



# Estimating potential economic effects of revised Universal Action elements of the proposed Sustainable Farming Scheme

## Phase 5 Farm-level modelling report

July 2025

# Estimating potential economic effects of revised Universal Action elements of the proposed Sustainable Farming Scheme

## Phase 5 Farm-level modelling report

Authors: Steven Thomson<sup>1</sup> and Andrew Moxey<sup>2</sup>

A deliverable under Welsh Government project  
C054/2023/2024

July 2025

1



2

Pareto Consulting

RSK ADAS Ltd (ADAS) has prepared this report for the sole use of the client, showing reasonable skill and care, for the intended purposes as stated in the agreement under which this work was completed. The report may not be relied upon by any other party without the express agreement of the client and ADAS. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report.

Where any data supplied by the client or from other sources have been used, it has been assumed that the information is correct. No responsibility can be accepted by ADAS for inaccuracies in the data supplied by any other party. The conclusions and recommendations in this report are based on the assumption that all relevant information has been supplied by those bodies from whom it was requested.

No part of this report may be copied or duplicated without the express permission of ADAS and the party for whom it was prepared.

Where field investigations have been carried out, these have been restricted to a level of detail required to achieve the stated objectives of the work.

This work has been undertaken in accordance with the quality management system of RSK ADAS Ltd

The suggested citation for this work is: Moxey, A. and S. Thomson. 2025. Estimating potential economic effects of revised Universal Action elements of the proposed Sustainable Farming Scheme. Phase 5 Farm-level modelling report. A report to Welsh Government under project C054/2023/2024.

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	1
Key sensitivities .....	29
Annex A: Model overview .....	32

## Table of Tables

<b>Table 1.a: Estimated managed areas under SFS Universal Actions, by farm type (full-time businesses only, n=8,781)<sup>7</sup></b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>Table 1.b: Estimated managed areas under SFS Universal Actions, by region (full-time businesses only, n=8,781)<sup>7</sup></b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>Table 1.c: Estimated managed areas under SFS Universal Actions, by farm size (full-time businesses only, n=8,781)</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Table 1.d: Estimated managed areas under SFS Universal Actions, by farm type (including part-time businesses, n=15,555)<sup>8</sup></b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Table 1.e: Estimated managed areas under SFS Universal Actions, by region (including part-time businesses, n=15,555)<sup>8</sup></b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Table 1.f: Estimated managed areas under SFS Universal Actions, by farm size (including part-time businesses, n=15,555)</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Table 2.a: Estimated output and cost effects of compliance with SFS UA requirements, by farm type (full-time businesses only, n=8,781)</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>Table 2.b: Estimated output and cost effects of compliance with SFS UA requirements, by region (full-time businesses only, n=8,781)</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>Table 2.c: Estimated output and cost effects of compliance with SFS UA requirements, by farm size (full-time businesses only, n=8,781)</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>Table 2.d: Estimated output and cost effects of compliance with SFS UA requirements, by farm type (including part-time farms, n=15,555)</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>Table 2.e: Estimated output and cost effects of compliance with SFS UA requirements, by farm region (including part-time farms, n=15,555)</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>Table 2.f: Estimated output and cost effects of compliance with SFS UA requirements, by farm size (including part-time farms, n=15,555)</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>Table 3.a: Estimated payment for SFS UA requirements, by farm type (full-time businesses only, n=8,781)</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>Table 3.b: Estimated payment for SFS UA requirements, by farm region (full-time businesses only, n=8,781)</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>Table 3.c: Estimated payment for SFS UA requirements, by farm size (full-time businesses only, n=8,781)</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>Table 3.d: Estimated payment for SFS UA requirements, by farm type (including part-time farms, n=15,555)</b> .....	<b>18</b>

<b>Table 3.e: Estimated expenditure and income effects of compliance with SFS UA requirements, by farm region (including part-time farms, n=15,555) .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Table 3.f: Estimated payment for SFS UA requirements, by farm size (including part-time farms, n=15,555) .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Table 4.a: Estimated change in FBI under SFS UA requirements, by farm type (full-time businesses only, n=8,781) .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Table 4.b: Estimated change in FBI under SFS UA requirements, by farm region (full-time businesses only, n=8,781) .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Table 4.c: Estimated change in FBI under SFS UA requirements, by farm size (full-time businesses only, n=8,781) .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Table 4.d: Estimated change in FBI under SFS UA requirements, by farm type (including part-time farms, n=15,555) .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Table 4.e: Estimated change in FBI under SFS UA requirements, by farm region (including part-time farms, n=15,555) .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Table 4.f: Estimated change in FBI under SFS UA requirements, by farm size (including part-time farms, n=15,555) .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Table 5.a: Estimated change in FBI under SFS UA requirements, relative to dynamic BPS tapering baseline, by farm type (including part-time farms, n=15555) SVP=£115/ha with no capping ....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Table 6.a: Estimated change in FBI under SFS UA requirements, relative to dynamic BPS tapering baseline, by farm type (including part-time farms, n=15,555) SVP=£70/ha with no capping .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Table 7.a: Estimated avoidance of livestock unit displacement and associated avoidance of GM reductions under different illustrative propensities of non-adherence to SFS stocking density guidance .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Table 8.a: Estimated Whole Farm compliance costs already being incurred and hence non-additional under different illustrative propensities of baseline adherence to best practice .....</b>	<b>31</b>

## Introduction

1. The Welsh Government commissioned research by ADAS, Pareto Consulting, SRUC and University College Dublin to estimate the potential economic effects of elements of the proposed Sustainable Farming Scheme (SFS) across Wales in terms of agricultural land and labour use, farm output and farm incomes. The project has collated and analysed physical and financial data to construct a farm business-level model of Welsh agriculture to simulate SFS Universal Action proposals.
2. Phase 5 of the project updated the model to reflect newly available biophysical and financial data plus the most recent SFS proposals, including: updating payment rates whilst introducing capping and tapering of total payments; modifying stocking density calculations; removing previous buffers around environmental designations and the minimum woodland threshold; including common land; including aspects of agricultural pollution regulations in the baseline; and updating Farm Business Survey (FBS) financial data to 2022/23 and using new hedgerow information.
3. Numbers of livestock remain, however, baselined to 2019. Given that reported aggregate headcounts of animals have fallen since 2019, this means that the model is likely to over-estimate livestock displacement attributable to the SFS alone i.e. some displacement has already occurred for other reasons. Similarly, the policy decision to now use guidance rather than more prescriptive management requirements also means that the model may over-estimate displacement if a proportion of farms choose to not adhere to the guidance. In both cases, estimated reductions in farm output, labour usage and Farm Business Income (FBI) will exaggerate the effect of introducing the SFS.
4. These, and other caveats, are considered further below and highlight that all estimates should be viewed as indicative rather than definitive. Ideally, they should be interpreted in tandem with insights from other models and ground-truthing exercises. Equally, data gaps and related caveats highlight potential challenges that merit further investigation for practical policy implementation purposes. Nonetheless the results do indicate the likely relative magnitudes and patterns of potential impacts arising from proposed SFS Universal Actions and where pressure for change is likely to be felt.
5. Unlike Phase 4, only two sets of SFS payment rates were considered in Phase 5, but with SFS support now replacing most Pillar II as well Pillar I CAP support. These were: a Whole Farm Payment of £31 payable on each ha of the farm business; a habitat-management payment of £69 payable on each ha of eligible semi-natural habitat (or £25/ha for common land habitat under a grazing agreement); a woodland management payment of £62 payable on each ha of owned woodland (tenanted farms are assumed to have no managerial control over woodland); and a new 'social value payment' of either £115 or £70 payable on each ha.
6. In addition, total payments to a farm business were also subject to progressive tapered reductions: 0% on up to £150k; then 15% on the next £50k up to £200k; then 30% on the next £50k up to £250k; then 55% on the next £50k up to £300k; and then 100% on anything over £300k. All farms are required to have 10% of their area under semi-natural habitat, and various stocking rate restrictions have been applied to different habitat types to reflect anticipated SFS guidance to farmers.

7. For ease of comparison, the following Tables summarise Phase 5 modelling results in a similar format to previous Phase 4 results, by farm type, region and size.<sup>1</sup> Results presented include aggregate biophysical indicators plus expenditure, output and farm income alongside median and mean values (which differ due to unevenness in underlying distributions, and where medians are zero it highlights that at least half the farms are unaffected). Future 'Optional' and 'Collaborative' SFS elements are not modelled. Unlike previous Phases, analysis is extended to part-time as well as full-time farms<sup>2</sup>, thereby duplicating each Table.
8. Tables 1 and 2 present biophysical results whilst Tables 3 and 4 present financial results. In each case, Tables a to c relate to full-time farms and Tables d to f to all farms in receipt of CAP support in the baseline. To aid navigation, farm type Tables have a blue header row, region Tables have a yellow header row and size Tables have a green header, with a lighter colour shading in each case for only full-time farms and a darker shading for the wider farm business population. Tables 5 and 6 offer further results only for all farms and only by farm type, showing the changes in FBI under the SFS Universal Actions relative to the proposed progressive reduction in BPS support over time. Tables 7 and 8 summarise some sensitivity analysis in relation to key assumptions regarding adherence to SFS guidance and the additionality of compliance costs.

## Headline results

9. Relative to Phase 4, the estimated area of woodland maintained under the SFS is lower. This reflects removal of the previous proposed scheme rule for 10% tree cover but also a new assumption that woodland on tenanted farms will not be claimed by tenants.<sup>3</sup> Conversely, the inclusion of commons adds to the SFS area. Extending analysis to part-time farms also increases the SFS area.
10. Relative to Phase 4 results, the aggregate number of livestock units displaced is significantly lower. This reflects a combination of factors, including the removal of the 10% minimum tree cover scheme rule and removal of the 300m buffer around environmental designations. The former retains grazing land (because no trees are planted) whilst the latter reduces the area subject to stocking density restrictions. Modelled reallocation of potentially displaced livestock within a business, subject to spare carrying capacity, further reduces estimated net displacement.
11. Retention of more livestock also means that reductions in estimated aggregate labour requirements are also less than in Phase 4. Extending analysis to include part-time farms increases the estimated livestock and labour displacement, but only modestly since part-time farms account for small shares of total livestock and labour requirements. The distribution of livestock (and hence labour) displacement is uneven, with the median farm in all regions and most farm types and sizes incurring zero displacement but the mean farm incurring some.

---

<sup>1</sup> Size is expressed in terms of European Size Units (ESUs) related to output rather than area, meaning that a farm with a smaller physical area but a bigger turnover will be classed as a bigger business than a farm with a larger physical footprint but lower turnover. The size classes used are: Very Small <8 ESU; Small => 8 and <40 ESU; Medium => 40 and <100 ESU; Large => 100 and <200 ESU; 8 ESU is equivalent to €25k of Standard Output, the approximate threshold for a full-time farm.

<sup>2</sup> All farms in receipt of Basic Payment Scheme (BPS) and/or Pillar II funding in the baseline and with sufficient financial data to model, with full-time being defined as a Standard Output of at least €25k. Specialist pig, poultry and horticultural farms are excluded due to lack of financial performance data.

<sup>3</sup> This may not be true in all cases since tenancy agreements can include areas of woodland but, in the absence of such detailed information, is taken as the default position here.



Very large farms and dairy farms have higher medians and higher means, reflecting their general tendency to be more densely stocked.<sup>4</sup>

12. Aggregate Output and Gross Margin reductions are also lower than in Phase 4, reflecting less livestock displacement. However, higher gross margins reflecting updated financial data mean that losses per livestock unit displaced are higher than in Phase 4, partially countering the lower level of livestock displacement. Again, the distribution of effects is uneven with medians being highest for very large and for dairy farms. Aggregate compliance costs are higher than in Phase 4, primarily reflecting assumed higher farmer time commitments. Median and mean compliance costs are very similar by farm size, reflecting that only minor elements (e.g. soil testing) vary with farm scale. The fixed overhead nature of many compliance requirements (e.g. planning, reporting) means that smaller farms' compliance costs represent a proportionately higher share of their SFS payment than larger farms.
13. The Social Value Payment (SVP) is the single largest element of total SFS payments, with the aggregate difference between SVP at £115/ha and £70/ha being stark. Aggregate SFS payments are only affected modestly by capping and tapering. However, capping does limit the largest payments, resulting in lower mean values. For example (although not shown in the Tables), with the SVP @£115/ha, capping catches 74 businesses (mean area >1300ha), predominantly sheep, beef or LFA grazing farms; with the SVP @£70/ha, capping catches 29 businesses (mean area > 1900ha), predominantly sheep or LFA grazing farms.
14. Relative to Phase 4 results, the percentage reductions in Farm Business Income (FBI) are lower. Again, this reflects reduced livestock displacement – although this effect is partially offset by higher compliance costs and by updated financial unit values.<sup>5</sup> Unsurprisingly, FBI losses are higher with the lower SVP rate and with capping. Median and mean values are highest for very large and for dairy farms. The percentage of farms suffering FBI reductions (relative to the baseline) is lower than in Phase 4 but remains high. The small proportion of farms gaining FBI generally do so modestly, although some uncapped payments are very high.
15. As before, the result that aggregate FBI is reduced (albeit by less than in Phase 4) even where total support remains approximately the same (i.e. at the higher SVP rate) reflects the fact that the SFS imposes additional compliance costs<sup>6</sup> and imposes Gross Margin losses through livestock displacement (noting that, due to heterogeneity across the population, it is still possible for some farms to gain whilst others lose FBI). Restoring aggregate FBI with flat-rate payments would require additional support expenditure and/or improved market returns through better farmgate prices and improved productivity.
16. Whereas Tables 4a to 4f compare estimated FBI under the SFS to baseline FBI with 100% of historical Basic Payment Scheme (BPS) support, Tables 5 and 6 compare it to FBI under progressively lower (80% to 20%) levels of BPS support. This illustrates the shifting relativities between FBI under declining legacy CAP support compared to future SFS support, with FBI under the former declining and hence aggregate changes in FBI under the SFS ultimately shifting from relative losses to relative gains. Such tapering of BPS support is proposed to ease a gradual transition from legacy CAP schemes to the SFS, and the changing relative levels of FBI offer an indication of the possible relative attractiveness of enrolling in the SFS rather

---

<sup>4</sup> Because size is defined by output not by area.

<sup>5</sup> For example, output price spikes (notably for milk) boosted Gross Margins, meaning that the cost of displacing a livestock unit is higher than in Phase 4.

<sup>6</sup> Farmer time elements of compliance costs could perhaps be excluded from FBI calculations (i.e. as managerial effort to be rewarded by FBI) but would still need to be accounted for and hence are included here (see also sensitivity analysis and discussion of key caveats below).

than continuing with BPS support (although the absence of Optional and Collaborative layers means that modelled funding support is less than the total that may be available in future).

17. Unsurprisingly, FBI under the SFS is relatively better at higher rates of BPS tapering. Again, however, the pattern of effects is uneven across different farm types, with dairy farms still suffering relative losses whilst other types see relative gains. It should also be noted that calculating relative changes in FBI against a shifting BPS baseline does not alter the absolute level of FBI under the SFS, nor the relevance of seeking to enhance business resilience through (e.g.) improved market returns and productivity.



