Activity 3: Value Chain Assessment for each pilot site

Value Chain Analysis of the Irish Pilot Site

Authors: Dr. Nina Röhrig[1], Prof. Dr. Markus Hassler[1], Dr. Amey Tilak[2], Seamus Hoyne[2], Julius Meyer[1]

[1] Philipps-Universität Marburg, Germany
[2] Limerick Institute of Technology, Ireland

Content

1. Introduction and methods

Within the CConnects project, value chain analyses have to be carried out for all of the pilot sites by Philipps-University Marburg (UMR). Value chain analysis is based on the theories of global value chains (e.g. *Gereffi* et al. 2005) and global production networks (e.g. *Coe* and *Yeung* 2015; *Coe* et al. 2008; *Henderson* et al. 2002) and explores the different stages of production, processing and distribution of materials and products. It thereby allows an understanding of where, how and by whom value is created, enhanced and captured and takes into consideration power relations between different actors and the embeddedness of production systems in broader political and societal contexts (*Henderson* et al. 2002; *Gereffi* et al. 2005).

During a partner meeting in Durham, UK in November 2019 partners expressed the wish to conduct interviews themselves to cater for the language needs of interviewees and maintain relationships that partners have built with local stakeholders over time. It was agreed that partners would then transcribe and possibly translate the interviews before sending them to UMR for analysis. To facilitate this process and ensure a coherent data collection approach within the project, UMR have designed sample interview guidelines alongside a brief on how to conduct interviews for qualitative data collection, which was shared with partners in May 2020. For the Irish data collection, the interview guideline was bilaterally adjusted by the Limerick Institute of Technology (LIT) and UMR to make it more applicable to the conditions of the Irish farmers selected for interviews. The interview guideline is included in Annex I.

The Irish case study was carried out in October and November 2020 with five farmers of mixed farms in Ireland. The farms were located in counties of Galway, Mayo, Kerry and Limerick. The farms were purposefully selected, based on farm size, their locations, size of peatlands on farmlands and different land management activities on peatlands and farmlands. Out of five farmers interviewed, 4 farmers were working with the European Innovation Partnership project known as the "Freshwater Pearl Mussel Project (https://www.pearlmusselproject.ie/). All five farmers actively participated in the Irish farmer-farmer survey designed by the LIT and had provided their contact details. The interviews were conducted by a senior researcher from LIT on the phone and took between 19 and 36 minutes. Interviews were recorded and initially transcribed using the software "Transcribe Wreally (https://transcribe.wreally.com/)". Transcripts were then manually verified by LIT and a second time by UMR if irregularities or omissions were detected during data processing. Coding was conducted using the software MAXQDA©, and the data was assessed by applying content analysis and interpretation techniques by UMR. An overview of codings is included in Annex II.

2. Farm and peatland characteristics

2.1 Farm sizes, labour and overall activities

The size of interviewed farms ranged between 35 and 800 hectares (ha) (Table 1) which means they are all larger than the average farm in Ireland, which had a size of 32.4 ha when last assessed for the Farm Structure Survey in 2016 (*CSO Ireland* 2016). Most of the farmers owned the farms, having often inherited the business from their parents. Two farms furthermore held a share of grazing rights under a commonage agreement on upland bogs (F4, F5). All farmers were farming livestock, with sheep being farmed on a commercial basis on four of the five farms. Two farms were additionally grazing beef and one farm had horse breeding. Two farms had established forestry plantations on their lands and one farm was engaged in tourism activities.

Most farmers relied on family members, which were working on the farm part-time. Two farms were also employing labourers on a part-time basis and three farms were using contractors at peak times in the year, e.g. for silage making, slurry spreading, sheep shearing. Views on the availability of workers was mixed, with one farmer stating it was difficult to recruit them while another reported to have no issues in finding them.

