

STATES OF JERSEY



RURAL ECONOMY STRATEGY 2011 – 2015 (S.R.11/2010): RESPONSE OF THE MINISTER FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

**Presented to the States on 25th November 2010
by the Minister for Economic Development**

STATES GREFFE

**RURAL ECONOMY STRATEGY 2011 – 2015 (S.R.11/2010):
RESPONSE OF THE MINISTER FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

Ministerial Response: S.R.11/2010

Ministerial response required by Minister for Economic Development and Minister for Planning and Environment

Review title: Rural Economy Strategy 2011 – 2015

Scrutiny Panel: Rural Economy Strategy Sub-Panel

Introduction

The Rural Economy Strategy Sub-Panel report is a fair and well-balanced document. The fact that the report is supportive of many of the policy proposals as set out in the Rural Economy Strategy 2011 – 2015 is welcomed. In addition, the role that the Sub-Panel has played as a ‘critical friend’ has led to a list of sensible recommendations, which with the exception of one, can be agreed and which will undoubtedly add positively to the strategy.

It is to the credit of the Sub-Panel that the review was conducted in a thorough and thoughtful way, with the input of a well-respected external adviser from the Royal Agricultural College providing a useful external perspective. The fact that the Chairman of the Sub-Panel was familiar with agriculture no doubt helped ensure key issues were properly addressed, although the Sub-Panel as a whole had a range of expertise that allowed an appropriate consideration of the ‘triple bottom line’ of people, profit and environment, as proposed in the strategy.

Findings

	Findings	Comments
1	There was inadequate review/evaluation by the Rural Economy Section of the performance against the ‘measures of progress’ of the Rural Economy Strategy 2006 – 2010.	An interim report on progress against measures outlined within the Rural Economy Strategy (RES) 2006 – 2010 was provided by the Rural Economy section to the RES Sub-Panel in May 2010. The report covered and reported on all measures from 2006 up until May 2010. The introduction to the report noted that it was an interim report, due to the fact that the strategy was ongoing and would not be fully completed until 31st December 2010. A further final analysis of the success measures associated with RES 2006 – 2010 will be undertaken and published in 2011.
2	The document made available to the Sub-Panel detailing performance against the measures of progress was incomplete. Furthermore, this	The interim report covered and reported on progress against all measures to date. Progress against measures are published and reported annually through the States annual statistics ‘Jersey in Figures’ (e.g. GVA sector analysis) and departmental business plans and annual reports

	Findings	Comments
	information was not made available to the public.	<p>(e.g. number of smallholders and increased access provision), ecological/ environmental measures are not measured annually, but every 5 years as part of the 'State of Jersey' reporting mechanism, which is a public document.</p> <p>Advisory officers liaise with stakeholders on a regular basis, to discuss RES issues in detail, as part of their day-to-day activities. In addition, there is an annual public meeting reporting on grants associated with the Countryside Renewal Scheme (CRS), highlighting progress against RES measures, i.e. the amount of land area in Jersey covered by environmental initiatives.</p> <p>As such, stakeholders will have been aware of key success indicators as set out in the RES 2006 – 2010, i.e. that there was economic growth year on year, that production-led subsidies were withdrawn, that there was development of environmental improvement and rural enterprise activity through provision of the Rural Initiative Scheme (RIS) and the CRS and that this would be ongoing over the 5 year lifetime of the strategy.</p>
3	There are two Ministers with primary political responsibility for the rural economy, the Minister for Economic Development (economic matters) and the Minister for Planning and Environment (environmental aspects). However, it is clear that a significant number of stakeholders feel the agricultural industry and the rural interest lack a political 'champion'.	Noted.
4	The Minister for Economic Development believes that all elected States Members are champions of Jersey's key industries including agriculture.	Correct, as per comments made by the Minister during the Public Hearing, Minister for Economic Development and Assistant Minister for Planning and Environment, 16th June 2010.

