

# CONSULTATION

## Response Document



**Sustainable Farming Scheme  
Llywodraeth Cymru/Welsh Government**

**7th March 2024**

# Introduction to CIEEM

The Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM), as the leading membership organisation supporting professional ecologists and environmental managers in the United Kingdom and Ireland, welcomes the opportunity to comment on this consultation.

CIEEM was established in 1991 and has over 7,000 members drawn from local authorities, government agencies, industry, environmental consultancy, teaching/research, and voluntary environmental organisations. The Chartered Institute has led the way in defining and raising the standards of ecological and environmental management practice with regard to biodiversity protection and enhancement. It promotes knowledge sharing through events and publications, skills development through its comprehensive training and development programme and best practice through the dissemination of technical guidance for the profession and related disciplines.

CIEEM is a member of:

- Scottish Environment Link
- Wildlife and Countryside Link
- Northern Ireland Environment Link
- Wales Environment Link
- Environmental Policy Forum
- IUCN – The World Conservation Union
- Professional Associations Research Network
- Society for the Environment
- UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration 2021-2030 Network
- Greener UK
- Irish Forum on Natural Capital (working group member)
- National Biodiversity Forum (Ireland)
- The Environmental Science Association of Ireland

CIEEM has approximately 483 members in Wales who are drawn from across the private consultancy sector, NGOs, government and SNCOs, local authorities, academia and industry. They are practising ecologists and environmental managers, many of whom regularly provide input to and advice on land management for the benefit of protected species and biodiversity in general.

**This response was coordinated by Members of our [Welsh Policy Group](#).**

We welcome the opportunity to participate in this consultation and we would be happy to provide further information on this topic. Please contact Jason Reeves (CIEEM Head of Policy) at

[JasonReeves@cieem.net](mailto:JasonReeves@cieem.net) with any queries.

## Framework

### 1. The Scheme will provide a long-term approach to support for our agricultural sector to respond to evolving challenges and changing needs, contributing to the Sustainable Land Management objectives. In your view, what may strengthen this support?

We have contributed to, and are in broad agreement with, the Wales Environment Link's (WEL) response to the SFS consultation. In this, our response, we wish to express views on areas that are particularly relevant to our membership of ecologists and environmental managers.

CIEEM supports the SFS in principle because the status quo is not working for the climate<sup>1</sup> or the environment<sup>2</sup>. The impacts from agricultural intensification are well documented and show why a shift in agricultural practice is needed to reverse environmental and biodiversity declines. There is also evidence of public support for strengthened environmental protection as part of the return for public funding<sup>3</sup> <sup>4</sup>. Farmers need to be supported in making that shift, and the SFS is key to providing that financial and professional support.

**Meet the ambitions of the Scheme with adequate funding:** It is a concern that the consultation provides no information on payment rates for Universal Actions, and no indication of what funding will be ring-fenced for the Optional and Collaborative Layers. Though we understand that public funding is under extreme pressure, we share the Nature Friendly Farming Network's (NFFN) concern that the level of funding outlined in the budget for Rural Affairs 2024-25 (~£420 million), does not reflect the level of ambition required to meet Sustainable Land Management (SLM) objectives (estimated at over £500m per annum)<sup>5</sup> <sup>6</sup>.

Long-term support for the agricultural sector is dependent on adequate funding for all layers of the Sustainable Farming Scheme — universal, additional and collaborative. Funding and payment rates should reflect the high value placed on SLM and its benefits to society and the environment, including water conservation and flood management, soil health, biodiversity restoration and enhancement, and carbon emission reductions.

It is important that farmers, not least those who have already shown their commitment to sustainable farming practices, are assured of the financial viability of engagement with the SFS. This is as much to secure the biodiversity gains already achieved through S16 agreements and Glastir, as those of the future.

