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1. Introduction

In 2009 the Dartmoor Commoners’ Council and the Dartmoor National Park Authority (DNPA) met with the Secretary of State, Hilary Benn. The Secretary of State invited a submission setting out the issues arising from agri-environment delivery on common land and the impressive array of public goods found on the South West uplands. He also requested that the submission should include potential solutions to those problems identified. Fundamental to the solutions proposed was empowering the farming community to take more responsibility for land management. In particular it made the case that farmers should be given the opportunity to design a new approach to delivering agri-environment; an approach that recognised all the public goods, local conditions and traditions.

Dartmoor Farming Futures arose from that submission. It is divided into two work areas:

- developing a new approach to agri-environment delivery and
- extending the Dartmoor Vision to include a further selection of eco-system services.

The project to progress Dartmoor Farming Futures began in 2010, funded by DNPA and Natural England (NE) (as part of their SW eco-system pilot). Two areas of common land were selected on Dartmoor. Although very different in nature, both have a selection of the public goods within their boundaries and are about to come to the end of their ESA agreement.

The opportunity was created for those actively involved in managing this common land, especially the active graziers, to engage with the initiative and provide facilitation. The response to this opportunity from the graziers was very positive and over six months a design was developed. All the participating farmers had considerable experience of agri-environment and wished to build on the positive aspects of this experience. The emerging design now requires trialling and testing.

Published as a map in 2006, the Dartmoor Vision continues to influence Environmental Stewardship applications and provides guidance to land managers, indicating the priorities requiring management on any area of open moorland.

The Dartmoor Farming Futures initiative also proposed developing the "vision process" to see if it is applicable to some of the other public benefits to be found on Dartmoor’s moorland, besides the ecological and archaeological assets originally addressed. Maps showing the principal areas for public access, water catchments and carbon storage will be merged with the existing Vision to provide guidance to farmers on which eco-system services they should consider when managing the land.

Data used in the compilation of the new vision maps is complemented by Natural England's report: Dartmoor Ecosystems Services Pilot (in draft).
2. Summary

Developing a new approach to agri-environment delivery

The active graziers on two areas of common land on Dartmoor have designed a new scheme intended for common land that has the potential for environmental improvement (i.e. land that would currently be targeted for Higher Level Stewardship (HLS)). Their design is a natural progression from the previous agri-environment schemes, and benefits from the considerable experience gained by the farmers over the last 15 years.

Both groups of commoners began by identifying a number of key issues that guided their ambitions. These are:

- The new scheme must be simple and easily understood.
- There must be a clear link between the payments and those public benefits provided by the work undertaken under the scheme.
- The new scheme must enable local farmers to offer their expertise and experience to achieve a successful outcome.
- The new scheme must enable local farming practice and traditions to survive.
- Trust between all must be established.
- The scheme should enable new graziers to join.
- The scheme should build on the positive aspects of previous agri-environment schemes.

The proposed new approach to delivery is predicated on an agreed set of outcomes, understood by all, and allowing the land management necessary to deliver the outcomes, to be determined by the farmers and the owners of the common. There are no prescriptions within the agreement.

The process begins by applicants answering a number of questions. This ensures all the public benefits that might be relevant on their land are considered. It also identifies which public benefits they should focus on. The completed form is then discussed with Natural England. If an application is encouraged, the applicant begins to draft a set of outcomes relevant to the public goods on the land. These draft outcomes then benefit from input from the relevant agencies. This ensures that the agencies’ ambitions for this land are also considered.

These draft outcomes are then discussed with a small group of representatives from relevant agencies, including the National Park, Environment Agency, English Heritage and Natural England. This avoids one individual dominating the process. Their role is to ensure that the outcomes are clear and appropriate. The outcomes should be compatible with the guidance set out in the Dartmoor Vision. The meeting also provides an opportunity to ensure that work for one outcome does not compromise or damage another.
A programme of review and monitoring is also agreed. This is essential and should provide confidence to the agreement holders and Natural England that the land management is progressing in the right direction.