	Findings	Comments
5	Although not strictly part of the Rural Economy Strategy Review, issues were identified given the lack of a clear separation between administration and regulation.	Noted.
6	Overall the Rural Economy Section conducted an effective consultation exercise and communicated effectively with the Sub-Panel in support of the Scrutiny process, in development of the Rural Economy Strategy 2011 – 2015.	Agreed.
7	As a result of the way the Draft Rural Economy Strategy 2011 – 2015 was constructed, the marine and fisheries industry was not drawn into the consultation process.	<p>In order to provide some perspective, 7 out of the 63 policy proposals in the RES White Paper were specific to the marine and fisheries industry. As such, the level of consultation is considered as proportionate, with the industry submitting consultation responses either as individuals, or via industry representatives to the 2009 RES review and subsequent Green and White Papers. In addition, industry representatives met with senior officers in July 2010 to discuss relevant policies and wording within the White Paper.</p> <p><u>April 2009 – Review of the Rural Economy Strategy 2006 – 2010</u> All industry stakeholders, including those in receipt of rural economy grants and subsidies, were given the opportunity to feedback on the original 2005 Rural Economy Strategy. The Jersey Fishermen’s Association responded with their comment. Mr. Stephen Luce also responded from both agricultural and aquaculture perspectives.</p> <p><u>March – April 2010 – Green Paper consultation</u> All industry partners and the general public were invited to comment on the Green Paper proposals, via the consult.gov.je portal or in hard copy. Individuals were invited to comment on the issues and options proposed in the Green Paper and to also comment via an accompanying questionnaire. Tony Legg, Secretary of the Jersey Aquaculture Association, submitted a response.</p>

	Findings	Comments
		<p><u>July – September 2010 – White Paper consultation</u></p> <p>All industry partners and the general public were invited to comment on the policies proposed in the White Paper via the consult.gov.je portal or in hard copy. It is minuted that the RES White Paper was brought up for discussion at the 59th meeting of the Fisheries and Marine Resources Advisory Panel on Wednesday 18th August 2010. Mike Taylor responded as Chairman of the Fisheries and Marine Resources Advisory Panel, as did Tony Legg on behalf of the Jersey Aquaculture Association. Representatives from the Jersey Aquaculture Association met with Director of Rural Economy, the Head of Fisheries and Marine Resources and the States Vet to discuss relevant policies and wording within the White Paper at Howard Davis Farm on 29th July 2010.</p>
8	<p>There was limited financial information supplied at Green and Draft White Paper stages, which has made it very difficult for stakeholders to comment with any degree of certainty on the measures proposed.</p>	<p>The Sub-Panel at no time specified their requirements in this area. The level of financial information supplied in the Green Paper was not criticised during the Green Paper consultation. The level of financial information provided was agreed by the Council of Ministers and the Corporate Strategy Group.</p> <p>The Green Paper was a statement of proposed government policy, the principles of which were consulted upon. Once this consultation was completed, firmer policy proposals were developed on the basis of responses to the Green Paper. The subsequent draft White Paper was costed in more detail and further consultation was then undertaken.</p> <p>The level of financial information provided in the White Paper was similar to that provided in the RES 2006 – 2010 which was endorsed by the States, with the addition that key financial movements were highlighted.</p> <p>At the request of the Jersey Farmers' Union (JFU), the Director of Rural Economy met with the JFU to explain, in detail, the proposed budget for the RES 2011 – 2015.</p> <p>The subsequent 5 year budget could only ever be indicative, due to the fact that departmental budgets are debated by the States on an annual basis and that associated CSR proposals were, by necessity, developed prior to the 2011 States business plan and CSR 1 debate.</p>

	Findings	Comments
9	There is continued and mounting pressure to take land out of agricultural production with potentially detrimental consequences for the appearance of the countryside, the economic potential for Jersey agriculture and the degree of food security the Island enjoys.	A balance is required to address the needs of the agricultural industry, of society for housing and amenity, whilst maintaining the environment. Land is not relinquished from agriculture lightly and the Island Plan, along with the Agricultural Land (Control of Sales and Leases) (Jersey) Law 1974, provides protection for agricultural land.
10	There is wide acknowledgment of certain inadequacies of the <i>Agricultural Land (Control of Sales and Leases) (Jersey) Law 1974</i> to the extent that it will be extensively reviewed as part of the Rural Economy Strategy 2011 – 2015.	Agreed. The Agricultural land (Control of Sales and Leases) (Jersey) Law 1974, “the 1974 Law”, regulates the use of land subject to this Law. However, only 55% of the available agricultural land is currently subject to the Law. Previous legal opinion has advised that the 1974 Law cannot be extended to all agricultural land, but it is intended to review the 1974 Law in order to determine whether it is fit for purpose and whether the conditions for land control used to secure agricultural use need strengthening.
11	Equine use of agricultural land as a bona fide agricultural activity is a highly contentious issue, with some regarding the loss of land from production as unacceptable and others defending its legitimacy as an economic activity in its own right.	Previous legal advice has established that commercial livery (equine use) is a bona fide agricultural activity. Future regulation of equine use will be reviewed. Nevertheless, it is recognised that the equine industry contributes considerably to the rural economy and supports a number of local businesses.
12	The increasing loss of agricultural land to domestic curtilage is of major concern to the agricultural sector.	Agreed. However, the loss of agricultural land to domestic curtilage is controlled through planning legislation and the Land Controls Section of the Environment Department.
13	There is insufficient attention and detail given to the issue of food security within the Draft White Paper.	It is recognised that food security is becoming a major concern; and whilst there are a number of policy options addressing the issue in the White Paper, a review of the issue will be undertaken as suggested by the Sub-Panel.

