



Department  
for Environment  
Food & Rural Affairs

[www.gov.uk/defra](http://www.gov.uk/defra)

# **Consultation on the National Pollinator Strategy: for bees and other pollinators in England**

## **Summary of responses**

**November 2014**



© Crown copyright 2014

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence v.3. To view this licence visit [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/) or email [PSI@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:PSI@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk)

This publication is available at [www.gov.uk/government/publications](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications)

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at:

Pollinators and Plant Health Policy,  
Defra,  
Sand Hutton,  
York,  
YO41 1LZ  
[pollinatorstrategy@defra.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:pollinatorstrategy@defra.gsi.gov.uk)  
01904 406659

## Contents

Background.....	1
Summary of responses .....	1
Summary of responses to Questions 4 to 14.....	2
Next steps.....	13
Annex A: List of respondents .....	14

# Background

1. The purpose of the consultation was to seek views on the draft National Pollinator Strategy, and to provide further evidence and information to help finalise it for publication. The consultation period ran from 6th March 2014 to 2nd May 2014.

Questions were posed through the consultation:

- To gauge and understand opinions on the Strategy document, and on the evidence and policy actions;
- for further ideas on how to protect pollinators;
- for advice on how to promote the 'Call to Action'; and
- to invite offers of support for the implementation of the Strategy.

## Summary of responses

2. A total of 331 responses were received, comprising 262 online responses on Citizen Space and a further 69 responses by post or email (written responses). Of these, 10 responses were submitted by the science community, 12 from expert/training institutes, 40 from environmental campaign groups, 12 from private companies, 6 from trade associations, 7 from government organisations (including 3 from local authorities), 61 from farmers/landowners, 19 from local/national beekeeping associations, 65 from members of beekeeping associations, 21 from members of environmental campaign groups and 78 from individuals. A list of respondents is at Annex A.
3. This document summarises the answers given to the questions raised in the consultation and outlines the Government response. For the questions requiring a yes/no answer, tables are included to present the percentage of online respondents who answered yes or no. Written (e-mail and letter) respondents are not included in the tables as they tended to reply in more general terms and did not necessarily answer every question. In addition, the online results are broken down into the groups of respondents: beekeepers (both associations and individual), farmers, environmental organisations (including members) and other groups. For the questions inviting further comments, the text summarises both online and written responses.
4. The first three questions of the consultation were to identify respondents and the organisations they belonged to (see Annex A).

# Summary of responses to Questions 4 to 14

## Question 4. Do you have any comments on the vision and aims for pollinators (in Chapter 2)? If 'Yes', please comment in the box below.

5. **Background:** The **vision** set out in the draft Strategy is 'to see pollinators thrive, providing essential pollination services and benefits for food production, the wider environment and everyone.' The **aims** are to build partnerships and consensus, improve our understanding, refresh our commitment and to think globally.
6. **Responses:** 73% of online respondents had comments to make on the Strategy's vision and aims, as did over half of the written respondents. Overall the comments were supportive of the visions and aims, although highlighted a number of particular issues. There was notable support for the cross-sector approach of building partnerships with environment groups and businesses. Many were in favour of improving the evidence base over the next five years, although respondents also wanted to emphasise the urgent need to act, in line with the precautionary principle.
7. Some key areas of concern stood out. Environmental organisations emphasised the importance of addressing the full diversity of pollinators, and notably those species of conservation concern. They also stressed the need to develop connected, joined up habitats for pollinators right across the UK. Farmers raised concerns about the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), and an expectation and reliance on the voluntary actions of farmers. While a minority resisted further regulation, many felt strongly that further financial support and incentives should be provided through CAP reform and the new environmental land management schemes (now called Countryside Stewardship), if farmers are to make changes for pollinators.
8. **Government response:** We agree that, as we gather further evidence, action is needed now through the Strategy to support pollinators. Building on current policies and initiatives, we will work with a wide range of organisations to encourage land owners and managers to provide essential resources for pollinators across towns, cities and the countryside. This will include species of conservation concern and will be guided by the 'more, bigger, better and joined' principles embedded in the Natural Environment White Paper (2011) and in Biodiversity 2020 (2011).
9. Farmers have opportunities through the new CAP to make positive changes for pollinators, building on existing stewardship agreements and voluntary measures actively promoted by the Campaign for the Farmed Environment. As part of the new Countryside Stewardship programme, a wild pollinator and wildlife "package", developed in consultation with partners, will describe clearly and simply for farmers the best choice of options to deliver essential requirements for wild pollinators. We will also be exploring how the targeting and scoring mechanisms of the scheme and advice can enhance the delivery of this package.