**Table 1.a: Estimated managed areas under SFS Universal Actions, by farm type (full-time businesses only, n=8,781)<sup>7</sup>**

	Arable (233)	LFA Dairy (894)	Lowland Dairy (621)	Lowland grazing (1,133)	Lowland Mixed/ other (326)	Mixed LFA grazing (2,796)	Specialist beef SDA (549)	Specialist sheep SDA (2,229)	All FT farms (8,781)
SN habitat created (ha)	1.2k	4.7k	4.5k	3.9k	1.4k	5.4k	0.5k	1.2k	<b>22.7k</b>
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	3.5; 5.1	4.3; 5.2	6.1; 7.3	2.5; 3.4	2.3; 4.2	0.0; 1.9	0.0; 1.0	0.0; 0.5	<b>0.0; 2.6</b>
Retained SN habitat paid (ha)	0.4k	4.8k	0.1k	2.4k	3.3k	51.0k	20.4k	149.6k	<b>231.9k</b>
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	0.0; 1.8	0.0; 5.4	0.0; 0.1	0.0; 2.1	0.0; 10.1	1.6; 18.2	5.5; 37.1	15.3; 67.1	<b>0.7; 26.4</b>
Woodland maintained (ha)	1.5k	4.5k	2.3k	4.0k	2.4k	13.2k	3.4k	19.6k	<b>51.0k</b>
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	1.4; 6.6k	2.1; 5.1k	0.8; 3.8k	0.4; 3.5k	2.2; 7.2k	1.9; 4.7k	2.6; 6.2k	4.0; 8.8k	<b>2.0; 5.8k</b>
Commons managed (ha)	0.0k	0.9k	0.2k	2.1k	0.9k	14.7k	4.3k	51.1k	<b>74.3k</b>
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	0.0; 0.0	0.0; 1.0	0.0; 0.3	0.0; 1.9	0.0; 2.8	0.0; 5.3	0.0; 7.9	0.0; 22.9	<b>0.0; 8.5</b>
Total SFS area (ha)	35.3k	113.1k	83.4k	104.2k	47.0k	335.6k	85.6k	453.0k	<b>1,257.2k</b>
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	119.3; 151.6	93.8; 126.6	108.2; 134.2	68.1; 92.0	104.5; 144.1	86.5; 120.0	100.5; 155.9	144.4; 203.2	<b>99.2; 143.2</b>

**Table 1.b: Estimated managed areas under SFS Universal Actions, by region (full-time businesses only, n=8,781)<sup>7</sup>**

	Carmarthenshire (1,254)	Ceredigion (850)	NE Wales (1,355)	NW Wales (1,279)	Pembrokeshire (813)	Powys (2,171)	South Wales (1,059)	All FT farms (8,781)
SN habitat created (ha)	3.1k	2.5k	4.7k	2.8k	3.0k	3.3k	3.2k	<b>22.7k</b>
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	0.6; 2.4	0.9; 3.0	1.8; 3.5	0.0; 2.2	1.9; 3.7	0.0; 1.5	0.0; 3.1	<b>0.0; 2.6</b>
Retained SN habitat paid (ha)	8.4k	25.5k	33.4k	75.5k	3.4k	70.5k	15.2k	<b>231.9k</b>
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	0.0; 6.7	0.5; 30.0	0.0; 24.7	7.7; 59.0	0.0; 4.1	2.7; 32.5	0.1; 14.4	<b>0.7; 26.4</b>
Woodland maintained (ha)	7.1k	3.9k	6.0k	7.4k	4.2k	16.5k	5.9k	<b>51.0k</b>
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	2.8; 5.7k	2.0; 4.6k	1.0; 4.4k	0.4; 5.8k	1.4; 5.1k	4.0; 7.6k	1.8; 5.5k	<b>2.0; 5.8k</b>
Commons managed (ha)	7.4k	0.4k	11.2k	7.6k	3.0k	38.7k	6.0k	<b>74.3k</b>
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	0.0; 5.9	0.0; 0.5	0.0; 8.3	0.0; 5.9	0.0; 3.7	0.0; 17.8	0.0; 5.6	<b>0.0; 8.5</b>
Total SFS area (ha)	133.8k	109.8k	188.0k	214.0k	104.8k	364.2k	142.7k	<b>1,257.2k</b>
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	82.8; 106.7	89.0; 129.2	90.9; 138.8	105.2; 167.3	94.9; 128.9	121.2; 167.8	99.5; 134.8	<b>99.2; 143.2</b>

**Table 1.c: Estimated managed areas under SFS Universal Actions, by farm size (full-time businesses only, n=8,781)<sup>7</sup>**

	<b>Small (2,664)</b>	<b>Medium (3,323)</b>	<b>Large (1,320)</b>	<b>Very Large (1,467)</b>	<b>All FT farms (8,774)</b>
SN habitat created (ha)	3.4k	5.6k	3.9k	9.7k	<b>22.7k</b>
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	0.0; 1.3	0.0; 1.7	0.0; 3.0	5.3; 6.6	<b>0.0; 2.6</b>
Retained SN habitat paid (ha)	44.9k	95.0k	58.6k	33.4k	<b>231.9k</b>
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	0.8; 16.8	2.3; 28.6	2.1; 44.3	0.0; 22.8	<b>0.7; 26.4</b>
Woodland maintained (ha)	9.5k	18.7k	11.6k	11.2k	<b>51.0k</b>
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	1.2; 3.6k	2.2; 5.6k	3.4; 8.7k	2.2; 7.7k	<b>2.0; 5.8k</b>
Commons managed (ha)	10.8k	30.2k	22.0k	11.2k	<b>74.3k</b>
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	0.0; 4.1	0.0; 9.1	0.0; 16.6	0.0; 7.7	<b>0.0; 8.5</b>
Total SFS area (ha)	216.9k	449.6k	284.4k	306.2k	<b>1,257.2k</b>
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	61.5; 81.4	104.9; 135.3	165.7; 214.8	136.2; 208.6	<b>99.2; 143.2</b>

<sup>7</sup> 'SN habitat created' is new semi-natural habitat created on land previously under arable, temporary grass or permanent pasture, and receives the £69/ha habitat management payment. 'Retained SN habitat paid' is existing semi-natural habitat retained (excluding commons and woodland) and in receipt of the £69/ha payment. 'Commons managed' (i.e. under a grazing agreement) receives £25/ha for habitat management. 'Woodland maintained' receives £62/ha. The total area of semi-natural habitat used to meet the minimum 10% threshold requirement includes commons and broadleaf woodlands, but some of these receive separate payments and thus are not included in the retained area paid the £69/ha habitat management payment. The total SFS area receives both the Whole Farm payment of £31/ha and the Social Value Payment of either £115/ha or £70/ha.

**Table 1.d: Estimated managed areas under SFS Universal Actions, by farm type (including part-time businesses, n=15,555)<sup>8</sup>**

	Arable (301)	LFA Dairy (924)	Lowland Dairy (621)	Lowland grazing (2,124)	Lowland Mixed/ other (1,680)	LFA Mixed grazing (4,752)	Specialist beef SDA (978)	Specialist sheep SDA (4,175)	All farms (15,555)
SN habitat created (ha)	1.3k	4.7k	4.5k	5.1k	2.4k	7.0k	0.7k	1.9k	27.6k
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	1.9; 4.2	4.2; 5.1	6.1; 7.3	1.4; 2.4	0.0; 1.4	0.0; 1.5	0.0; 0.8	0.0; 0.4	0.0; 1.8
Retained SN habitat paid (ha)	0.5k	4.8k	0.1k	2.9k	8.0k	55.1k	25.9k	167.3k	264.6k
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	0.0; 1.6	0.0; 5.2	0.0; 0.1	0.0; 1.3	0.0; 4.8	0.4; 11.6	2.9; 26.5	4.6; 40.1	0.2; 17.0
Woodland maintained (ha)	1.7k	4.6k	2.3k	5.2k	7.0k	16.5k	4.2k	24.2k	65.9k
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	0.8; 5.8	2.0; 5.0	0.8; 3.8	0.1; 2.4	0.7; 4.2	1.0; 3.5	1.2; 4.3	1.8; 5.8	1.0; 4.2
Commons managed (ha)	0.0k	0.9k	0.2k	2.3k	1.5k	15.2k	5.5k	56.1k	81.6k
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	0.0; 0.0	0.0; 1.0	0.0; 0.3	0.0; 1.1	0.0; 0.9	0.0; 3.2	0.0; 5.6	0.0; 13.4	0.0; 5.2
Total SFS area (ha)	37.2k	114.0k	83.4k	130.2k	94.0k	390.8k	105.7k	533.7k	1,488.9k
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	85.3; 123.5	90.8; 123.3	108.2; 134.2	41.6; 61.3	29.1; 55.9	52.8; 82.2	60.2; 108.1	75.2; 127.8	58.3; 96.7

**Table 1.e: Estimated managed areas under SFS Universal Actions, by region (including part-time businesses, n=15,555)<sup>8</sup>**

	Carmarthenshire (2,428)	Ceredigion (1,605)	NE Wales (2,160)	NW Wales (2,340)	Pembrokeshire (1,337)	Powys (3,526)	South Wales (2,159)	All farms (15,555)
SN habitat created (ha)	3.9k	3.1k	5.5k	3.4k	3.4k	4.2k	4.0k	27.6k
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	0.0; 1.6	0.0; 1.9	0.8; 2.6	0.0; 1.5	0.6; 2.5	0.0; 1.2	0.0; 1.9	0.0; 1.8
Retained SN habitat paid (ha)	11.6k	29.7k	36.5k	85.9k	4.2k	77.2k	19.4k	264.6k
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	0.0; 4.8	0.3; 18.5	0.0; 16.9	2.1; 36.7	0.0; 3.2	0.8; 21.9	0.0; 9.0	0.2; 17.0
Woodland maintained (ha)	8.4k	0.5k	12.1k	9.0k	3.3k	41.3k	7.1k	65.9k
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	0.0; 3.5	0.0; 0.3	0.0; 5.6	0.0; 3.8	0.0; 2.4	0.0; 11.7	0.0; 3.3	1.0; 4.2
Commons managed (ha)	8.4k	0.5k	12.1k	9.0k	3.3k	41.3k	7.1k	81.6k
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	0.0; 3.5	0.0; 0.3	0.0; 5.6	0.0; 3.8	0.0; 2.4	0.0; 11.7	0.0; 3.3	0.0; 5.2
Total SFS area (ha)	170.6k	132.6k	213.0k	251.1k	120.6k	417.6k	183.4k	1,488.9k
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	49.5; 70.3	51.3; 82.7	58.9; 98.7	54.5; 107.3	57.9; 90.3	76.1; 118.5	55.4; 85.0	58.3; 96.7

**Table 1.f: Estimated managed areas under SFS Universal Actions, by farm size (including part-time businesses, n=15,555)<sup>8</sup>**

	<b>Very Small (3,489)</b>	<b>Small (5,949)</b>	<b>Medium (3,324)</b>	<b>Large (1,324)</b>	<b>Very Large (1,469)</b>	<b>All farms (15,555)</b>
SN habitat created (ha)	1.7k	6.6k	5.6k	3.9k	9.7k	<b>27.6k</b>
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	0.0; 0.5	0.0; 1.1	0.0; 1.7	0.0; 3.0	5.3; 6.6	<b>0.0; 1.8</b>
Retained SN habitat paid (ha)	9.5k	68.0k	95.0k	58.6k	33.4k	<b>264.6k</b>
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	0.0; 2.7	0.3; 11.4	2.3; 28.6	2.1; 44.3	0.0; 22.8	<b>0.2; 17.0</b>
Woodland maintained (ha)	5.6k	18.7k	18.7k	11.6k	11.2k	<b>65.9k</b>
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	0.2; 1.6	0.8; 3.2	2.2; 5.6	3.4; 8.7	2.2; 7.6	<b>1.0; 4.2</b>
Commons managed (ha)	1.4k	16.7k	30.2k	22.0k	11.3k	<b>81.6k</b>
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	0.0; 0.4	0.0; 2.8	0.0; 9.1	0.0; 16.6	0.0; 7.7	<b>0.0; 5.2</b>
Total SFS area (ha)	75.1k	373.2k	449.7k	284.4k	306.4k	<b>1,488.9k</b>
Median; Mean per farm (ha)	15.4; 21.5	47.2; 62.7	104.9; 135.3	165.7; 214.8	136.3; 208.6	<b>58.3; 96.7</b>

<sup>8</sup> 'SN habitat created' is new semi-natural habitat created on land previously under arable, temporary grass or permanent pasture, and receives the £69/ha habitat management payment. 'Retained SN habitat paid' is existing semi-natural habitat retained (excluding commons and woodland) and in receipt of the £69/ha payment. 'Commons managed' (i.e. under a grazing agreement) receives £25/ha for habitat management. 'Woodland maintained' receives £62/ha. The total area of semi-natural habitat used to meet the minimum 10% threshold requirement includes commons and broadleaf woodlands, but some of these receive separate payments and thus are not included in the retained area paid the £69/ha habitat management payment. The total SFS area receives both the Whole Farm payment of £31/ha and the Social Value Payment of either £115/ha or £70/ha.

**Table 1.g: Estimated output and cost effects of compliance with SFS UA requirements, by farm type (full-time businesses only, n=8,781)**

	Arable (233)	LFA Dairy (894)	Lowland Dairy (621)	Lowland grazing (1,133)	Lowland Mixed/ other (326)	LFA Mixed grazing (2,796)	Specialist beef SDA (549)	Specialist sheep SDA (2,229)	All FT farms (8,781)
Livestock reduction (GLU)	0.2k	8.5k	12.2k	6.2k	1.3k	10.1k	1.9k	22.9k	<b>63.4k</b>
%change	-4.3%	-4.0%	-6.7%	-5.3%	-4.5%	-3.6%	-3.9%	-8.9%	<b>-5.6%</b>
Median, Mean per farm (GLU)	0.0; 1.0	2.1; 9.5	4.2; 19.6	0.0; 5.5	0.0; 4.0	0.0; 3.6	0.0; 3.5	0.0; 10.3	<b>0.0; 7.2</b>
Output reduction (£)	£0.4m	£21.4m	£32.3m	£4.5m	£0.9m	£6.6m	£1.7m	£11.2m	<b>£79.0m</b>
%change	-0.7%	-3.9%	-6.9%	-4.3%	-1.6%	-2.8%	-3.1%	-7.0%	<b>-4.7%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.0k; £1.6k	£3.9k; £24.0k	£9.6k; £52.0k	£0.0k; £3.9k	£0.0k; £2.9k	£0.0k; £2.4k	£0.0k; £3.1k	£0.0k; £5.0k	<b>£0.0k; £9.0k</b>
GM reduction (£)	£0.3m	£12.6m	£19.7m	£2.9m	£0.5m	£3.9m	£0.9m	£6.3m	<b>£47.0m</b>
%change	-0.9%	-4.8%	-8.6%	-5.2%	-1.5%	-3.4%	-3.1%	-8.4%	<b>-5.7%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.0k; £1.1k	£2.5k; £14.1k	£6.1k; £31.8k	£0.0k; £2.5k	£0.0k; £1.4k	£0.0k; £1.4k	£0.0k; £1.6k	£0.0k; £2.8k	<b>£0.0k; £5.4k</b>
Other compliance costs (£)	£0.7m	£2.4m	£1.7m	£2.6m	£0.9m	£6.7m	£1.4m	£5.7m	<b>£22.2m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£2.5k; £2.9k	£2.4k; £2.7k	£2.5k; £2.8k	£2.1k; £2.3k	£2.4k; £2.8k	£2.2k; £2.4k	£2.3k; £2.5k	£2.3k; £2.6k	<b>£2.3k; £2.5k</b>
CAP PI & PII reduction (£) <sup>9</sup>	£5.2m	£17.5m	£12.9m	£17.6m	£7.1m	£55.0m	£13.2m	£68.8m	<b>£197.3m</b>
%change	-97.2%	-95.8%	-96.1%	-95.4%	-92.0%	-92.6%	-89.0%	-87.8%	<b>-91.4%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£19.1k; £22.4k	£16.7k; £19.6k	£18.2k; £20.8k	£13.7k; £15.5k	£17.5k; £21.7k	£15.8k; £19.7k	£17.3k; £24.0k	£23.1k; £30.9k	<b>£17.3k; £22.5k</b>
Change in SLR	5	170	244	111	27	188	34	443	<b>1,221</b>
%change	-1.2%	-3.8%	-6.4%	-4.5%	-2.6%	-2.7%	-3.4%	-5.1%	<b>-4.2%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (SLR)	0.0; 0.0	0.0; 0.2	0.1; 0.4	0.0; 0.1	0.0; 0.1	0.0; 0.1	0.0; 0.1	0.0; 0.2	<b>0.0; 0.1</b>

<sup>9</sup> SFS Universal Action support is intended to replace annual funding under the Basic Payment Scheme (including Greening) and the Habitat Wales scheme, which are therefore removed from farms currently receiving them. However, some other legacy Glastir schemes will continue until SFS Optional and Collaborative actions become available. Hence less than 100% of baseline Pillar I and II support under the CAP is removed. Similarly, existing capital grants schemes are not included in the modelling.