	Findings	Comments
14	There appears to be some confusion amongst stakeholders, from the evidence received, about the purpose of the proposal to classify land.	To clarify, there is no holistic classification of the Island's agricultural land, other than a subjective rating of "poor" or "good" to identify the most productive agricultural areas. There is currently no classification identifying the quality or potential of environmental or amenity areas. A land classification system would provide an independent and objective assessment of all land, not just on the basis of agricultural value, but also to identify the most productive environmental and amenity areas. Land may be poor in agricultural terms, but be valuable either environmentally or for amenity use. Therefore, it does not follow that if land is classified as poor agriculturally, that approval for development would consequently be granted. A definitive, objective and independent land classification system would provide additional protection from development to land not subject to the 1974 Law and also help identify the most vulnerable and valuable environmental and amenity areas.
15	The Ministers responsible have failed to convince many stakeholders of the need for a system of land classification as outlined in the Draft White Paper.	Noted.
16	The glasshouse industry remains mainly in a state of under-development or neglect brought on by a lack of support for continued production on the one hand and the hope of potential gain by redevelopment on the other.	Noted. There is a known demand for modern glasshouses, locally produced crops and greater food security. The removal of viable infrastructure does not sit well with these demands. Modern glasshouses were encouraged by the States through a Glasshouse Interest Subsidy Scheme which was provided to help meet building costs. The removal of the support for the glasshouse industry was initially instigated by the growers themselves. In 2001, the then Agriculture and Fisheries Committee considered an independently produced document supported by the JFU entitled 'Managed Exit Policy for Commercial Growers, claiming that their sector was no longer viable. Subsequent meetings with the States, led to the Restructuring Payment for the High Value Sector (a 3 year roll-up payment of future subsidies to enable the growers to re-invest, diversify or leave the industry) within the 2005 RES, which was subsequently taken up by growers.

	Findings	Comments
17	The Rural Economy Strategy 2011 – 2015 seeks to increase the regulation and recording of farming practices affecting the environment.	<p>Correct. The RES 2011 – 2015 seeks to improve the environmental credentials of the agricultural industry by purchasing agreed minimum standards of husbandry and environmental performance, via conditionality and the need to produce an Environment Plan as a condition for receipt of public support.</p> <p>To ensure that environmental objectives are achieved, there is an ongoing need for effective monitoring and administrative procedures in order to measure success and compliance. It is an objective of the Rural Economy section to keep this necessary bureaucracy to a minimum and avoid duplication with other auditing and industry assurance schemes.</p>
18	Opposition to the proposals to introduce Codes of Good Agricultural and Environmental Practice (CGAEP) and Environment Plans was largely on the grounds of the overlap with (more demanding) standards applied by major commercial purchasers of farm produce.	<p>Aspects of Jersey Codes of Good Agricultural and Environmental Practice, e.g. Water Code, have been designed to meet the specific needs of Jersey, whilst the assured produce schemes operated by UK commercial companies are designed to safeguard their retail businesses under a varied set of geographical circumstances.</p> <p>It is therefore inevitable that assured produce schemes are generalised, do not cover the entire range of environmental needs of the Island, and are assessed by individuals who have little or no knowledge of the Island's circumstances. Whilst accepting farmers, who undertake commercial audits, have achieved compliance with assurance schemes, it is important that future conditionality associated with public support includes those husbandry and environmental concerns that are specific to the Island, and are not currently covered in industry assurance schemes.</p> <p>It should be noted that there is a wide variation in the requirements of the assured produce schemes, and depending on the market they are supplying, farmers may not be under any obligation to belong to any of them.</p>
19	Farmers are paid by the Transport and Technical Services Department to receive its green waste for use as a fertiliser and soil	<p>Correct. Transport and Technical Services Department fund the disposal of a fertiliser and soil conditioner derived from green waste to agricultural land in order to remove it efficiently from the limited available storage area. It is</p>