---

<sup>1</sup> Stats Wales (2023): <https://statswales.gov.wales/Catalogue/Environment-and-Countryside/Greenhouse-Gas/emissionsofgreenhousegases-by-year>

<sup>2</sup> State of Nature Partnership — Wales: <https://stateofnature.org.uk/countries/wales/>

<sup>3</sup> Scottish Government (2019). Citizens' forums, and attitudes to agriculture, environment and rural priorities: research report: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/citizens-forums-attitudes-agriculture-environment-rural-priorities/pages/1>

<sup>4</sup> WWF (2022): <https://www.wwf.org.uk/press-release/rural-wales-want-farmers-be-supported#:~:text=The%20survey%20of%201%2C000%20respondents,that%20farmers%20have%20an%20important>

<sup>5</sup> NFFN Cymru (2024). Sustainable Farming Scheme Key Points: <https://www.nffn.org.uk/assets/nffn-cymru-sfs-key-points-briefing.pdf>

<sup>6</sup> RSPB, the National Trust and The Wildlife Trusts (2023). An assessment of the financial resources needed for environmental land management in the UK: <https://www.wildlifetrusts.org/sites/default/files/2023-06/Finance%20for%20UK%20Environmental%20Land%20Management%2C%20June%202023.pdf>

**Invest in the provision of quality advice and advisors:** Farmers must have access to ecological advice that is professional, objective and evidence-based, from advisors who are competent to deliver the Scheme and its intended outcomes for SLM in Wales.

CIEEM, as the professional body for ecologists and environmental managers, is ideally placed to provide advice and guidance, and support training. Together with Plantlife, we have developed a Farm Environment Advisor Competency Framework<sup>7</sup> with sixteen areas of competency for farm advisors, outlining the standard of knowledge, understanding, and skills, required for the role. While Land Agents and Agricultural Advisors have their role in supporting farmers, they should only advise within their own competencies, and not on ecological matters.

Quality ecological advice is required at all stages of the SFS, including the initial habitat evaluations, in order to ensure that: each farm manages a diverse range of farmland habitats that benefit farm operations and landscape-scale biodiversity; tree-cover and habitats are integrated and managed so as to complement and deliver benefits to farm operations; the outcomes of actions are favourable and ecological benefits are being delivered.

However, there is a skills gap and capacity crisis within the wider ecology industry, and any requirement for ecological advice input to the SFS could create additional strain on resources. There needs to be certainty that sufficient ecologists will be available and prepared to take on the roles required for a SFS to be realised.

**Use high-quality baseline habitat data and evaluations:** Appropriate selection of actions for specific farms, and favourable outcomes for SLM, are dependent upon accurate baseline habitat evaluations. These evaluations, in turn, rely on baseline data that is up-to-date, of the highest quality, and from a variety of sources, including Natural Resources Wales, Local Environmental Record Centres, and the RSPB. The data should also have strategic value, usable at both a landholding and wider landscape-scale context, in order to be fit for “collaborative” scale projects down the line.

Remote sensing data is useful, but it must be cross-checked with ground-truthing. This should be done by a competent professional (see CIEEM's Farm Environment Advisor Competency Framework). We are concerned that the Scheme will be reliant on farmers to correct and add to baseline data from Rural Payments Wales (RPW) which is acknowledged to be incomplete, inaccurate, and out-of-date.

We are of the understanding that Farming Connect does not have the capacity to support all of the applicants to the scheme to make changes to RPW's data. While there may be an inspection regime and sanctions matrix in place, these will be based upon a sample-based approach, and so not all transgressions will be identified and corrected. The impacts of inaccurate baseline evaluations will undermine the long-term contributions to SLM objectives.

---

<sup>7</sup> CIEEM (2021). Farm Environment Advisor Competency Framework: <https://cieem.net/resource/farm-environment-adviser-competency-framework/>

**Establish a properly funded and structured monitoring scheme:** A properly funded and structured monitoring scheme is essential to observing outcomes of management actions over time and to check that habitat improvement is actually occurring. Monitoring is also necessary for creating opportunities to adapt the prescription in the events of unfavourable or unintended consequences; the rigidity of some Glastir prescriptions have led to some less than successful outcomes. Furthermore, independent verification of self-reported data is necessary to ensure both compliance and the delivery of public money for public good. As with the baseline evaluations, monitoring should be undertaken by ecologically competent professionals.

**Outline details of and funding for the optional and collaborative layers:** The optional and collaborative layers have the greatest potential to contribute to nature-positive aims, including restoring nature, reducing carbon emissions and pollution, as well as providing landscape-scale ecological services. Yet, there is very little detail in the consultation on what these crucial layers will entail.

We share WEL's concern that, particularly with the long delay in introducing these more advanced layers of the Scheme, provision for the Universal Layer will leave relatively little of the Scheme's budget for the Optional and Collaborative Layers — see recent announcements about funding of Scotland's scheme<sup>8</sup>. It is important to have clarity on what proportion of the budget will be ringfenced for their implementation in the future as soon as possible.