The outcomes and monitoring schedule would form the application, and be submitted by one individual on behalf of the management committee. Additional information provided by the applicant at this stage would include a map of the area including the boundary, a short report setting out information relating to any designated sites, legal obligations (e.g. arising from scheduled monuments and SSSIs) and a list of those benefiting from the agreement.

Prior to the start of the agreement, the Commons Association or management committee will have agreed with the participating commoners the following:

- An internal deed - describing the operation of the committee and agreement.
- A Management Plan, that includes stocking rates, timing, type of stock and swaling programme, written by the committee. The plan will conform to all appropriate regulations, including those arising from cross-compliance, the National Park and the Dartmoor Commoners' Council.
- Agreement from those commoners signed to the agreement on the following year's work plan including grazing regime, stock numbers and additional work.

The draft design is offered as an improvement to delivery on common land that would greatly increase the potential of agri-environment schemes to deliver real change and enhancement of a suite of eco-system services and public benefits, whilst encouraging farmers to take ownership the scheme. This model will need trialling and further refinement. The practical implications of many parts of the process will need review and testing.

The next stage is to secure agreement from Natural England to trial this novel approach on two commons.

The model was tested on four home farms (see 5.a). With some modification, the approach appears to be suitable for farmland that is not common land.

**Extension to the Vision**

Maps showing the areas of greatest value for public access, water catchments and carbon storage have been produced that complement the existing Dartmoor Vision. This extension to the Vision is designed to provide guidance to farmers and other land managers on which eco-system services they should prioritise when managing a particular area of land.
3. Part 1 - developing a new approach to agri-environment delivery

3a. The pilot sites - a brief description.

A list of commons nearing the end of their current agri-environment agreement (ESA) was obtained from Natural England. An assessment of those eco-system goods and services found on each common identified two commons that between them had examples of all the natural assets required for the initiative.

The two areas selected were:

1. The southern part of the Forest of Dartmoor (common) of approximately 2400 ha. Currently part of the Forest ESA that ends in 2011. A large area of high moorland dominated by blanket bog and deep peat, it is almost entirely notified as an SSSI and includes several important water catchments.

2. The Haytor and Bagtor commons. These two commons are managed as a unit (c700 ha.) and currently have one ESA agreement over both commons due to end in 2013. An outlying and almost separate block of common land well used for recreation and public access. It is rich in historical sites and includes a geological SSSI.

3b. The Process

The Chairmen of the two Common Associations responsible for both sites were asked if they would consider taking part in the initiative. They suggested contacting all the active graziers as it was this group of commoners that would hold the greatest level of experience in managing the moorland. Letters were written to all active graziers (23 on one common and 9 on the other), explaining the proposed project and inviting them to a meeting. A separate meeting was arranged for each of the two sites. At each inaugural meeting the commoners (active graziers) were invited to decide whether or not to participate. Both meetings unanimously agreed to engage with the opportunity.

A number of meetings were held, seven for the graziers on the Forest (south) and five for the graziers on Bagtor/Haytor commons. Representatives from 18 of the 23 graziers on the Forest (south) attended one or more meetings with 11 graziers attending at least five meetings. All 9 graziers from Bagtor/Haytor attended at least three meetings with 5 attending all the meetings. All meetings were held in the evening. A note of each meeting was sent to all graziers contacted in the first stages of the initiative.

The first meeting explained the opportunity and sought their ideas on how agri-environment delivery might be improved. All had direct experience of ESA and some had experience of National Park management schemes before the ESA.
The subsequent meetings were used to identify issues that might be addressed by an agri-environment scheme and those aspects of the current scheme that might be improved. It also identified those parts of the ESA that did not need to change. Members of the National Park’s archaeological team attended one meeting from each group to help develop some of the group’s thinking. Additional information requested by the groups was sourced by the facilitator and made available at the following meeting. As the scheme took shape drafts were provided and discussed with staff from the relevant agencies. Their comments and suggestions were fed back to the group.