Table 1: Overview of interviewed farms

Farm	**Farm size, acre**	**Farm size, ha**	**Peat-land size, acre**	**Peat-land size, ha**	**Farm Activities**	**Peatland Activities**
F1	590	239	320-520	130-210	Forestry; Firewood business; organic sheep	Seasonally grazed by sheep, forestry
F2	100	41	35	14	Sheep; beef	Grazed by sheep and occasionally cattle
F3	860	348	“a few 100”, (possibly at least 200)	Possibly at least 81	Sheep; conifer plantation; turf cutting	Turf cutting, sheep grazing, conifer plantation
F4	75 + 11 common-age	30+5	7	3	Beef; horse breeding; outdoor pigs, chickens, sheep “as pets”	Fodder production, grazed with young cattle or horses
F5	1,977	800	618	250	Sheep; tourism	Turf cutting demonstration, occasional sheep grazing on commonage land

While most farmers received subsidies under the basic payment scheme, three farmers additionally received disadvantaged area payments and one farmer each mentioning payments under an organic, and the Freshwater Pearl Mussel schemes. Two farmers also stated they received payments under the Green Low-Carbon Agri-Environment Scheme (GLAS) without having to change much in the way they were farming.

2.2 Peatland status and activities

All of the interviewed farmers were managing peatland areas as part of their own farms or commonage area. The extent of peatland differed as much as its use or management amongst farmers (Table 1). Grazing of peatlands by livestock such as sheep, cattle and horses was practised by all farmers, yet at varying degrees, ranging from occasional grazing on only commonage uplands (F5), over seasonal stocking (F1) and grazing with younger, lighter animals (F4) to regular use for livestock (F2, F3). Two farmers (F1, F3) had planted some of their peatlands with trees and one farmer produced livestock fodder from their peatland area. One farmer (F3) was still actively cutting turf on their peatland. On the other farms, turf cutting activities stopped between 70-80 and 20 years ago. The products derived from peatlands of the interviewed farmers were animals for meat, fodder to feed to own livestock, wood from plantations and turf from cutting activities.

The drainage status of peatlands varied on farms with two farmers reporting large areas to be drained (F1, F3), while others drained some of it to make it accessible for livestock, yet maintaining a soft, boggy ground and one farm leaving the peatlands completely unattended (F5). The main challenges managing the peatlands arose from their nature of providing less fodder for livestock and softer ground conditions making it difficult for livestock to access the land, which can then become overgrown. Sunken holes as remnants of turf cutting activities or drains were also considered as dangerous. Spruce seedlings invading virgin bog from neighbouring commercial plantations was also considered an issue by one farmer.

In terms of biodiversity, farmers identified different species inhabiting the peatlands such as heather, Sphagnum moss, Bog Asphodel, Bog cotton, Fenugreek and gorse, which some farmers considered to be problematic. The farmer of the unattended bog (F5) reported to often see cranes and Brent geese on the peatland and listed plants such as mountain ash, bog willow, marsh thistle and red clover to be found on the peatland. All of the interviewed farmers recognised ecological benefits from healthy peatlands such as carbon sequestration and CO_2 emissions reduction, water quality improvements as well as providing habitat for insects and other small animals, and rare plants. One farmer (F5) specifically stressed the need to keep peatlands waterlogged to maintain their functioning.

3. Peatland economics

Most of the interviewed farmers grazed their peatlands with sheep, cattle or horses or produced fodder from them. The products derived from these peatlands will therefore often be identical to products from non-peatland grazing activities of farms, i.e. animals for meat or breeding or finished meat products which can be sold directly to customers. Yet, three farms were located in areas designated as 'severely disadvantaged` with constraints from the topography, the habitat also in relation to high levels of peatlands and the weather, all of which lower the productivity of farms. Peatlands cannot be used to maximise efficiency like other areas of the farms can, with poorer biomass production and wet soil conditions limiting stocking densities and times, grazing on peatlands was not considered to be viable by many farmers.

> "**I suppose ecologically it would be one of the richest areas in ecology and wildlife and economically it would be the least economic part of the farm." (F4)**

Yet, one organic farmer (F1) saw meat production as a viable and sustainable business model for peatlands but stated that some adjustments, e.g. with regards to stocking times and densities, might be necessary. This seems to be true especially where the management can be paired with direct marketing channels allowing for an open exchange with consumers, successful brand establishment and recognition, and third-party certification such as an organic label as an additional quality attribute, overall enhancing prices for meat. Despite supplying farmers with a saleable product, livestock was also understood as caretakers of peatlands to prevent overgrowth of the land.