**Question 5: Have we given a fair summary of the main areas of concern for pollinators and the available evidence (in Annex 1 of the Strategy)?**

10. **Background:** Annex 1 of the draft Strategy sets out our current understanding of the status of insect pollinator populations in the UK. It shows that while we have some information on pollinator occurrence and distribution, we lack information on trends in abundance. It explains the current uncertainty around how we value the benefit pollinators bring to society, both economically, through boosting crop yield and quality, and culturally, through their intrinsic value. Pollinators face multiple environmental pressures including agricultural land use change, pesticide use, urbanisation, pests and pathogens, invasive non-native species, and climate change. At this stage, there is considerable uncertainty around how a change in pollinator population would impact on the pollination of crops and wild plants.

**11. Q5 Responses:**

Group	Yes (no.)	No (no.)	Total	Yes (% of group)	No (% of group)
Beekeepers	49	31	80	61.3%	38.7%
Farmers	47	11	58	81.0%	19.0%
Environmental organisations	15	15	30	50.0%	50.0%
Other	53	41	94	56.4%	43.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>62.6%</b>	<b>37.4%</b>

**Question 6: If you answered ‘No’ to question 5, please use the box below if you wish to identify any further issues about the areas of concern and the available evidence.**

12. Although a majority of respondents expressed agreement with the areas of concern, nearly 40% replied otherwise. Much the largest area of concern was pesticides, and the need to reduce use of chemicals in both a rural and urban setting. Many respondents stressed the importance of independent, peer-reviewed studies to fully grasp the impact of neonicotinoids on pollinators.

13. Several environmental organisations highlighted the need for preservation of semi-natural and natural habitat such as wildflower meadows and grassland. Farmers (and other groups) reiterated the point that they needed to be given sufficient support to ensure that supporting pollinators was economically sustainable. Beekeepers

expressed concern regarding imported bumble bees and the threat of disease spread. Others emphasised the impact of urbanisation and questioned why pollinators were not considered as part of planning procedures for new developments.

14. **Government response (questions 5 and 6):** The independence and transparency of company studies was an issue raised by respondents under a number of the consultation questions. Given that neonicotinoids are already subject to restrictions to limit the exposure of pollinators, the main purpose of further research would be to establish a case within the EU regulatory system for lifting or relaxing these restrictions. The arrangements for this are dictated by EU rules, which are clear that it is for companies to arrange this work. Companies are not free to design whatever studies they wish. The studies they submit must be those required by the EU regime, which normally requires that they are conducted to internationally recognised guidelines and must also carry verified Good Laboratory Practice and quality assurance certification. There is also now a requirement (in Article 8(5) of the EU Regulation) for companies to include recent scientific peer-reviewed open literature in their Dossiers. The Government has emphasised to the companies the benefits of transparency and the publication of data.
15. Recent evidence of pests and disease risks from commercially produced non-native bumble bees indicated that some of these colonies carried pests and diseases with the potential to spread to wild pollinators (Graystock et al. 2013)<sup>1</sup>; bumble bee producers used this research as a call to action to reduce risks. Following a public consultation<sup>2</sup>, Natural England and Defra are reviewing licensing policy for commercially produced non-native bumble bees. Any changes would come into effect from January 2015. In the final version of the Strategy, we have included a new policy action (number 23 in the final Strategy) to keep under active review disease risks from commercially-used bumble bees.
16. Planning was an issue raised under several of the consultation questions. As well as cascading the 'Call to Action' to local authorities, we have added two new policy actions to the Strategy to address the work of planners and local councils. First, Defra will be holding regional workshops on managing urban pollinators for planners, developers, councils and Local Nature Partnerships (policy action 16). We will develop the workshop with the Construction Industry Research and Information Association, the Town and Country Planning Association, and NGOs including Buglife, Bumblebee Conservation Trust, Friends of the Earth, and Plantlife. Second, the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) will be promoting plants

---

<sup>1</sup> The GB non-native Species Risk Assessment for non-native *Bombus terrestris* bumblebees <http://www.nonnativespecies.org/index.cfm?sectionid=51> has been revised to reflect recent evidence

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/wildlife-licensing-changes-to-class-licence-wml-cl22-non-native-bumblebee-release-in-commercial-glass-houses> .

for pollinators as part of its sustainable building certification scheme (policy action 17). In addition to these actions, the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) will be integrating the Bees' Needs call to action and advice into planning guidance (policy action 15).