We are also concerned that payments for delivery of management plans for SSSIs will come under 'Optional Actions', despite preparation of management plans for statutorily protected sites being a requirement in the Universal Layer. As WEL note, having a plan alone is no guarantee of safeguarding or improvement of these sites, and there needs to be clear incentive for carrying out management actions.

**Integration with the DECCA framework:** While the SLM objectives refer to ecosystem resilience, the DECCA (Diversity, Extent, Condition, Connectivity and Aspects) framework for evaluating ecosystem resilience is absent in the consultation document. Any habitat creation, including tree planting, should promote the diversity, extent, connectivity, and condition of the ecosystems that those habitats contribute to. We would therefore like to see greater integration of the SFS with the DECCA framework.

## Universal Actions

2. **There will be Universal requirements in the SFS to have woodland cover at least 10% of suitable land, and to manage a minimum of 10% of your farm for biodiversity.**
  - a. **What are your views on these requirements?**
  - b. **What support might you need to achieve them?**

All suggestions for how to support the achievement of actions and requirements are underpinned by the need for adequate funding of the scheme and provision of high-quality, professional, ecological advice and data.

---

<sup>8</sup> BBC (2024) Scottish farmers win battle over food subsidies: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-68216387>

**Clarify details of these requirements, so as to quell misunderstanding and misinformation:**

There has been strong resistance to the 10% tree cover requirement, in part due to misinformation which has been circulating. Coed Cadw's communications on the subject are a useful resource for dispelling misinformation; they point out that farms are not required to plant 10% of their land, only to bring their existing tree and woodland cover up to 10%, and that, on average, farms in Wales already have 6–7% tree cover<sup>9</sup>.

It is also important to clarify payment rates for farmers as soon as possible in order to address concerns about the financial viability of enrolling in the scheme. In terms of the forthcoming collaborative actions, it would be worth making clear whether the 10% minimum thresholds can be averaged across a group of collaborating farm units, and if so, how payment rates would be calculated.

**Make clear that the requirements are a baseline, not a target:** We are concerned that the 10% criteria may become a target rather than a baseline, so that where a farm unit already has greater than 10% habitat and/or greater than 10% tree cover, there may be an incentive to reduce these habitats to that level.

**Encourage and support integration of trees into farming systems:** There should be flexibility and support for a wide range of different ways of increasing the cover of trees and woody habitats. Natural regeneration of trees, for example, should be encouraged because the process itself is of value to a great number of species, it is often more resilient and cost-effective, particularly in upland and difficult-to-reach locations. Natural regeneration would also still contribute to 10% habitat minimum requirement, until such time as the resulting trees were mature and dominant enough to meet the minimum tree cover requirements. Despite the benefits, the language in the consultation document appears to discourage allowing natural successional regeneration by saying, under UA13 'Create new woodland and agro-forestry', that it is slower and the contribution to 10% tree cover will be minimal until trees have developed. Professional ecological advice can support farmers to meet the requirements in a way that both benefits farm operations and maximises biodiversity gains.

**Choice of habitat and locations should be informed by the requirements of protected species in the area:** In relation to the 10% habitat requirement, the choice of habitat type and locations should be informed by requirements of protected species in the area. For example, habitat creation should contribute to the favourable conservation status of European protected species. We reiterate the need to consult a range of data, including that of Local Environmental Record Centres.

**Encourage retention of semi-natural habitats over creation of temporary:** We are concerned that existing semi-natural habitats could be removed in favour of the temporary habitat features on improved land, which would qualify under UA8. Where a farm unit does not currently support 10% habitat, it appears that applicants are encouraged to create temporary habitat on improved land, rather than to create or manage permanent, quality habitat ('Scheme Rule', p30). There may be situations where creating temporary habitat features is the more appropriate approach, but equal consideration should be given to creating permanent habitat features.

---

<sup>9</sup> Coed Cadw (2024). Fair and flexible approach could meet the tree cover requirement for welsh farms: <https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/press-centre/2024/02/welsh-farm-tree-cover-requirement/>

While tree planting is an important component of efforts to tackle the twin crises of climate change and biodiversity loss, it is not a panacea, as detailed in our position statement on habitat creation and restoration for tackling the climate emergency<sup>10</sup>. The wide range of semi-natural habitats — including, salt marshes and mudflats; rivers and wetlands such as floodplains, ponds and lakes; and open habitats including heathland, species-rich grasslands, blanket bogs, raised bogs and fens — provide many opportunities for Nature-based Solutions, including substantial greenhouse gas absorption and storage, as well as biodiversity gains. We therefore emphasise the need to communicate and enforce the EIA (Uncultivated Land and Semi-Natural Areas) (Wales) Regulations 2002.

