

Costs of Nature 2030 policy proposals

Final Report

Wildlife and Countryside Link

05/09/2023

10F Printing House Yard
Hackney Road
London E2 7PR

 +44 (0) 20 7580 5383
 eftec@eftec.co.uk
 eftec.co.uk

This document has been prepared for Wildlife and Countryside Link by:

Economics for the Environment Consultancy Ltd (eftec)
10F Printing House Yard
Hackney Road, London
E2 7PR
www.eftec.co.uk

Study team:

Agata Makowska
Victoria Reeser
Ian Dickie

Reviewers

Ian Dickie
Ece Ozdemiroglu

Disclaimer

This report has been prepared in accordance with our proposal dated 28th June 2023 and agreed revisions to it. We are reliant on the information provided by you and that is available in the public domain. While we have endeavoured to provide accurate and reliable information, we are not responsible for the completeness or accuracy of any such information. This report is intended solely for the information and use of Wildlife and Countryside Link and is not intended to be, and should not be, used by anyone other than the specified parties. eftec, therefore, assumes no responsibility to any user of this document other than Wildlife and Countryside Link.

Document evolution

| | | |
|--------------|------------|--|
| Draft report | 11/08/2023 | Reviewed by Ian Dickie and Ece Ozdemiroglu |
| Final report | 30/8/2023 | Reviewed by Ian Dickie |

This report is based on eftec's Version 3 – November 2021 report template.



eftec offsets its carbon emissions through a biodiversity-friendly voluntary offset purchased from the World Land Trust (<http://www.carbonbalanced.org>) and only prints on 100% recycled paper.

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|----------|
| 1. Introduction | 2 |
| 2. Method | 3 |
| 3. Summary results | 5 |
| 4. Key Assumptions | 9 |

1. Introduction

The UK Government's action towards its legal commitment to stop the decline of species abundance and protect 30% of the land and sea laid out in the Environment Act 2021 is regarded as insufficient by Wildlife and Countryside Link (WCL).

Together with over 70 environmental charities, WCL have developed five policy proposals needed to turn around the ongoing decline in the state of nature in the UK, collectively referred to as *Nature 2030*. The proposed Nature 2030 policies are:

- **Policy 1: Doubling the budget for agroecological farming and land management** to at least £6 billion annually to incentivise farmers and land managers to incorporate nature-friendly land management practices;
- **Policy 2: A Nature Recovery Obligation for the private sector** to disclose their impacts on nature and publish nature positive plans along transition planning to avoid and reduce nature damage caused by economic activity;
- **Policy 3: A 30 by 30 Rapid Delivery Project** to accelerate the UK's progress towards its commitment to manage 30% of land and sea for nature by 2030. This will require it to restore its habitats by means of introducing new incentives and obligations for landowners and more powers over and responsibility for nature given to public bodies;
- **Policy 4: A National Nature Service** to establish a new fund to pay for habitat restoration at scale and provide a paid work and training programme to equip people with habitat restoration skills, and;
- **Policy 5: A legal right to a Healthy Environment** to introduce a new Environmental Rights Bill to establish a human right to a healthy environment.

eftec was commissioned by WCL to develop an analysis of public sector costs of each of the five policies to support its Nature 2030 policy proposals.

2. Method

This section outlines the data and method used to evaluate the costs of the Nature 2030 policy proposal.

Overview

At the early stage of the project, eftec's team reviewed WCL's policy proposals, and developed a set of questions about each of the five Nature 2030 policies. The answers to these questions helped to support the analysis, particularly to allow eftec to better understand the assumptions underlying each policy proposal. eftec then set up a costing model to quantify the costs of each policy.

In addition to the information shared by WCL, the analysis used multiple other data and evidence sources to support the analysis. These included public evidence sources (e.g., UK Government publications or Natural England statistics), as well as any other sources in the grey literature known by eftec. The estimates were developed using the most recent and reliable data whenever possible. However, in some cases due to data scarcity or unavailability, the modelling followed assumptions made based on eftec and WCL's knowledge.

Section 4 summarises the key assumptions and evidence sources used to derive the Nature 2030 policy costs.