3c. Results

In the initial stages the two groups developed their models separately. However, as the process developed, the ideas from both groups began to converge and now only one model is proposed.

Both groups identified a very similar set of issues that they considered to be important for a scheme and which guided their ambitions. These included:

- The new scheme must be simple and easily understood.
- There must be a clear link between the payments and those public benefits provided by the work undertaken under the scheme.
- The new scheme must enable local farmers to offer their expertise and experience to achieve a successful outcome.
- The new scheme must enable local farming practice and traditions to survive.

The new model has a number of stages:

Stage 1: Does the land qualify for a higher level scheme?

This stage is intended to help potential applicants understand what natural resources/eco-system services are relevant to their land.

For the trial we assume that we are seeking to address a wide range of natural resources and public goods, including those normally included in a list of eco-system services. For the purposes of this work such assets or natural resources include:

- wildlife and the natural environment/biodiversity
- landscape
- public access
- archaeology/historic environment
- food production and traditional farming practices
- water - quality and quantity
- carbon stored in the soil
- air quality
- cultural heritage
The approach seeks to encourage the applicant (this can be a Common's management committee) to think about all of the natural and historic resources and to consider whether they can enhance or maintain their condition. It is simple and serves only to act as a prompt. It contains questions that should be easy to understand and answer. However it is essential to manage expectations. There would not be a presumption that all applications would be successful. Access to Natural England's target areas and priorities would be essential.

A form enables the applicant(s) to indicate which of the above assets are present on the land. Once completed it should suggest whether there is sufficient potential for a higher level scheme to be considered. The preference is for this form to be completed by those hoping to benefit from a scheme and without the need to employ professionals or agencies.

A draft form, Form A, is provided. It includes some questions to illustrate the type of question that might be asked. Some of the questions have benefited from comment by agencies and individuals. More work on refining the questions is required.

Stage 2: Meet with scheme adviser (Natural England adviser).

The applicants in this exercise are representatives from the common's rights holders and owners. The representatives may wish to progress the application as a management committee. The management committee should consider including representation from the common's owners and progressing a joint approach with the common owners where practical.

This is assumed to be the position for this exercise. The management committee ensures that Form A has been completed and that it identifies which natural resources have the potential to benefit from a high level scheme. At a meeting with the adviser agreement on the suitability or relevance of a higher level scheme is reached. A yes or no time.

If yes, agree those assets to be addressed by the proposed scheme.

(An issue that remains unresolved is whether there should there be an appeal process at this stage).

Stage 3: Develop suitable outcomes for each of the agreed assets.

Getting the outcomes right is critical to the whole process. All parties, especially the management committee and Natural England, must understand the outcomes, what is meant by good condition and what the outcome should look like.

The preference is for the applicant to draft the outcomes. These draft outcomes would then be used during discussion with a small group of representatives from relevant agencies (3 or 4) including the Natural England adviser. This group might be composed of someone from the National Park, Environment Agency, English Park,
Heritage and Natural England. This would avoid one individual dominating the process. The experts would, in addition to the Natural England adviser, be able to provide information and guidance on such issues as access, archaeology and landscape. Their role is to ensure that the outcomes are SMART. Whilst the outcomes would be created by a consensus amongst the relevant agencies, the final determination would remain with Natural England.

Only outcomes that can be delivered by the applicant should be included (on commons, only those relating to the rights held by the applicant). The outcomes should be compatible with the guidance set out in the Dartmoor Vision (revised). The meeting should also provide the opportunity to ensure that work for one outcome does not compromise or damage another. If there is the potential for conflicting land management, this should be identified by the agencies and the management committee made aware. Such concerns might then be resolved by a site visit. The land managers would have to assure Natural England that they could and would provide the necessary delivery.