**Encourage creation and maintenance of a diversity of habitats:** The consultation refers to discrete units such as fields of habitat, trees & woodland, hedgerows, etc.; but ephemeral, ruderal, marginal and ecotone habitats can be equally important in the habitat matrix. We are concerned that such habitats, which may be important for a range of species such as reptiles for example, may be seen as of ‘lower’ value, and therefore targeted for tree planting or habitat ‘improvement’. Professional, on-the-ground, ecological advice can ensure that each farm manages and benefits from a diverse range of farmland habitats.

**Deliver detail on habitat maintenance requirements:** There is a lack of information on habitat maintenance requirements for all but semi-natural dry grassland, hedgerow, and woodland in the consultation. Information on habitat maintenance, when it is provided, should be informed by experienced professionals and objective evidence.

There should be opportunities to adjust management prescriptions if, for any reason, a standard prescription is not working. A structured monitoring scheme is essential to identifying, in a timely manner, when and where an alternative approach to habitat and maintenance is required.

- 3. Aside from the 10% woodland and habitat requirements, will the Universal Actions:**
  - a. Provide benefit for your farm business?**
  - b. Provide an achievable set of actions paid for through the Universal Baseline Payment?**

**Support farmers to safeguard protected sites (SSSIs):** We welcome the requirement to create management plans for SSSIs under the Universal Layer. However, with delivery of plans relegated to the Optional Layer for which we are waiting on details of funding and payment rates, the incentive to safeguard and improve these sites, beyond preparation of a management plan, is not apparent. Existence of a management plan alone does not guarantee the safeguarding of SSSIs. We share the NFFN's concern that farmers who manage SSSIs should not be left in financial uncertainty by the decision to delay delivery of the Optional and Collaborative Layers until 2026.

We echo WEL's call for in-person site visits and specialist input to produce updated assessments on SSSI condition and drivers; this is essential to supporting farmers in developing management plans and prioritising actions. The implementation of management plans should be followed by regular monitoring and reporting to guide long-term management.

---

<sup>10</sup> CIEEM (2021): <https://cieem.net/resource/position-statement-on-habitat-creation-and-restoration-for-tackling-the-climate-emergency/>

**Need for greater incentives to tackle existing and future INNS:** While the management and control of Invasive Non-native Species (INNS) is primarily cited as being under consideration as a cross-compliance issue with existing regulations, a greater incentive to tackle existing priority INNS and prevent future problems would come from including it in the Universal Actions. Perhaps UA17 could be expanded to include threats to biodiversity from INNS, as well as agricultural biosecurity.

**Continuous Personal Development for farmers is welcome, but not a substitute for provision of expert advice:** While we welcome CPD, particularly opportunities for farmers to learn face-to-face, including on demonstration sites, we agree with WEL that this is not a substitute for expert ecological input. Farmers should be encouraged to work alongside ecologists to raise awareness and mutual understanding, and should be supported on their farms by competent Farm Environment Advisors.

- 4. On-farm data reporting allows the Welsh Government to confirm actions are being undertaken and help you to make decisions about your farm. In your view, is the reporting requirement for the Universal Actions appropriate?**

**Reporting is necessary to meet the basic principle of public money for public goods:** Taxpayers must see that the SFS delivers value for money in terms of tangible benefits for the environment, and other industries and activities which also rely on a healthy environment. Payments under the SFS must not sustain the status quo; farmers should be paid to deliver Natural Capital benefits (i.e. public goods) for everyone to benefit from. We note that the economic assessment of SFS makes no reference to the Natural Capital benefits it will deliver, though we also recognise that there are challenges to integrating this into the SFS<sup>11</sup>.

Again, a properly funded and structured monitoring scheme, building on a quality habitat baseline assessment, and administered by ecologically competent professionals, is needed to ensure compliance and delivery of public goods for public money; please see our answers to Q1 and Q16.

- 5. The Stability Payment will provide additional support during the Transition Period. In your view, is this appropriate whilst the Optional and Collaborative Actions are being introduced?**

## **Scheme Operation**

- 6. We have proposed that applicants should have sole management responsibility for the land for 10 months and ensure completion of the Universal Actions for the full scheme year (12 months). In your view, is the 10-month period sufficient?**
- 7. We are proposing the use of a single carbon calculator for everyone in the Scheme. Do you agree and how might we best support you to complete this?**

Our understanding is that carbon calculators are to be used to observe change in carbon emissions over time within farms, and to aggregate the results nationally, rather than compare different farms.