Policy analysis

Each of the five Nature 2030 policies was broken down into high-level actions necessary to achieve their desired outcomes. Where necessary, these high-level actions were split into more detailed cost items to capture their full range. For example, one of the policy actions aimed at implementing Policy 3, was the expansion of the current SSSI network in England. The preliminary assessment identified that this policy action requires more than one type of public spending, namely the capital expenditure for SSSI network expansion and the operating cost needed to maintain the additional area of land.

The analysis was conducted following a bottom-top approach, where the most disaggregated cost items were added up to arrive at the total cost of each of the five policies.

Additionality

Following the HM Treasury's Green Book guidance¹, each policy was assessed for the role it is expected to play in the desired outcome it is trying to achieve. This involved understanding the policies' additionality (i.e., would the same outcomes have been achieved anyway without the intervention) and displacement (i.e., has the intervention displaced outcomes that would have happened elsewhere).

The preliminary assessment considered the alternative ways that the public sector is currently using to achieve the same policy objectives (e.g., existing public commitments and strategies), as well as whether the funds from existing public investments could be re-allocated to support Nature 2030 policies. The additionality of Nature 2030 policies was compared against these alternative policy measures in terms of their scale, timing, area, and quality of the outputs (e.g., anticipated improvement in habitat condition from

¹ HM Treasury, 2022. The Green Book: appraisal and evaluation in central government.

nature restoration), whenever possible.

Any policy overlap identified as part of the initial assessment was only removed once, from the policy that was lower placed on the list of five measures, from the total figures.

3. Summary results

Table 1 summarises the annual costs of each of the five Nature 2030 policies, broken down by the high-level policy actions they entail. The results give a high-level estimate of the additional public spending requirements of the Nature 2030 policy objectives of £3 billion per year. The estimated costs are additional to existing spending commitments and take account of overlaps between the five Nature 2030 policy objectives. Due to the assumptions required, and brief time period and resources for this study, the results have a moderate level of confidence – they indicate the overall scale of resources the policies will require, but more detailed costings will be needed to support policy implementation.

The annual cost estimates presented in the table are grouped into the following categories:

- **Gross required spend** estimates the total public spending required to implement Nature 2030 policy actions.
- **Current existing spend** estimates the total current public spending on existing UK Government policy actions aimed at achieving targets aligned with those of Nature 2030 policy actions'. See Section 4 for the detailed description of the overlaps between the current UK Government policies with the individual policy actions proposed as part of the Nature 2030 programme. Note that in some cases, it was not possible to attribute certain existing public policies to a single Nature 2030 policy action (i.e., their scope was broader than the scope of a single Nature 2030 policy action). The cost of such policies was captured separately, under the 'Additional public spending with overlap' cost category, described below.
- **Net additional spend (action specific)** estimates the additional public spending required to implement individual Nature 2030 policies, net of the current existing spend (i.e., Net additional spend = Gross required spend – Current existing spend).
- **Net additional spend (Nature 2030 overlap adjusted)** adjusts the net additional spend estimate to account for the overlap between the Nature 2030 policies. See Section 4 for the detailed description of the overlaps between the Nature 2030 policies.
- **Total Nature 2030** estimates the total public spend required to implement the full Nature 2030 policy package, net of the current public spending overlapping with individual Nature 2030 policy actions, and net of the overlap between the Nature 2030 policies.
- **Additional public spending with overlap** estimates the total value of the current public spending on policies aligned with more than one Nature 2030 policy (i.e., current policies which could not be assigned to an individual Nature 2030 policy due to their broader scope). See Section 4 for the detailed description of the policies overlapping with the Nature 2030 proposal as a whole (rather than with individual policy actions proposed).
- **Total Nature 2030 (net of overlaps) estimates** the total additional public spending required to implement the complete Nature 2030 policy package, net of the overlaps with all the relevant current policies and proposed Nature 2030 policies.