Ensuring all parties are clear about the outcomes by increasing effort at this stage will reduce the administration and compliance required later. The input from experts may take time and those charged with proposing outcomes must realise that this is not an opportunity to demand certain land management. The outcomes should be mutually agreed and not imposed, whilst challenging and providing value for money. The use of photographs should be considered. These should show examples of relevant land management, examples of bad condition and examples of land management similar to that sought by the scheme. If the outcome is to maintain something considered to already be in good condition, a photo of that resource should be provided.

Some work associated with delivering an outcome will require access to capital payments. These will need to be identified so they can be progressed as part of the scheme.

Encouraging the applicant to draft the outcomes will encourage ownership of the scheme. However, the knowledge held by the applicants may not be sufficient in all the assets. Therefore there should be a presumption that the applicant will provide the initial draft but in some cases "experts" might be invited by the applicant to provide some. This might have to happen in the case of notified wildlife sites (SSSIs).

**Stage 4: The application form becomes the contract.**

Once agreed the outcomes are set out on a simple spreadsheet (form B). The number of outcomes against each natural resource would have been agreed in advance (suggest no more than 6 per asset). The form would be submitted by one individual on behalf of the management committee.

Additional information provided by the applicant at this stage would include:
• a map of the area including the boundary, that shows main features. Possibly supported by aerial photos.
• photos, numbered, that relate to the outcomes, and provide examples of land and features in good condition.
• a short report setting out information relating to any designated sites, legal obligations (e.g. arising from scheduled monuments and SSSIs) and useful data (e.g. results of previous wildlife surveys). Similar to the ESA management plan but without the management prescriptions and with less detail.
• a list of those benefiting from the agreement.
• a timetable of review and monitoring, agreed in advance with Natural England.

**Stage 5: Scheme administration and operation.**

**Internal to Association or Management Committee.** This stage would begin at the same time as stage 4 and be progressed by the management committee. It is about getting the workings of the agreement right and includes providing an internal deed. The internal deed would identify who will be receiving payment and how the money will be distributed. The management committee appointed to run the scheme might also decide to provide a grazing schedule to participants. It is not intended for there to be external input to this stage. However where a common only has a few active graziers it may be necessary to seek additional input.

The intention is to provide a scheme that encourages the active land managers, with local experience and expertise, to determine what land management is required to secure the outcomes. However they may chose to seek the advice of others.

This will result in a considerable shift in responsibility for scheme delivery. It will be the committee's responsibility to secure the appropriate land management that will, in turn, deliver the agreed outcomes. On the other hand, no one will be telling the participants in the scheme what to do. It is crucial to understand this significant change.

How each individual agreement operates will depend entirely on its own management committee. The distribution of funding, to reward work may be unique to an agreement. If appropriate, payments to land owners and non-graziers will be set out in the internal deed.

The management committee may wish, at this stage, to confirm the review schedule with Natural England.
Stage 6: Scheme starts.

Prior to the start of the agreement the Commons Association or management committee will have agreed with the participating commoners the following:

- An internal deed
- A Management or Work Plan, that includes stocking rates, timing, type of stock and swaling programme, written by the committee. The work schedule will conform to all appropriate regulations, including those arising from cross-compliance, the National Park and the Dartmoor Commoners' Council.
- Agreement from those commoners signed to the agreement on the following year's work plan, including grazing regime, stock numbers and additional work.
- A meeting with the adviser to review the plan and ensure both parties are clear on the outcomes and monitoring.

The outcomes and supporting information will have been agreed with Natural England.

A contract with Natural England, copied to the Rural Payment Agency, will provide.

- An agreed start and finish date
- The cost of agreement (annual payment), see later
- The outcomes
- A review timetable
- A monitoring schedule
- A list of capital works with timetable

The contract will be signed by one person on behalf of the management committee.