**Question 7: Do you have any suggestions on the best way to communicate the 'Call to Action' (once agreed) to many different audiences (in Chapter 3)?**

17. **Background:** The 'Call to Action' is a simple message on the essential needs of pollinators and how to fulfil them. It has been produced as a collaborative piece of work with stakeholders and is supported by evidence showing how habitat restoration to support pollinators is effective. It is formulated around a key tagline 'Bees' Needs: Food and a Home' and includes a series of 'simple actions' that can be taken by all land managers and the public to support pollinators. The call and the simple actions were launched on 18 July 2014 alongside a custom-made pollinator animation, explaining the scientific uncertainty around pollinator status, the threats they face and what we can do to help ([www.beesneeds.org.uk](http://www.beesneeds.org.uk)). More detailed advice for different land managers is being developed over the next 12-18 months, with initial advice published with the final Strategy and posted on this website.

**18. Q7 Responses:**

Group	Yes (no.)	No (no.)	Total	Yes (% of group)	No (% of group)
Beekeepers	54	26	80	67.5%	32.5%
Farmers	35	23	58	60.3%	39.7%
Environmental organisations	23	7	30	76.7%	23.3%
Other	61	33	94	64.9%	35.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>66.0%</b>	<b>34.0%</b>

**Question 8: If you answered 'Yes' to question 7, please use the box below to offer your suggestions.**

19. Many organisations took the opportunity not only to offer suggestions as to how to promote the 'Call to Action' but also to offer their own support. They encouraged Defra to work collaboratively with non-governmental organisations (NGOs), professional bodies, farmers, businesses and the science community in raising public awareness.



20. Many respondents, in particular the environmental organisations, called for a national media campaign to raise public awareness. They emphasised the effectiveness of social media in engaging younger generations, and suggested appointing one or more celebrity figureheads. A number of organisations offered their own sector-specific press as a way of reaching their own members. Garden centres were also felt to be an effective channel to reach the general (gardening) public.
21. A number of respondents emphasised the importance of tailoring the message of the ‘Call to Action’ to different groups. They saw this as especially important for farmers, and that it would therefore be beneficial to involve farming experts and agricultural colleges in the development of the advice. One respondent pointed out that more focus is needed on councils, since local authorities often lack any ecological expertise. A common theme was engagement of children and youth, through the development of specific educational materials for schools.
22. **Government response (questions 7 and 8):** Defra is grateful for the many offers of support to disseminate the pollinator ‘Call to Action’. Following the successful launch of the simple actions in July, the initial detailed advice has been published with the Strategy. It is being publicised through multiple channels including social media, national media and sector-specific press.
23. The initial detailed advice is the ‘Call to Action’ message tailored to different land management groups, including farmers, gardeners, and managers of public spaces. This advice will be updated and expanded over the next 1-2 years as the results from the Insect Pollinators Initiative emerge.

### Question 9: do you agree with the priority actions summarised in chapter 3?

24. **Background:** The draft Strategy set out 18 policy priority actions for Government and others to implement. They included the ‘Call to Action’, CAP, management of farmland, actions on Integrated Pest Management (IPM), management of towns, cities, and public land, responding to pest and disease risks, and knowledge sharing.

#### 25. Q9 Responses:

Group	Yes (no.)	No (no.)	Total	Yes (% of group)	No (% of group)
Beekeepers	60	20	80	75.0%	25.0%
Farmers	52	6	58	89.7%	10.3%
Environmental organisations	18	12	30	60.0%	40.0%

<b>Other</b>	72	22	94	76.6%	23.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>77.1%</b>	<b>22.9%</b>

