ResULTS project: Case Study G, interview 47

Telephone interview with academic with upland interests, conducted 7th December 2018

Interviewer: I

Respondent: R

I Tell me a bit about yourself and [organisation 1].

R My background is academic in agricultural, social science really, so professor at [University A]. I’ve had an interest in the uplands for decades and I did a research project on tourism in the uplands in 1980/81 I think. So I’ve had an interest for some time in that regard. [section deleted to maintain anonymity]

I You mentioned outputs, can you share some links with those things?

R Yes. You might need to send me a follow-up email to remind me.

I Whatever [organisation 1] produce is very relevant to what we are doing.

R You are aware of what they’re doing are you?

I Yes, from what I have found from the website.

What are the special features particular to upland areas that should be maintained in your view?

R [inaudible] I don’t know that area well enough to do that.

It’s hard to know how to answer that in some ways. Clearly they are areas with considerable natural assets in terms of landscape character, biodiversity, carbon storage, water storage and all those sorts of things, and considerable cultural resonance in some cases as well. Therefore, what needs to be maintained are those qualities but maintained in a way that allows for progression and change if circumstances change. I can see a situation whereby we put more emphasis on some ecosystem services, particularly in the context of climate change than perhaps we do at the moment, so there will probably be some adjustment to the balance between those different outcomes and outputs.

I’m passionately a believer in cultural landscapes and therefore the importance of sheep and cattle in those environments, that doesn’t mean to say that I want every single last acre of upland Britain to retain that function. I think there are particular landscapes where that is really important. There are other landscapes where it is probably less important and we might see more tree cover or wetting of the mires or whatever it is.

I The question is more about what people value in upland areas.

This project is about the resilience of the UK food systems related to upland areas.

Card 1.

R Upland food system agents?

I Diagram of supply chain.

[section deleted to maintain anonymity]

R Yes, probably. That’s probably the better place to put it, but bearing in mind that we have within that not only the people who are interested in producing food but the people who are interested in producing habitat and biodiversity etc, which doesn’t seem to fit. I don’t quite see where that fits in your schema really. You’ve got environmental and/or social interest NGOs at the top, haven’t you? It’s up to you where you fit it, I would say we have a bit of that green one and a bit of the orange industry one as well.

I I understand it’s difficult to link with this supply chain.

R We have people, [organisation 1] has a fair old smattering of academics as well, and it has a smattering of people from the advisory and education training side as well. We’re not in Scotland, we are in England and I think that’s possibly where you need to bear that in mind. We see ourselves as open to anybody who’s interested in how this land is used and wishes to have some sort of voice in that. Perhaps something else I should say, we have had a lot of support from Defra in this, [section deleted to maintain anonymity].

I In Scotland I haven’t seen the equivalent to the initiative of [organisation 1].

What do you think about this diagram?

R I think it broadly makes sense. The only thing I think I would say is that any such diagram tends to imply some kind of segmentation which may or may not be very true to practice. Somebody from Planet Mars could look at that and say, you could get rid of all the green boxes, you’d still have a supply chain, whereas of course in reality you wouldn’t. So yes they’re the people bit but… If I take the example of support for public goods, there’s a tendency at the moment to separate these off as though the market is one thing, the supply chain is one thing and public goods is entirely another, whereas all the evidence shows that the supply chain would be radically altered if there were different forms of support, even different forms of support from environmental goods.

In other words, these things that come out of the uplands, whether they be sheep or environmental services are interdependent, you don’t have the sheep without the environmental services, you don’t have the environmental services without the sheep. That doesn’t mean there aren’t negative aspects of that but if you have too many sheep you have too few environmental services and if you have no sheep at all you just have very different kind of environmental services. It’s very difficult to imagine a situation whereby you would only have sheep as an output, in other words the whole economy of upland farming would fall apart without those two linking.

You’ve got agri-environment payments, you’ve got the basic payment scheme, both of which in different ways obviously are justified on supporting these high value systems. Do you see what I’m getting at? So there’s kind of a lot of interlinkages and separating things out. As a schema it’s absolutely fine, you can get incredibly worked, one can look at these things and start wagging one’s finger, I’m not going to do that. It seems absolutely fine for what its purpose is. My one caution is, just don’t forget the interlinkages.

I I’m glad you focused on the interlinkages because that’s our key area of focus.

What does resilience mean for you?

R I’ve read a lot of stuff, I’ve written a little bit. Summing it up, it’s the ability to withstand shocks, it goes beyond sustainability into a sort of… Yes, it’s an ability to withstand change and shocks putting it very simply.

I Card 2, definition of resilience.

R Do you think converting to organic in an upland context is a radical change, I’m not sure that I do?

I I put it as an example because it’s a radical shift in the way farmers manage their farm.

What do you think about that definition?

R Yes, I think that makes sense. I wouldn’t want to add anything to that.

I The question, how is your organisation doing in terms of resilience. I you think of sheep farmers in upland areas, where do you think most of their businesses are?