**Table 1.h: Estimated output and cost effects of compliance with SFS UA requirements, by region (full-time businesses only, n=8,781)**

	<b>Carmarthenshire (1,254)</b>	<b>Ceredigion (850)</b>	<b>NE Wales (1,355)</b>	<b>NW Wales (1,279)</b>	<b>Pembrokeshire (813)</b>	<b>Powys (2,171)</b>	<b>South Wales (1,059)</b>	<b>All FT farms (8,781)</b>
Livestock reduction (GLU)	6.5k	3.2k	12.4k	9.7k	3.0k	20.4k	8.2k	<b>63.4k</b>
%change	-4.1%	-3.0%	-6.8%	-6.3%	-2.2%	-7.3%	-7.3%	<b>-5.6%</b>
Median, Mean per farm (GLU)	0.0; 5.2	0.0; 3.7	0.0; 9.1	0.0; 7.6	0.0; 3.7	0.0; 9.4	0.0; 7.7	<b>0.0; 7.2</b>
Output reduction (£)	£12.0m	£4.3m	£17.9m	£9.1m	£5.0m	£20.6m	£10.1m	<b>£79.0m</b>
%change	-4.1%	-2.5%	-6.3%	-4.7%	-1.6%	-7.4%	-6.3%	<b>4.7%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.0k; £9.6k	£0.0k; £5.1k	£0.0k; £13.2k	£0.0k; £7.1k	£0.0k; £6.2k	£0.0k; £9.5k	£0.0k; £9.5k	<b>£0.0k; £9.0k</b>
GM reduction (£)	£7.3m	£2.6m	£10.6m	£5.4m	£3.0m	£12.0m	£6.1m	<b>£47.0m</b>
%change	-5.2%	-3.1%	-7.7%	-5.8%	-2.0%	-9.0%	-7.5%	<b>-5.7%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.0k; £5.9k	£0.0k; £3.1k	£0.0k; £7.8k	£0.0k; £4.2k	£0.0k; £3.7k	£0.0k; £5.5k	£0.0k; £5.7k	<b>£0.0k; £5.4k</b>
Other compliance costs (£)	£3.1m	£2.1m	£3.2m	£3.4m	£2.3m	£5.6m	£2.6m	<b>£22.2m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£2.3k; £2.5k	£2.3k; £2.5k	£2.1k; £2.4k	£2.3k; £2.6k	£2.5k; £2.8k	£2.4k; £2.6k	£2.2k; £2.4k	<b>£2.3k; £2.5k</b>
CAP PI & PII reduction (£)	£21.8m	£18.2m	£30.1m	£33.3m	£16.0m	£55.8m	£22.1m	<b>£197.3m</b>
%change	-96.4%	-88.0%	-92.2%	-86.5%	-95.3%	-91.5%	-93.7%	<b>-91.4%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£15.1k; £17.4k	£16.4k; £21.4k	£16.4k; £22.2k	£18.4k; £26.1k	£16.6k; £19.6k	£20.1k; £25.7k	£17.1k; £20.9k	<b>£17.3k; £22.5k</b>
Change in SLR	127	61	237	186	58	394	158	<b>1,221</b>
%change	-3.5%	-2.3%	-5.2%	-4.9%	-1.8%	-4.9%	-5.3%	<b>-4.2%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (SLR)	0.0; 0.1	0.0; 0.1	0.0; 0.2	0.0; 0.1	0.0; 0.1	0.0; 0.2	0.0; 0.1	<b>0.0; 0.1</b>



**Table 1.i: Estimated output and cost effects of compliance with SFS UA requirements, by farm size (full-time businesses only, n=8,781)**

	<b>Small (2,666)</b>	<b>Medium (3,323)</b>	<b>Large (1,324)</b>	<b>Very Large (1,468)</b>	<b>All FT farms (8,781)</b>
Livestock reduction (GLU)	3.3k	13.3k	14.6k	32.2k	<b>63.4k</b>
%change	-3.0%	-4.3%	-6.3%	-6.6%	<b>-5.6%</b>
Median, Mean per farm (GLU)	0.0; 1.3	0.0; 4.0	0.0; 11.0	4.8; 21.9	<b>0.0; 7.2</b>
Output reduction (£)	£2.1m	£6.9m	£8.8m	£61.3m	<b>£79.0m</b>
%change	-2.0%	-2.7%	-3.9%	-5.6%	<b>4.7%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.0k; £0.8k	£0.0k; £2.1k	£0.0k; £6.6k	£9.9k; £41.7k	<b>£0.0k; £9.0k</b>
GM reduction (£)	£1.3m	£4.2m	£5.0m	£36.6m	<b>£47.0m</b>
%change	-2.4%	-3.2%	-4.4%	-7.0%	<b>-5.7%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.0k; £0.5k	£0.0k; £1.3k	£0.0k; £3.8k	£5.8k; £24.9k	<b>£0.0k; £5.4k</b>
Other compliance costs (£)	£5.4m	£8.0m	£4.0m	£4.8m	<b>£22.2m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£1.9k; £2.0k	£2.3k; £2.4k	£2.8k; £3.0k	£2.8k; £3.3k	<b>£2.3k; £2.5k</b>
CAP PI & PII reduction (£)	£38.8m	£73.0m	£41.2m	£44.3m	<b>£197.3m</b>
%change	-92.8%	-91.1%	-89.7%	-92.6%	<b>-91.4%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£12.9k; £14.6k	£18.0k; £22.0k	£24.9k; £31.1k	£21.5k; £30.2k	<b>£17.3k; £22.5k</b>
Change in SLR	64	254	273	630	<b>1,221</b>
%change	-2.0%	-3.0%	-4.4%	-5.8%	<b>-4.2%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (SLR)	0.0; 0.0	0.0; 0.1	0.0; 0.2	0.1; 0.4	<b>0.0; 0.1</b>

**Table 1.j: Estimated output and cost effects of compliance with SFS UA requirements, by farm type (including part-time farms, n=15,555)**

	Arable (301)	LFA Dairy (924)	Lowland Dairy (621)	Lowland grazing (2,124)	Lowland Mixed/ other (1,680)	LFA Mixed grazing (4,752)	Specialist beef SDA (978)	Specialist sheep SDA (4,175)	All farms (15,555)
Livestock reduction (GLU)	0.2k	8.5k	12.2k	6.8k	1.4k	10.6k	2.3k	23.4k	65.5k
%change	-4.2%	-4.0%	-6.7%	-5.2%	-4.1%	-3.4%	-4.0%	-8.4%	5.4%
Median, Mean per farm (GLU)	0.0; 0.8	1.8; 9.2	4.2; 19.6	0.0; 3.2	0.0; 0.9	0.0; 2.2	0.0; 2.3	0.0; 5.6	0.0; 4.2
Output reduction (£)	£0.4m	£21.5m	£32.3m	£4.9m	£1.0m	£6.8m	£1.9m	£11.4m	£80.2m
%change	-0.7%	-3.9%	-6.9%	-3.0%	-2.6%	-6.2%	-3.8%	-1.3%	-4.5%
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.0k; £1.3k	£15.8k; £23.3k	£34.2k; £52.0k	£0.0k; £2.3k	£0.0k; £0.6k	£0.0k; £1.4k	£0.0k; £1.9k	£0.0k; £2.7k	£0.0k; £5.2k
GM reduction (£)	£0.3m	£12.7m	£19.7m	£3.1m	£0.5m	£4.0m	£1.0m	£6.4m	£47.7m
%change	-0.9%	-4.8%	-8.6%	-3.0%	-3.1%	-7.7%	-4.6%	-1.1%	-5.4%
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.0k; £0.9k	£2.2k; £13.7k	£6.1k; £31.8k	£0.0k; £1.5k	£0.0k; £0.3k	£0.0k; £0.8k	£0.0k; £1.0k	£0.0k; £1.5k	£0.0k; £3.1k
Other compliance costs (£)	£0.8m	£2.4m	£1.7m	£4.2m	£3.3m	£10.0m	£2.1m	£8.9m	£33.4m
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£2.2k; £2.6k	£2.4k; £2.6k	£2.5k; £2.8k	£1.8k; £2.0k	£1.6k; £1.9k	£1.9k; £2.1k	£1.9k; £2.1k	£1.9k; £2.1k	£1.9k; £2.1k
CAP PI & PII reduction (£)	£5.6m	£17.7m	£12.9m	£22.9m	£15.5m	£66.0m	£16.9m	£84.3m	£241.8m
%change	-97.2%	-95.9%	-96.1%	-95.9%	-93.3%	-93.3%	-89.7%	-89.0%	-92.2%
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£15.6k; £18.5k	£16.4k; £19.1k	£18.2k; £20.8k	£8.7k; £10.8k	£5.7k; £9.2k	£11.2k; £13.9k	£12.7k; £17.3k	£14.6k; £20.2k	£12.4k; £15.5k
Change in SLR	5	171	244	122	30	198	40	453	1,262
%change	-1.1%	-3.8%	-6.4%	-3.4%	-2.6%	-4.8%	-4.3%	-2.0%	-4.0%
Median; Mean per farm (SLR)	0.0; 0.0	0.0; 0.2	0.1; 0.4	0.0; 0.1	0.0; 0.0	0.0; 0.0	0.0; 0.0	0.0; 0.1	0.0; 0.1

**Table 1.k: Estimated output and cost effects of compliance with SFS UA requirements, by farm region (including part-time farms, n=15,555)**

	<b>Carmarthenshire (2,428)</b>	<b>Ceredigion (1,605)</b>	<b>NE Wales (2,160)</b>	<b>NW Wales (2,340)</b>	<b>Pembrokeshire (1,337)</b>	<b>Powys (3,526)</b>	<b>South Wales (2,159)</b>	<b>All farms (15,555)</b>
Livestock reduction (GLU)	6.8k	3.3k	12.7k	10.2k	3.2k	20.6k	8.7k	<b>65.5k</b>
%change	-4.0%	-2.9%	-6.6%	-6.1%	-2.2%	-7.0%	-6.9%	<b>-5.4%</b>
Median, Mean per farm (GLU)	0.0; 2.8	0.0; 2.0	0.0; 5.9	0.0; 4.4	0.0; 2.4	0.0; 5.8	0.0; 4.0	<b>0.0; 4.2</b>
Output reduction (£)	£12.2m	£4.4m	£18.1m	£9.3m	£5.1m	£20.7m	£10.4m	<b>£80.2m</b>
%change	-4.0%	-2.4%	-6.1%	-4.5%	-1.6%	-7.0%	-5.8%	<b>-4.5%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.0k; £5.0k	£0.0k; £2.7k	£0.0k; £8.4k	£0.0k; £4.0k	£0.0k; £3.8k	£0.0k; £5.9k	£0.0k; £4.8k	<b>£0.0k; £5.2k</b>
GM reduction (£)	£7.5m	£2.6m	£10.7m	£5.5m	£3.1m	£12.1m	£6.2m	<b>£47.7m</b>
%change	-4.9%	-3.0%	-7.5%	-5.4%	-2.0%	-8.4%	-6.8%	<b>-5.4%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.0k; £3.1k	£0.0k; £1.6k	£0.0k; £5.0k	£0.0k; £2.4k	£0.0k; £2.3k	£0.0k; £3.4k	£0.0k; £2.9k	<b>£0.0k; £3.1k</b>
Other compliance costs (£)	£5.0m	£3.3m	£4.5m	£5.2m	£3.2m	£7.9m	£4.4m	<b>£33.4m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£1.9k; £2.1k	£1.9k; £2.1k	£1.8k; £2.1k	£1.9k; £2.2k	£2.1k; £2.4k	£2.0k; £2.2k	£1.8k; £2.0k	<b>£1.9k; £2.1k</b>
CAP PI & PII reduction (£)	£28.9m	£22.8m	£35.0m	£40.3m	£19.0m	£66.0m	£29.9m	<b>£241.8m</b>
%change	-96.4%	-89.2%	-92.8%	-87.5%	-95.7%	-92.2%	-94.3%	<b>-92.2%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£10.1k; £11.9k	£11.1k; £14.2k	£12.6k; £16.2k	£11.9k; £17.2k	£12.0k; £14.3k	£14.8k; £18.7k	£11.6k; £13.8k	<b>£12.4k; £15.5k</b>
Change in SLR	134	63	243	195	60	398	170	<b>1,262</b>
%change	-3.3%	-2.2%	-5.0%	-4.6%	-1.8%	-4.7%	-4.9%	<b>-4.0%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (SLR)	0.0; 0.1	0.0; 0.0	0.0; 0.1	0.0; 0.1	0.0; 0.0	0.0; 0.1	0.0; 0.1	<b>0.0; 0.1</b>

**Table 1.I: Estimated output and cost effects of compliance with SFS UA requirements, by farm size (including part-time farms, n=15,555)**

	<b>Very Small (3,489)</b>	<b>Small (5,949)</b>	<b>Medium (3,324)</b>	<b>Large (1,324)</b>	<b>Very Large (1,469)</b>	<b>All farms (15,555)</b>
Livestock reduction (GLU)	0.4k	5.0k	13.4k	14.6k	32.2k	<b>65.5k</b>
%change	-2.4%	-2.9%	-4.3%	-6.3%	-6.6%	<b>-5.4%</b>
Median, Mean per farm (GLU)	0.0; 0.1	0.0; 0.8	0.0; 4.0	0.0; 11.0	4.8; 21.9	<b>0.0; 4.2</b>
Output reduction (£)	£0.2m	£2.9m	£6.9m	£8.8m	£61.3m	<b>£80.2m</b>
%change	-0.8%	-1.7%	-2.7%	-3.9%	-5.6%	<b>-4.5%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.0k; £0.1k	£0.0k; £0.5k	£0.0k; £2.1k	£0.0k; £6.6k	£9.9k; £41.7k	<b>£0.0k; £5.2k</b>
GM reduction (£)	£0.1m	£1.8m	£4.2m	£5.0m	£36.6m	<b>£47.7m</b>
%change	-0.8%	-2.0%	-3.2%	-4.4%	-7.0%	<b>-5.4%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.0k; £0.0k	£0.0k; £0.3k	£0.0k; £1.3k	£0.0k; £3.8k	£5.8k; £24.9k	<b>£0.0k; £3.1k</b>
Other compliance costs (£)	£5.4m	£11.2m	£8.0m	£4.0m	£4.8m	<b>£33.4m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£1.5k; £1.5k	£1.8k; £1.9k	£2.3k; £2.4k	£2.8k; £3.0k	£2.8k; £3.3k	<b>£1.9k; £2.1k</b>
CAP PI & PII reduction (£)	£14.7m	£68.5m	£73.0m	£41.2m	£44.4m	<b>£241.8m</b>
%change	-96.1%	-93.8%	-91.1%	-89.7%	-92.6%	<b>-92.2%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£3.1k; £4.2k	£9.9k; £11.5k	£18.0k; £22.0k	£24.9k; £31.1k	£21.5k; £30.2k	<b>£12.4k; £15.5k</b>
Change in SLR	8	97	255	273	630	<b>1,262</b>
%change	-1.1%	-1.9%	-3.0%	-4.4%	-5.8%	<b>-4.0%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (SLR)	0.0; 0.0	0.0; 0.0	0.0; 0.1	0.0; 0.2	0.1; 0.4	<b>0.0; 0.1</b>

