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What is an Environmental Farm Plan?

• Voluntary, confidential risk assessment prepared by each farm
• Builds farmers’ environmental awareness
• Rank performance in 23 topic areas or Worksheets
  – Water, soil, air, nature
  – Up to 319 risk assessment questions
• Rank farm’s performance on each topic
  – 1, 2, 3, 4 (Best)
• Action Plan: actions to improve all 1 and 2 ratings to at least 3 (good)
  – Short- and long-term actions, compensating factors, monitoring, barriers to action
• 3rd party review
• Ready to implement
  – Many projects eligible for cost shared funding
  – Other actions implemented through business activities
Process for EFP Development

**Introductory Workshop**
- Site Evaluation
- Introduction to worksheets and action plan
- Assess potential concerns

**Complete Farm Review at Home**
- Review all parts of farm operations
- Fill in all worksheets that apply
- Develop draft action for all risk ratings of 1 or 2

**Workshop 2**
- Review worksheets
- Review Action Plan and complete

**Review**
- Add suggestions
- Ask for changes
- Return plan to farmer

**Implement Action Plan**
- Put plan into action
- Re-evaluate each year
EFP History and Governance

• Began as a farm organization-led initiative, supported by government, 1991
• A response to perceived threat of regulation
• Coalition of farm organizations developed an agenda for voluntary EFP
• Workbook manual developed by consensus, farm organizations and government participants
• Gradual acceptance in farm community
• Changed social norms
• Mid-1990s adopted in Canadian Maritime provinces
• 2003 – Canada-wide acceptance of EFP model
• Now in 4th edition, joint copyright by farm groups and government
Research objectives

- Assess level of implementation of Environmental Farm Plan (EFP) Action Plans
  - Important to measure progress of major policy tool
  - Move beyond participation levels
  - Comparisons between survey in 1999 and 2010
- Assess potential for ongoing measurement of progress in implementing EFPs
- Investigate services to encourage participating farmers to fully implement their EFP Action Plans
Research methodology

• Two-stage survey of 189 EFP Participants in 2010
  – Questionnaire on farm/producer characteristics
  – Interviews to review EFP Action Plans and how much of plans have been implemented

• Comparisons with EFP participant survey in 1999 (n=179)
Motivation for EFP Participation

- Access to cost-sharing for environmental projects: 100%
- Education: 80%
- Assistance in complying with regulations: 25%
- Recognition of completing the program: 25%
- Request of family and partners: 5%
Level of EFP Implementation

- 75% or more
- 50% to 75%
- 25% to 49%
- Less than 25%

1999 Median = 55%
2010 Median = 68%
Factors Influencing EFP Implementation

• Farming experience
  – Higher implementation with number of years experience in farming

• Time since EFP preparation
  – Higher implementation with years since completing the EFP Action Plan

• Farm income
  – Higher implementation for farms with higher farm revenue

• Off-farm income
  – Higher implementation for those with moderate off-farm income
  – Lower for those with high off-farm income
Perceived Environmental Improvements

Those reporting improvements had significantly higher levels of implementation.
Time and Costs of EFP Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999 All Farms</th>
<th>2010 All Farms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Hours in Implementation</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average total cost per farm</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
<td>$69,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent self-funded per farm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent cost-share funding per farm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant differences between farm types for costs and hours in 2010 (among field crops, horticulture, livestock).
**Information Sources Used**

- **Materials**
  - Booklets on BMPs
  - Fact sheets from government
  - Internet resources
  - Other fact sheets
  - Newspaper/magazine articles

- **Advisors**
  - Government Agriculture Staff
  - Crop/nutrient advisors
  - Agribusiness sales staff
  - Conservation authority staff
  - Farm organization staff

- **Social Networks**
  - Contractors
  - Neighbours and friends
  - Family
  - Other

Percent of Participants
What would aid EFP completion?

- Additional technical information
- On-farm assistance to complete Action Plan
- More one-on-one assistance in person
- Group sessions to complete Action Plan
- More assistance by phone or email
- CD version of workbook
- Other
What would aid EFP Implementation?

- Tours of environmental practices used on other farms
- One-to-one on-farm visits by technical specialists
- On-farm demonstrations of specific practices or technologies
- Discussions with other farmers about how to implement certain practices
- Supplemental workshops/presentations on specific topics or practices
- Picture/slide show/virtual tours

Percent of Participants
Recommendations for Improvement

Continue the Mix of Education and Incentives

1. Build on the success of education through EFP Program
2. Continue powerful linkage of education and cost-sharing

Enhance Services to Spur More Action

3. Offer more services tailored to needs of different types of producers
4. Consider additional ways to encourage implementation of EFP Action Plans
5. Consider additional services to enhance social interaction among farmers regarding EFP implementation
6. Revise EFP Action Plan to identify changes in risk ratings resulting from activities undertaken
Recommendations, continued

**Expand Farmer Participation**

7. Conduct research on motivators for farmers not participating in EFP

**Improve Performance Measurement**

8. Expand performance measures to show success of EFP

9. Use Action Plan data to document the value of EFP

10. Ongoing EFP performance measurement
Evolution of EFP to Sustainability
Sustainability now a complex, retailer-driven, commodity-based maze of standards and approaches.

Multi-year initiative of Ontario’s farmers and food and beverage processors

Builds on 25-year success of Environmental Farm Plan

Expands scope into a whole farm sustainability plan

Goal to create system that reduces redundancy, is farmer-friendly and provide platform for next 25 years.

Initial work to develop concept, benchmark against other sustainability platforms.
Key Findings

- High levels of implementation 65% in 2010, up from 54% in 1999
- Significant investments in environmental projects $69.6K average, up from $10.8K in 1999
  - 77% of funds were farmers’ own funding
  - 42% of actions taken had no reported costs
- Evidence of behaviour change, education influencing priorities (45% changed priorities after workshop)
- High satisfaction with EFP program (100% satisfied or very satisfied)
- About 3/4 perceived an improvement in environmental quality
- Participants took advantage of educational resources available
- Recommendations of new techniques for improvements
Questions?