R It’s a tough area. They hold their head above water because they have the basic payment and the agri-environment payments, they don’t make any money on, they lose money basically on the farming side of the business, except in a few cases. I think some of them are obviously better than others, some of them have heavily invested in sheep genetics and improving things are doing better but the overall picture is one of fragility.

I So something like struggling or surviving? Beef cattle, do you think they are in a slightly different position?

R I think beef cattle in some ways are even worse because it’s become… I know it fluctuates from year to year but there’s far fewer beef cattle on the hills than there were and that’s led to various environmental challenges. I think a lot of farmers are thinking, we put a few sheep out on the hill but we keep the beef in the in-by land now or we don’t do them at all. Certainly in England, there’s the whole TB problem as well so beef is challenging as well.

I How has resilience changed in the last five years, what is your prediction for the next 10 years and the next 15 years?

R I think it’s hard to answer that really.

I Card 3. Is there any important function, role or goal for farmers in upland areas that is missing from that list and can you rank the five most important critical roles or functions?

R I don’t think there’s anything fundamentally missing, so I think that’s ok. My only little quibble I think is 21, conflating historic cultural value and local cuisine, to me they are entirely different matters. I’m not saying local cuisine isn’t of cultural and historic significance but I think it’s a shame to have conflated those two.

I We have had comments about farm architecture or farming practices.

R In terms of the importance, I think this is difficult. I’m not sure if it’s helpful to try and work out importance. I think in a sense that’s the whole point, the whole point is most of these things are important and it’s the interactions that are significant. I can easily say I don’t think food security is as important as something else, and at one level it isn’t because the significance of what the food security offer from the uplands in terms of feeding human populations is not that great. On the other hand, if that is then used saying the really important things are carbon sequestration and biodiversity enhancement then I think it’s getting to a daft place because we begin to lose links with agriculture. I’m really not overly happy with playing that game but if you want me to play the game I guess I will.

I do have a small farm so I do understand how farmers think. Maybe there should have been a different questionnaire for different people I agree, and I daresay yes you could get someone putting a business hat on and saying farming’s obviously the most important thing or someone with an environmentalist hat saying nature conservation’s the most important, I appreciate that.

I From the farming community in upland areas, what do you think are the functions, roles or goals that they currently recognise as important?

R One response to that is, of course it depends who you’re talking to in the farming community. An average relatively well-informed farmer will clearly be extremely interested in his profit margin, he will be interested in succession, I say he because most of them are he but take it as he or she, will have probably quite a lot of respect for the community issues and social cohesion. I don’t think they’ll be quite so interested in adding value and increasing customer satisfaction, if they’re producing sheep it’s down the chain. Wellbeing will be important. When it comes to all the public good services, it will vary but most of them… Agri-environment schemes pretty well started in the uplands, most of them will have some sense of all of those I would say. They’re aware that a significant proportion of their money comes for doing those different kind of things.

I Anything you would like to add about functions or roles?

R I don’t think so, no.

I Is the full potential of adding value to the beef and lamb products coming from upland areas currently reached?

R Probably not. This is horrendously complex. As you know there have been a number of attempts in different parts of the country to increase, to add value through marketing with a particular provenance, with some success. I strongly suspect more can be done but it’s got to be done in the context of a generally declining meat market in Britain anyway. I know we export as well. I don’t think we’ve gone as far as we might along that route but this is highly competitive territory.

Unless a farmer can find a way of adding value that he or she thinks haven’t been tried before and finds a corner of the market they can get into, it’s tough. There’s certainly a sheep producer in North Wales for example who has had a lot of publicity for adding value with his lamb products getting into top London hotels and restaurants. I think they’re Welsh mountain sheep so there’s a premium around the breed, a premium around the provenance, and he’s done incredibly well. But there’s a limit how many lamb-based dishes are served in London restaurants, top London restaurants and hotels every day, it’s obviously a finite number, so how many more farmers could break into that kind of market is hugely questionable.

I Card 4, drivers of change. Is there any important driver missing?

R One thing that doesn’t seem to be there and hasn’t been mentioned yet is common land. I think there are some real challenges around responding to the possible new opportunities from new policy in terms of common land because, all of the challenges that go with the governance of common land. So I think that’s something that is really quite important.

Commoners have to agree amongst themselves about how they’re going to respond to new opportunities. It’s hard to see new environmental land management schemes taking place without buy-in from a lot of commoners working together, and that’s had to happen in the past and it will have to happen again. It’s not always easy to achieve and there is a certain lowest common denominator issue that comes to bear if certain commoners are not behaving as well as others, and that obviously has a potential risk for other people. So there’s that side of thing as well.

Obviously the Brexit issues are hugely important. I think it’s mostly there.

I Is there anything there that could be seen as an opportunity?