26. Seventy-seven percent of online respondents expressed agreement with the priority actions. Many also commented on this question in their written responses. A common theme was objection to pesticides, with suggestions ranging from pesticide reduction targets in urban and rural areas to the complete banning of pesticides. Certain environmental organisations linked pesticides to pollinator decline. Several took the view that the Strategy does not sufficiently address Integrated Pest Management (IPM), and needs to set out actions on IPM in addition to existing commitments. Others advocated that only a return to organic principles would bring about the change needed for pollinators.
27. Some respondents expressed concerns about the future of CAP. They worried about the implications for pollinators if their habitat needs were not addressed in both the regulatory measures of Pillar I and the voluntary measures of Pillar II. A number of respondents, particularly environmental organisations, felt strongly about urban planning. One respondent stated that the necessary step change in land management cannot take place unless more is done to address the planning and development of land. They advocated that DCLG develop best practice guidance for bees and pollinators in its 'Planning Practice Guidance on Natural Environment' and ensure that Local Plans produced by local planning authorities Government aim to deliver gains for nature.
28. **Government response:** Pollinators face many threats, of which habitat loss is the main one, as highlighted in the independent report on the 'Status and Value of Pollinators and Pollination Services', which we have issued again with the Strategy. Intensification of land use and loss of good quality natural and semi-natural habitat is leading to loss of food sources and shelter which are essential for pollinator survival. Defra's assessment of the evidence in 2013 was that the risk to bee populations in the field from neonicotinoids is low. We will update this assessment in the context of the EU review scheduled to commence in 2015. If companies wish to see the EU restrictions lifted, they will need to provide further good quality scientific data on the field effects of neonicotinoids on wild/managed pollinators. Government is examining the company plans carefully and is taking views from independent experts and key stakeholders, to consider whether there is additional work which we should carry out. Neonicotinoids are not the only pesticides that could pose a threat to pollinators and the other pesticides will be reviewed over time under the developing EU regime. Across-the-board targets to reduce the use of pesticides are not helpful. Reducing the risk of harm does not equate to reducing the quantity used.
29. In relation to comments on organic farming, the Strategy recognises that this type of production is beneficial for pollinators and other wildlife, and that recent evidence

shows greater species richness on organic farms than on conventional farms, with pollinator species being particularly affected (Tuck *et al.* 2014 Land-use intensity and the effects of organic farming on biodiversity: a hierarchical meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Ecology*). This is thought mainly to be due to increased floral resource on organic farms compared to conventional farms.

30. With regards to IPM, we have included a new action in the Strategy to keep under review research on IPM to identify specific practical advice on supporting pollinators (action 11). The aim is to then share this amongst farmers and growers.
31. The issue of CAP has already been covered under the government response to question 4 and planning under questions 5/6.

**Question 10: We would welcome any examples of good practices which are already helping pollinators and which we've not mentioned in the consultation document or the separate supporting document (such as, land management in towns and cities, local authority initiatives, particularly in fruit growing areas, management of farmland, and integrated pest management and knowledge sharing networks). If you have any further examples please provide in the box below.**

32. 129 online respondents offered examples of good practice, as did a number of written respondents by letter and by e-mail. Many also took the opportunity to suggest how current practices can be changed and improved.
33. Several examples were given of local council good practice. This included planting wild flowers on the reservations of dual carriageways and road verges, changes to cutting regimes and reductions in mowing, meadow planting schemes, wildflower beds on public land, native flower gardens, the promotion of community gardens and orchards, building homes for bees, succession planting on public land, setting up a honey cooperative, and various kinds of pollinator-themed events. One respondent suggested that councils use reciprocating cutter bars rather than flails to trim road verges, so that vegetation is laid down rather than destroyed through cutting, helping to protect insects.
34. Farmers and landowners also gave several examples of good practice, such as giving field margins and corners to wildflowers or leaving areas that are not flailed in the late summer. One suggested growing some hardy plants in semi-protected structures that encourage pollinator activity even during adverse weather conditions. An orchard owner explained that he does not use insecticides during the blossom period. Several farmers indicated their support for, and employment of, IPM.
35. Beekeeping associations gave examples of their work with schools and young people in training up future beekeepers, some through formal apprenticeships schemes. One respondent recommended having bee farmers who specialise in selecting near native

stocks with local adaptation. A larger, national beekeeping organisation has set up 'pollination dating', linking beekeepers with landowners so that the bees have somewhere to feed and forage, and the landowners can benefit from pollination services. Many associations encouraged more people to take up beekeeping and emphasised the value of knowledge sharing among beekeepers.