	Findings	Comments
	conditioner.	considered that this is a highly cost-effective method of waste disposal.
20	Opinions are divided as to whether farmers should be funded by the States to accept its green waste.	Noted. However, opinions are not divided within the industry itself, who do not view this as a subsidy, rather a cost-effective payment for waste disposal, compared to other options for disposing of this waste.
21	There is concern amongst the agricultural sector as to the compliance issues arising from using the green waste produced by the Transport and Technical Services Department.	Correct. There is evidence that in some cases the quality of the green waste would jeopardise compliance with industry assurance schemes. The Environmental Management and Rural Economy (EMRE) Section will liaise with the T&TS Department, reference the quality of the fertiliser and soil conditioner, and help ensure it is able to meet the relevant industry standards, in order to alleviate the concerns of the agricultural sector, enhance its value and minimise the costs of waste disposal to the public purse.
22	The present method of disposing of green waste is a cost to the public purse.	See comments above.
23	The Sub-Panel acknowledges the argument in favour of parity in both the level of and nature of support given to farmers in the EU and Jersey, and consequently it appears logical to maintain an area based decoupled payment.	<p>The RES 2011 – 2015 includes an area payment (Single Area Payment) that is currently similar to that received by EU and UK farmers through the Common Agricultural Policy, to ensure that Jersey farmers are not put at a competitive disadvantage in their local or export markets.</p> <p>In addition, the Countryside Renewal Scheme (CRS) and the Rural Initiative Scheme (RIS) have been included to provide similar rural development support measures to EU schemes whilst being tailored to meet the specific commercial and environmental needs of Jersey.</p>
24	A major concern about the Rural Initiative Scheme is its apparent lack of transparency. In addition, there are concerns about scheme administration.	Noted. An annual report detailing administration and projects funded under the RIS will be published from 2011.
25	The effectiveness and value of the Countryside Renewal Scheme can only be judged in the context of funding	The White Paper proposes a Countryside Renewal Scheme (CRS) and the indicative budget included within the White Paper quantifies funds to support this scheme. Clearly, no awards have been made

	Findings	Comments
	proposals that are not made available in the White Paper.	<p>against the indicative budget, as it is a forecast for the future and therefore no grants have yet been awarded.</p> <p>A CRS review will be published during 2011. The review will ensure that funds are appropriately targeted, to ensure that they are delivering outputs that are effectively monitored and that are in line with Environment Plans and Jersey's Multilateral Environmental Agreements. An annual report detailing administration and projects funded under the CRS will be published from 2011.</p>
26	Promoting efficiency in dairy production by directly subsidising animal breeding, costings and milk-recording has been useful in achieving goals set out in the Roadmap vision for the future of the dairy industry in Jersey.	<p>Animal breeding and milk-recording services are part-funded by the States in recognition of their importance to the industry 'Roadmap to Recovery' and the historical low profitability of the dairy industry, which would have been further compromised by full cost recovery for these services by the RJA&HS.</p> <p>The above services directly benefit individual dairy farmers by improving the efficiency of their businesses, and in these circumstances future States policy dictates a greater emphasis on a 'user pays' approach.</p> <p>The current Royal Jersey Agriculture & Horticulture Society Service Level Agreement, finishing in 2013, will be honoured. A detailed review considering how these services will be provided to the industry post-2013 will be undertaken. In parallel, the RIS will be expanded to include vocational training support to encourage skills development in these areas, in order to promote greater self-reliance.</p> <p>The Dairy Industry Costing Scheme (DICS) delivers financial information for individual farmers and comparative data for the industry and the States and, therefore, it is proposed that States funding remains in place for 2011 – 2015 to enable this service to continue.</p>
27	The results of performance recording are used to provide comparative data for farmers and for use by industry representatives and by government.	Correct. See above.

	Findings	Comments
28	The viability of dairy production in Jersey depends on maintaining throughput at the new dairy at least at current levels. This means that almost total current farmer loyalty to the Jersey Milk Marketing Board and the supply of at least current levels of fresh milk from the new dairy is a prerequisite of the Jersey Milk Marketing Board's business plan.	Noted. The RES 2011 – 2015 proposes to maintain the current level of QMP at £180 per cow per annum until 2012, following which there will be reductions, assuming profitability improvements are realised, resulting from the continued implementation of the industry 'Roadmap to Recovery'.
29	Wholesale and retail milk prices in Jersey are well above those in France or the UK. The Jersey Milk Marketing Board could seek to increase prices to substitute for the loss of Quality Milk Payment, but this carries with it certain risks for Jersey Dairy including possible calls for the importation of fresh milk.	<p>Correct. The States objective is to ensure that a viable and increasingly profitable dairy industry is promoted in Jersey, with a view to narrowing the gap between UK, EU and Jersey liquid milk prices, to safeguard the Jersey cow in her Island home and to ensure the existence of a certain level of food security.</p> <p>To meet these objectives, the States will continue to licence the import of liquid milk and will continue to robustly challenge any threat to this arrangement via the EU Commission, whilst the import of liquid milk is likely to undermine dairy industry recovery and consolidation.</p> <p>It is important to note that price increases would need to be justified under the Competition Law, particularly in relation to the dominant market position of the Jersey Milk Marketing Board.</p>
30	There is overlap in function between the Rural Economy Section administering the Rural Initiative Scheme and Jersey Enterprise providing general support and business advice for Small to Medium Enterprises (SMEs).	<p>The Rural Economy section and Jersey Enterprise are both funded by the Economic Development Department (EDD) and both deliver business advice and support for business growth and development.</p> <p>The working relationship is being reviewed in the RES and the Enterprise and Business Development Strategy 2011 – 2015 to ensure that in future the rural sector receives an integrated and efficient service.</p>