Costs of Nature 2030 policy proposals

Table 1: Annual Nature 2030 policy costs (£ million, 2023 prices)

| Nature 2030 Policy | Policy Action(s) | Gross required spend | Current existing spend | Net additional spend (action specific) | Net additional spend (Nature 2030 overlap adjusted) |
|---|---|----------------------|------------------------|--|---|
| Policy 1: Doubling the budget for agroecological farming and land management | ELM+ | £4,400.0 | £3,500.0 | £900.0 | |
| | Accessibility | £500.0 | £250.0 | £250.0 | |
| | Animal welfare; protected sites; local economies; enforcement of regs. | £1,100.0 | N/A | £1,100.0 | |
| | Total | £6,000 | £3,750 | £2,250 | £2,250 |
| Policy 2: Developing a Nature Recovery Obligation policy | Establishment of Environmental Markets Authority | £2.7 | N/A | £2.7 | |
| | Administration and management of the Nature Recovery Obligation levy | £3.8 | £0.1 | £3.7 | |
| | Creation of a single, public-access registry to track credits | £7.4 | £0.4 | £7.0 | |
| | Monitoring and verification | £22.8 | N/A | £22.8 | |
| | Total | £36.6 | £0.1 | £36.5 | £37 |
| Policy 3: A 30 by 30 Rapid Delivery Project | Expansion of the SSSI network | £8.4 | N/A | £8.4 | |
| | Habitat recovery of protected landscapes | £13.8 | £9.9 | £3.9 | |
| | Funding for good management of protected sites & better advice for landowners | £34.0 | £0.0 | £34.0 | |
| | Nature restoration obligation for public bodies | £5.3 | N/A | £5.3 | |
| | Acquisition of new land by public bodies to enable better management for nature | £403.7 | N/A | £403.7 | |
| | Total | £465.3 | £10.0 | £455.3 | £452 |
| Policy 4: National Nature Service | Establishment of the National Nature Fund | £200.0 | N/A | £200.0 | |
| | Establishment of the National Nature Service | £57.8 | N/A | £57.8 | |
| | Total | £258 | N/A | £258 | £229 |
| Policy 5: A legal right to a Healthy Environment | Implementation of the Environmental Rights Bill | £118.4 | £4.7 | £113.7 | |
| | Establishment of a Natural Health Fund for Local Authorities | N/A | N/A | N/A | |
| | Total | £118 | £5 | £114 | £114 |
| Total Nature 2030 | | £6,878 | £3,765 | £3,113 | £3,081 |
| Additional public spending with overlap (across all Nature 2030 policies) | | | | | £38 |
| Total Nature 2030 (net of overlaps) | | | | | £3,044 |

Source: eftc own calculations

Notes: (1) Annual costs do not cover one-off capital costs. These costs were included in the PV calculation presented in Table 2.

(2) Where the Current existing spend = N/A, this means that any equivalent existing policies aimed at achieving similar targets have not been identified / their costs are marginal in comparison with the aggregated costs reported in the table. Gross required spend = N/A indicates that the policy action does not require additional funding due to redistribution of budget savings resulting from the policy (i.e., the overall cost of the policy to the Exchequer is assumed to be zero).

As reported in Table 1, the total annual net cost² of the Nature 2030 programme is **£3.0 billion**, with Policy 1 contributing to almost 73% of this overall cost. Policy 3 places second in terms of the amount of public expenditure required to implement it (15% of the overall cost). Policies 2, 4 and 5 require lower public investment and represent 12% of the total cost altogether.

The distribution of costs by Nature 2030 policy reflects the type and scope of policy actions needed to implement them. Policies 1 and 3 require significant capital investment by definition; Policy 1 would lead to changes in farm practices, significantly increasing the existing farming budget; Policy 3 relies on additional funding for nature restoration and purchasing new land by the public sector. In fact, this finding is further confirmed by the cost figures for individual policy actions: establishment of ELM+ programme and acquisition of new land by the public sector are the main drivers of the total policy cost of Policies 1 and 3, respectively.

On the contrary, Policy 2 puts a higher financial burden on the private sector through levy payments and other regulatory requirements; the actual public costs are limited to the regulator set up and administration costs which tend to be low relative to these big investments envisaged for Policies 1 and 3.

The total annual gross public cost of implementing the Nature 2030 policy package is more than double the net cost. The difference between the gross and net cost is primarily due to the overlap between individual Nature 2030 policy actions and existing UK Government policy objectives. Less than 50% of the required funding for Nature 2030 was found to be additional compared to the public spending on current policies which were designed to achieve similar outcomes (see 'Current existing spend' column vs. 'Gross required spend' columns in Table 1). Note, however, that the proportion of current policy overlap varies between the five policies, with Policies 2 and 4 requiring almost entirely new and additional funding which cannot be met by reallocating using the current public spending. On the other hand, there is little overlap between Nature 2030 policies – only £32 million of the total annual funding for the five policies can support more than one policy.