Additional issues:

1. Review of progress. A Bi-annual or Annual review meeting (on site?). Proceeded by a short note on progress against all outcomes from commoners. Progress is recorded and signed off by both parties. Frequency of review meetings to be agreed between NE and committee in advance of agreement. Both parties would be expected to have first-hand experience of the situation and to have visited the site before the review. Criticism and discussion should be supported by evidence.

2. Payment: The preference is for a flat rate area payment paid on all of the land (common land).
4. Part 2 - Extending the Dartmoor Vision

The outcomes from this part of the project are the maps and accompanying text. A short description of the process follows. This process should help develop a common understanding of ‘ecosystem services’ or public benefits that hill farmers contribute to through their management of the land. The objective is to provide clear guidance which will then be used to shape agri-environment schemes, management of the moorland and the work programmes of individual agencies. It will enable potential conflicts between management for different ecosystem services/public benefits to be identified and resolved.

4a. The process

The Dartmoor Vision (to be referred to as the Vision) captures what the statutory bodies want the moorland areas of Dartmoor to look like in 2030 and is intended to give guidance to those responsible for land management. The Vision was formally adopted in 2005. The Vision for the moorland is one of a farmed (grazed) landscape kept open by stock and land management. When published in 2005 it included maps of the principal vegetation, mires, new woodland and archaeology. Premier Archaeological Landscapes (PALs) were designed and included to show those archaeological sites that required to be set in a well managed landscape.

The process of capturing the original Vision began by securing agreement between the relevant statutory agencies on a specific issue and then putting the relevant information onto maps. After consultation and consensus these maps were combined to provide the Vision.

Part 2 of the Dartmoor Farming futures project is to investigate whether or not the same process might be applicable to other eco-system services.

Those eco-system services to be addressed by this project included:

- carbon storage
- water (quantity and quality)
- access and recreation
- food production

**Carbon:** Progressed with Natural England, DNPA and Lauren Parry (Phd student Exeter University). The Sustainable Carbon Management of British Moorlands: a case study on Dartmoor provided a Carbon Distribution Map and in a form suitable to be a layer within the vision map. This study estimated there to be an impressive 9.7 Mt of carbon within the peat soils of Dartmoor. The majority (7.22 Mt) is found within Blanket Peat, 1.71 Mt in shallow peat and 0.77 Mt in the peat to loam soils. Additional information from Lauren Parry confirmed that uncontrolled burns (wild fires) posed the greatest threat to carbon stored in the peat, with the potential to reduce the stored carbon by 50%. There remains some concern over the impact of swaling (controlled burning) and little information on the relative importance of grazing. Information of most use to land managers - the distribution and quality of
peat soils (with carbon) will be selected for the vision. Additional text will stress the threat to this natural resource from wild fire.

**Water:** South West Water, the Environment Agency and Natural England confirmed the importance of the water resource and its high quality. All agreed that the priority for mapping should be to show the catchments, and identify those above reservoirs and abstraction points. The information was provided and a map setting this out has been constructed. Whilst overall the chemical river quality from these catchments is considered to be very good and good, this is based on 2006 data. A review by EA of all the moorland catchments will begin in 2012. Until this data is available it is not possible to map the quality of water per catchment. Land management within these catchments is essential to maintain the quality of water (and quantity). The main threat to the quality of the water entering the reservoirs or at abstraction points is fire (especially wildfire). Appropriate vegetation management is essential to reduce this threat and to ensure effective and efficient capture of rain.

**Access:** The main participants were DNPA staff including rangers, and the Dartmoor Access Forum. The Dartmoor Access Forum established a sub-group. Meetings with the sub-group produced draft maps showing where land management has an important role in providing access and recreation. A separate meeting with the NP Rangers was held to review the drafts. The project was explained to the Dartmoor Recreational Users Group. The resulting map shows where land management can enable access, areas where access could be encouraged and is accompanied by a general presumption that access is not compromised by inappropriate vegetation. The map has been designed as a layer suitable for the vision map.