	Findings	Comments
31	There is little or no demand from the agricultural industry for formal adoption of risk management planning.	Noted. There will be no requirement for rural businesses to adopt formal risk management planning in the RES 2011 – 2015.
32	The management of disease risk by the use of appropriate regulatory measures by government is in the interests of the whole of the agricultural industry and consumers.	Agreed. These policies will be retained in the RES 2011 – 2015.
33	The States of Jersey has neither the resources nor the need to sponsor standalone agricultural research unless the problems under investigation are specific to the Island.	<p>It is agreed that Jersey does not need to investigate and research the complete range of issues facing the Island’s agricultural industry, as it would be too costly and duplicate other work being undertaken in other larger jurisdictions.</p> <p>Jersey however has, and is likely to continue to face, unique problems which will not be addressed by research institutions abroad. The RES therefore proposes the formation of a Priorities Board promoting industry collaboration to identify and approve research and funding mechanisms. There is support for this approach from the agricultural industry.</p>
34	The proposed withdrawal of Jersey Product Promotions Limited (JPPL) funding from 2013 as outlined in the Draft White Paper has been much criticised, and the success of JPPL and Genuine Jersey appear to have provided a solid case for continued funding.	Noted. It is recognised that Genuine Jersey, as part of JPPL is an excellent brand. The role of Jersey Products Promotion Limited, including the Genuine Jersey Products Association (GJPA), has been highlighted as valuable for supporting local businesses, not least during the early stages of business development. Feedback received has also highlighted a valuable future role in developing a Jersey Food and Farming Partnership with other key stakeholders within the food chain.
35	Licensing supermarkets operating in Jersey by seeking to control their sourcing of product is neither feasible nor desirable in the context of offering free consumer choice.	Agreed.

	Findings	Comments
36	The costs of import and export were raised as an area of concern for the agriculture sector.	Noted.
37	Awareness of agriculture and wildlife is important in maintaining public appreciation of the value of the countryside. Farmers' groups, schools and organisations such as the Royal Jersey Agricultural & Horticultural Society, Jersey Farmers' Union and National Trust for Jersey can all play their part in continually raising awareness.	Agreed.
38	There is a tension between organisations that see public access as being necessarily as of right, and farmers and landowners who prefer it to be on a discretionary basis.	Noted. There is misunderstanding regarding access provision. The RES 2011 – 2015 is not seeking to promote mandatory, unrestricted access to the countryside, but to enhance the current network through voluntary agreements, joining-up existing footpaths, bridleways, etc. to form a cohesive network of access within the Island, where a specific need is identified and the landowner/tenant is willing to construct the necessary infrastructure. This initiative will be supported through funding from the CRS.
39	There is some disagreement amongst stakeholders regarding where, and by which, organisations, allotments should be managed.	Noted. Allotments are now overseen by “the Jersey Allotment and Leisure Gardens Association”, an independent organisation set up as a Purpose Trust with the Jersey Financial Services Commission for the development of allotments in Jersey following the Working Party report.
40	The Draft White Paper identifies succession planning within the rural economy as an area for concern, but this view was not shared by some key industry stakeholders.	Noted.
41	Whilst there is some concern about an ageing farm population and lack	Noted. Succession planning will be reviewed by the States, looking at opportunities and barriers for new entrants as well as looking at the age profile of the

	Findings	Comments
	of successors on farms, there is confidence amongst the farming organisations that whilst the industry remains buoyant and profitable young people will come forward.	farming industry. Working with industry partners, the States will then develop a specific skills strategy for the rural economy.
42	There is an anomaly in the absence of States of Jersey funding to support young people wishing to study at agricultural college overseas post-16 years of age and pre-University.	Noted. Policy PE2 proposes investigation into providing opportunities for 16 – 18 year-olds to attend agricultural college in the UK.