Table 2 presents the summary of the total costs³ of the Nature 2030 programme across the period of 5 years between 2025 and 2030 (i.e., until the last year by which the anticipated policy outcomes should be achieved). The total aggregated net additional public cost of the Nature 2030 programme until 2030 is **£14.5 billion**.

² I.e., adjusted for the overlap with policies outside and within the Nature 2030 policy programme.

³ Note that the cost categories referenced in the table follow the same definitions as the costs referenced in Table 1

Costs of Nature 2030 policy proposals

Table 2: Total Nature 2030 policy costs across years 2025-2030 (£ million, 2023 prices, discounted)

| Nature 2030 Policy | Policy Action(s) | Gross required spend | Current existing spend | Net additional spend (action specific) | Net additional spend (Nature 2030 overlap adjusted) |
|--|--|----------------------|------------------------|--|---|
| Policy 1: Doubling the budget for agroecological farming and land management | ELM+ | £20,561.5 | £16,355.8 | £4,205.8 | |
| | Accessibility | £2,336.5 | £1,168.3 | £1,168.3 | |
| | Animal welfare; protected sites; local economies; enforcement of regs. | £5,140.4 | N/A | £5,140.4 | |
| | Total | £28,038 | £17,524 | £10,514 | £10,514 |
| Policy 2: Developing a Nature Recovery Obligation policy | Establishment of Environmental Markets Authority | £12.5 | N/A | £12.5 | |
| | Administration and management of the Nature Recovery Obligation levy | £17.7 | £0.5 | £17.2 | |
| | Creation of a single, public-access registry to track credits | £35.2 | £0.4 | £34.8 | |
| | Monitoring and verification | £106.3 | N/A | £106.3 | |
| | Total | £172 | £1 | £171 | £171 |
| Policy 3: A 30 by 30 Rapid Delivery Project | Expansion of the SSSI network | £343.6 | N/A | £343.6 | |
| | Habitat recovery of protected landscapes | £64.6 | £50.8 | £13.8 | |
| | Additional funding for good management of protected sites & better advice for landowners | £159.1 | £0.2 | £158.9 | |
| | Nature restoration obligation for public bodies | £24.7 | N/A | £24.7 | |
| | Acquisition of new land by public bodies to enable better management for nature | £1,886.5 | N/A | £1,886.5 | |
| | Total | £2,478 | £51 | £2,427 | £2,412 |
| Policy 4: National Nature Service | Establishment of the National Nature Fund | £934.6 | N/A | £934.6 | |
| | Establishment of the National Nature Service | £270.0 | N/A | £270.0 | |
| | Total | £1,205 | N/A | £1,205 | £1,070 |
| Policy 5: A legal right to a Healthy Environment | Implementation of the Environmental Rights Bill | £553.2 | £22.0 | £531.2 | |
| | Establishment of a Natural Health Fund for Local Authorities | N/A | N/A | N/A | |
| | Total | £553 | £22 | £531 | £531 |
| Total Nature 2030 | | £32,446 | £17,598 | £14,849 | £14,698 |
| Additional public spending with potential overlap (across all Nature 2030 policies) | | | | | £175 |
| Total Nature 2030 (net of overlap) | | | | | £14,523 |

Source: eftec own calculations

Notes: (1) The total costs reported in the table were discounted using the 3.5% discount rate, as recommended in the HM Treasury Green Book (2022).

(2) Total costs reported in the table cover one-off capital costs. Some ongoing maintenance costs were increased over time in line with the annual expansion of the area of land maintained.

(3) Where the Current existing spend = N/A, this means that any equivalent existing policies aimed at achieving similar targets have not been identified / their costs are marginal in comparison with the aggregated costs reported in the table. Gross required spend = N/A indicates that the policy action does not require additional funding due to redistribution of budget savings resulting from the policy (i.e., the overall cost of the policy to the Exchequer is assumed to be zero).

4. Key Assumptions

The Nature 2030 policy costs were estimated using modelling assumptions aligned to the spending definitions described in Section 3. This section gives an overview of the key assumptions, including overarching assumptions applicable across the entire analysis, as well as policy-specific parameters.