**Food/farming:** The production of food is fundamental to those that farm on Dartmoor's moorland. The majority, if not all, of land management that benefits the suite of eco-system services is a by-product of livestock farming. The main farming on the moorland revolves around the production of calves and lambs with stock benefiting from extensive grazing opportunities at certain times of the year. Some of the calves and lambs are finished on enclosed land as part of the home farm. Others are sold to finishers elsewhere. Dartmoor’s suckler herds provide calves and lambs at the start of the food chain.

Providing information in the form of a map has proved difficult and is considered not useful by those farmers consulted. However all the consultees supported the need for a clear statement on the importance of farming on the final version of the Vision. It was therefore decided to provide a short statement to be included within the Vision.

Some background information is provided in Natural England's report: *Dartmoor Ecosystems Services Pilot* (in draft).
4b. Results of Part 2

The vision process was found to be applicable to three of the four original subjects. However the number of relevant experts that participated was lower than previously when the original vision was prepared. This was partly due to the subjects - more focused and the responsibility of one agency (e.g. water) and to the time available.

It was also apparent that agency staff were less willing to engage in external initiatives than previously. The timing coincided with significant restructuring within several relevant agencies.

Draft maps that showed relevant information relating to each subject were prepared and offered to the participants for comment and refinement. The information displayed had to fulfil criteria developed during the vision’s development. These criteria were based on only providing information of relevance to land managers, to look to the future (2030) and in a form that would not become out of date before that date.

The final maps were provided to DNPA. Discussion on the eventual design of the expanded vision is on-going. It may be more practical to incorporate only some of the new layers.
5. Summary of home farm interviews

DFF Home farm testing

A short note on the results of testing the emerging design for its relevance and applicability to home farms. This was a quick investigation focused on the first stages of the process.

Four home farms were selected that reflect the main farming enterprises in the area. All are farms with common rights on one or both of the commons in the initiative and the farmers are active graziers on this common land.

Farm descriptions

The farms are livestock farms varying from 80 ha. to 225 ha. Two are predominantly dairy farms (this is not representative), one organic and one not, but both have additional suckler herds and sheep. The other two have suckler herds and sheep, with one finishing all the calves. Two keep hill ponies. Almost all of the land (96%) is within the Severely Disadvantaged Area (SDA) and all is within the National Park boundary. One is farmed under a tenancy and the other three are a mix of freehold and rented. All have been or are still in an ESA agreement.

Identifying if the land is suitable for an agri-environment scheme.

Form A (Does your land qualify for high level agri-environment?) was completed by each farmer. The main headings were useful in identifying which, if any, public goods might be relevant. The following is a summary of the results.

Access: All the farmers understood the status of access on their land but only two farmers found these questions relevant. The existing questions were considered to be fit for purpose.

Archaeological and historic environment: This was particularly relevant to two farms. The other farmers were aware of historic features (a well and tin workings) on their land but not aware of their significance. An additional question on signage was suggested by one farmer.

Nature / wildlife: All of the farmers were unsure of the status of the wildlife on their farm and said they would seek advice on this issue. None were aware of an SSSI on their land but two thought that this designation was relevant to land that they rented. The questions were considered to be complex and all thought there should be an additional question related specifically to woodland.

Landscape: All farmers completed these questions. There was confidence that the farmed landscape was of value and that their management contributed to the
landscape. A question addressing the view from the moorland over the enclosed land was suggested.

**Water:** All farmers completed these questions. An additional question on fish was suggested.

**Carbon:** None of the farmers thought these questions were relevant to their farms apart from the farm with newtakes on peat soils. There was a suggestion for a new question on permanent pasture and its role in storing carbon.

**Sustainable Food Production:** These questions were considered to need refining and possibly to be expanded. There was support for re-wording to acknowledge the need to maintain low input/low output systems and continue good practice.

(Farming) part of above. The need for a question that identified a link between the home farm and moorland (common) grazing was supported. This is particularly relevant to home farms that provide stock for the grazing of high nature and/or landscape value. The home farm is vital to providing the means of managing the moorland.