Recommendations

	Recommendations	To	Accept/ Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
1	The performance of the Rural Economy Strategy 2010 – 2015 against published Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) should be monitored annually. The annual results should be made available publicly, be well publicised and discussed with all stakeholders at an annual conference.		Accept	Agreed. RES 2011 – 2015 KPIs will be monitored annually and be available publicly for discussion at an Annual Rural Conference.	Annually
2	An annual full stakeholder conference should be established by the Rural Economy Section to discuss, debate, draft and update a long-term vision for the rural economy of Jersey and to discuss and resolve ongoing and emerging issues.		Accept	Agreed. An Annual Rural Conference will be held at a time of year that suits the majority of key stakeholders.	Annually
3	The Ministers for Economic Development and Planning and Environment must present a clear signal to the agricultural industry that they are championing its cause within the States Assembly.		Accept	Agreed.	Acceptance of the majority of RES Sub-Panel recommendations in November 2010 and adoption of recommendations within the RES 2011 – 2015
4	Consideration should be given by the responsible Ministers to establishing a clear separation between administrative and regulatory functions.		Accept	Agreed. A Review of the relationship between administrative and regulatory functions will be undertaken and published.	2011

	Recommendations	To	Accept/ Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
5	Jersey's marine and fisheries industry should not be included within the Rural Economy Strategy. It warrants its own comprehensive strategy which should be developed by January 2012.		Accept	Agreed. A separate Fisheries and Marine Resources Strategy will be developed.	January 2012
6	Indicative financial information should be provided alongside content to illustrate White Paper proposals.		Accept	Agreed. The White Paper will include indicative financial information, alongside content, to illustrate policy proposals.	December 2010
7	The Sub-Panel welcomes the Review of <i>Agricultural Land (Control of Sales and Leases) (Jersey) Law 1974</i>, which should include the effectiveness and equity of the application of the legislation with the aim of broadening its scope and tightening definitions of what constitutes non-agricultural use.		Accept	The <i>Agricultural Land (Control of Sales and Leases) (Jersey) Law 1974</i> , will be reviewed with a view to broadening its scope and tightening definitions of what constitutes agricultural use. A revision of the imposed conditions can be achieved through a Ministerial Decision but a change in the Law will need legal advice and Law Drafting time.	September 2012
8	The responsible Ministers must thoroughly examine the use of agricultural land for equine use and, although no evidence was received on the matter, leisure and sport use, as part of its Review of <i>Agricultural Land (Control of Sales and Leases) (Jersey) Law 1974</i> and considered in future strategies. This Review		Accept	The review of the <i>Agricultural Land (Control of Sales and Leases) (Jersey) Law 1974</i> will include the use of agricultural land for equine, leisure and sport use and the case for a separate register of horses and equine use.	September 2012

	Recommendations	To	Accept/ Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
	must include an evaluation of the case for the introduction of a Register of horses and a Register of land used for equine purposes.				
9	The responsible Ministers must thoroughly examine the use of agricultural land for domestic curtilage as part of its Review of <i>Agricultural Land (Control of Sales and Leases) (Jersey) Law 1974</i>.		Accept	The review of the <i>Agricultural Land (Control of Sales and Leases) (Jersey) Law 1974</i> will include the use of agricultural land for domestic cartilage.	September 2012
10	The responsible Ministers need to address the issue of food security and produce a strategy and long-term vision for Jersey in consultation with the industry and the public by January 2012.		Accept	A food security strategy including long-term vision for Jersey will be completed and published.	January 2012
11	The proposed system of universal land classification should not be included within the Rural Economy Strategy 2011 – 2015.		Accept	Whilst a land classification system would provide an objective assessment of land to identify the most productive agricultural, environmental and amenity areas and provide additional protection to land not subject to the 1974 land Law, it is recognised that this measure should be withdrawn from the Rural Economic Strategy 2011 – 2015, not least due to the level of funding required in the current economic climate.	December 2010

	Recommendations	To	Accept/ Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
12	The Rural Economy Strategy should not be advocating partial or enabling development until all other options have been exhausted.		Accept	Noted. The RES does not include linked and enabling development, as in the previous Strategy. This is now being considered under the Island Plan review.	N/A
13	A set of minimum standards for environmental compliance by all Island agricultural producers should be developed by the Rural Economy Section, taking into account those standards demanded by commercial purchasers of farm produce so as to avoid unnecessary duplication and the expense of developing the standard and enforcing compliance.		Accept	Agreed. Duplication with existing assurance schemes will be avoided when developing environmental standards.	2011
14	The Rural Economy Section should liaise with Transport and Technical Services Department to ascertain whether improvements could be made, and the necessary analysis undertaken, to make green waste more acceptable to the agriculture industry. The results of this should be publicised and shared with the industry.		Accept	Agreed. The Rural Economy section will liaise with T&TS and produce a report on the nutrient value and assurance issues related to the use of green waste, in order to make it a more attractive option to the agricultural industry.	September 2011
15	The Rural Economy Section, Transport and Technical Services Department and the agriculture sector should work together to make the best use of this valuable resource (green waste).		Accept	Agreed as above.	

