part in a trusted food supply chain. It considers that government can best support industry to develop an ambitious plan to tackle endemic diseases and drive up animal health standards by removing politics from disease control plans.

Risk management and resilience

Insurance considerations have ranged amongst young farmers who were surveyed. When asked, ‘How do you think that farmers should be prepared for any significant challenges to the industry – ie catastrophic weather events, global downturns in trading, national disease outbreaks - 62% of members surveyed chose that government should establish a ‘crisis reserve’ to support farmers in times of need, but 37% chose that farmers should insure themselves against most types of natural disaster and use market mechanisms (ie forward selling) to guard against trading risks. When asked how they would justify their choice to the public and to farmers, two themes were apparent: food security and farms-as-businesses.

For a crisis reserve, the main arguments focused on food security:
- the need for food with an increasing world and domestic population. We should not be reliant on imports but should safeguard our food industry for the future
- a safe and secure food supply is a public good
- being an island nation outside the EU

Or
- for farmers insuring themselves and using market mechanisms to guard against trading risks, the main arguments focused around the awareness for farming to be business-focused.

Additional skills, data and tools to help manage volatility could be enhanced by efficient use of existing services already provided. For example, AHDB and industry membership organisations, plus a portal of information (incorporating signposting) for further business analysis and development. A range of current information includes the NFYFC Smart Farming Guide through to AHDB Horizon papers, but information (even within membership/levy organisations) is not always used to maximum benefit for a variety of reasons. Therefore, heighten awareness and collaborate for optimum use of existing organisations and their respective information.

There is a recognised need for a joint industry and government effort to underline the importance of food production, the risks involved and the public benefit of ensuring food security.
Fairness in the supply chain

To improve transparency and relationships across the food supply chain we consider it essential to ensure parity between food producers, processors and retailers. We refer to a recommendation made in NFFC AGRI position paper that the current Groceries Code Adjudicator’s (GCA) remit is welcomed but does not cover the entire supply chain and the recent GCA call for evidence on extension of remit. Correct and transparent labelling and consumer education is needed both for public good and to ensure fairness and transparency in the food chain. Primary producers do not want to be tarnished or treated unfairly by inappropriate action of those involved in the food chain process. We reiterate the importance for the public to have a trusted and valued supply chain providing safe, quality food.

Suggestions for improving transparency and relationships across the food supply chain include understanding the supply chain and supply chain training. Our suggestions for barriers to collaboration amongst farmers include:

- existing business/farming culture – in some cases not ‘natural’ collaborators and slow to change/adopt a new business model
- lack of collaborative business knowledge
- a need for more case studies, workshops and training
- improved communication and marketing.

Suggested benefits that collaboration between farmers and other parts of the supply chain and government help to enable includes:

- future farming – thinking about contracts
- understanding your sector supply chain
- how you and your business profitability fit into the supply chain
- awareness of routes to market
- interrogation of reasons for being in business
- customer intimacy
- product innovation
- breaking convention - what can you do differently?
- better understanding of business opportunities
- benchmarking
- power to negotiate
- increased profits
- employment opportunities.

Facilitation and training provided or incentivised by government would be beneficial.
Answering the question posed about protecting and promoting our brand, remaining global leaders in environmental protection, food safety, and in standards of production and animal welfare, we refer to objectives within April 2018’s joint EU Code of Conduct on sharing of agricultural data' from the EU agri-food chain. The objective of which is to create a framework of cooperation among agri-food chain operators to make the best use of much-needed data in a constantly digitising farming sector. We understand and support that precision farming will play a key role in future farming and in addressing climate change issues.

Considerations for a domestic system include:

- data security
- known data sharing
- robust systems

Promoting our brand

In answer to the question of how best to protect and promote our brand, we refer to key points within the EFSA Strategy 2020 Trusted science for safe food:

- identify pertinent scientific advice and make this available
- communicate on risks to the public, and deliver a coherent, trusted food safety system in the UK
- protect the public from health risks in the food chain
- create a forward-looking policy that has the tools and the culture to address new and complex risks
- ensure that there is confidence in the quality and relevance of new policies
- acknowledge public expectations of greater transparency and engagement and the impact of globalisation
- closer cooperation with stakeholders, and international partners whilst guarding our independence
- widen our evidence base and optimise access to data
- build the UK’s scientific assessment capacity and knowledge community
- prepare for future risk assessment challenges.

3 The framework for our the new policy

Whilst the NFYFC membership is not wholly made up of farmers, the majority enjoy living or working in a rural environment. We acknowledge the thoughts on the principles of a proposed UK framework, devolution and Agricultural Bill, and the principle to put in place a common UK framework for a future policy. We look forward to hearing further detail for this framework.
NFYFC also recognises and has outlined that there is a tension in Defra’s desire to maintain and enhance environmental and welfare standards while reducing support to farmers, alongside a trade policy that promotes lower prices for consumers. Food producers recognise that we will compete with farmers around the world who will be receiving support and all farmers need a level playing field.

The membership acknowledges the positive contribution our active farmers and land managers contribute to food production, the environment and sustainable rural communities and the recognition needed for provision of public goods.

NFYFC Agriculture and Rural Issues Steering Group (AGRI)
2 May 2018

\[1\] Considerations for a Future British Agricultural Policy, NFYFC 2016
\[2\] NFYFC Considerations for a future British Agricultural Policy 2017
\[3\] NFYFC AGRI Manifesto
\[4\] Groceries Code Adjudicator News from the Adjudicator Edition 15
\[5\] EU Code of Conduct on sharing of agricultural data
\[6\] EFSA Strategy 2020 Trusted science for safe food