**Table 0.a: Estimated payment for SFS UA requirements, by farm type (full-time businesses only, n=8,781)**

	<b>Arable (233)</b>	<b>LFA Dairy (894)</b>	<b>Lowland Dairy (621)</b>	<b>Lowland grazing (1,133)</b>	<b>Lowland Mixed/ other (326)</b>	<b>LFA Mixed grazing (2,796)</b>	<b>Specialist beef SDA (549)</b>	<b>Specialist sheep SDA (2,229)</b>	<b>All FT farms (8,781)</b>
Habitat main payment (£) <sup>10</sup>	£0.1m	£0.7m	£0.3m	£0.4m	£0.3m	£3.9m	£1.4m	£10.4m	<b>£17.6m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.3k; £0.5k	£0.3k; £0.7k	£0.4k; £0.5k	£0.3k; £0.4k	£0.4k; £1.0k	£0.4k; £1.4k	£0.5k; £2.6k	£1.1k; £4.7k	<b>£0.4k; £2.0k</b>
Habitat commons payment (£)	£0.0m	£0.0m	£0.0m	£0.1m	£0.0m	£0.4m	£0.1m	£1.3m	<b>£1.9m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.0k; £0.0k	£0.0k; £0.0k	£0.0k; £0.0k	£0.0k; £0.0k	£0.0k; £0.1k	£0.0k; £0.1k	£0.0k; £0.2k	£0.0k; £0.6k	<b>£0.0k; £0.2k</b>
Woodland payment (£)	£0.1m	£0.3m	£0.1m	£0.2m	£0.1m	£0.8m	£0.2m	£1.2m	<b>£3.2m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.1k; £0.4k	£0.1k; £0.3k	£0.1k; £0.2k	£0.0k; £0.2k	£0.1k; £0.4k	£0.1k; £0.3k	£0.2k; £0.4k	£0.2k; £0.5k	<b>£0.1k; £0.4k</b>
Whole Farm payment (£)	£1.1m	£3.5m	£2.6m	£3.2m	£1.5m	£10.4m	£2.7m	£14.0m	<b>£39.0m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£3.7k; £4.7k	£2.9k; £3.9k	£3.4k; £4.2k	£2.1k; £2.9k	£3.2k; £4.5k	£2.7k; £3.7k	£3.1k; £4.8k	£4.5k; £6.3k	<b>£3.1k; £4.4k</b>
Social Value @£115 (£)	£4.1m	£13.0m	£9.6m	£12.0m	£5.4m	£38.6m	£9.8m	£52.1m	<b>£144.6m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£13.7k; £17.4k	£10.8k; £14.6k	£12.4k; £15.4k	£7.8k; £10.6k	£12.0k; £16.6k	£9.9k; £13.8k	£11.6k; £17.9k	£16.6k; £23.4k	<b>£11.4k; £16.5k</b>
Social Value @£70 (£)	£2.5m	£7.9m	£5.8m	£7.3m	£3.3m	£23.5m	£6.0m	£31.7m	<b>£88.0m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£8.4k; £10.6k	£6.6k; £8.9k	£7.6k; £9.4k	£4.8k; £6.4k	£7.3k; £10.1k	£6.1k; £8.4k	£7.0k; £10.9k	£10.1k; £14.2k	<b>£6.9k; £10.0k</b>
Total if SVP@£115 (£)	£5.4m	£17.5m	£12.6m	£15.9m	£7.3m	£54.1m	£14.3m	£79.0m	<b>£206.1m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£18.1k; £23.0k	£14.1k; £19.6k	£16.5k; £20.3k	£10.3k; £14.1k	£15.9k; £22.5k	£13.3k; £19.3k	£15.9k; £26.0k	£23.7k; £35.5k	<b>£15.4k; £23.5k</b>
Total if SVP@£70 (£)	£3.8m	£12.4m	£8.9m	£11.3m	£5.2m	£39.0m	£10.4m	£58.6m	<b>£149.6m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£12.7k; £16.2k	£10.0k; £13.9k	£11.6k; £14.3k	£7.2k; £9.9k	£11.1k; £16.1k	£9.5k; £13.9k	£11.3k; £18.9k	£17.1k; £26.3k	<b>£10.9k; £17.0k</b>
Capped Total SVP £115 (£)	£5.4m	£16.4m	£12.6m	£15.9m	£7.3m	£53.9m	£14.0m	£76.3m	<b>£201.9m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£18.1k; £23.0k	£14.1k; £18.3k	£16.5k; £20.3k	£10.3k; £14.0k	£15.9k; £22.5k	£13.3k; £19.3k	£15.9k; £25.5k	£23.7k; £34.2k	<b>£15.4k; £23.0k</b>
Capped Total SVP£70 (£)	£3.8m	£11.6m	£8.9m	£11.3m	£5.2m	£38.9m	£10.3m	£57.0m	<b>£147.1m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£12.7k; £16.2k	£10.0k; £13.0k	£11.6k; £14.3k	£7.2k; £9.9k	£11.1k; £16.1k	£9.5k; £13.9k	£11.3k; £18.8k	£17.1k; £25.6k	<b>£10.9k; £16.7k</b>

<sup>10</sup> Paid on SN habitat created and retained SN habitat other than commons and woodland

**Table 0.b: Estimated payment for SFS UA requirements, by farm region (full-time businesses only, n=8,781)**

	<b>Carmarthenshire (1,254)</b>	<b>Ceredigion (850)</b>	<b>NE Wales (1,355)</b>	<b>NW Wales (1,279)</b>	<b>Pembrokeshire (813)</b>	<b>Powys (2,171)</b>	<b>South Wales (1,059)</b>	<b>All FT farms (8,781)</b>
Habitat main payment (£) <sup>11</sup>	£0.8m	£1.9m	£2.6m	£5.4m	£0.4m	£5.1m	£1.3m	<b>£17.6m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.3k; £0.6k	£0.5k; £2.3k	£0.4k; £1.9k	£0.8k; £4.2k	£0.3k; £0.5k	£0.4k; £2.3k	£0.4k; £1.2k	<b>£0.4k; £2.0k</b>
Habitat commons payment (£)	£0.2m	£0.0m	£0.3m	£0.2m	£0.1m	£1.0m	£0.1m	<b>£1.9m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.0k; £0.1k	£0.0k; £0.0k	£0.0k; £0.2k	£0.0k; £0.1k	£0.0k; £0.1k	£0.0k; £0.4k	£0.0k; £0.1k	<b>£0.0k; £0.2k</b>
Woodland payment (£)	£0.4m	£0.2m	£0.4m	£0.5m	£0.3m	£1.0m	£0.4m	<b>£3.2m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.2k; £0.4k	£0.1k; £0.3k	£0.1k; £0.3k	£0.0k; £0.4k	£0.1k; £0.3k	£0.2k; £0.5k	£0.1k; £0.3k	<b>£0.1k; £0.4k</b>
Whole Farm payment (£)	£4.1m	£3.4m	£5.8m	£6.6m	£3.2m	£11.3m	£4.4m	<b>£39.0m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£2.6k; £3.3k	£2.8k; £4.0k	£2.8k; £4.3k	£3.3k; £5.2k	£2.9k; £4.0k	£3.8k; £5.2k	£3.1k; £4.2k	<b>£3.1k; £4.4k</b>
Social Value @£115 (£)	£15.4m	£12.6m	£21.6m	£24.6m	£12.0m	£41.9m	£16.4m	<b>£144.6m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£9.5k; £12.3k	£10.2k; £14.9k	£10.5k; £16.0k	£12.1k; £19.2k	£10.9k; £14.8k	£13.9k; £19.3k	£11.4k; £15.5k	<b>£11.4k; £16.5k</b>
Social Value @£70 (£)	£9.4m	£7.7m	£13.2m	£15.0m	£7.3m	£25.5m	£10.0m	<b>£88.0m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£5.8k; £7.5k	£6.2k; £9.0k	£6.4k; £9.7k	£7.4k; £11.7k	£6.6k; £9.0k	£8.5k; £11.7k	£7.0k; £9.4k	<b>£6.9k; £10.0k</b>
Total if SVP@£115 (£)	£20.9m	£18.2m	£30.7m	£37.3m	£16.1m	£60.3m	£22.6m	<b>£206.1m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£12.8k; £16.7k	£14.0k; £21.4k	£14.1k; £22.7k	£16.9k; £29.2k	£14.4k; £19.8k	£19.2k; £27.8k	£15.2k; £21.4k	<b>£15.4k; £23.5k</b>
Total if SVP@£70 (£)	£14.9m	£13.3m	£22.3m	£27.7m	£11.4m	£43.9m	£16.2m	<b>£149.6m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£9.1k; £11.9k	£9.9k; £15.6k	£10.0k; £16.4k	£12.2k; £21.6k	£10.1k; £14.0k	£13.7k; £20.2k	£10.8k; £15.3k	<b>£10.9k; £17.0k</b>
Capped Total if SVP@£115 (£)	£20.9m	£18.2m	£30.4m	£36.2m	£16.0m	£57.5m	£22.6m	<b>£201.9m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£12.8k; £16.7k	£14.0k; £21.4k	£14.1k; £22.4k	£16.9k; £28.3k	£14.4k; £19.7k	£19.2k; £26.5k	£15.2k; £21.3k	<b>£15.4k; £23.0k</b>
Capped Total if SVP@£70 (£)	£14.9m	£13.3m	£22.2m	£27.0m	£11.3m	£42.1m	£16.2m	<b>£147.1m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£9.1k; £11.9k	£9.9k; £15.6k	£10.0k; £16.4k	£12.2k; £21.1k	£10.1k; £14.0k	£13.7k; £19.4k	£10.8k; £15.3k	<b>£10.9k; £16.7k</b>

<sup>11</sup> Paid on SN habitat created and retained SN habitat other than commons and woodland



**Table 0.c: Estimated payment for SFS UA requirements, by farm size (full-time businesses only, n=8781)**

	<b>Small (2,666)</b>	<b>Medium (3,323)</b>	<b>Large (1,324)</b>	<b>Very Large (1,468)</b>	<b>All FT farms (8,781)</b>
Habitat main payment (£) <sup>12</sup>	£3.3m	£6.9m	£4.3m	£3.0m	<b>£17.6m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.3k; £1.2k	£0.4k; £2.1k	£0.6k; £3.3k	£0.5k; £2.0k	<b>£0.4k; £2.0k</b>
Habitat commons payment (£)	£0.3m	£0.8m	£0.5m	£0.3m	<b>£1.9m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.0k; £0.1k	£0.0k; £0.2k	£0.0k; £0.4k	£0.0k; £0.2k	<b>£0.0k; £0.2k</b>
Woodland payment (£)	£0.6m	£1.2m	£0.7m	£0.7m	<b>£3.2m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.1k; £0.2k	£0.1k; £0.3k	£0.2k; £0.5k	£0.1k; £0.5k	<b>£0.1k; £0.4k</b>
Whole Farm payment (£)	£6.7m	£13.9m	£8.8m	£9.5m	<b>£39.0m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£1.9k; £2.5k	£3.3k; £4.2k	£5.1k; £6.7k	£4.2k; £6.5k	<b>£3.1k; £4.4k</b>
Social Value @£115 (£)	£24.9m	£51.7m	£32.7m	£35.2m	<b>£144.6m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£7.1k; £9.4k	£12.1k; £15.6k	£19.1k; £24.7k	£15.7k; £24.0k	<b>£11.4k; £16.5k</b>
Social Value @£70 (£)	£15.2m	£31.5m	£19.9m	£21.4m	<b>£88.0m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£4.3k; £5.7k	£7.3k; £9.5k	£11.6k; £15.0k	£9.5k; £14.6k	<b>£6.9k; £10.0k</b>
Total if SVP@£115 (£)	£35.9m	£74.5m	£47.1m	£48.7m	<b>£206.1m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£9.5k; £13.4k	£16.3k; £22.4k	£25.7k; £35.6k	£20.6k; £33.1k	<b>£15.4k; £23.5k</b>
Total if SVP@£70 (£)	£26.1m	£54.3m	£34.3m	£34.9m	<b>£149.6m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£6.7k; £9.8k	£11.6k; £16.3k	£18.2k; £25.9k	£14.5k; £23.8k	<b>£10.9k; £17.0k</b>
Capped Total if SVP@£115 (£)	£35.8m	£74.1m	£45.7m	£46.2m	<b>£201.9m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£9.5k; £13.4k	£16.3k; £22.3k	£25.7k; £34.5k	£20.6k; £31.5k	<b>£15.4k; £23.0k</b>
Capped Total if SVP@£70 (£)	£26.1m	£54.0m	£33.4m	£33.5m	<b>£147.1m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£6.7k; £9.8k	£11.6k; £16.3k	£18.2k; £25.3k	£14.5k; £22.8k	<b>£10.9k; £16.7k</b>

<sup>12</sup> Paid on SN habitat created and retained SN habitat other than commons and woodland

**Table 0.d: Estimated payment for SFS UA requirements, by farm type (including part-time farms, n=15,555)**

	Arable (301)	LFA Dairy (924)	Lowland Dairy (621)	Lowland grazing (2,124)	Lowland Mixed/ other (1,680)	LFA Mixed grazing (4,752)	Specialist beef SDA (978)	Specialist sheep SDA (4,175)	All farms (15,555)
Habitat main payment (£) <sup>13</sup>	£0.1m	£0.7m	£0.3m	£0.5m	£0.7m	£4.3m	£1.8m	£11.7m	<b>£20.2m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.2k; £0.4k	£0.3k; £0.7k	£0.4k; £0.5k	£0.2k; £0.3k	£0.1k; £0.4k	£0.2k; £0.9k	£0.3k; £1.9k	£0.4k; £2.8k	<b>£0.2k; £1.3k</b>
Habitat commons payment (£)	£0.0m	£0.0m	£0.0m	£0.1m	£0.0m	£0.4m	£0.1m	£1.4m	<b>£2.0m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.0k; £0.0k	£0.0k; £0.0k	£0.0k; £0.0k	£0.0k; £0.0k	£0.0k; £0.0k	£0.0k; £0.1k	£0.0k; £0.1k	£0.0k; £0.3k	<b>£0.0k; £0.1k</b>
Woodland payment (£)	£0.1m	£0.3m	£0.1m	£0.3m	£0.4m	£1.0m	£0.3m	£1.5m	<b>£4.1m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.0k; £0.4k	£0.1k; £0.3k	£0.1k; £0.2k	£0.0k; £0.2k	£0.0k; £0.3k	£0.1k; £0.2k	£0.1k; £0.3k	£0.1k; £0.4k	<b>£0.1k; £0.3k</b>
Whole Farm payment (£)	£1.2m	£3.5m	£2.6m	£4.0m	£2.9m	£12.1m	£3.3m	£16.5m	<b>£46.2m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£2.6k; £3.8k	£2.8k; £3.8k	£3.4k; £4.2k	£1.3k; £1.9k	£0.9k; £1.7k	£1.6k; £2.5k	£1.9k; £3.4k	£2.3k; £4.0k	<b>£1.8k; £3.0k</b>
Social Value @£115 (£)	£4.3m	£13.1m	£9.6m	£15.0m	£10.8m	£44.9m	£12.2m	£61.4m	<b>£171.2m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£9.8k; £14.2k	£10.4k; £14.2k	£12.4k; £15.4k	£4.8k; £7.1k	£3.3k; £6.4k	£6.1k; £9.5k	£6.9k; £12.4k	£8.6k; £14.7k	<b>£6.7k; £11.0k</b>
Social Value @£70 (£)	£2.6m	£8.0m	£5.8m	£9.1m	£6.6m	£27.4m	£7.4m	£37.4m	<b>£104.2m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£6.0k; £8.6k	£6.4k; £8.6k	£7.6k; £9.4k	£2.9k; £4.3k	£2.0k; £3.9k	£3.7k; £5.8k	£4.2k; £7.6k	£5.3k; £8.9k	<b>£4.1k; £6.7k</b>
Total if SVP@£115 (£)	£5.7m	£17.6m	£12.6m	£19.9m	£14.9m	£62.7m	£17.7m	£92.5m	<b>£243.7m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£13.1k; £18.8k	£13.9k; £19.1k	£16.5k; £20.3k	£6.3k; £9.4k	£4.6k; £8.9k	£8.2k; £13.2k	£9.5k; £18.1k	£12.0k; £22.2k	<b>£9.1k; £15.7k</b>
Total if SVP@£70 (£)	£4.0m	£12.5m	£8.9m	£14.1m	£10.7m	£45.2m	£12.9m	£68.5m	<b>£176.7m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£9.3k; £13.2k	£9.7k; £13.5k	£11.6k; £14.3k	£4.5k; £6.6k	£3.3k; £6.4k	£5.8k; £9.5k	£6.8k; £13.2k	£8.6k; £16.4k	<b>£6.4k; £11.4k</b>
Capped Total if SVP@£115 (£)	£5.7m	£16.5m	£12.6m	£19.9m	£14.9m	£62.6m	£17.4m	£89.7m	<b>£239.4m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£13.1k; £18.8k	£13.9k; £17.9k	£16.5k; £20.3k	£6.3k; £9.4k	£4.6k; £8.9k	£8.2k; £13.2k	£9.5k; £17.8k	£12.0k; £21.5k	<b>£9.1k; £15.4k</b>
Capped Total if SVP@£70 (£)	£4.0m	£11.7m	£8.9m	£14.1m	£10.7m	£45.1m	£12.8m	£66.9m	<b>£174.2m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£9.3k; £13.2k	£9.7k; £12.7k	£11.6k; £14.3k	£4.5k; £6.6k	£3.3k; £6.4k	£5.8k; £9.5k	£6.8k; £13.1k	£8.6k; £16.0k	<b>£6.4k; £11.2k</b>

<sup>13</sup> Paid on SN habitat created and retained SN habitat other than commons and woodland