General assumptions

- All costs were estimated using 2023 prices. The input data from earlier years was inflated using the HM Treasury GDP deflators at market prices as needed.
- Total costs estimates were aggregated across the period between 2025 (i.e., first year following a one-year long transition period since the May 2024 general election) and 2030 (the last year by which the Nature 2030 policy outcomes should be achieved). The future costs were discounted using a 3.5% discount rate following the HM Treasury recommendations.
- Three current UK Government programmes and legislations were identified as potentially targeting overlapping policy objectives to those of multiple Nature 2030 policies. These were: the inclusion of nature recovery duties in the set-up of the UK Infrastructure Bank, the Big Nature Impact Fund, and the Nature Recovery Impact Fund. To avoid double-counting of existing spending, the total annual value of each of these initiatives was deducted from the total estimated public expenditure required to implement Nature 2030 policies. See table below for breakdown.

| Policy action overlap | Description | Key assumptions |
|---|---|---|
| Inclusion of nature recovery duties in the set-up of the UK Infrastructure Bank | The Bank has already announced £1.2 billion of deals since its formation in 2021. However, it's only made one natural capital transaction to date (31st March 2023) of £12 million to support a nature restoration project in the Scottish Highlands. | £24 million/year assuming two nature restoration projects annually at a fixed cost. |
| Big Nature Impact Fund | UK Gov £30 million of seed capital in the Big Nature Impact Fund (BNIF) which will attract private sector investment into a range of nature projects in England. | £4 million/year assuming the total budget will be distributed annually until 2030 (starting in 2021 following the official announcement). |
| Nature Recovery Impact Fund (NERIF) | To date, 86 projects across England have received development grants of up to £100,000 through two competitive rounds of the £10 million NEIRF in 2021 and 2022 | £10 million/year assuming NEIRF grants remain at a fixed cost |

Individual policy overlaps are described in the relevant policy sections.

Policy-specific assumptions

Policy 1: Doubling the budget for agroecological farming and land management

- Geographical coverage: whole of the UK

Costs of Nature 2030 policy proposals

- Habitat coverage: UK farmland (roughly 70% of the UK)
- Policy actions specification:

| Nature 2030 Policy Action | Description | Key assumptions |
|--|--|--|
| ELM+ | Farm payments to adopt less intensive practices | £4.4 bn/ year cost from the Rayment Consulting report ⁴ |
| Accessibility | Access on farmland | £500 m/year following WCL's assumption |
| Animal welfare; protected sites; local economies; enforcement of regs. | Higher animal welfare standards; Improved management of protected sites; Support for local economies and shortened supply chains; More advice for farmers and better enforcement regulations | £1.1 bn/year overall cost (WCL's assumption) eftec assumption 1: 25% of 1 bn/year for each of the four policy actions (see description). eftec assumption 2: remaining £100 mln/year for contingency |

- Policy actions overlap with current public policies:

| Nature 2030 Policy Action | Current UK Gov policy | Assumption |
|--|-----------------------|---|
| ELM+ | ELM | 100% overlap with the existing ELMs annual budget ⁵ (Sustainable Farming Incentive) |
| Accessibility | Health budgets | Overlap with the current health budget aimed at improving public access to nature to enable health benefits. Assume that at least 50% of costs are offset by savings to health budgets ⁶ . |
| Animal welfare; protected sites; local economies; enforcement of regs. | N/A | This required spending is treated as additional (i.e., no overlap with the existing policy identified). |

Policy 2: Developing a Nature Recovery Obligation policy

- Geographical coverage: England
- Habitat coverage: All habitats
- Sector coverage: Large businesses (over 250 employees, as per Gov definition) in the retail, water, energy, housing and construction sectors.
- Policy actions specification:

| Nature 2030 Policy Action | Description | Key assumptions |
|--|---|--|
| Establishment of Environmental Markets Authority | Establishment of a robust governance system to achieve a suite of high integrity environmental markets in the UK. | Assume the operating cost of the new Environmental Markets Authority similar to the costs of the costs of the Office for |

⁴ <https://www.wildlifetrusts.org/sites/default/files/2023-06/Finance%20for%20UK%20Environmental%20Land%20Management%2C%20June%202023.pdf>

⁵ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/sfi-handbook-for-the-sfi-2023-offer>

⁶ Health budget savings will conservatively be worth 50% of spending on accessibility. eftec assumption based on forthcoming analysis for Nature North.