> **"It's [a] very important enterprise in terms of ecological services: try and keep the habitat managed, to keep the heap managed, to keep the grass managed, to keep weeds managed. If there are no sheep, the place would go wild. So [it is] necessary to maintain stock, but as I said it's not profit making." (F3)**

Where peatlands are planted with forestry plantations, this forms another type of income for farmers. However, one farmer noted that this management was no longer considered to be ecologically compatible on peat soils. One farmer, who currently is not manging trees on his peatland, was thinking about planting willows on peatlands as a short rotation coppice. At the same time, extracting peat was viewed the only way of making peatlands profitable by one farmer (F1), which was confirmed by the one farmer of the study who still cuts turf (F3), and sells it locally on a direct basis, making it the only profit-maker of the farming business.

„I suppose you could really say that the turf cutting is the only standalone profit-making enterprise we have on the farm." (F3)

As peat cutting activities involve modification of existing machinery, this indicates a willingness and ability of farmers to develop innovations and resilience which might be useful when dealing with changing challenges arising in future rewetting scenarios. Yet, this may also require investments in infrastructure and machinery, which will need to pay themselves off before making profits from a piece of rewetted peatland. For the interviewed farmers, finding workable and financially sound uses for their peatlands was central in the statements on rewetting.

While being open to changes and new options for peatlands, at the moment most farmers of the study seemed to view their peatlands either as low-quality grazing land or as an income source when receiving payments through GLAS, when they leave them undisturbed. For areas of intact, un-drained or even naturally rewetted peatlands, this latter option can be favourable from both farmers' and ecological perspective. Yet, changing management of more intensively used peatlands is important to reduce emissions and encourage CO_2 sequestration. However, peatlands are parts of areas that farmers receive direct farm payments for and farmers were tentative about whether changes in management would mean that the land status and/or payments would change, leaving them performing worse than before rewetting. Interestingly, rewetting activities themselves were not seen as costly or difficult tasks. Farmers assumed that they could let ditches fill themselves (i.e. stop to dig them out again), however this may depend on the individual situations on farms and levels of drainage prior to rewetting. Additionally, some farmers indicated that they would prefer rewetting activities on peatland areas with already low productivity. This was probably suggested in order to put less productive land to a more productive use while keeping more productive land for other activities such as grazing or fodder production.

4. Knowledge, awareness and public support for peatland management

The interviewed farmers were generally aware of the damage done by drained peatlands and the positive effects that could be observed when drains were blocked and peatlands rewetted. Three farmers knew about the ability of wet peatlands to sequester carbon and reduce emissions and one farmer also mentioned water quality and storage functions of peatlands. At the same time, one farmer stated not to know enough about peatlands, while another was unsure about the consequences of rewetting for the existing habitat and the flora and fauna in it. Most farmers stated that they either did not know other landowners being involved in peatland rewetting, that the topic would not be discussed with other landowners and if it was, opinions on it would be negative.

„It will be something that would be mentioned, but they would not consider it. They would be very negative about it." (F4)

The fact that the interviewed farmers were open for rewetting their peatlands and knew about its positive environmental effects could be related to their active participation in the Pearl Mussel Project, highlighting the importance of results-based payment schemes for engaging and educating farmers. One farmer also believed that people would start talking about rewetting if there was an economic incentive to do so.

For finding information on peatland rewetting, the interviewed farmers had a broad range of ideas of where they would be able to get advice. While some stated they did not know where they could find advice on peatland management, some stated that the internet and smartphones could be utilized. Others pointed out that that farm advisors, consultants or Irish Agricultural Authority (Teagasc) would be their points of contact for peatland rewetting. Conferences and experts either from the farming or wind/renewable energy industry were also considered by some farmers for gaining information on peatland rewetting. Generally, farmers seemed to welcome the prospect of training and education, while pointing out the lack of knowledge and need for educating and training Irish farmers on peatland rewetting and their habitats.

In this regard, using the existing memberships of farmers in certain groups could be helpful for reaching farmers. The interviewed farmers were members of different schemes and groups such as the Organic Trust (1 farmer), a wood fuel quality assurance scheme (1 farmer), the Irish Farmers Association (2 farmers), Teagasc (1 farmer) and the Irish Hill and Natura Farming Association (1 farmer).

Considering public support for farming from either society or politics, views were mixed amongst farmers. Some felt well supported – either by their local communities, customers and leaders or from entities like Teagasc and the Department of Agriculture, who were considered to support farmers by providing tools and options benefitting both the viability and sustainability of farms, also through projects funded by the EU. The Pearl Mussel project was mentioned specifically in this regard.