**Table 0.e: Estimated expenditure and income effects of compliance with SFS UA requirements, by farm region (including part-time farms, n=15,555)**

	<b>Carmarthenshire (2,428)</b>	<b>Ceredigion (1,605)</b>	<b>NE Wales (2,160)</b>	<b>NW Wales (2,340)</b>	<b>Pembrokeshire (1,337)</b>	<b>Powys (3,526)</b>	<b>South Wales (2,159)</b>	<b>All farms (15,555)</b>
Habitat main payment (£) <sup>14</sup>	£1.1m	£2.3m	£2.9m	£6.2m	£0.5m	£5.6m	£1.6m	<b>£20.2m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.2k; £0.4k	£0.3k; £1.4k	£0.2k; £1.3k	£0.4k; £2.6k	£0.2k; £0.4k	£0.2k; £1.6k	£0.2k; £0.7k	<b>£0.2k; £1.3k</b>
Habitat commons payment (£)	£0.2m	£0.0m	£0.3m	£0.2m	£0.1m	£1.0m	£0.2m	<b>£2.0m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.0k; £0.1k	£0.0k; £0.0k	£0.0k; £0.1k	£0.0k; £0.1k	£0.0k; £0.1k	£0.0k; £0.3k	£0.0k; £0.1k	<b>£0.0k; £0.1k</b>
Woodland payment (£)	£0.6m	£0.3m	£0.4m	£0.6m	£0.3m	£1.2m	£0.5m	<b>£4.1m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.1k; £0.3k	£0.1k; £0.2k	£0.0k; £0.2k	£0.0k; £0.3k	£0.1k; £0.2k	£0.1k; £0.4k	£0.1k; £0.2k	<b>£0.1k; £0.3k</b>
Whole Farm payment (£)	£5.3m	£4.1m	£6.6m	£7.8m	£3.7m	£12.9m	£5.7m	<b>£46.2m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£1.5k; £2.2k	£1.6k; £2.6k	£1.8k; £3.1k	£1.7k; £3.3k	£1.8k; £2.8k	£2.4k; £3.7k	£1.7k; £2.6k	<b>£1.8k; £3.0k</b>
Social Value @£115 (£)	£19.6m	£15.2m	£24.5m	£28.9m	£13.9m	£48.0m	£21.1m	<b>£171.2m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£5.7k; £8.1k	£5.9k; £9.5k	£6.8k; £11.3k	£6.3k; £12.3k	£6.7k; £10.4k	£8.7k; £13.6k	£6.4k; £9.8k	<b>£6.7k; £11.0k</b>
Social Value @£70 (£)	£11.9m	£9.3m	£14.9m	£17.6m	£8.4m	£29.2m	£12.8m	<b>£104.2m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£3.5k; £4.9k	£3.6k; £5.8k	£4.1k; £6.9k	£3.8k; £7.5k	£4.1k; £6.3k	£5.3k; £8.3k	£3.9k; £5.9k	<b>£4.1k; £6.7k</b>
Total if SVP@£115 (£)	£26.8m	£21.9m	£34.7m	£43.6m	£18.5m	£68.9m	£29.1m	<b>£243.7m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£7.7k; £11.1k	£7.9k; £13.7k	£9.0k; £16.1k	£8.7k; £18.7k	£8.9k; £13.9k	£11.9k; £19.5k	£8.6k; £13.5k	<b>£9.1k; £15.7k</b>
Total if SVP@£70 (£)	£19.1m	£16.0m	£25.1m	£32.3m	£13.1m	£50.1m	£20.8m	<b>£176.7m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£5.5k; £7.9k	£5.6k; £10.0k	£6.4k; £11.6k	£6.2k; £13.8k	£6.4k; £9.8k	£8.4k; £14.2k	£6.1k; £9.7k	<b>£6.4k; £11.4k</b>
Capped Total if SVP@£115 (£)	£26.8m	£21.9m	£34.4m	£42.6m	£18.5m	£66.2m	£29.1m	<b>£239.4m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£7.7k; £11.0k	£7.9k; £13.6k	£9.0k; £15.9k	£8.7k; £18.2k	£8.9k; £13.8k	£11.9k; £18.8k	£8.6k; £13.5k	<b>£9.1k; £15.4k</b>
Capped Total if SVP@£70 (£)	£19.1m	£16.0m	£25.0m	£31.7m	£13.1m	£48.3m	£20.8m	<b>£174.2m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£5.5k; £7.9k	£5.6k; £10.0k	£6.4k; £11.6k	£6.2k; £13.6k	£6.4k; £9.8k	£8.4k; £13.7k	£6.1k; £9.7k	<b>£6.4k; £11.2k</b>

<sup>14</sup> Paid on SN habitat created and retained SN habitat other than commons and woodland

**Table 0.f: Estimated payment for SFS UA requirements, by farm size (including part-time farms, n=15,555)**

	<b>Very Small (3,489)</b>	<b>Small (5,949)</b>	<b>Medium (3,324)</b>	<b>Large (1,324)</b>	<b>Very Large (1,469)</b>	<b>All farms (15,555)</b>
Habitat main payment (£) <sup>15</sup>	£0.8m	£5.1m	£6.9m	£4.3m	£3.0m	<b>£20.2m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.1k; £0.2k	£0.2k; £0.9k	£0.4k; £2.1k	£0.6k; £3.3k	£0.5k; £2.0k	<b>£0.2k; £1.3k</b>
Habitat commons payment (£)	£0.0m	£0.4m	£0.8m	£0.5m	£0.3m	<b>£2.0m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.0k; £0.0k	£0.0k; £0.1k	£0.0k; £0.2k	£0.0k; £0.4k	£0.0k; £0.2k	<b>£0.0k; £0.1k</b>
Woodland payment (£)	£0.3m	£1.2m	£1.2m	£0.7m	£0.7m	<b>£4.1m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.0k; £0.1k	£0.1k; £0.2k	£0.1k; £0.3k	£0.2k; £0.5k	£0.1k; £0.5k	<b>£0.1k; £0.3k</b>
Whole Farm payment (£)	£2.3m	£11.6m	£13.9m	£8.8m	£9.5m	<b>£46.2m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.5k; £0.7k	£1.5k; £1.9k	£3.3k; £4.2k	£5.1k; £6.7k	£4.2k; £6.5k	<b>£1.8k; £3.0k</b>
Social Value @£115 (£)	£8.6m	£42.9m	£51.7m	£32.7m	£35.2m	<b>£171.2m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£1.8k; £2.5k	£5.4k; £7.2k	£12.1k; £15.6k	£19.1k; £24.7k	£15.7k; £24.0k	<b>£6.7k; £11.0k</b>
Social Value @£70 (£)	£5.3m	£26.1m	£31.5m	£19.9m	£21.4m	<b>£104.2m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£1.1k; £1.5k	£3.3k; £4.4k	£7.3k; £9.5k	£11.6k; £15.0k	£9.5k; £14.6k	<b>£4.1k; £6.7k</b>
Total if SVP@£115 (£)	£12.1m	£61.2m	£74.5m	£47.1m	£48.7m	<b>£243.7m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£2.4k; £3.5k	£7.3k; £10.3k	£16.3k; £22.4k	£25.7k; £35.6k	£20.6k; £33.1k	<b>£9.1k; £15.7k</b>
Total if SVP@£70 (£)	£8.7m	£44.4m	£54.3m	£34.3m	£34.9m	<b>£176.7m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£1.7k; £2.5k	£5.2k; £7.5k	£11.6k; £16.3k	£18.2k; £25.9k	£14.5k; £23.8k	<b>£6.4k; £11.4k</b>
Capped Total if SVP@£115 (£)	£12.1m	£61.2m	£74.1m	£45.7m	£46.3m	<b>£239.4m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£2.4k; £3.5k	£7.3k; £10.3k	£16.3k; £22.3k	£25.7k; £34.5k	£20.6k; £31.5k	<b>£9.1k; £15.4k</b>
Capped Total if SVP@£70 (£)	£8.7m	£44.4m	£54.0m	£33.4m	£33.5m	<b>£174.2m</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£1.7k; £2.5k	£5.2k; £7.5k	£11.6k; £16.3k	£18.2k; £25.3k	£14.5k; £22.8k	<b>£6.4k; £11.2k</b>

<sup>15</sup> Paid on SN habitat created and retained SN habitat other than commons and woodland

**Table 0.a: Estimated change in FBI under SFS UA requirements, by farm type (full-time businesses only, n=8,781)**

	<b>Arable (233)</b>	<b>LFA Dairy (894)</b>	<b>Lowland Dairy (621)</b>	<b>Lowland grazing (1,133)</b>	<b>Lowland Mixed/ other (326)</b>	<b>LFA Mixed grazing (2,796)</b>	<b>Specialist beef SDA (549)</b>	<b>Specialist sheep SDA (2,229)</b>	<b>All FT farms (8,781)</b>
FBI change if SVP @£115 (£; %)	-£0.8m; -5.7%	-£15.1m; -11.8%	-£21.8m; -18.8%	-£7.1m; -43.6%	-£1.1m; -8.8%	-£11.6m; -25.3%	-£1.2m; -12.7%	-£1.8m; -2.8%	<b>-£60.4m; -15.0%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£3.9k; -£3.4k	-£7.7k; -£16.9k	-£10.3k; -£35.1k	-£5.2k; -£6.3k	-£4.3k; -£3.4k	-£4.6k; -£4.1k	-£3.8k; -£2.2k	-£3.2k; -£0.8k	<b>-£4.6k; -£6.9k</b>
%losing FBI	83.7%	96.6%	95.0%	95.9%	86.2%	88.1%	78.7%	70.0%	<b>85.1%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£4.4k; -£5.3k	-£8.2k; -£18.8k	-£11.0k; -£37.2k	-£5.3k; -£7.0k	-£4.8k; -£5.6k	-£4.8k; -£5.7k	-£4.4k; -£5.7k	-£4.6k; -£6.6k	<b>-£5.1k; -£10.1k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£3.3k; £6.2k	£2.3k; £40.3k	£2.4k; £4.6k	£2.2k; £10.8k	£5.7k; £10.2k	£3.2k; £7.3k	£7.0k; £10.9k	£5.7k; £12.7k	<b>£4.5k; £11.3k</b>
FBI change if SVP @£70 (£; %)	-£2.4m; -17.2%	-£20.2m; -15.8%	-£25.5m; -22.1%	-£11.8m; -72.3%	-£3.2m; -25.7%	-£26.7m; -58.4%	-£5.0m; -54.0%	-£22.1m; -35.4%	<b>-£117.0m; -29.0%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£9.1k; -£10.2k	-£12.0k; -£22.6k	-£14.9k; -£41.1k	-£8.8k; -£10.4k	-£9.0k; -£9.9k	-£8.6k; -£9.5k	-£8.1k; -£9.2k	-£8.6k; -£9.9k	<b>-£9.0k; -£13.3k</b>
%losing FBI	99.1%	99.8%	99.7%	99.3%	97.9%	98.8%	96.9%	95.2%	<b>98.0%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£9.1k; -£10.4k	-£12.0k; -£23.5k	-£14.9k; -£41.3k	-£8.8k; -£10.7k	-£9.1k; -£10.4k	-£8.7k; -£9.7k	-£8.2k; -£9.7k	-£8.8k; -£11.2k	<b>-£9.0k; -£14.0k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£5.2k; £5.2k	£381.8k; £381.8k	£7.0k; £7.0k	£4.1k; £24.0k	£4.1k; £14.1k	£4.9k; £8.4k	£5.1k; £8.2k	£4.5k; £15.0k	<b>£4.7k; £17.4k</b>
FBI change Capped, SVP £115 (£; %)	-£0.8m; -5.7%	-£16.2m; -12.7%	-£21.8m; -18.8%	-£7.1m; -43.8%	-£1.1m; -8.9%	-£11.7m; -25.7%	-£1.4m; -15.2%	-£4.5m; -7.2%	<b>-£64.7m; -16.0%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£3.9k; -£3.4k	-£7.7k; -£18.1k	-£10.3k; -£35.1k	-£5.2k; -£6.3k	-£4.3k; -£3.4k	-£4.6k; -£4.2k	-£3.8k; -£2.6k	-£3.3k; -£2.0k	<b>-£4.6k; -£7.4k</b>
%losing FBI	83.7%	96.6%	95.0%	95.9%	86.2%	88.1%	78.7%	70.2%	<b>85.1%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£4.4k; -£5.3k	-£8.2k; -£18.9k	-£11.0k; -£37.2k	-£5.3k; -£7.0k	-£4.8k; -£5.6k	-£4.8k; -£5.7k	-£4.4k; -£6.2k	-£4.6k; -£7.2k	<b>-£5.1k; -£10.2k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£3.3k; £6.2k	£2.3k; £4.8k	£2.4k; £4.6k	£2.2k; £10.2k	£5.7k; £10.1k	£3.2k; £6.9k	£7.0k; £10.7k	£5.6k; £10.2k	<b>£4.4k; £9.0k</b>
FBI change Capped, SVP £70 (£; %)	-£2.4m; -17.2%	-£20.9m; -16.4%	-£25.5m; -22.1%	-£11.8m; -72.3%	-£3.2m; -25.7%	-£26.7m; -58.5%	-£5.1m; -54.9%	-£23.8m; -38.0%	<b>-£119.5m; -29.6%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£9.1k; -£10.2k	-£12.0k; -£23.4k	-£14.9k; -£41.1k	-£8.8k; -£10.4k	-£9.0k; -£9.9k	-£8.6k; -£9.5k	-£8.1k; -£9.3k	-£8.6k; -£10.7k	<b>-£9.0k; -£13.6k</b>
%losing FBI	99.1%	99.8%	99.7%	99.3%	97.9%	98.8%	96.9%	95.4%	<b>98.0%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£9.1k; -£10.4k	-£12.0k; -£23.5k	-£14.9k; -£41.3k	-£8.8k; -£10.7k	-£9.1k; -£10.4k	-£8.7k; -£9.8k	-£8.2k; -£9.9k	-£8.8k; -£11.6k	<b>-£9.0k; -£14.1k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£5.2k; £5.2k	£5.1k; £5.1k	£7.0k; £7.0k	£4.1k; £23.2k	£4.1k; £14.1k	£4.9k; £8.4k	£5.1k; £8.2k	£4.2k; £9.7k	<b>£4.4k; £10.0k</b>