36. There were a number of interesting examples given of initiatives in urban areas, including work being done to plant flowers on housing estates. Roof gardens were mentioned, as well as efforts to improve urban office environments through planting.
37. Private companies gave a range of examples of pollinator good practice. For instance, some garden suppliers now use logos to denote pollinator friendly plants, the RHS 'Perfect for Pollinators' logo being the prime example. A number of suppliers are working to make their farming habitats more pollinator-friendly with initiatives such as wildflower meadows, the introduction of nesting sites and monitoring pests on crops. One company has an in-house encyclopaedia which assists field and factory staff in identifying pests and more beneficial insects, and helps them to avoid inappropriate use of pesticides. Another company pays farmers premium prices for grass grown on farms which have significant amounts of land designated to wild flowers.
38. Environmental organisations are working in many different ways to protect pollinators. Some have launched campaigns to save meadows and semi-natural land, to encourage the general public to leave areas of their garden to grow wild, and to request that local councils cut road verges less often. A number are working with local authorities to survey the local landscape and to manage both urban and rural areas in a way that benefits pollinators, from planting wild flowers on road verges and islands, to setting targets for the review of cutting regimes. The larger organisations have undertaken landscape scale projects to restore and reconnect natural habitats across the country. Several groups have produced literature aimed at specific groups, such as gardeners and farmers, or produced educational and training material for schools and other organisations to encourage pollinator-friendly land management. A number of NGOs indicated that they are keen for Defra to build on the campaigns and voluntary work that is already taking place for pollinators.
39. **Government response:** Defra welcomes examples of good practice which is already taking place to support pollinators. Defra will develop case studies across the different sectors to celebrate success and to act as a practical example for those looking to respond to the 'Call to Action'. We will post these case studies on [www.beesneeds.org.uk](http://www.beesneeds.org.uk).

### **Question 11: Have we identified the right priority areas for further research and monitoring (in Chapter 3)?**

40. Background. The draft Strategy set out 12 evidence actions, which address key evidence gaps on pollinators. These can be summarised as follows: the current status

of insect pollinators, developing a fit-for-purpose monitoring programme, understanding if pollination services are adequate or in deficit, learning more about the key drivers of change, the effect of neonicotinoids on pollinators and the impact of the recent EU moratorium on farming practices, and lastly the threats to native pollinators from commercially-produced bumble bees.

#### 41. Q11 Responses:

Group	Yes (no.)	No (no.)	Total	Yes (% of group)	No (% of group)
Beekeepers	51	29	80	63.8%	36.2%
Farmers	45	13	58	77.6%	22.4%
Environmental organisations	16	14	30	53.3%	46.7%
Other	50	44	94	53.2%	46.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>61.8%</b>	<b>38.2%</b>

#### Question 12: If you answered 'No' to question 11, please use the box below to identify any further issues about priority areas for research and monitoring.

42. Nearly 40% of online respondents commented further on the priority areas for research and monitoring, along with a significant proportion of written respondents. Many felt it important to stress the urgency of acting to support pollinators, even if evidence remains patchy.
43. There were three further issues commonly raised by consultees. First, there were strong feelings regarding the issue of pesticides, notably amongst beekeepers and environmental organisations. Many objected to evidence action 10, arguing that research into neonicotinoids should not be left only to pesticide companies. Some beekeepers suggested that targets were urgently needed for the reduction of pesticide use, pointing to the pesticide reduction targets set out in the Sustainable Use Directive. Others made the point that the focus should be on pesticides more broadly, not just neonicotinoids.
44. Second, several respondents brought up the threat of habitat loss, and reiterated the need to understand the relationship between plants and pollinators. Specific types of habitat were mentioned, in particular wildflower meadows, grassland and also woodland.

45. Third, the impact of climate change was pointed to by a number of respondents, most notably by farmers. Many would like to better understand the interaction between weather and pollination services. One respondent suggested that we should learn more about the impact of air pollution on pollinators.
46. In terms of directly addressing delivery, several respondents queried whether Defra has the resources and funding to implement the proposed monitoring. Many endorsed the use of volunteers and 'citizen science', but also cautioned that volunteers lack expertise and that they would therefore require much professional support.
47. **Government response (questions 11 and 12):** Eleven evidence actions will be implemented over the next five years in order to address key gaps in our understanding and provide a sound base for future policy. This includes exploring the socio-cultural value of pollinators, and their implication for public wellbeing.
48. We have already commissioned evidence action 1, which is a two-year research project to develop and test a nationwide programme to monitor pollinators. We want this programme to be sustainable for the longer term; it will be led by professionals and incorporate the best that Citizen Science data collection has to offer.
49. Pesticides and field trials is covered under the government response to questions 5/6 and 9.
50. The relationship between plant and pollinator actions will be considered as part of evidence action 8 in the Strategy.
51. Providing essential resources for pollinators and improving the availability and quality of habitats through the Strategy will help pollinators withstand severe weather events and climate change. The Strategy does not include any evidence actions to investigate this relationship as there are other competing priorities for limited resources.
52. Defra has allocated £500,000 from current budgets to implement the evidence actions on which it will lead in the Strategy. This builds on Defra's contribution of £2.5 million from 2009 to 2014 to the jointly funded £10 million Insect Pollinators Initiative which is supporting projects aimed at researching the causes and consequences of threats to insect pollinators, and to inform the development of appropriate mitigation strategies. The Strategy's evidence actions also build on long-established research programmes in other policy areas relevant to pollinators such as biodiversity and pesticides.