On the other hand, other farmers stated that they either felt not supported or that support was limited to the payments they received, but that there was a lack of attention especially to small farms in the west of Ireland. Furthermore, farmers acknowledged that people were interested in where food came from but criticised a lack of knowledge and related susceptibility to misinformation and **"misinformed negativity towards agriculture" (F1)** or an **"attitude that there is towards farmers in recent years in particular in relation to the environment" (F4)**. While some farmers stated they felt that farmers

were rewarded if they kept up good environmental standards of farming and that some farmers not sticking to the rules were doing a disservice to farming as a whole, other directly contradicted this by stating that farmers were not recognized for the carbon sequestration that was already happening on farms or that people from non-farming backgrounds did not understand that farmers were working together with nature, which would not necessarily suffer from mainstream farming methods. Ultimately farmers also stressed how changes in ideologies and policies would be disruptive for farms and how subsidies and land use/restoration could be conflicting in ways that could lead to a deduction of payments.

Financial farming support was seen ambiguously by the interviewed farmers. Some underlined an inequality and expressed a wish for payments for smaller farms or farms in the West of Ireland to be increased, while larger farms were viewed as doing better economically. While they recognised a political willingness to improve payments for smaller farms, they criticised missing shifts in economic models to support this. One farmer pointed out that many farmers were working part-time off the farm to sustain their living and suggested they believed that numbers of farmers would decrease over the coming years. On the other hand, one farmer pointed out that they were happy with the recent common agricultural policy delivering on a fairer payment system for farmers in the west of Ireland.

Some farmers feared that under current regulations, introducing payments for rewetting could lead to farmers losing subsidies from the single farm or designated area payments. While it was suggested that policies should subsidize the outcomes that they desire, some farmers claimed that current subsidies were not distinguished enough in doing this and needed to be carefully reconsidered to deal with changing demands in a clear way. At the same time, one farmer talked about their experience with the existing GLAS, which allowed them to receive payments for maintaining practises they were already undertaking or by choosing activities they would have done without the payment as well. While this is arguably related to a discussion on additionality when it comes to payments for emissions reductions, another farmer pointed out that they would like to implement changes, but would need to receive some regulatory and policy support e.g. for the storage of carbon in the farm.

Looking to the future of peatland products and their markets, carbon was mentioned as a secondary product from the land that could be included in the product narratives. Products from rewetted peatlands were considered as good marketing stories both for their environmental advantages and their origin from a ‘difficult piece of land’. Other benefits that were mentioned with regard to long term economic models from rewetted peatlands were linked to water filtration and storage or habitat improvements.

Ecotourism was also viewed as an option for generating an income from rewetted peatlands, yet it was suspected that the market for this might be saturated quickly.

Growing crops such as willow or cranberry on the peatlands was also mentioned as a possibility for rewetted peatlands. or cranberry on the peatlands was also mentioned as a possibility on rewetted peatlands. At the same time, the farmer who was still cutting peat on his land, pointed out that turf demand increased in his local community during the COVID-19 pandemic, especially in winter 2020.

5. Barriers and enablers of rewetting

There are a number of different barriers to peatland rewetting which can be identified from farmers' statements. The lack of financial incentives for sustainable peatland management and rewetting was identified as the most important barrier, with future payments being prompted to be better or higher than what farmers are able to receive under current schemes. Currently the are no financial incentives to rewet and some farmers were clear in that without a financial incentive or economic model they do not see that rewetting will be taken up by many farmers. At the same time, it was suggested that even if rewetting was not discussed widely at the moment, once financial incentives were in place and individual farmers would start rewetting peatlands, more farmers would consider it.

> **"There has never been an idea of any use of peatland, so it wouldn't be a topic we'd speak about, but [...] if there is an incentive there, people will start talking" (F2)**

While farmers agreed that economic support would be the most important driver or incentive for peatland rewetting, there were different ideas on how this support could look like. Most farmers envisioned specific payments for the rewetting itself (e.g. through the REPS (now GLAS)) and a compensation for taking land out of production for it. At the same time, others also saw payments for rewetting as a possibility to bring pieces of peatland with low productivity into a viable use again. Others suggested that rewetting will also need a mechanism that offers a long-term income flow that is both comparable and compatible with existing or future payments. Including the emission benefits of rewetted peatlands in calculations of carbon footprints of farms or products could further help market output from rewetted peatlands.

