

**SUMMARY OF THE CEREALS & OILSEEDS SECTOR COUNCIL MEETING
HELD ON FRIDAY 22ND JULY AT 8.00 A.M. VIA TEAMS**

PRESENT:

Sarah Bell (Chair) (SB), David Bell (DB), Tony Bell (TB), Polly Davies (PD),
Russ McKenzie (RM), Sarah Nightingale (SN), James Standen (JS), Patrick Stephenson (PS)

IN ATTENDANCE:

Jenn Birrell (JB), Ken Boyns (KB), Angela Christison (AC), David Eudall (DE), Paul Flanagan (PF), Chris Gooderham (CG), Will Jackson (WJ), Sara Maslowski (SM), Tim Rycroft (TR), Jenna Watts (JW), Caroline Burniston (CB) (notes)

CHAIR WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

SB welcomed the Council members to the meeting and gave an overview of the agenda along with extending thanks to the team due to this being SB's final meeting.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Stephen Briggs (SBr), Tom Clarke (TC), Julius Deane (JD), Cecilia Pryce (CP) and David Walston (DW) confirmed as an apology.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No new declarations reported.

MINUTES FROM THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 7TH JUNE 2022

The Council agreed the minutes from the previous meeting held on the 7th June as a true record and were signed off by the Chair.

MATTERS ARISING AND ACTION POINTS FROM THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 7TH JUNE 2022 – KEN BOYNS

KB updated on outstanding matters, with clarification on all key items.

CREATING A CEREALS AND OILSEEDS SECTOR PLAN – STEP TWO – JULY 2022

KB gave the context to the meeting and explained the steps that would be followed.

Agreement was given that in relation to section one of the plan, the direction of travel was correct. However, it was confirmed that the plan focus must be on the levy payers and must respond accordingly to levy payer views as opposed to coming across inward facing and academic.

Prioritisation grid discussion summarised as follows: -



RL

- Agreement on the green rating. The aims, which will determine the measurement, needs to reflect that the RL is genuinely helping on farm decisions, ensuring a genuine and strong feedback loop to support evolution is in place. Measurement focus goes beyond satisfaction and captures the value that the RL offers to LP businesses.

Education

- Small amount of spend. Work shared across all four sectors. Current aim is to educate children about nutrition and how to cook. Ensure no duplication with other education providers. Include in the impact we are targeting hard to reach children.

MI

- Red rating – Labour market, Leave to TIAH and others
- Amber Activities - spend will be minimised to those areas with maximum benefit for spend
- Green – all relevant for levy payers. More Carbon/biodiversity market analysis rather than global work to be addressed (as global information now more readily available). Work closely with the Environment team.
- Outcome – All RAG ratings agreed with. Amber areas to be strongly reviewed

Export

- Small area of spend – need to review exactly what support is needed including whether any needed for exports of food that use British cereals and oilseeds.
- UKP/UKS value & need for support on Phytosanitary work was discussed. Mixed opinion of where the value sits. After some discussion around benefit and aims, it was agreed to devise a clearer export strategy based on gathering views of people currently within the trade.

RB209

- Focus on development and evolution. RL Review is initial focus due to it being the biggest spend and highest used area. RB209 review to follow. Suggestion that nutrient management may become a pilot area for the What Works centre.
- Detailed discussion developed on whether this should be linked with the RL or not and the reasoning both for and against. This culminated in a business decision to keep the areas separate.
- It was flagged that FRFW will continue to be a focus and RB209 work would support this in the run up to 2025.

Reputation

- Not as critical as other sectors due to fewer challenges compared to livestock, core funding going into comms team to support this area and develop position statements. Need to link in with Red Tractor and Defra. Outcome – approved as Green

IPM

- Key area. Good discussion around the accuracy regarding the rating for each area of work. Important to be justifying to levy payers why we are not working in certain areas. Discussion around whether the IPM hub is fit for purpose. Debate raised on how we get the IPM information we hold out to partner organisations. Important to be discussing with the industry and supply chain in



relation to crop health and IPM research. Farmer direction needed on this along with feedback into the risk register of the threats that need an IPM solution. Agreed this needed to be developed and the What Works centre might provide an opportunity (including revising the AHDB website). To be focused on after the RL Review has commenced and within the context of What Works developments.

Managing the reduction in BPS

- Discussion developed around the importance of historic farm performance data particularly in a crisis for use with government and retailers.
- This approach was agreed.

People working in agriculture

- Agreement to cease the red rated activities.
- Discussion around AgriLeader and its amber status. The benefits of this debated and a general agreement to review how this can be used in a different way, perhaps as an engagement tool. Update on planned changes in October.

Environment

- Crowded space. Where does AHDB need to operate. External organisation Eunomia helping us identify industry gaps. Environment strategy going to main board in September and then the sector council will be updated in October. This approach was agreed on the assumption the final plan would show clear outcomes and costs around each activity following the agreement of the environment strategy.

Digital Grain Passport

- DE gave an update on the overall scheme. Clarification that September will provide a mocked up working model of the DGP. Workshops taking place including a Scotland specific session. Early November meeting will require a yes/no decision.
- This approach was agreed in principle. Confirmed as amber due to no decision on this currently.

TOR for RL REVIEW APPROVAL

CG offered an overview on this area. The roles and responsibilities of the RL board were explained. Key outcomes from the discussion were: -

- RL Review should be more prominent on the web site (and who the existing RL Board are)
- The steering group should have a wider membership and fewer AHDB staff if a review is taking place, to ensure open and pragmatic discussions. Membership to be agreed with PS.
- Reach is key – better approach needs to be agreed by steering group for testing what levy payers want rather than to rely on a survey
- Provide the steering group with a clear understanding of the barriers relating to implementation of recommendations from the previous review so lessons can be learnt.
- Comms strategy should be overseen by steering group to ensure clear, transparent and far-reaching communication of the outcomes along with ongoing publicity for the review.
- AHDB website needs improving Levy payers understanding of untreated to be clarified
- Rye – be clear it refers to grain and not AD



- Keen to see other uses for the data identified as part of the review Appreciation given to PS for Chairing the RL Review Steering Group. PS to take the lead of RL recommendations on behalf of the Chair.
- Council members to suggest any individuals they thought would add value to the steering group to CG/PS by e-mail

AOB

There was no other business.

CLOSE

The Chair closed the meeting at 10am and thanked everyone for their attendance. Gratitude expressed to SB for her role as Chair over the past year.

Date of next meeting: - Tuesday 4th October 2022