**Table 0.b: Estimated change in FBI under SFS UA requirements, by farm region (full-time businesses only, n=8,781)**

	<b>Carmarthenshire (1,254)</b>	<b>Ceredigion (850)</b>	<b>NE Wales (1,355)</b>	<b>NW Wales (1,279)</b>	<b>Pembrokeshire (813)</b>	<b>Powys (2,171)</b>	<b>South Wales (1,059)</b>	<b>All FT farms (8,781)</b>
FBI change if SVP @ £115 (£; %)	-£11.3m; -16.5%	-£4.7m; -10.7%	-£13.2m; -19.8%	-£4.8m; -9.8%	-£5.2m; -7.2%	-£13.1m; -18.9%	-£8.1m; -23.3%	<b>-£60.4m; -15.0%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£4.7k; -£9.0k	-£4.8k; -£5.6k	-£5.0k; -£9.7k	-£4.6k; -£3.7k	-£4.9k; -£6.4k	-£4.3k; -£6.0k	-£4.5k; -£7.6k	<b>-£4.6k; -£6.9k</b>
%losing FBI	90.8%	88.4%	87.3%	77.9%	91.5%	81.5%	83.9%	<b>85.1%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£5.0k; -£10.4k	-£5.1k; -£7.8k	-£5.4k; -£12.7k	-£5.4k; -£9.0k	-£5.1k; -£7.8k	-£4.9k; -£10.2k	-£5.0k; -£10.7k	<b>-£5.1k; -£10.1k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£2.4k; £4.8k	£4.4k; £11.3k	£4.6k; £10.9k	£6.7k; £14.9k	£2.3k; £8.4k	£4.7k; £12.5k	£4.1k; £8.2k	<b>£4.5k; £11.3k</b>
FBI change if SVP @ £70 (£; %)	-£17.3m; -25.3%	-£9.7m; -21.9%	-£21.6m; -32.4%	-£14.4m; -29.7%	-£9.9m; -13.8%	-£29.5m; -42.6%	-£14.5m; -41.8%	<b>-£117.0m; -29.0%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£8.6k; -£13.8k	-£8.9k; -£11.4k	-£9.1k; -£16.0k	-£9.0k; -£11.3k	-£9.2k; -£12.2k	-£9.1k; -£13.6k	-£8.9k; -£13.7k	<b>-£9.0k; -£13.3k</b>
%losing FBI	99.4%	98.4%	98.2%	95.5%	99.4%	97.9%	97.5%	<b>98.0%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£8.6k; -£13.9k	-£8.9k; -£11.8k	-£9.2k; -£16.4k	-£9.1k; -£12.7k	-£9.2k; -£12.5k	-£9.2k; -£14.4k	-£8.9k; -£14.3k	<b>-£9.0k; -£14.0k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£2.3k; £4.9k	£8.6k; £11.5k	£3.0k; £10.1k	£6.0k; £18.6k	£5.9k; £31.7k	£3.9k; £26.2k	£4.5k; £9.5k	<b>£4.7k; £17.4k</b>
FBI change Capped, SVP @ £115 (£; %)	-£11.3m; -16.5%	-£4.8m; -10.8%	-£13.5m; -20.3%	-£5.9m; -12.0%	-£5.2m; -7.3%	-£15.8m; -22.9%	-£8.1m; -23.4%	<b>-£64.7m; -16.0%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£4.7k; -£9.0k	-£4.8k; -£5.6k	-£5.0k; -£10.0k	-£4.6k; -£4.6k	-£4.9k; -£6.4k	-£4.3k; -£7.3k	-£4.5k; -£7.7k	<b>-£4.6k; -£7.4k</b>
%losing FBI	90.8%	88.4%	87.3%	78.0%	91.5%	81.7%	83.9%	<b>85.1%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£5.0k; -£10.4k	-£5.1k; -£7.8k	-£5.4k; -£12.9k	-£5.5k; -£9.1k	-£5.1k; -£7.8k	-£4.9k; -£10.8k	-£5.0k; -£10.7k	<b>-£5.1k; -£10.2k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£2.4k; £4.7k	£4.4k; £10.6k	£4.6k; £10.1k	£6.7k; £11.5k	£2.3k; £7.9k	£4.6k; £8.3k	£4.1k; £8.0k	<b>£4.4k; £9.0k</b>
FBI change Capped, SVP @ £70 (£; %)	-£17.3m; -25.3%	-£9.7m; -21.9%	-£21.8m; -32.6%	-£15.0m; -30.9%	-£9.9m; -13.8%	-£31.2m; -45.2%	-£14.5m; -41.8%	<b>-£119.5m; -29.6%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£8.6k; -£13.8k	-£8.9k; -£11.4k	-£9.1k; -£16.1k	-£9.0k; -£11.8k	-£9.2k; -£12.2k	-£9.1k; -£14.4k	-£8.9k; -£13.7k	<b>-£9.0k; -£13.6k</b>
%losing FBI	99.4%	98.5%	98.2%	95.6%	99.4%	98.1%	97.5%	<b>98.0%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£8.6k; -£13.9k	-£8.9k; -£11.7k	-£9.2k; -£16.5k	-£9.1k; -£12.7k	-£9.2k; -£12.5k	-£9.2k; -£14.9k	-£8.9k; -£14.3k	<b>-£9.0k; -£14.1k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£2.3k; £4.9k	£6.3k; £11.4k	£3.0k; £9.9k	£6.2k; £9.1k	£5.9k; £30.5k	£3.9k; £9.5k	£4.5k; £9.4k	<b>£4.4k; £10.0k</b>



**Table 0.c: Estimated change in FBI under SFS UA requirements, by farm size (full-time businesses only, n=8,781)**

	<b>Small (2,666)</b>	<b>Medium (3,323)</b>	<b>Large (1,324)</b>	<b>Very Large (1,468)</b>	<b>All FT farms (8,781)</b>
FBI change if SVP @ £115 (£; %)	-£9.6m; -54.2%	-£10.8m; -14.5%	-£3.0m; -5.2%	-£37.0m; -14.6%	<b>-£60.4m; -15.0%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£4.4k; -£3.6k	-£4.4k; -£3.2k	-£4.4k; -£2.3k	-£9.7k; -£25.2k	<b>-£4.6k; -£6.9k</b>
%losing FBI	90.2%	83.5%	74.3%	89.0%	<b>85.1%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£4.6k; -£4.8k	-£4.9k; -£5.6k	-£5.6k; -£8.2k	-£11.2k; -£30.5k	<b>-£5.1k; -£10.1k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£3.3k; £7.3k	£4.2k; £8.8k	£6.0k; £15.0k	£5.0k; £17.9k	<b>£4.5k; £11.3k</b>
FBI change if SVP @ £70 (£; %)	-£19.3m; -109.6%	-£31.0m; -41.6%	-£15.8m; -27.4%	-£50.8m; -20.0%	<b>-£117.0m; -29.0%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£7.4k; -£7.3k	-£8.9k; -£9.3k	-£10.3k; -£11.9k	-£16.0k; -£34.6k	<b>-£9.0k; -£13.3k</b>
%losing FBI	98.5%	97.7%	96.1%	99.3%	<b>98.0%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£7.5k; -£7.5k	-£9.0k; -£9.7k	-£10.5k; -£13.5k	-£16.1k; -£35.4k	<b>-£9.0k; -£14.0k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£4.0k; £9.8k	£3.7k; £7.9k	£6.0k; £26.1k	£7.6k; £75.2k	<b>£4.7k; £17.4k</b>
FBI change Capped, SVP @ £115 (£; %)	-£9.6m; -54.3%	-£11.2m; -15.1%	-£4.4m; -7.7%	-£39.4m; -15.5%	<b>-£64.7m; -16.0%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£4.4k; -£3.6k	-£4.4k; -£3.4k	-£4.4k; -£3.3k	-£9.7k; -£26.9k	<b>-£4.6k; -£7.4k</b>
%losing FBI	90.2%	83.6%	74.4%	89.3%	<b>85.1%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£4.6k; -£4.8k	-£4.9k; -£5.7k	-£5.6k; -£8.3k	-£11.2k; -£31.3k	<b>-£5.1k; -£10.2k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£3.3k; £7.2k	£4.1k; £8.4k	£6.0k; £11.0k	£4.5k; £9.8k	<b>£4.4k; £9.0k</b>
FBI change Capped, SVP @ £70 (£; %)	-£19.3m; -109.6%	-£31.3m; -41.9%	-£16.7m; -28.9%	-£52.2m; -20.6%	<b>-£119.5m; -29.6%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£7.4k; -£7.3k	-£8.9k; -£9.4k	-£10.4k; -£12.6k	-£16.1k; -£35.6k	<b>-£9.0k; -£13.6k</b>
%losing FBI	98.5%	97.7%	96.3%	99.4%	<b>98.0%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£7.5k; -£7.5k	-£9.0k; -£9.8k	-£10.5k; -£13.5k	-£16.2k; -£35.9k	<b>-£9.0k; -£14.1k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£4.0k; £9.8k	£3.7k; £7.8k	£5.9k; £11.3k	£9.4k; £22.4k	<b>£4.4k; £10.0k</b>

**Table 0.d: Estimated change in FBI under SFS UA requirements, by farm type (including part-time farms, n=15,555)**

	<b>Arable (301)</b>	<b>LFA Dairy (924)</b>	<b>Lowland Dairy (621)</b>	<b>Lowland grazing (2,124)</b>	<b>Lowland Mixed/ other (1,680)</b>	<b>LFA Mixed grazing (4,752)</b>	<b>Specialist beef SDA (978)</b>	<b>Specialist sheep SDA (4,175)</b>	<b>All farms (15,555)</b>
FBI change if SVP @£115 (£; %)	-£1.0m; -6.8%	-£15.2m; -11.8%	-£21.8m; -18.8%	-£10.3m; -49.7%	-£4.3m; -15.9%	-£17.3m; -35.2%	-£2.3m; -28.4%	-£7.2m; -10.5%	<b>-£79.3m; -18.4%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£3.6k; -£3.2k	-£7.3k; -£16.4k	-£10.3k; -£35.1k	-£4.0k; -£4.9k	-£2.7k; -£2.6k	-£3.6k; -£3.6k	-£3.2k; -£2.3k	-£2.9k; -£1.7k	<b>-£3.6k; -£5.1k</b>
%losing FBI	86.4%	96.6%	95.0%	97.2%	91.6%	92.2%	85.2%	81.6%	<b>89.8%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£3.9k; -£4.7k	-£7.8k; -£18.4k	-£11.0k; -£37.2k	-£4.1k; -£5.3k	-£2.8k; -£3.4k	-£3.9k; -£4.5k	-£3.7k; -£4.5k	-£3.6k; -£4.7k	<b>-£3.9k; -£6.8k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£3.3k; £6.1k	£2.3k; £39.0k	£2.4k; £4.6k	£2.2k; £9.1k	£2.5k; £7.1k	£2.7k; £6.8k	£5.6k; £10.3k	£5.1k; £11.6k	<b>£3.9k; £10.1k</b>
FBI change if SVP @£70 (£; %)	-£2.6m; -18.5%	-£20.3m; -15.8%	-£25.5m; -22.1%	-£16.2m; -77.9%	-£8.5m; -31.4%	-£34.9m; -71.0%	-£7.1m; -87.1%	-£31.2m; -45.8%	<b>-£146.3m; -33.9%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£8.6k; -£8.8k	-£11.5k; -£22.0k	-£14.9k; -£41.1k	-£6.5k; -£7.6k	-£4.1k; -£5.1k	-£6.8k; -£7.3k	-£6.5k; -£7.2k	-£6.7k; -£7.5k	<b>-£7.0k; -£9.4k</b>
%losing FBI	98.7%	99.7%	99.7%	99.4%	97.1%	99.1%	97.6%	97.0%	<b>98.3%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£8.6k; -£9.0k	-£11.5k; -£22.9k	-£14.9k; -£41.3k	-£6.5k; -£7.8k	-£4.2k; -£5.4k	-£6.8k; -£7.5k	-£6.6k; -£7.6k	-£6.8k; -£8.1k	<b>-£7.1k; -£9.8k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£4.2k; £3.8k	£5.8k; £254.7k	£7.0k; £7.0k	£3.5k; £16.8k	£1.9k; £6.9k	£3.2k; £6.8k	£3.9k; £9.4k	£3.5k; £13.2k	<b>£3.3k; £13.4k</b>
FBI change Capped, SVP £115 (£; %)	-£1.0m; -6.8%	-£16.3m; -12.7%	-£21.8m; -18.8%	-£10.4m; -49.8%	-£4.3m; -15.9%	-£17.4m; -35.5%	-£2.5m; -31.3%	-£9.9m; -14.6%	<b>-£83.6m; -19.4%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£3.6k; -£3.2k	-£7.3k; -£17.6k	-£10.3k; -£35.1k	-£4.0k; -£4.9k	-£2.7k; -£2.6k	-£3.6k; -£3.7k	-£3.2k; -£2.6k	-£2.9k; -£2.4k	<b>-£3.6k; -£5.4k</b>
%losing FBI	86.4%	96.6%	95.0%	97.2%	91.6%	92.2%	85.2%	81.7%	<b>89.8%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£3.9k; -£4.7k	-£7.8k; -£18.4k	-£11.0k; -£37.2k	-£4.1k; -£5.3k	-£2.8k; -£3.4k	-£3.9k; -£4.5k	-£3.7k; -£4.8k	-£3.6k; -£5.0k	<b>-£3.9k; -£6.9k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£3.3k; £6.1k	£2.3k; £4.7k	£2.4k; £4.6k	£2.2k; £8.6k	£2.5k; £7.0k	£2.7k; £6.3k	£5.6k; £10.1k	£4.9k; £9.4k	<b>£3.9k; £8.2k</b>
FBI change Capped, SVP £70 (£; %)	-£2.6m; -18.5%	-£21.1m; -16.4%	-£25.5m; -22.1%	-£16.2m; -77.9%	-£8.5m; -31.4%	-£34.9m; -71.1%	-£7.1m; -88.2%	-£32.8m; -48.2%	<b>-£148.8m; -34.5%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£8.6k; -£8.8k	-£11.5k; -£22.8k	-£14.9k; -£41.1k	-£6.5k; -£7.6k	-£4.1k; -£5.1k	-£6.8k; -£7.3k	-£6.5k; -£7.3k	-£6.7k; -£7.9k	<b>-£7.0k; -£9.6k</b>
%losing FBI	98.7%	99.7%	99.7%	99.4%	97.1%	99.1%	97.6%	97.1%	<b>98.4%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£8.6k; -£9.0k	-£11.5k; -£22.9k	-£14.9k; -£41.3k	-£6.5k; -£7.8k	-£4.2k; -£5.4k	-£6.8k; -£7.5k	-£6.6k; -£7.7k	-£6.8k; -£8.3k	<b>-£7.1k; -£9.9k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£4.2k; £3.8k	£4.3k; £3.5k	£7.0k; £7.0k	£3.5k; £16.3k	£1.9k; £6.9k	£3.2k; £6.8k	£3.9k; £9.4k	£3.3k; £8.6k	<b>£3.2k; £8.3k</b>

**Table 0.e: Estimated change in FBI under SFS UA requirements, by farm region (including part-time farms, n=15,555)**

	<b>Carmarthenshire (2,427)</b>	<b>Ceredigion (1,604)</b>	<b>NE Wales (2,159)</b>	<b>NW Wales (2,339)</b>	<b>Pembrokeshire (1,336)</b>	<b>Powys (3,525)</b>	<b>South Wales (2,158)</b>	<b>All farms (15,555)</b>
FBI change if SVP @ £115 (£; %)	-£14.6m; -19.9%	-£6.8m; -14.6%	-£15.5m; -22.2%	-£7.3m; -14.0%	-£6.8m; -9.0%	-£17.0m; -22.9%	-£11.4m; -28.1%	-£79.3m; -18.4%
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£3.5k; -£6.0k	-£3.6k; -£4.2k	-£4.0k; -£7.2k	-£3.2k; -£3.1k	-£3.9k; -£5.1k	-£3.6k; -£4.8k	-£3.4k; -£5.3k	-£3.6k; -£5.1k
%losing FBI	93.5%	92.6%	90.8%	85.4%	93.7%	86.8%	89.8%	89.8%
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£3.7k; -£6.7k	-£3.8k; -£5.4k	-£4.3k; -£8.9k	-£3.8k; -£6.0k	-£4.2k; -£5.9k	-£4.0k; -£7.3k	-£3.8k; -£6.7k	-£3.9k; -£6.8k
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£3.7k; £9.9k	£4.2k; £10.5k	£5.6k; £13.6k	£2.1k; £7.2k	£4.2k; £11.3k	£3.3k; £7.2k	£3.9k; £10.1k	£3.9k; £10.1k
FBI change if SVP @ £70 (£; %)	-£22.2m; -30.5%	-£12.7m; -27.4%	-£25.0m; -35.9%	-£18.6m; -35.6%	-£12.2m; -16.3%	-£35.8m; -48.0%	-£19.6m; -48.6%	-£146.3m; -33.9%
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£6.5k; -£9.2k	-£6.4k; -£7.9k	-£7.5k; -£11.6k	-£6.1k; -£8.0k	-£7.6k; -£9.1k	-£7.6k; -£10.2k	-£6.7k; -£9.1k	-£7.0k; -£9.4k
%losing FBI	99.1%	98.8%	98.6%	96.9%	99.1%	98.2%	98.1%	98.3%
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£6.5k; -£9.3k	-£6.5k; -£8.2k	-£7.6k; -£11.9k	-£6.3k; -£8.8k	-£7.6k; -£9.3k	-£7.7k; -£10.7k	-£6.8k; -£9.4k	-£7.1k; -£9.8k
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£5.9k; £8.7k	£3.2k; £11.0k	£4.6k; £16.5k	£1.5k; £13.9k	£3.1k; £19.8k	£2.6k; £7.0k	£3.3k; £13.4k	£3.3k; £13.4k
FBI change Capped, SVP £115 (£; %)	-£14.6m; -20.0%	-£6.8m; -14.7%	-£15.8m; -22.7%	-£8.4m; -16.1%	-£6.8m; -9.1%	-£19.8m; -26.5%	-£11.4m; -28.2%	-£83.6m; -19.4%
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£3.5k; -£6.0k	-£3.6k; -£4.3k	-£4.0k; -£7.3k	-£3.2k; -£3.6k	-£3.9k; -£5.1k	-£3.6k; -£5.6k	-£3.4k; -£5.3k	-£3.6k; -£5.4k
%losing FBI	93.5%	92.6%	90.8%	85.5%	93.7%	86.9%	89.8%	89.8%
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£3.7k; -£6.7k	-£3.8k; -£5.4k	-£4.3k; -£9.0k	-£3.8k; -£6.0k	-£4.2k; -£5.9k	-£4.0k; -£7.6k	-£3.8k; -£6.7k	-£3.9k; -£6.9k
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£3.7k; £9.4k	£4.2k; £9.7k	£5.5k; £10.7k	£2.1k; £6.8k	£4.2k; £7.7k	£3.3k; £7.1k	£3.9k; £8.2k	£3.9k; £8.2k
FBI change Capped, SVP £70 (£; %)	-£22.2m; -30.5%	-£12.8m; -27.5%	-£25.1m; -36.1%	-£19.3m; -36.7%	-£12.2m; -16.3%	-£37.6m; -50.4%	-£19.6m; -48.6%	-£148.8m; -34.5%
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£6.5k; -£9.2k	-£6.4k; -£8.0k	-£7.5k; -£11.6k	-£6.1k; -£8.2k	-£7.6k; -£9.1k	-£7.6k; -£10.7k	-£6.7k; -£9.1k	-£7.0k; -£9.6k
%losing FBI	99.1%	98.8%	98.6%	96.9%	99.1%	98.3%	98.1%	98.4%
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£6.5k; -£9.3k	-£6.5k; -£8.2k	-£7.7k; -£12.0k	-£6.3k; -£8.8k	-£7.6k; -£9.3k	-£7.7k; -£11.0k	-£6.8k; -£9.4k	-£7.1k; -£9.9k
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£5.8k; £8.5k	£3.2k; £10.8k	£4.6k; £9.1k	£1.5k; £13.4k	£2.6k; £7.4k	£2.6k; £6.9k	£3.2k; £8.3k	£3.2k; £8.3k