> **"If there was a recognized carbon benefit that could be incorporated into the overall carbon footprint of the farm, whereby people would recognize that the meat was grown with a very small carbon footprint" (F1)**

This coincides with another farmer's view on the importance of monitoring the effects of rewetting. Other farmers suggested that payments should also be made for maintaining peatlands in healthy conditions. At the same time, keeping the payments open to other activities on the land is something to be considered as well.

> **"My vision would be if policy and regulatory and the proper support were put in place, I would like to re-wet my bogs, rehabilitate them and potentially [...] put some renewable energy portfolio on the land" (F3)**

While the interviewed farmers were open about thinking of the possibility of rewetting peatlands, they mentioned a negative attitude of landowners or farmers on rewetting peatlands as something that would be mentioned but not considered. This might also be related to the fact that draining and grazing peatlands is an established form of landscape management, with farmers of the study also arguing that peatlands needed grazing by livestock to prevent places growing over and becoming wild. One farmer stated that in the last 30-40 years, peatland draining for turf cutting was promoted to farmers or their parents as a favoured option for managing the land. The current change towards peatland rewetting as the best management option is therefore completely contradictory and it will take time and effort to change farmers' mind-sets on peatland management.

> **„In the time of my father of the previous generation, they were instructed by agricultural advisors to drain the land and to put in drains in order to improve its productivity for various reasons, and now we have a phase we're looking at we need to block the drains in order to increase the potential of the carbon sink. So it's a complete, [...] 180 in-terms of policy and 180 in-terms of [...] the approach to manage the land." (F3)**

Additionally, farmers' concerns over rewetting relate to the suitability of peatlands to be used for alternative activities. Peatlands are viewed to **"have limited potential because of their nature" (F3)** and extracting peat from them is seen as „**the only way to make peatlands viable" (F1)** by one farmer even if they do not cut peat themselves, while the peat-producing farmer confirms peat cutting to be the only profitable enterprise on his farm. While this is a major problem in terms of convincing farmers to rewet their peatlands, it also emphasises the need to promote alternatives that work for farmers.

> **"I think we need to look at what are the alternatives for the individuals who are making a living and using those peatlands as a commercial activity." (F5)**

Some farmers stated that they simply had not thought about rewetting peatlands and different use options before. A lack of knowledge on uses or crops for rewetted peatlands can be noted as limiting rewetting activities, one farmer (F3) also shared their experiences with trying to grow blueberries on their peatland – which failed – or

considering to grow cranberries, but **"abandoned that idea eventually, [because] we didn't think it was feasible" (F3).** Difficulties in finding labour or a need to utilize and afford more specific machinery to manage new crops on rewetted peatlands could become a further barrier to rewetting. As a result, farmers might move to planting crops they are more familiar with, that have proved to work on peatlands or that would be more economical to grow, such as conifers in this specific case, which might not be the most favourable option from an environmental perspective (*Renou-Wilson* and *Byrne* 2015).

> **"I suppose the biggest barriers would be [...] choosing a crop that would be economical for it to be grown on the land, one could argue that it would be more economical to plant the land with trees, with commercial forestry" (F4)**

Creating awareness amongst farmers on the risks of current management practices and the benefits of rewetting and providing training opportunities were also regarded as very important for promoting rewetting by most farmers of the study.

6. Conclusions

Peatlands are part of all of the studied farms and most farmers used them either for grazing livestock or for producing fodder. Thus, while being of lower productivity, the peatlands are simply parts of the existing and established livestock enterprises or value chains of products, either for meat or as breeding stock. Only two farmers, who were selling turf and/or cultivated the peatland with conifers were able to achieve a direct revenue from the peatlands, with local outlets for the turf. It was therefore not possible to identify a value chain for products from rewetted peatlands for the studied cases.

Nevertheless, this study gave good insight into farmer's opinions on rewetting their peatlands. It is noticeable that all farmers had some awareness about the benefits of peatland rewetting, i.e. carbon sequestration, biodiversity and improved water quality, and the implications of peatland drainage. This is possibly linked to their active participation with the EIP "Freshwater Pearl Mussel" project. While farmers seemed largely open to the idea of rewetting their own peatlands, they identified a number of possible barriers and incentives to peatland rewetting.