**Specific issues that arose whilst filling in the form.**

On one farm three-quarters of the land is classified as Open Access Land and has a public bridleway crossing the remaining enclosed land and farm. Another had several paths crossing a piece of rented land. Concerns were expressed over accepting responsibility for managing paths. Two farms had no public access, including paths. One of these would consider providing permitted access especially if connected to education. However this would have cost implications and need payment for time and infrastructure. One farmer suggested re-routing or extending a public footpath to provide better views of a major archaeological site.

Archaeology was recognised to be very important but only two farms had scheduled and other sites on their enclosed land. In both cases rented land, one a newtake and the other a farmstead, were rich in archaeology.

The biodiversity on 3 farms was probably relatively poor. The need to manage the grassland to provide feed for stock resulted in little natural or semi-natural vegetation with the exception of woodland. However in all cases the woodland was recognised to need management to deliver produce and improve its wildlife value.

The need for advice was stressed by 3 farmers. All the farmers were aware of the importance of Greater Horseshoe bats and their use of hedges and rough ground and two had carried out positive management.

All the farms had streams on the land that eventually fed into rivers. Concern over cattle in rivers and bank erosion was expressed by two farmers. Fish and fishing were raised by two farmers, with one of these farmers stating he had carried out positive management for spawning fish at the request of "somebody in the past".
Farming in a sustainable way was important to all four farmers. One had converted to organic and all stressed that their carbon foot-print was low compared to most (lowland) farms and that this should be acknowledged. Providing grazing animals on the moorland was an efficient use of excess vegetation turning it into food. The quality of meat from moorland animals is high and deserves to benefit from a premium.

Linking the home farm (with possibly low public benefits) with the moorland (with high public benefits) was explored. Payment for providing the management of the public goods must recognise the real costs incurred by having to remove stock from the moorland in winter.

Conclusions

The process appeared to be relevant for identifying the suitability of a high level scheme for farm land. It quickly identified the main assets that might benefit from specific management and empowered the farmer to consider what was of value on the land.

The questions set out on form A would require re-working to become relevant to farm land.

Additional questions that revealed the links between the home farm and the moorland are required.

No attempt to quantify the revealed assets was made. The implications of rewarding the home farm as the source of management on areas of high public value requires further development.
### 5a. List of participants in part 1

#### Haytor & Bagtor Commons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tony Colwill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Vallance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Bowden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Mann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Bowden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Retallick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Retallick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### The Forest (southern part)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colin Abel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layland Branfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Coaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jed Caunter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Cleave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anton Coaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt &amp; Bridget Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Colton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A C &amp; Mrs A Colwill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W J Edmunds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C Hutchings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr D Legassick,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr David Mudge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Radmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr M Northmore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5b. Consultees in part 2.

**Carbon:** Dr Lauren Parry (Univ. of Exeter) and Frances Cooper (DNPA).

**Water:** Martin Ross (SWW), Mary-Rose Lane (EA) and Dr Anna Harlow (EA).

**Access:** Andrew Watson (DNPA), the Ranger Service (DNPA), Patrick Watson (Chair of Dartmoor Access Forum and sub-group), Access sub-group members - Bill Lane, Juliet Edmunds, Sharon Gedye, John Howell and Sue Bishop (DNPA).

In addition to the above, staff from Natural England, especially Eamon Crowe, Andy Guy, Pete Stevens and Mat Carter, provided information and advice on specific issues and on part 1. Likewise Sue Goodfellow, Norman Baldock, Andy Crabb and Jane Marchand from Dartmoor National Park were particularly helpful on many aspects of the project. Special mention goes to David Partridge who had the unenviable job of translating the draft maps into something useful.

This short project was overseen by a small review group composed of Prof. Ian Mercer (Dartmoor Commoners' Council), Sue Goodfellow (DNPA) and Eamon Crowe (NE).