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What I've already talked to you about

- The difficulties of getting equitable basic support to First Pillar claimants with common grazings shares (mostly crofters) and what might be done about it

- The worryingly inadequate uptake of Second Pillar agri-environment by common grazings (mostly crofters common grazings) and what might be done about it
Uptake of agri-environment on crofts

• Widely accepted to be important for biodiversity
• SRDP says crofting is a ‘strength’ and it will “address the fact that the average size of farm holdings is small. Crofting also needs to be recognised.”
• Should be monitoring how well we’re doing, BUT…
• Crofts can’t be separately identified in the data
  – CPH number e.g. 79/460/0222 – a croft or not??
  – Holdings with crofts (farm census data)
27 parishes where >80 of SPS+LFASS claimants have common grazings shares

- Contain 67% of all such claimants
- 27 of the 30 parishes with most in absolute terms
- 21 of 61 HIE Fragile parishes
The samples

- ‘Crofting-dominated’ – 3245 claimants of whom at least 2956 (91%) are crofters
- Lewis & Harris - 1279 claimants of whom at least 1209 are crofters
- Shetland – 1046 claimants of whom at least 724 are crofters
- 76 Non-LFA Aberdeenshire parishes – 2192 claimants of whom none are crofters
As a proportion of the Scottish totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;Crofting areas&quot; sample</th>
<th>Non-LFA Aberdeenshire</th>
<th>Lewis &amp; Harris</th>
<th>Shetland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total IACS claimants</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total LMO AE claimants</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total LMO AE spend</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RP AE claimants</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RP AE spend</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total all RDP AE spend</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Walls – one of 6 Shetland parishes with no Rural Priority AE uptake
Sandwick - another Shetland parish with no Rural Priority AE uptake
Stornoway parish – 1.8% Rural Priority AE uptake
Strichen parish – 78% Rural Priority AE uptake
### Strichen, Lewis and South Uist compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strichen</th>
<th>Lewis</th>
<th>S Uist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of inbye</td>
<td>4,322</td>
<td>12,150</td>
<td>15,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IACS claimants</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RP AE spend</td>
<td>£1,973,571</td>
<td>£2,041,234</td>
<td>£2,164,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP AE spend per ha</td>
<td>£457</td>
<td>£168</td>
<td>£142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP AE spend per IACS claimant</td>
<td>£48,136</td>
<td>£1,926</td>
<td>£5,166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Why?***
Recommendations - programming

• Crofting and small units should feature specifically and in a quantified way in all sections of the new RDP, and unlike the present RDP, it should contain clear and robust connections between the ex-ante evaluation, the design of measures and the monitoring plan, including specific crofting-related sub-indicators.

• Crofts should be specifically identified through the farm code in order to facilitate monitoring and evaluation.
Recommendations - advice

• Art.16. At least a doubling of advisory provision in Crofting Counties by a reinforcement of the Advisory Activity 411 mechanism. Advisors should be based preferentially in the areas currently short-staffed and income budgets for the relevant advisory offices should not rise accordingly.

• Art. 16. Serious consideration should be given to whether the balance between general advisory funding, within-scheme funding and subsidised consultancy support is appropriate (and adjustment made where necessary).
Recommendations – agri-environment

• Art 29. Design access mechanisms which enable a significant proportion of HNV crofts and small units to avail themselves of meaningful and relevant AE options

• Art 29. Replacement of the current small unit management prescription with a better measure

• Art 29. Replacement of the current cattle retention prescription with a better measure. The extra costs for reintroductions should be recognised as with the current option.
Recommendations – monitoring and revision

• Ask sensible, relevant questions

• Extract sensible lessons from the answers

• Act on them
The survey covered a wide range of holding sizes and there was no particular size of holding that was significantly more represented than others.
But in the real world, some holding sizes ARE significantly more represented than others!!!!!

Data shows the exact OPPOSITE of what this taxpayer-funded report implies!
- Govt.: Plan and monitor meaningfully

- MSPs and NGOs: Ask questions!