| Nature 2030 Policy Action | Description | Key assumptions |
|--|---|---|
| | | Environmental Protection. |
| Administration and management of the Nature Recovery Obligation levy | Cost of managing a new levy scheme and development of 5 additional UK Gov codes. | Assume the cost of levy administration is similar to the annual cost of the Exchequer departments managing environmental taxes and the cost of administering the climate change levy. Assume the cost of creating a single new code the same as the cost of creating and running the Woodland Carbon Code ⁷ . |
| Creation of a single, public-access registry to track credits | Total capital and operating cost of setting up the central credit registry (incl. development of data collection techniques, data operation and resources). | Assume the capital and ongoing costs of setting up the central registry the same as for BNG registry ⁸ . |
| Monitoring and verification | Costs of monitoring and permanent advisory (+ 30% overheads) for 152 LAs | Assume the ongoing operating cost of monitoring and permanent advisory at LA level 2x larger than BNG costs ⁹ . |

- Policy actions overlap with current public policies:

| Nature 2030 Policy Action | Current UK Gov policy | Assumption |
|--|---|--|
| Establishment of Environmental Markets Authority | N/A | 100% additionality, no environmental authority currently in the UK. |
| Administration and management of the Nature Recovery Obligation levy | Potential for BNG system to contribute to the levy system. Several additional codes in development through the Natural Environment Investment Readiness Fund (e.g., saltmarsh and hedgerow codes). | Assume no adjustment for BNG system (100% additionality of the levy-system). Assume that a proportion of the NERF grant covers the development cost of two new codes which overlaps with the Nature 2030 policy action. |
| Creation of a single, public-access registry to track credits | Set up costs of developing a single, central credit registry can be reduced if the existing codes' systems are transferred/scaled up. | Assume 30% contribution of the existing codes towards the creation of a central credit registry. |
| Monitoring and verification | BSI and Defra programme on nature investment principles | There is a potential overlap between the two actions but assume no adjustment (i.e., 100% additionality). |

⁷ <https://forestry.gov.scot/publications/588-assessing-the-wider-benefits-of-the-woodland-carbon-code/viewdocument/588>

⁸ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/839610/net-gain-ia.pdf

⁹ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/839610/net-gain-ia.pdf

Policy 3: A 30 by 30 Rapid Delivery Project

- Geographical coverage: England
- Habitat coverage: all protected sites (SSSIs, SAC & SPAs, National Parks, AONBs, MPAs)
- Policy actions specification:

| Nature 2030 Policy Action | Description | Key assumptions |
|---|---|--|
| Expansion of the SSSI network | Expansion of the SSSI network with additional 94,000 hectares by 2030 | Assume the annual cost of priority habitat expansion and maintenance per ha from Rayment (2017) ¹⁰ . |
| Habitat recovery of protected landscapes | Restoration of habitats in unfavourable condition in Natural Parks and AONBs in England | Assume that the restoration cost per ha from Rayment (2017) ¹⁰ and that only habitats in unfavourable condition require additional funding for restoration. |
| Funding for good management of protected sites & better advice for landowners | Additional funding for SSSI and MPAs recovery (National Parks and AONBs recovery covered in the cost item above). | Assume that only habitats in unfavourable condition require additional funding for habitat restoration & recovery. Assume a 50% overlap between SSSIs and protected landscape and adjust the figure to remove the overlap. |
| Nature restoration obligation for public bodies | Annual cost of recovering & maintaining publicly owned priority habitats in unfavourable condition outside SSSIs | Assume the publicly owned area for restoration excludes SSSIs and relates to priority habitats in unfavourable condition. |
| Acquisition of new land by public bodies to enable better management for nature | Annual cost of purchasing and maintaining new publicly owned land | Assume cost of expansion of public land of 1,500 ha per year x average market price per ha of land. |

- Policy actions overlap with current public policies:

| Nature 2030 Policy Action | Current UK Gov policy | Assumption |
|---|--|---|
| Expansion of the SSSI network with additional 94,000 hectares by 2030 | N/A | 100% additional, no equivalent policy in place |
| Habitat recovery of protected landscapes | Additional budget for AONBs and National Parks | Assume the UK Gov's new commitment to support NPs ¹¹ and AONBs ¹² can achieve the same policy outcome. Assume that 5% of NP annual budget is used for nature restoration. |