Barriers to rewetting related to changing mind-sets of farmers and landowners; economic barriers including the need for incentives for rewetting, possibilities to extract direct revenue from peatlands by growing crops with a commercial value as well as public farm support payments for rewetted peatlands; and a lack of knowledge and training.

First, for the peat cutting farmer, the production of turf was considered the only profit maker of the peatland, which while being counterproductive for the rewetting cause also offers possibilities for farmers to improve farm economics if by being able to capitalise on the ecological services delivered by rewetted peatlands. According to four farmers, peatland rewetting could increase biodiversity, carbon sequestration and improve water quality, but these ecosystem services need to be quantified financially for farmers to increase their farm income and livelihoods.

Financial incentives were regarded as most important by farmers with regard to motivating farmers to rewet their peatlands. These public payments can compensate for the land taken out of productivity i.e. the rewetted peatland for providing various ecosystem service benefits besides sequestering carbon. Farmers thus envisioned payments not only for the process of rewetting but also for maintaining peatlands in wet, healthy conditions. With farmers stating that the peatland areas were often low in productivity, this could be interesting by making land into an income producing asset again. Yet, it needs to be mentioned that this is linked to a wider discussion on fulfilling additionality in carbon emission reductions through payments. Furthermore, from a farmer's perspective, payment design needs to not only be constructed so that it does not diminish a farmer's payments received prior to rewetting but also consider whether and which other uses for peatlands will be allowed while being part of any payment schemes.

Education and training were further mentioned as important for making farmers aware of the damaging implications of draining peatlands and the positive effects of peatland rewetting. From a research perspective, more experimenting, trialling and showcasing of growing crops on peatlands can be considered as important to be able to offer farmers results and experiences which fits their realities. At the same time, it needs to be stressed that even with options in place, shifting peatland management is a challenge that does not only touch on the practical implications but also mind-sets, learnings and internalised understandings of peatlands as managed habitats in a managed landscape.

7. References

Central Statistics Office (CSO) Ireland 2016: Farm Structure Survey 2016. <https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/ep/p-fss/farmstructuresurvey2016/kf/> (Access: 27/05/2021)

Coe, N.M. and H.W.C. Yeung 2015: Global Production Networks. – Oxford.

Coe, N.M., Dicken, P. and *M. Hess* 2008: Global production networks: realizing the potential. – Journal of economic geography 8(3): 271-295.

Gereffi, G., Humphrey, J. and *T. Sturgeon* 2005: The governance of global value chains. – Review of International Political Economy 12(1): 78-104. DOI: 10.1080/09692290500049805

Henderson, J., Dicken, P., Hess, M., Coe, N. and *H.W.C. Yeung* 2002: Global production networks and the analysis of economic development. – Review of international political economy 9(3): 436-464.

Renou-Wilson, F. and K. A. Byrne 2015: Irish peatland forests: lessons from the past and pathways to a sustainable future in Restoration of Boreal and Temperate Forests. – Taylor and Francis Group. CRC Press. Boca Ranton. https://doi.org/10.1201/b18809.

Annex I Interview Guideline

WP T3, Activity 3: Value Chain Analysis

Interview guideline for project partners – Farmers and Landowners Ireland

Authors: Prof. Dr. Markus Hassler, Dr. Tim Roesler, Dr. Nina Röhrig, Dr. Amey Tilak
Philipps-Universität Marburg, Germany

Preliminary remarks

- Give an estimation of how long the interview will take
- Ask for consent to record the interview and tell them when you start the record (especially when conducting interviews on the phone)
  START RECORDING
- Reassure confidentiality of data use, no names will be communicated, data will be handled anonymously
- Thank people for agreeing on the interview
- Briefly explain the purpose of the interview: "This interview contributes to the value chain assessment of the project Carbon Connects, which among other things aims at developing business models from re-wetted peatlands. For this purpose, we are conducting interviews with farmers/landowners and businesses involved with peatland management and products or supplies in order to better understand which actors are involved, what are challenges faced and strategies employed to overcome them."
- Clarify on any questions interviewees might have

Part I: General Information on the Farm

For a start I'd like to get to know the characteristics of your farm. Can you outline the development of the farm and describe what you are doing here?

- Ownership, Age, Buildings
- Type of management (arable, livestock, …)
- Products (from the whole farm, not only peat soils)

Please describe the land you are farming with regards to size, quality and ownership.