### **Question 13: How could you contribute further to priority actions?**

53. 155 online respondents and many of the written responses offered to contribute further to priority actions, demonstrating a general willingness to ensure the success of the National Pollinator Strategy.



54. A number of academic/expert institutions offered to assist with evidence gathering or to share recent findings relevant to pollinators. One academic volunteered a journal of which they are editor as a means of knowledge sharing between land managers, local authorities and conservation organisations.
55. Many environmental groups and beekeeping organisations were also keen to share technical expertise, to contribute to monitoring and citizen science, and to help develop land management advice. They emphasised the value of knowledge sharing, given that there are a number of organisations that have already begun monitoring work. They offered their own communication channels to disseminate information and updates and expressed willingness to run events in communities and schools to promote the pollinator cause. Some proposed to work with local authorities to develop pollinator-friendly practices on public land.
56. **Government response:** Defra welcomes offers of support for the priority actions, which reinforce the collaborative nature of the Strategy. Defra will work with stakeholders to address how it can best draw upon the voluntary and professional/academic work that is already taking place.

**Question 14: We have asked a number of specific questions. If you would like to provide any comments on related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use the space below to report them.**

57. 119 online respondents had additional comments to make, as did the majority of written respondents (hence their chosen response format of letter or e-mail).
58. Habitat was a recurring theme. Beekeepers focussed particularly on the growth of monoculture and the persistent cutting of grass and hedges. One respondent, however, did make the point that many economic and social benefits have resulted from land-use intensification, and such intensification is historic rather than recent.
59. A lack of focus on urban land management (gardens, public spaces, road verges) was highlighted by many, in particular environmental organisations. Some drew attention to the opportunity offered by brownfield sites. A common theme was the need to thoroughly engage local authorities in changing land management practices for pollinators.
60. A responsible attitude to pesticides was re-emphasised, with respondents pointing to current initiatives such as LEAF, IPM and the Code of Good Practice. Many farmers cautioned, however, that whatever recommendations are made, they need to be economically sustainable and cost-effective, including decisions taken on pesticides. IPM was again a strong theme. One respondent emphasised the importance of Government and industry developing a clear definition of IPM, as well as crop and sector-specific protocols. They highlighted a need for provision of outreach services to assist farmers in implementing IPM, and suggested the incorporation of mandatory training in IPM for all sectors into existing assurance schemes.

61. Several expressed a hope that CAP reform would prioritise pollinators, and noted the statement in the Strategy that the new environmental land management scheme would be targeted towards pollinators. A number of farmers requested more expert, technical support in order to manage their land to encourage biodiversity.
62. Beekeepers highlighted the importance of the beekeeping industry in maintaining levels of pollinators. They suggested an ongoing campaign to encourage people to keep bees.
63. Several respondents questioned the robustness of the Strategy. They highlighted a lack of specific, practical actions and asked if anything new was being introduced or any value added. Some asked whether the Strategy had sufficient cross-departmental buy-in, particularly whether it would have a joined up approach with the Department for Communities and Local Government.
64. Other comments related specifically to the delivery of the Strategy. A number questioned whether the Strategy had sufficient powers and funding to ensure effective implementation. While there was great support for Citizen Science as an awareness raising exercise, concerns were reiterated regarding the reliance on volunteers for evidence gathering. Some said the Strategy could only be effective if specific, measurable targets were set for the priority actions. Several pointed to Wales as an example of where a pollinator strategy implementation has already begun.
65. **Government response:** Many of the points raised above have already been addressed in the government response to previous questions.
66. Defra will draw up a delivery plan over the next 6 months to turn the priority actions into reality, working with a wide range of organisations.
67. Defra will take a cross-departmental approach to Strategy delivery, to ensure successful implementation across all relevant policy areas.
68. Defra will closely monitor the results generated from the evidence actions and monitoring programme, to enable a review and refresh of the Strategy in 2019. This will include assessing the effectiveness of current policy actions and the partnerships we establish over the next two years. There will also be opportunity to review whether to add further priority actions, and whether and how to set more quantitative targets for measuring success of Strategy implementation.