¹⁰ <https://www.wildlifetrusts.org/sites/default/files/2018-03/RSPB%2C%20The%20National%20Trust%20and%20The%20Wildlife%20Trusts%20-%20Assessing%20the%20costs%20of%20environmental%20land%20management%20in%20the%20UK.%20Final%20report.pdf>

¹¹ Campaign for National Parks charity. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/travel/2023/mar/03/english-national-parks-welcome-44m-funding-boost-from-government>

¹² Defra Landscape Review 2019. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/833726/landscapes-review-final-report.pdf

| Nature 2030 Policy Action | Current UK Gov policy | Assumption |
|---|--|--|
| Funding for good management of protected sites & better advice for landowners | Highly Protected Marine Areas (HPMAs) policy Habitat creation and rural development schemes | Assume that the newly created HPMAs overlap in scope with the Nature 2030 policy. Habitat creation and rural development schemes overlap with the policy action, but their scope is broader hence the overlap is removed from the total cost of Nature 2030 programme, rather than apportioned to one policy action. |
| Nature restoration obligation for public bodies | N/A | Assume that a similar obligation not in place currently |
| Acquisition of new land by public bodies to enable better management for nature | N/A | Assume that the UK Government currently doesn't acquire new land for nature restoration purposes |

- Policy actions overlap with Nature 2030 policies: Assume National Nature Fund contributes £3.3 million p.a.

Policy 4: National Nature Service

- Geographical coverage: England
- Habitat coverage: all habitats

| Nature 2030 Policy Action | Description | Key assumptions |
|--|---|--|
| Establishment of the National Nature Fund | Establishment of larger version of the Green Recovery Challenge Fund, known as the National Nature Fund. | Assume that NNF captures nature recovery outside the scope of policies 1-3. |
| Establishment of the National Nature Service | Establishment of a National Nature Service, providing a one-year paid nature work & training placement for 10,000 people over five years. | Assume 10,000 trainees over 5 years. Cost per trainee includes an annual minimum wage, cost per training provider and cost for covering Natural England's facilitation fees. |

- Policy actions overlap with current public policies:

| Nature 2030 Policy Action | Current UK Gov policy | Assumption |
|--|-----------------------|--|
| Establishment of the National Nature Fund | N/A | 100% additional, no equivalent policy in place |
| Establishment of the National Nature Service | N/A | 100% additional, no equivalent policy in place |

- Policy actions overlap with Nature 2030 policies: assume 50% of Policy 4 budget for NNS funded through Policy 2 (i.e., 50% of the £58 million).

Policy 5: A legal right to a Healthy Environment

- Geographical coverage: England
- Habitat coverage: all habitats

| Nature 2030 Policy Action | Description | Key assumptions |
|--|--|--|
| Implementation of the Environmental Rights Bill | A fund from central Government to help public bodies comply with the new legal requirement to uphold the right to a healthy environment. | Assume that costs of additional guidance are negligible or not additional to the usual operating costs of the UK Gov bodies which will be responsible for developing the guidance. Assume that to meet the legal requirement public bodies will need to make changes on the same scale as restoring English greenspace to a favourable condition. |
| Establishment of a Natural Health Fund for Local Authorities | Establishment of a Natural Health Fund (NHF), which local authorities can bid into to support projects that will give communities better access to nature. | NHF budget is not treated as additional because it is assumed to be funded through savings made on lower healthcare costs resulting from the programme. |

- Policy actions overlap with current public policies:

| Nature 2030 Policy Action | Current UK Gov policy | Assumption |
|--|--|---|
| Implementation of the Environmental Rights Bill | Ongoing UK Gov programmes aimed at improving access to green and blue space: Access for All programme, Levelling up green spaces programme | Assume 100% overlap. The new programmes announced in the recent Environmental Improvement Plan ¹³ . |
| Establishment of a Natural Health Fund for Local Authorities | Green social prescribing | No overlap adjustment needed as the Natural Health fund budget assumed to be £0 in the analysis – it will be funded through redistribution of the health budget savings achieved by health improvements as a result of the programme. |

¹³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environmental-improvement-plan>

10F Printing House Yard, Hackney Road,
London, E2 7PR



+44 (0) 20 7580 5383



eftec@eftec.co.uk



eftec.co.uk



[@eftecUK](https://twitter.com/eftecUK)