	Recommendations	To	Accept/ Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
16	The Sub-Panel supports the Draft White Paper recommendation to undertake a review of rural sector funding in Jersey, vis-à-vis the EU in general and Single Area Payments in particular.		Accept	Noted. EMRE to undertake review of EU and UK rural funding mechanisms and publish findings.	August 2013
17	The States of Jersey should continue with Single Area Payments but the relevant Ministers should seriously consider whether the mechanism of the payment provides the best use of funds in supporting the Jersey farmer. This Review should consider whether applying equivalent, if not exactly identical, support to EU counterparts is a better mechanism than following CAP policy instruments just in order to achieve parity. The work should be undertaken in full consultation with the industry and a Report published by August 2013 in time for inclusion in the Rural Economy Strategy 2016 – 2020.		Accept	Agreed. Single Area Payments will be continued. A detailed review of EU and UK rural support mechanisms will begin in 2011, in full consultation with the industry, with a report published by or before August 2013. The review will consider whether the SAP currently provides the best use of funds and whether the perceived need for parity with the EU and UK is justified and achievable.	August 2013
18	The Sub-Panel welcomes the proposed continuation and widening of the remit of the Rural Initiative Scheme, but with stricter funding allocation, greater transparency, a need to clarify criteria for eligibility for		Accept	The RIS eligibility criteria will be enlarged to include projects which address issues such as climate change, fossil fuel use, animal health, research and development into crop pests and diseases and training skills	2011

	Recommendations	To	Accept/ Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
	potential applicants and the publication of an Annual Report.			shortages. In addition the application form will be amended to clarify eligibility and the Panel allocation process will also be amended to bring a greater transparency in to the allocation of grants. An RIS annual report will also be published.	
19	The Sub-Panel supports the continuation of the Countryside Renewal Scheme but agrees that the proposed Review is required. The Review should include proposals on how to introduce greater transparency on funding proposals and allocation.		Accept	The CRS review process will be completed in 2011 with the aim of bringing forward a new scheme which addresses States environmental and strategic objectives as well as targeting improvements identified in individual farm Environmental Plans. In addition the application and allocation process will be developed to give a greater level of transparency.	2011
20	As with the Rural Initiative Scheme, an Annual Report of the Countryside Renewal Scheme should be published detailing the grants made and the reasons for these.		Accept	Agreed. The CRS 2005 to 2010 has included an Open Day where applicants are invited to view examples of improvements achieved under the scheme as well as receive reports from officers on budget allocation and the components completed. In addition awards for outstanding projects completed	September 2012

	Recommendations	To	Accept/ Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
				each year are presented by the Minister. This open day process will be supplemented with an annual report.	
21	In order to be justifiable, dairy services should become self-financing.		Accept	The service level agreement (SLA) to provide milk-recording and artificial insemination services to the dairy industry until 2013 will be honoured. The Rural Economy section will enter into discussions with the dairy industry on how these services could be delivered on a self-financing basis.	January 2014
22	Recording of certain financial information from the dairy industry should still be supported by Government in order that performance in the industry can be evaluated against targets towards the industry becoming self-supporting under the Roadmap plan. However, milk-recording and cattle breeding services should cease to be subsidised as recommended by the Draft White Paper.		Accept	The Dairy Industry Costing Scheme (DICS) is subject to an SLA signed with Jersey Milk Marketing Board which finishes on 31st March 2011. The Rural Economy section will renegotiate the current SLA with the objective of continuing support for the DICS until 31st March 2016.	March 2011
23	The Sub-Panel considers there is merit in phasing-out the Quality Milk Payment. Consideration should be given, by the Ministers responsible, to creating a cut-off point in terms of the number of cows eligible and progressively reducing this over time rather than progressively reducing		Accept	The RES proposes gradual phasing-out of the QMP. The proposal for a cut-off point for receipt of QMP is accepted and is already in place based on the number of cows in each herd over a 12 month period ending in March 2008. This date coincides	2013