## Next steps

69. Defra is grateful to all consultation respondents, who took the time to provide their comments and share their ideas on the National Pollinator Strategy. We are pleased that a majority showed support for the Strategy's proposals and priority actions. The National Pollinator Strategy has been published with this Summary of Responses. The



next steps will be to ensure the development of a strong implementation plan, and that good progress is made with the monitoring programme.

## **Annex A: List of respondents**

### **Academics**

Bumblebee Conservation Trust Ecologists  
International Bee Research Association  
NERC Centre for Ecology & Hydrology  
Queen's University Belfast  
University of Bristol  
University of Cambridge  
University of London, Royal Holloway (3 responses)  
University of Reading

### **Beekeeping Associations**

Barkston Ash Beekeepers Association (part of BBKA)  
Bedfordshire Beekeepers Association  
Bee Collective  
Bee Farmers Association of the UK  
British Beekeepers Association  
Chairman, Hampshire BKA: President, Basingstoke & District BKA  
Chairman, Salisbury Beekeepers Association, Wiltshire  
Cornwall Beekeepers Association  
Durham Beekeepers Association  
Hampshire and Petersfield Beekeepers Associations  
Leeds Beekeepers Association

Ludlow & District BKA

North Devon Beekeepers Association

Shipston Branch of Warwickshire Beekeepers

Slough, Windsor & Maidenhead Beekeepers' Society

Somerset Beekeepers Association

Somerset BKA Frome Division

Whitehaven and District Beekeepers

## **Environmental Organisations**

Birmingham Friends of the Earth

British Wildlife

Buglife - The Invertebrate Conservation Trust

Bumblebee Conservation Trust

Butterfly Conservation

Capital Bee

Daylesford Foundation

Derbyshire Wildlife Trust

Eastbourne & District Friends of the Earth

Environmental Justice Foundation

Field Studies Council

Friends of the Earth

Goxhill Women's Institute

Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership

Hale Women's Institute

Herefordshire Friends of the Earth

Hillingdon Friends of the Earth

Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust

Luton Friends of the Earth

National Federation of Women's Institutes

National Trust

North Pennines AONB Partnership

Oxford Friends of the Earth

Penistone Friends of the Earth

Pesticide Action Network UK

Plant Heritage (National Council for the Conservation of Plant & Gardens)

Plantlife

RSPB

Soil Association

South Bedfordshire Friends of the Earth

The Conservation Volunteers

The Wildlife Trusts

Torfaen Friends of the Earth

Transition Town Horncastle

Urban Bees

Wildlife and Countryside Link

Wildlife Gardening Forum

Women of Woolton WI

### **Expert/training institute**

Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board

Bayer Crop Science

Center for Regulatory Effectiveness, USA

Cornwall Deer Research Programme

Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Entomological Society

Dipterists Forum

Institute of Horticulture

National Biodiversity Network

National Diploma in Beekeeping (NDB)

Rothamsted Research

Royal Horticultural Society

The Organic Research Centre

### **Farmers/landowners**

Country Land and Business Association (CLA)

Church Commissioners

### **Government**

Advisory Committee on Pesticides

All Party-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) on Agroecology

Eastbourne Borough Council

Kent County Council

Westminster City Council

Member of Parliament for Belfast East

Natural England

### **Private Company**

Binsted Nursery and Walberton Nursery

FlowerScapes Ltd

Forshaw Salads

Lakewood Organics

Naturetale Limited

RaineMaker

Syngenta

The Buzzing Bee Honey Company

The Ecology Consultancy

Therapi Honey Skincare

Underhill Partnership

Vitacress Salads Ltd.

### **Trade Association**

Agricultural Industries Confederation (AIC)

Crop Protection Association

Horticultural Trades Association

National Association of Agricultural Contractors (NAAC)

National Farmers' Union of England and Wales

Potato Processors' Association (PPA).

**Plus 59 responses from individual farmers, 65 from members of beekeeping associations, 21 from members of environmental campaign groups and 78 from individuals.**