---

<sup>11</sup> Environment and Rural Affairs Monitoring & Modelling Programme (ERAMMP): [https://erammp.wales/sites/default/files/2023-12/ERAMMP%20Report-102%20NC%20Rates%20v1.0.0\\_0.pdf](https://erammp.wales/sites/default/files/2023-12/ERAMMP%20Report-102%20NC%20Rates%20v1.0.0_0.pdf)



As NFFN<sup>12</sup> observe, a farm's performance will depend on how the carbon footprint is measured: more intensive and efficient farm units are likely to fare better using CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent per kg of farm output; whereas, more extensive farms, with trees and carbon sequestering soils, are likely to perform better with CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent per ha of farm.

While carbon calculators can be useful, it may not be realistic or appropriate for the Welsh Government to impose a single carbon calculator for all farms.

**8. To ensure continued high standards on our farms, we have outlined a proportionate approach to controls and sanctions, including compliance with additional legislation as a condition of Scheme payment. Do you have any views on this approach?**

Recipients of payments from the Scheme must be compliant with existing farming regulations, but their actions should also go beyond these to provide public value for money. Dependable cross-compliance with a broad range of existing laws and regulations, including public rights of way (from a public health and countryside enjoyment perspective), should underpin payments, along with good professional advice, robust monitoring and enforcement.

**9. Adopting the Welsh Government appeals process will provide an effective and efficient mechanism. Is there any reason we should deviate from this?**

### **Payment Methodology**

**10. We would like to know your views on the proposed approach to: a) the SFS universal baseline payment; b) the SFS stability payment**

### **Transition Period**

**11. Farmers outside the Scheme may wish to access support for actions similar to those offered in the Optional and Collaborative Layers. In your view, should farmers within the Scheme receive priority support to undertake these actions?**

**12. What actions and support within the Optional and Collaborative layers do you believe should be prioritised?**

We refer to WEL's response in answer to this question.

### **Basic Payment Scheme**

**13. Do you agree with the proposed changes to BPS from 2025?**

### **Regulations**

**14. We would like to know your views on our proposed approach to secondary legislation, which will support BPS and the introduction of support schemes under the powers in the Agriculture (Wales) Act 2023.**

We agree with WEL on the need for the scheme to be effectively monitored and enforced, and that both farmers and environmental stakeholders need to understand how non-compliance will be managed within the Scheme. We would welcome the opportunity to comment on proposals for further legislation, including on regulation.

---

<sup>12</sup> NFFN Cymru (2024). Sustainable Farming Scheme Key Points. Available at <https://www.nffn.org.uk/assets/nffn-cymru-sfs-key-points-briefing.pdf>

## Evidence

### **15. Economic analysis and modelling will conclude in 2024 and will provide evidence to inform the final decision on Scheme implementation by Welsh Ministers. We would like to know your views on the existing analysis and evidence required.**

It was hoped that the SFS would be a mechanism for payment for ecosystem services/Natural Capital/public goods. The SLM outcomes on page 14 represent these ecosystem services or 'public goods', but no payment rates for these are available as they are yet to be determined. While we recognise there are challenges integrating this into the SFS, it is a concern that the economic assessment of SFS makes no reference to the Natural Capital benefits it will deliver.

The potential for growth in green jobs and the benefits this can have on the rural economy should not be overlooked, and further analysis is needed. The current gap in expert ecological capacity is a constraint to the SFS that needs to be addressed both within the current Farming Connect framework and from within the farming sector itself. This challenge also represents an opportunity for the creation of thousands of jobs<sup>13</sup>, including in roles vital to the SFS, such as Farm Environment Advisor, for which CIEEM has developed a competency framework.

## Monitoring & Evaluation

### **16. We would like to know your views on which information and evidence should be used to monitor and evaluate the Scheme.**

As detailed in our answer to Q1, we consider the following to be essential to effective monitoring and evaluation of the Scheme:

- high quality baseline habitat assessment, based on quality data from a range of source;
- provision of quality advice and advisors, including for farmers making additions and corrections to the baseline data, as well as subsequent on-farm monitoring and reporting, with independent verification of self-reported data;
- a properly funded and structured monitoring scheme.