	Recommendations	To	Accept/ Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
	the level of payment per cow (as proposed in the Draft White Paper). This has the merit of protecting the most vulnerable smaller producers from the full effect of the cuts, whilst at the same time placing emphasis on milk production rather than cow numbers as a means of maximising returns.			with the Industry restructuring scheme (supported by a roll-up of QMP payments) which allowed 3 farmers (500 cows) to leave the industry and bring milk production in line with the then market demand. Maximum QMP payments to individual farms are therefore based on March 2008 cow numbers, with any growth in cow numbers beyond that level based on returns from the market place. The suggestion that instead of reducing QMP in monetary terms, the States reduces support by reducing the number of cows eligible in each herd to safeguard the economics of small herds will be considered in detail.	
24	The Sub-Panel accepts that a phased withdrawal of the Quality Milk Payment is desirable but believes that as a priority proper analysis should be undertaken as to the implications and to ensure that performance improvements necessary to substitute for the payment are realistic and achievable.		Accept	Agreed.	2012
25	The Sub-Panel supports the Draft White Paper's		Accept	Agreed.	2011

	Recommendations	To	Accept/ Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
	call for a review of business advice and suggests that business advice should be consolidated and more clearly demarcated.				
26	The Draft White Paper proposal (PR31) to provide evidence of use of risk management measures as a condition of receipt of grants and subsidies is unnecessarily prescriptive and should be removed from the Rural Economy Strategy.		Accept	Agreed.	December 2010
27	Animal diseases are far more containable in Jersey than would be the case either in Continental Europe or in the UK, making an exceptionally high health status a realistic and worthwhile aim. The Rural Economy Section should ensure that the maintenance of exceptionally high health status is a priority goal, thus benefiting the marketing of Jersey produce.		Accept	Agreed. The RES 2011 – 2015 will continue to support measures to enhance the health status of the Island’s farm livestock via financial support from the RIS and via agreed research and development proposals from the industry.	January 2011
28	The Sub-Panel supports the Draft White Paper’s recommendations to provide some support for the Plant Health Laboratory and a Priorities Board to focus small-scale research funding, but with the remit to address specific cases of need in Jersey.		Accept	The RES 2011 – 2015 will include funding for the plant health laboratory. In addition, a research Priorities Board, with strong industry representation, will be set up to address the specific research needs in Jersey.	December 2011

	Recommendations	To	Accept/ Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
29	The Ministers should undertake a Review of the benefits and disadvantages, from a farmer's perspective, of Jersey formally entering the European Union.		Reject	EU membership is not in the remit of the RES 2011 – 2015. This subject is being addressed by the Chief Minister's Department through the Jersey Brussels Group, which can undertake a much wider strategic review of Jersey's interests.	N/A
30	Jersey Product Promotions Limited funding should not be withdrawn by the Rural Economy Strategy 2011 – 2015.		Accept	Agreed. Discussions with JPPL will be undertaken to ascertain a mutually acceptable level of funding.	December 2010
31	Sourcing of local produce should be achieved based on availability, quality and promotion, rather than restriction through licensing. Local supermarkets should be actively encouraged by the relevant Ministers to source from Jersey and support the Genuine Jersey marque.		Accept	The role of Jersey Products Promotion Limited, including the Genuine Jersey Products Association, has been highlighted as valuable for aiding start-up and supporting local rural businesses during their early stages of development; and the feedback received has also highlighted the role to be played in developing a Jersey Food and Farming Partnership with other key players within the industry.	2011 – 2015
32	The relevant Ministers should consult all parts of the agriculture industry regarding its concerns with the problems associated with importing and exporting goods and publish their findings.		Accept	Agreed. The Rural Economy section will review the costs of importing and exporting agricultural goods and publish the findings.	September 2012

	Recommendations	To	Accept/ Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
33	The Sub-Panel supports the Draft White Paper recommendation to promote Community Supported Agriculture and other schemes to raise awareness and understanding of the rural economy but suggests that formal measures may not be necessary to meet the broad aims.		Accept	Formal measures may not be necessary to promote community supported agriculture but cannot be ruled out.	2011 – 2015
34	The provision of allotments should be encouraged by Government but the management of provision should be left to non-Governmental organisations and interest groups.		Accept	Noted. The Jersey Allotment and Leisure Gardens Association is an independent organisation set up as a Purpose Trust with the Jersey Financial Services Commission for the development of allotments in Jersey, following the Working Party report which highlighted the many benefits of allotments, including reducing food miles, improving food security and health, and the communal benefits.	2011 – 2015
35	Although there are grounds for optimism regarding succession planning within the agriculture sector at present, the situation should be monitored and new entrants actively encouraged.		Accept	Agreed.	January 2011
36	The relevant Ministers should formally approach the Minister for Education, Sport and Culture with a view to addressing the student funding anomaly.		Accept	Agreed.	2011

Conclusion

The Ministers for Economic Development and Planning and Environment accept the conclusions within the Economic Affairs Sub-Panel's report on the RES 2011 – 2015.