- Size in hectares; owned/leased; quality of land (sufficient for what is done with it/what else would he like to do with the land)

Can you estimate the shares and/or hectares of the different kinds of land use on your farm?

- arable (incl. perennial field crops), cultivated grassland, pastures, fallows, forests/woodland/orchards, short-rotation-coppices, conservation zones, other

Are you planning on expanding or reducing the production range or amounts? Why?

Can you please outline how farm labour is organised?

- Number of employees (full time/part time)
- Ease/difficulty of finding skilled labour
- Number of family members working on the farm
- Labour costs

What sort of subsidies are you receiving?

Do you think the way subsidies are given is appropriate?

- Why, why not?
- What needs to change?

Do you follow any environmental or social production standards or schemes (e.g. organic, fair trade; private or public) and why or why not?

Are you member of a farmer cooperative/ production group?

Do you feel supported in the way you farm by politics, society, media…?

Part II: Paludiculture Plot

Can you describe the management activities on the peat soils? How does it differ from the previous management/the management of other parts of the farm? Which crops are grown and what are they used for?

How, when and why was the site established?

What types of machines do you own and use, especially on the peat soils? Who does repairs and maintenance?

- kind of machines
- repairs, maintenance
- ownership

What kind of supplies do you have to buy for the management of peatlands and where from? Can you describe quantities and cost as well? What are the largest expenses related to the management?

- e.g. infrastructure for re-wetting/maintaining water levels
- seedlings/seeds
- fuel
- plant protection
- utilities for processing of products

Do you see any benefits of this system compared to how it was managed before?

- ecological benefits?
- economic benefits?

Do you see any disadvantages of this system compared to how it was managed before/the management of other parts of the farm? Did you face any problems when establishing the site?

- non-familiarity with management
- labour
- machinery
- marketing

- cost
- subsidies

Would you consider the management of the plot "profitable"?

- If not: Why not, what needs to change to make it so?

How do you assess profitability for the peatland site and on your farm in general?

Are you considering changing the production system?

- If yes: In what ways and why?

Do you know any other farmers working with re-wetted peatlands? Is it a topic that you discuss with other farmers?

In what areas of would you wish to receive support regarding the peatland management?

- Financial support
- Knowledge/training
- Marketing
- Exchange with other producers

Where do you get advice, help, support in farming matters, especially concerning re-wetting?

How significant is the impact of the re-wetted plot on …?

- Overall farm economics
- Overall farm ecology

Part III: Output and Marketing

Please describe the processing, marketing and distribution of the product from the re-wetted site if it is not used on the farm. Could you track the flow of the product from harvest until it reaches the final consumer?

- Actors involved, location

- How much of the produce is sold through each of the channels?
- Which channel is financially most rewarding?
- Would you like to change anything about how you sell your products?

Do you communicate the re-wetting of peatlands to your customers?

- If yes: Why and how?
- If no: why not?

Could you elaborate on prices, how they are defined for products from the re-wetted system and whether you think they are appropriate?

- In which price range are you selling the products for? What would you consider a satisfactory price for the products?
- Do prices represent the true costs/benefits from the production system?

How would you describe the collaboration with your customers?

Do you have any difficulties regarding selling your produce?

How would you characterize the market for the products from re-wetted agriculture?

- Demand, why are people interested in these products?
- Supply
- Competition
- Future development

Conclude interview by thanking the interviewee again and give the opportunity to add anything that they feel is important.

Annex II Overview of category system and codings

First level		Second level		Third level	
General Farm	119	Costs/Inputs	7		
		Overall farm activities	26		
		Subsidies	20		
		Location/Geography	10		
		Ownership	6		
		Size	9		
		History	19		
		Labour	18		
		Organic	3		
Peatland Current Situation	133	Peatland size	8		
		Peatland economics	23		
		Ecological Benefits	12		
		Challenges	4		
		Market/Demand situation	1		
		Management/Activities	63	Drainage	6
				Turf cutting	16
				Crops	5
				Livestock	18
				Peatland status	15
				Re-wetting	3
		Peatland products	6		
		Biodiversity	16		
Peatland Future Situation	54	Market Outlook	9		
		Barriers/Future challenges	18		
		Incentives	27		
Peatland Knowledge/Awareness	18				
Embeddedness & Support	55	Regulation	20		
		Advice	8		
		Support by public/politics	15		
		Connection with other landowners	12		