**Table 0.f: Estimated change in FBI under SFS UA requirements, by farm size (including part-time farms, n=15,555)**

	<b>Very Small (3,489)</b>	<b>Small (5,949)</b>	<b>Medium (3,324)</b>	<b>Large (1,324)</b>	<b>Very Large (1,469)</b>	<b>All farms (15,555)</b>
FBI change if SVP @ £115 (£; %)	-£8.1m; -66.9%	-£20.4m; -61.4%	-£10.8m; -14.5%	-£3.0m; -5.2%	-£37.0m; -14.6%	<b>-£79.3m; -18.4%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£2.2k; -£2.3k	-£3.9k; -£3.4k	-£4.4k; -£3.2k	-£4.4k; -£2.3k	-£9.7k; -£25.2k	<b>-£3.6k; -£5.1k</b>
%losing FBI	96.6%	93.0%	83.5%	74.3%	89.0%	<b>89.8%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£2.2k; -£2.5k	-£4.0k; -£4.2k	-£4.9k; -£5.6k	-£5.6k; -£8.2k	-£11.2k; -£30.5k	<b>-£3.9k; -£6.8k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£1.4k; £3.0k	£2.9k; £6.7k	£4.2k; £8.8k	£6.0k; £15.0k	£5.0k; £17.9k	<b>£3.9k; £10.1k</b>
FBI change if SVP @ £70 (£; %)	-£11.5m; -94.7%	-£37.2m; -112.0%	-£31.0m; -41.6%	-£15.8m; -27.4%	-£50.8m; -20.0%	<b>-£146.3m; -33.9%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£2.8k; -£3.3k	-£6.3k; -£6.2k	-£8.9k; -£9.3k	-£10.3k; -£11.9k	-£16.0k; -£34.6k	<b>-£7.0k; -£9.4k</b>
%losing FBI	98.6%	98.8%	97.7%	96.1%	99.3%	<b>98.3%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£2.9k; -£3.4k	-£6.3k; -£6.4k	-£9.0k; -£9.7k	-£10.5k; -£13.5k	-£16.1k; -£35.4k	<b>-£7.1k; -£9.8k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£1.0k; £2.5k	£3.1k; £9.1k	£3.7k; £7.9k	£6.0k; £26.1k	£7.6k; £75.2k	<b>£3.3k; £13.4k</b>
FBI change if Capped, SVP @ £115 (£; %)	-£8.1m; -66.9%	-£20.4m; -61.5%	-£11.2m; -15.1%	-£4.4m; -7.7%	-£39.5m; -15.5%	<b>-£83.6m; -19.4%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£2.2k; -£2.3k	-£3.9k; -£3.4k	-£4.4k; -£3.4k	-£4.4k; -£3.3k	-£9.7k; -£26.9k	<b>-£3.6k; -£5.4k</b>
%losing FBI	96.6%	93.0%	83.6%	74.4%	89.3%	<b>89.8%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£2.2k; -£2.5k	-£4.0k; -£4.2k	-£4.9k; -£5.7k	-£5.6k; -£8.3k	-£11.3k; -£31.3k	<b>-£3.9k; -£6.9k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£1.4k; £3.0k	£2.9k; £6.7k	£4.1k; £8.4k	£6.0k; £11.0k	£4.5k; £9.8k	<b>£3.9k; £8.2k</b>
FBI change if Capped, SVP @ £70 (£; %)	-£11.5m; -94.7%	-£37.2m; -112.0%	-£31.3m; -42.0%	-£16.7m; -28.9%	-£52.2m; -20.6%	<b>-£148.8m; -34.5%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£2.8k; -£3.3k	-£6.3k; -£6.2k	-£8.9k; -£9.4k	-£10.4k; -£12.6k	-£16.1k; -£35.6k	<b>-£7.0k; -£9.6k</b>
%losing FBI	98.6%	98.8%	97.7%	96.3%	99.4%	<b>98.4%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£2.9k; -£3.4k	-£6.3k; -£6.4k	-£9.0k; -£9.8k	-£10.5k; -£13.5k	-£16.2k; -£35.9k	<b>-£7.1k; -£9.9k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£1.0k; £2.5k	£3.1k; £9.1k	£3.7k; £7.8k	£5.9k; £11.3k	£9.4k; £22.4k	<b>£3.2k; £8.3k</b>

**Table 0.g: Estimated change in FBI under SFS UA requirements, relative to dynamic BPS tapering baseline, by farm type (including part-time farms, n=15555) SVP=£115/ha with no capping**

<b>SVP=£115/ha; no capping</b>	<b>Arable (301)</b>	<b>LFA Dairy (924)</b>	<b>Lowland Dairy (621)</b>	<b>Lowland grazing (2,124)</b>	<b>Lowland Mixed/ other (1,680)</b>	<b>LFA Mixed grazing (4,752)</b>	<b>Specialist beef SDA (978)</b>	<b>Specialist sheep SDA (4,175)</b>	<b>All farms (15,555)</b>
FBI change if BPS@100% (£; %)	-£1.0m; -6.8%	-£15.2m; -11.8%	-£21.8m; -18.8%	-£10.3m; -49.7%	-£4.3m; -15.9%	-£17.3m; -35.2%	-£2.3m; -28.4%	-£7.2m; -10.5%	<b>-£79.3m; -18.4%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£3.6k; -£3.2k	-£7.3k; -£16.4k	-£10.3k; -£35.1k	-£4.0k; -£4.9k	-£2.7k; -£2.6k	-£3.6k; -£3.6k	-£3.2k; -£2.3k	-£2.9k; -£1.7k	<b>-£3.6k; -£5.1k</b>
%losing FBI	86.4%	96.6%	95.0%	97.2%	91.6%	92.2%	85.2%	81.6%	<b>89.8%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£3.9k; -£4.7k	-£7.8k; -£18.4k	-£11.0k; -£37.2k	-£4.1k; -£5.3k	-£2.8k; -£3.4k	-£3.9k; -£4.5k	-£3.7k; -£4.5k	-£3.6k; -£4.7k	<b>-£3.9k; -£6.8k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£3.3k; £6.1k	£2.3k; £39.0k	£2.4k; £4.6k	£2.2k; £9.1k	£2.5k; £7.1k	£2.7k; £6.8k	£5.6k; £10.3k	£5.1k; £11.6k	<b>£3.9k; £10.1k</b>
FBI change if BPS@80% (£; %)	£0.1m; 1.1%	-£12.7m; -10.2%	-£19.2m; -17.0%	-£5.8m; -35.6%	-£1.2m; -5.1%	-£4.2m; -11.8%	£0.8m; 18.0%	£6.9m; 13.5%	<b>-£35.3m; -9.2%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£1.3k; £0.5k	-£3.8k; -£13.8k	-£7.2k; -£30.9k	-£2.2k; -£2.7k	-£1.7k; -£0.7k	-£1.8k; -£0.9k	-£1.6k; £0.9k	-£1.4k; £1.7k	<b>-£1.8k; -£2.3k</b>
%losing FBI	60.1%	85.3%	84.2%	90.1%	84.7%	80.5%	70.7%	64.5%	<b>77.4%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£2.3k; -£3.5k	-£5.9k; -£17.1k	-£9.3k; -£37.7k	-£2.4k; -£3.6k	-£1.8k; -£2.1k	-£2.1k; -£2.8k	-£2.1k; -£3.1k	-£2.0k; -£3.3k	<b>-£2.2k; -£5.4k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£3.5k; £6.4k	£3.1k; £5.3k	£2.9k; £5.1k	£2.0k; £5.2k	£2.8k; £6.9k	£3.3k; £6.9k	£4.5k; £10.5k	£5.6k; £10.7k	<b>£4.0k; £8.5k</b>
FBI change if BPS@60% (£; %)	£1.3m; 10.4%	-£9.2m; -7.6%	-£16.6m; -15.0%	-£1.2m; -10.3%	£1.9m; 9.0%	£9.0m; 39.6%	£4.2m; 316.2%	£23.8m; 69.2%	<b>£13.1m; 3.9%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£1.8k; £4.2k	-£1.3k; -£10.0k	-£4.2k; -£26.8k	-£1.0k; -£0.6k	-£0.8k; £1.1k	-£0.5k; £1.9k	£0.1k; £4.3k	£0.6k; £5.7k	<b>-£0.5k; £0.8k</b>
%losing FBI	38.5%	65.9%	68.1%	73.2%	68.8%	58.6%	48.4%	44.7%	<b>57.7%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£1.1k; -£3.0k	-£5.7k; -£18.3k	-£7.9k; -£42.3k	-£1.2k; -£2.5k	-£1.1k; -£1.1k	-£1.1k; -£1.6k	-£1.1k; -£2.2k	-£1.1k; -£2.1k	<b>-£1.2k; -£4.9k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£4.9k; £8.6k	£3.3k; £6.2k	£4.7k; £6.4k	£2.2k; £4.6k	£2.3k; £6.1k	£3.2k; £6.9k	£4.7k; £10.4k	£6.2k; £12.0k	<b>£4.0k; £8.7k</b>
FBI change if BPS@40% (£; %)	£2.4m; 21.6%	-£5.7m; -4.8%	-£14.0m; -13.0%	£3.4m; 48.1%	£5.0m; 27.9%	£22.2m; 234.2%	£7.6m; -372.5%	£40.7m; 232.4%	<b>£61.5m; 21.5%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£4.5k; £7.9k	£0.5k; -£6.1k	-£0.9k; -£22.6k	£0.5k; £1.6k	£0.5k; £3.0k	£1.4k; £4.7k	£2.3k; £7.8k	£3.4k; £9.7k	<b>£1.4k; £4.0k</b>
%losing FBI	15.6%	45.9%	55.1%	39.8%	40.1%	27.0%	23.9%	21.3%	<b>30.5%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£0.8k; -£5.0k	-£5.2k; -£22.3k	-£7.2k; -£48.0k	-£0.8k; -£2.6k	-£0.6k; -£0.7k	-£0.7k; -£1.4k	-£0.6k; -£2.1k	-£0.7k; -£2.0k	<b>-£0.8k; -£6.9k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£6.5k; £10.2k	£4.5k; £7.5k	£6.1k; £8.5k	£2.0k; £4.4k	£2.0k; £5.4k	£3.1k; £6.9k	£4.5k; £10.9k	£6.2k; £12.9k	<b>£3.7k; £8.7k</b>
FBI change if BPS@20% (£; %)	£3.5m; 35.3%	-£2.1m; -1.9%	-£11.4m; -10.9%	£8.0m; 323.6%	£8.1m; 54.7%	£35.4m; -947.0%	£11.0m; -202.6%	£57.5m; 9124.3%	<b>£109.9m; 46.2%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£7.6k; £11.6k	£3.3k; -£2.3k	£1.7k; -£18.4k	£2.1k; £3.7k	£1.6k; £4.8k	£3.5k; £7.4k	£4.6k; £11.2k	£6.2k; £13.8k	<b>£3.6k; £7.1k</b>
%losing FBI	10.0%	33.5%	41.5%	22.6%	22.0%	13.7%	10.7%	11.9%	<b>17.3%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£0.5k; -£6.9k	-£5.2k; -£26.4k	-£8.6k; -£59.1k	-£0.6k; -£3.2k	-£0.4k; -£0.6k	-£0.5k; -£1.4k	-£0.6k; -£2.0k	-£0.4k; -£1.9k	<b>-£0.6k; -£10.2k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£9.3k; £13.6k	£6.3k; £9.9k	£7.3k; £10.5k	£3.3k; £5.8k	£3.0k; £6.3k	£4.6k; £8.8k	£5.6k; £12.8k	£8.1k; £15.9k	<b>£5.1k; £10.7k</b>

*N.B. some percentage changes are extreme due to small starting values*

**Table 0.h: Estimated change in FBI under SFS UA requirements, relative to dynamic BPS tapering baseline, by farm type (including part-time farms, n=15,555) SVP=£70/ha with no capping**