With regards to indicators for the success of the scheme, it seems appropriate that, as WEL have suggested, these be consistent with emerging biodiversity targets. Performance indicators should be expressed in practical, accessible terms, and established at the start of any habitat management regime.

Monitoring should also allow for opportunities to make minor adaptations to the prescription, agreed between the farmer and a Welsh Government appointed ecological advisor, in the event of unfavourable or unintended consequences.

## Other

---

<sup>13</sup> RSPB (2020). Developing a Green Workforce in Wales Estimating the Scale of the Need and Opportunity: <https://www.natureservice.wales/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/RSPBCymruEstimatingtheScaleReportNovember2020ENG1.pdf>

**17. What, in your opinion, would be the likely effects of the SFS on the Welsh language?**

**We are particularly interested in any likely effects on opportunities to use the Welsh language and on not treating the Welsh language less favourably than English. Do you think that there are opportunities to promote any positive effects? Do you think that there are opportunities to mitigate any adverse effects?**

**18. In your opinion, could the SFS be formulated or changed so as to: have positive effects or more positive effects on using the Welsh language and on not treating the Welsh language less favourably than English; or mitigate any negative effects on using the Welsh language and on not treating the Welsh language less favourably than English?**

CIEEM members fully support and apply the requirements of the Welsh Language Standards, under both the Act (1993) and Measure (2011). Language should not be a barrier to the sharing of knowledge and expertise within Wales; it is important to communicate with SFS participants in their first, or preferred, language, which means building the capacity to field competent Welsh language ecologists to advise farmers.

**19. Do you have any additional comments on any aspect of the consultation document?**

**On supplying ecological expertise to farmers:** Although we welcome Farming Connect's role in supplying advice to farmers, we consider that it lacks the ecological expertise needed to support farmers in making evaluations of habitat on their land.

Independent ecologists and those employed in small and medium-sized enterprises (SME) should be supported to offer their expertise both through Farming Connect and directly to farmers.

In addition to re-designing Farming Connect's service around SLM objectives, filling gaps in ecological expertise and advice in the process, we suggest having a platform for third-party providers of advice that works well (consider the well-known failures of Sell-to-Wales ITT), and is accessible to SME consultancies. Several bodies, including the Farming & Wildlife Advisory Group (FWAG), are already recruiting ecologists.

Provision of advice should be seen as an investment in, rather than a cost of, the SFS; otherwise there is a risk that lack of support will become a barrier to farmers' engagement; see Annex 1 of the ICF report on Sustainable Farming Scheme Co-design<sup>14</sup>, which offers useful insights into farmers' willingness to participate in the SFS along with motivations, barriers, and enablers.

**On filling the ecological skills gap:** In addition to providing ecological advice, guidance, and training, CIEEM is well-positioned to comment on addressing the ecological and nature-based green jobs skill shortage, having worked on several major initiatives to address skills shortages. This include CIEEM and Lantra commissioned research into vocational pathways into nature-based green jobs<sup>15</sup> which, among other things, found that the sector is looking for leadership from Governments to develop and fund a comprehensive sector-wide plan or 'workforce strategy' to address the skills and capacity challenges in the ecology profession.

---

<sup>14</sup> ICF (2023). Sustainable Farming Scheme Co-design: <https://www.gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2023-07/sustainable-farming-scheme-co-design-final-report.pdf>

<sup>15</sup> CIEEM (2023). Opening Up Vocational Pathways Into Nature-based Green Jobs: <https://cieem.net/resource/opening-up-vocational-pathways-into-nature-based-green-jobs/>

Farms in the SFS will need individual advice, as there is no one-size-fits-all approach to providing advice. As a professional institute, CIEEM's main concern is that this advice is given by suitably qualified and experienced ecologists. We are keen to work with the Welsh Government to discuss these skills requirements in more detail.

The Green Jobs for Nature Website<sup>16</sup> was developed by CIEEM, in partnership with many organisations. It is a key tool for highlighting what a green job for nature is, how to get one, and the range of employment opportunities. There are over 130 role profiles from people working in the profession, highlighting what their job involves and their route into the profession. We have featured the job profiles of ecologically-trained land managers who work with farmers<sup>17</sup>, and would be keen to further raise the profile and awareness of these roles which are essential to the success of the SFS.

---

<sup>16</sup> <https://greenjobsfornature.org/>

<sup>17</sup> <https://greenjobsfornature.org/job-profiles/caroline-corsie/>