SVP=£70/ha; no capping	Arable (301)	LFA Dairy (924)	Lowland Dairy (621)	Lowland grazing (2,124)	Lowland Mixed/ other (1,680)	LFA Mixed grazing (4,752)	Specialist beef SDA (978)	Specialist sheep SDA (4,175)	All farms (15,555)
FBI change if BPS@100% (£; %)	-£2.6m; -18.5%	-£20.3m; -15.8%	-£25.5m; -22.1%	-£16.2m; -77.9%	-£8.5m; -31.4%	-£34.9m; -71.0%	-£7.1m; -87.1%	-£31.2m; -45.8%	<b>-£146.3m; -33.9%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£8.6k; -£8.8k	-£11.5k; -£22.0k	-£14.9k; -£41.1k	-£6.5k; -£7.6k	-£4.1k; -£5.1k	-£6.8k; -£7.3k	-£6.5k; -£7.2k	-£6.7k; -£7.5k	<b>-£7.0k; -£9.4k</b>
%losing FBI	98.7%	99.7%	99.7%	99.4%	97.1%	99.1%	97.6%	97.0%	<b>98.3%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£8.6k; -£9.0k	-£11.5k; -£22.9k	-£14.9k; -£41.3k	-£6.5k; -£7.8k	-£4.2k; -£5.4k	-£6.8k; -£7.5k	-£6.6k; -£7.6k	-£6.8k; -£8.1k	<b>-£7.1k; -£9.8k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£4.2k; £3.8k	£5.8k; £254.7k	£7.0k; £7.0k	£3.5k; £16.8k	£1.9k; £6.9k	£3.2k; £6.8k	£3.9k; £9.4k	£3.5k; £13.2k	<b>£3.3k; £13.4k</b>
FBI change if BPS@80% (£; %)	-£1.5m; -11.6%	-£16.8m; -13.5%	-£23.0m; -20.3%	-£11.6m; -71.6%	-£5.4m; -22.6%	-£21.7m; -60.3%	-£3.7m; -77.9%	-£14.3m; -28.0%	<b>-£98.0m; -25.6%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£5.0k; -£5.1k	-£8.1k; -£18.2k	-£11.1k; -£37.0k	-£4.4k; -£5.5k	-£2.9k; -£3.2k	-£4.2k; -£4.6k	-£3.8k; -£3.8k	-£3.6k; -£3.4k	<b>-£4.2k; -£6.3k</b>
%losing FBI	97.0%	99.2%	99.0%	99.1%	95.1%	96.8%	91.1%	88.7%	<b>94.6%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£5.0k; -£5.4k	-£8.2k; -£19.2k	-£11.4k; -£37.4k	-£4.5k; -£5.6k	-£3.0k; -£3.7k	-£4.3k; -£4.9k	-£4.1k; -£5.0k	-£4.0k; -£5.2k	<b>-£4.4k; -£7.2k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£5.3k; £5.3k	£4.4k; £120.3k	£5.4k; £5.6k	£3.1k; £14.0k	£2.0k; £6.0k	£2.9k; £7.1k	£4.6k; £8.6k	£4.4k; £10.5k	<b>£3.9k; £10.1k</b>
FBI change if BPS@60% (£; %)	-£0.4m; -3.5%	-£13.2m; -10.9%	-£20.4m; -18.4%	-£7.0m; -60.5%	-£2.3m; -11.1%	-£8.4m; -37.2%	-£0.3m; -22.1%	£2.5m; 7.4%	<b>-£49.6m; -14.8%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£1.8k; -£1.4k	-£4.6k; -£14.3k	-£8.1k; -£32.8k	-£2.4k; -£3.3k	-£1.8k; -£1.4k	-£2.1k; -£1.8k	-£1.8k; -£0.3k	-£1.6k; £0.6k	<b>-£2.0k; -£3.2k</b>
%losing FBI	78.1%	92.6%	91.6%	95.5%	89.8%	87.0%	77.9%	71.6%	<b>84.1%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£2.2k; -£3.1k	-£5.9k; -£16.8k	-£9.3k; -£36.1k	-£2.5k; -£3.7k	-£1.9k; -£2.2k	-£2.3k; -£2.9k	-£2.2k; -£3.0k	-£2.0k; -£3.2k	<b>-£2.3k; -£5.4k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£2.8k; £4.8k	£1.8k; £16.2k	£2.1k; £3.4k	£1.7k; £5.4k	£2.1k; £5.8k	£2.7k; £6.0k	£4.0k; £9.2k	£4.4k; £10.3k	<b>£3.4k; £8.5k</b>
FBI change if BPS@40% (£; %)	£0.7m; 6.3%	-£9.7m; -8.3%	-£17.8m; -16.5%	-£2.4m; -34.8%	£0.8m; 4.3%	£4.8m; 50.3%	£3.1m; -151.0%	£19.4m; 110.9%	<b>-£1.2m; -0.4%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£0.8k; £2.3k	-£1.8k; -£10.5k	-£4.9k; -£28.6k	-£1.1k; -£1.2k	-£0.9k; £0.5k	-£0.7k; £1.0k	-£0.2k; £3.2k	£0.2k; £4.6k	<b>-£0.7k; -£0.1k</b>
%losing FBI	42.9%	70.3%	72.0%	77.7%	72.4%	63.6%	52.6%	47.8%	<b>61.9%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£1.1k; -£2.7k	-£5.8k; -£18.1k	-£8.9k; -£41.5k	-£1.2k; -£2.5k	-£1.1k; -£1.2k	-£1.1k; -£1.7k	-£1.1k; -£1.9k	-£1.1k; -£2.1k	<b>-£1.2k; -£4.8k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£3.4k; £6.1k	£2.3k; £7.6k	£3.2k; £4.4k	£1.7k; £3.5k	£1.7k; £4.7k	£2.5k; £5.7k	£3.5k; £8.7k	£4.9k; £10.9k	<b>£3.2k; £7.6k</b>
FBI change if BPS@20% (£; %)	£1.8m; 18.3%	-£6.2m; -5.4%	-£15.2m; -14.4%	£2.1m; 86.6%	£3.9m; 26.2%	£18.0m; -480.9%	£6.5m; -119.2%	£36.3m; 5753.1%	<b>£47.1m; 19.8%</b>
Median; Mean per farm (£)	£3.8k; £6.0k	£0.1k; -£6.7k	-£1.9k; -£24.5k	£0.4k; £1.0k	£0.4k; £2.3k	£1.2k; £3.8k	£2.0k; £6.6k	£2.9k; £8.7k	<b>£1.2k; £3.0k</b>
%losing FBI	16.6%	49.2%	58.1%	41.1%	41.5%	28.6%	25.5%	22.6%	<b>32.1%</b>
Loss Median; Mean per farm (£)	-£0.8k; -£4.8k	-£5.5k; -£21.9k	-£7.5k; -£47.0k	-£0.8k; -£2.7k	-£0.6k; -£0.8k	-£0.6k; -£1.5k	-£0.6k; -£1.4k	-£0.7k; -£2.1k	<b>-£0.8k; -£6.9k</b>
Gain Median; Mean per farm (£)	£5.6k; £8.1k	£3.8k; £8.1k	£5.0k; £6.8k	£1.8k; £3.6k	£1.8k; £4.5k	£2.7k; £5.9k	£4.0k; £9.4k	£5.5k; £11.8k	<b>£3.2k; £7.7k</b>

*N.B. some percentage changes are extreme due to small starting values*



## Key sensitivities

18. The estimates presented above are subject to various sensitivities and caveats, many of which are outlined briefly in Appendix A below. However, some merit particular attention. First, the choice of 2019 as a baseline year was made when modelling work commenced. However, downward trends in livestock numbers in more recent years (for reasons other than introduction of the SFS) mean that anticipated stocking density restrictions will now be less binding than in the model. That is, existing reductions in sheep and beef cattle headcounts will have created some headroom to accommodate SFS constraints without further adjustment. Consequently, whilst some farms will still be affected, estimated aggregate livestock displacement and therefore SFS-related output and income losses may be exaggerated here.<sup>16</sup>
19. Second, Gross Margin (GM) reductions reflect the estimated loss of livestock where assumed stocking density restrictions are adhered to for semi-natural habitats and displaced animals cannot be accommodated elsewhere on a farm. However, strictly, as proposed, the stocking densities are merely guidance rather than obligations. Consequently, it is possible that individual enrolled farmers may choose to not follow the guidance. If so, livestock displacement and subsequent reductions in GM and Farm Business Income could be lower. Hence financial results presented here are sensitive to the degree of assumed adherence to guidance.
20. Unfortunately, the propensity of an individual farmer to adhere to the guidance is unknown. If none adhere, all of the estimated GM and FBI reductions might be avoided (although alternative management might itself incur some costs); if all adhere, the estimates stand (subject to other caveats). However, between these two extremes lie a variety of possibilities. For example, if guidance was uniformly not followed for 10% of the affected livestock population across all farms, c.6.3k fewer livestock units would be displaced from full-time farms (c.6.6k from all farms) and GM and FBI reductions would be c.£4.7m (£4.8m for all farms) smaller.
21. However, the distribution of non-adherence matters. For example, if the c.6.3k (c.6.6k) of 10% avoided displacement occurred uniformly across only specialist sheep farms, GM loss would be c.£1.7m (£1.8m) smaller but if it occurred only on dairy farms it would be c.£10.2m (c.£10.3m) smaller (see Table 7). Similarly, if it occurred only on medium size farms it would be c.£2.0m (£2.1m) smaller but c.£7.2m (£7.4m) smaller if only on very large farms. These differences stem from systematic variation in management intensity and profitability across different farm types and sizes - much of the displacement and hence financial losses occur on very large farms and dairy farms.

---

<sup>16</sup> At an aggregate level, whilst dairy cattle numbers have largely been maintained, sheep and beef cattle numbers have fallen significantly, possibly by 40k to 50k in livestock unit terms

**Table 2.a: Estimated avoidance of livestock unit displacement and associated avoidance of GM reductions under different illustrative propensities of non-adherence to SFS stocking density guidance**

	LU displacement avoided (k)		GM loss avoided if uniformly across all farm types (£m)		GM loss avoided if uniformly across only sheep farms (£m)		GM avoided if uniformly across only dairy farms (£m)	
	FT farms	All farms	FT farms	All farms	FT farms	All farms	FT farms	All farms
0%	0.0k	0.0k	£0.0m	£0.0m	£0.0m	£0.0m	£0.0m	£0.0m
10%	6.3k	6.6k	£4.7m	£4.8m	£1.7m	£1.8m	£10.2m	£10.3m
20%	12.7k	13.1k	£9.4m	£9.5m	£3.5m	£3.6m	£19.8m	£20.5m
30%	19.0k	19.7k	£14.1m	£14.3m	£5.2m	£5.4m	£29.6m	£29.7m
100%	63.4k	65.5k	£47.0m	£47.7m	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

22. It is possible that propensity to not adhere to guidance might be greater on more intensively managed farms facing higher livestock displacement, but equally low intensity farms may have greater scope for alternative habitat management. However, much will depend on individual farmers' confidence in being able to meet inspection requirements if there is a risk that perceived habitat quality might be lower under alternative management practices.
23. Third, a proportion of estimated compliance costs for the Whole Farm payment may already be being incurred through some farms adhering to what is essentially best farming practice. For example, soil testing, nutritional planning and Continuing Professional Development. As such, they are not all necessarily additional or attributable to introduction of the SFS. However, the propensity of individual farmers to adhere to best practice is unknown. If they all adhere, none of the compliance costs would be additional but if none adhere then the estimates stand (subject to other caveats). As with adherence to guidance, other possible permutations lie between these two extremes.
24. For example, if best practice is uniformly followed across 10% of all farms, approximately 10% of estimated compliance costs (implying c.£2.2m for full-time farms, c.£3.3m for all farms) will already be being incurred and hence will not be additional under the SFS (Table 8). Again, the distribution of current adherence to best practice matters. For example, if the 10% of farms adhering to best practice were all very small or small, non-additional compliance costs would be c.£1.8m for full-time farms (c.£2.2m for all farms) but c.£2.4m (c.£3.2m) if the 10% of farms were all medium, large or very large.

***Table 2.b: Estimated Whole Farm compliance costs already being incurred and hence non-additional under different illustrative propensities of baseline adherence to best practice***

	Compliance costs already incurred if adherence uniformly across all farm types (£m)		Compliance costs already incurred if adherence uniformly across only very small and small (£m)		Compliance costs already incurred if adherence uniformly across only medium or bigger farms (£m)	
% Adherence to best practice	FT farms	All farms	FT farms	All farms	FT farms	All farms
0%	£0.0m	£0.0m	£0.0m	£0.0m	£0.0m	£0.0m
10%	£2.2m	£3.3m	£1.8m	£2.2m	£2.4m	£3.2m
20%	£4.4m	£6.7m	£3.6m	£4.4m	£4.8m	£6.3
30%	£6.6m	£10.0m	£5.3m	£6.5m	£7.2m	£9.5
100%	£22.2m	£33.4m	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

25. The degree of variation across farm groups is smaller than in Table 7 because (as noted previously) most compliance elements take the form of fixed overhead costs that are the same for all farm types and sizes. It is possible that propensity to currently adhere to best practice might be greater on larger full-time farms, especially members of Quality Assurance schemes.
26. Fourth, variation in current adherence to prescribed compliance and habitat management practices also has potential implications for the additional amount of labour devoted to such tasks by farmers and/or upstream suppliers because of the SFS. That is, some practices may already be being undertaken. For example, farmers' time on planning, vets' time in relation to animal health, and contractors' time in relation to hedge maintenance. If current adherence to practices prescribed by the SFS is low, the additional required effort will be high. This applies both on-farm (partially offsetting on-farm reductions in SLRs due to lower production) and, by extension, to upstream suppliers (stimulating additional jobs to partially offset reduced demand for other services). Conversely, additional labour requirements (and associated compliance costs) will be lower if the relevant practices are already undertaken across a proportion of farms.
27. Finally, the modelling approach was limited to very few payment rates and was mostly comparative static rather than dynamic. This means that many potential farm-level adjustments to enterprise mixes, management practices and resource allocations were not included. Consequently, although the results indicate where structural pressure may be felt, they may underplay the resilience and adaptiveness of farming and land use patterns. As such, it is important that communications around the SFS include consideration of possibilities for change and how these may be supported (e.g. through future Optional and Collaborative layers and/or advice, training and capital grants). Transition to the SFS undoubtedly presents some disruption, but continued commitments to support a foundational component of the Welsh economy remain and provide opportunities as well as challenges.

## Annex A: Model overview

28. The model simulates the effect of SFS Universal Actions on individual farms' land use and livestock numbers plus outputs, costs and incomes. The population used for analysis is farm businesses registered under the Integrated Administration and Control System (IACS) and in receipt of Pillar I or Pillar II CAP support payments in 2019. A biophysical and financial profile was constructed for each farm business by combining various existing datasets through Geographical Information Systems (GIS) and relational databases. The purpose of the model is to estimate upper-bound effects of the SFS Universal Actions. Consequently, 100% uptake is assumed (i.e. all farm businesses are assumed to enrol) and in general only first-order, static impacts are considered rather than allowing for potential dynamic adjustments to management practices and resource allocations.
29. Notwithstanding the use of "best available data", information weaknesses and gaps are apparent and create uncertainty about farm-specific accuracy. In addition, modelling unavoidably invokes simplifying assumptions. Consequently, use of the model and interpretation of results are caveated. For example:
  - a) Many of the biophysical spatial datasets contain imperfectly aligned boundaries and/or offer incomplete coverage and/or contain other ambiguities that require ground-truthing.
  - b) Financial data are taken from the Farm Business Survey (FBS), matched to the modelled population using Propensity Score Matching (PSM). The FBS is not necessarily representative of all farms (particularly very small farms) and PSM is itself an estimation process.
  - c) Although FBS data have been updated to 2022/23, farm profiles in terms of land use, livestock numbers and CAP support payments are taken from 2019 as a baseline. Although this conveys a degree of temporal consistency across various datasets, downward trends in livestock numbers in more recent years mean that stocking density restrictions will now be less binding than modelled for many farms, and hence the degree of estimated livestock displacement and subsequent FBS loss is likely to be exaggerated.
  - d) The 2019 baseline acts as a policy counterfactual but includes adjustments for estimated costs of compliance with the Water Resources (Control of Agricultural Pollution) (Wales) Regulations 2021 and replacement of entry level Glastir options with the Habitat Wales scheme.
  - e) Subsequent use of tapered BPS support represents an alternative policy counterfactual to reveal changing relativities but does not alter the absolute SFS estimates
  - f) The absence of proposals for Optional and Collaborative layers means that the level of funding support modelled is less than the total that may be available in future.
  - g) Rough grazing is taken as a proxy for semi-natural habitats. However, IACS data significantly under-report rough grazing relative to the June Agricultural Survey. Consequently, business-level areas of rough grazing have been estimated, including with reference to land capability. The accuracy of estimated rough grazing and its habitat status should be ground-truthed.
  - h) Unlike previous model Phases, livestock displaced from one part of a farm are now permitted to be reallocated elsewhere on the farm if spare carrying capacity is available. The carrying capacity (i.e. maximum stocking density) of rough grazing, permanent pasture and temporary grass is linked to their estimated average Dry Matter yields (and baseline estimated utilisation of bought-in feed). This neglects potential (but unobserved) variation across farms in Dry

matter yields and other constraints on carrying capacity (and as noted above, neglects possible spare carrying capacity created since 2019 through general downward trends in livestock numbers). The otherwise static nature of the model also neglects broader dynamic responses.

- i) Strictly, SFS proposals no longer include explicit restrictions on stocking densities, only guidance. However, guidance has been interpreted as continued de facto restrictions since otherwise the model has no tractability – although some sensitivity analysis is presented by varying the assumed rate of adherence to the guidance.
- j) Stocking rates for land parcels only partially covered by target habitats (e.g. environmental designations, Section 7) are restricted if coverage is at least 50%, otherwise they are unrestricted. Different threshold choices would affect model results but also have implications for practical adherence to and monitoring of SFS guidance.
- k) Stocking density restrictions and livestock displacement are expressed in terms of Grazing Livestock Units (GLUs). However, the coefficients for converting different categories of livestock are somewhat dated and may not be accurate e.g. the convention of a dairy cow being equivalent to one GLU assumes a milk yield significantly below current industry norms. Different coefficients would affect policy guidance (e.g. dairy farms would become more heavily stocked in GLU terms), with implications for modelling and actual farm management.
- l) Similarly, the Standard Labour Requirement (SLR) coefficients used to estimate on-farm labour usage are also somewhat dated and may generate over-estimates e.g. changing management practices, new technologies and structural change might be expected to have lowered labour requirements for many activities. That is, given that labour usage may already have fallen for other reasons, modelled labour reductions attributed to the SFS may be further exaggerated.