R Changed weather patterns I guess. Obviously if you have a gradual increase of temperature you’re going to have more grass in the grass growing areas of the uplands. Potentially speaking there’s a whole load of stuff caught up in that but that is a potential plus side I suppose. There’s not much else in that list that is a plus side. You could say that air pollution in terms of nitrous oxide is increasing productivity in the uplands as well. Purely from an agricultural production point of view that is probably the case, it’s not good in all sorts of other ways and of course it depends on what the vegetation is on to which it falls. It may not be decent grassland if it’s other things it’s probably increasing the growth of scrub and bracken etc, but I suppose there is a potential slight upside there, I wouldn’t want to put much emphasis on it. I don’t see there’s any potential upside in extreme weather or disease, or price volatility, or uneven power dynamic. The upside is if you change the power dynamics I suppose.

There is potential upside in terms of alternative land use, if there is more profitable use of land then yes of course there could be. You could have nature conservation being funded by Natural Capital Trusts or biodiversity offsetting net gain, all those kinds of things which could theoretically put much more money into the uplands. I think that one is a one where there is a potential plus side.

Looking at Brexit, it’s hard, we’ve got free access to the EU market. If we ended up having a Norway type Brexit that gave us continuing free access to the EU market I suppose in the current context we’d call that an upside but it would just be the same as we’ve already got. Access to foreign markets, that’s obviously a difficult one.

Limited basic infrastructure and access to services, I don’t see there’s an upside there apart from building some kind of alternative ways of living that might attract people in who don’t want to be part of that. Demographic pressures. Societal concerns about meat production for damaging ecosystems and animal welfare. There isn’t much of an upside to that unless we find a different use for the uplands in a sense.

I How do you rank the five most important threats for the upland areas?

R I think the most important threat is the loss of CAP subsidies, number 12. You’ve presumably seen the figures of the proportion of farm income that is derived from basic payment scheme and agri-environment. Although in the uplands they’re hugely dependent, you’ve seen those sorts of figures. I know it’s talking of a transition, I know it’s talking of new ELM schemes, but I still consider that to be a very major threat, so I would put that first.

I think I would put disease high up there as well, number 7 probably. We’ve not, TB, that’s one of the reasons why cattle aren’t on the hills. I think with climate change there’s a risk of other diseases all the time and we’ve had a period where we haven’t had much blue tongue in sheep. I just think as time goes on there’s going to be more of a risk from that with climate change. So that would probably be my number two. I don’t know whether you mean two or seven for what I’ve just said about diseases, I think it’s probably two rather than seven. I think it’s both actually.

I Is that related to climate change?

R Yes, definitely. Blue tongue is a classic example of a disease that is linked to mild wet winters, so that’s one. We could get more of that. I think that’s the main one that springs to mind, I’m not an expert in this area but I think the fungal biologists will tell you that there’s a whole load of stuff waiting to land on our shores if the temperature gets to a certain level, but blue tongue is the most obvious in regards to sheep.

I would probably put uneven power dynamics up there as three or four. I think it’s quite simply, unless farmers have got some kind of direct marketing or some kind of added value like I talked about with that Welsh farmer, they are price takers. They are price takers in a system whereby the power of the retailers in our food supply chain is huge, and we’ve not got strong cooperatives in ways of countervailing that power. So I think that’s what I mean by that. If Tesco’s or Sainsbury’s through their buyers decide that in such and such a week in June that it’s going to be really hot and therefore they’re not going to be selling so much meat as they would, they pull their buyers out of that marketplace for a couple of weeks then they pull their buyers out of that marketplace and it’s really tricky. In the same way as they, where they have direct contracts with farmers they’re in a very powerful… It’s either they’re buying indirectly through the livestock marts or they’re buying directly in some shape or form through a contract where they have a lot of power in that contract, and they alter the conditions that ? calves should be always kept together instead of kept isolated, all this sort of stuff, so they suddenly change what they want from the farmers in their schemes.

I Store animals.

R It knocks on, doesn’t it? Farmers who buy store animals, and I’ve bought store sheep in my time, you obviously want to get them as cheap as possible and what you think you’re going to make for them might determine what you’re prepared to pay for that market is obviously determined by what you think you’re going to get at the end when you sell them fat, either direct to an abattoir or in the local livestock mart. The fact that upland farmers are selling store animals does not in any way remove them from that sort of downward price pressure that comes from the retailers because it works through the system.

CL Do you think the structure and governance of the supply chain create some kind of barriers?

MW Yes, a bias towards those who’ve got the greater might and who are more likely to be able to influence the price, in this case for a lower price.

CL The majority of relationships are spot markets. Do these features create a side effect of farmers becoming price takers?

MW Yes, I think that’s exactly what farmers are in the vast majority of cases.

CL Why are they price takers?

MW That’s the main reason but it’s whether you consider the retail environment to be close to oligopoly as opposed to completely… There’s a relatively small number of big retailers of food and is it an oligopoly situation whereby even if they don’t, and I’m not for one moment suggesting they do, collectively seek to set prices, I think in an oligopolist situation they are, there’s an inevitable move towards them lowering the prices. There aren’t the alternative outlooks available to farmers in that context. It does come down to lack of marketing strength of farmers because they’ve lost what marketing boards they might once have had and they’ve not got the strong cooperatives that have come in in their stead. I think it’s as simple as that really.

CL Number 16, infrastructure.

MW There’s a whole set of regulations around slaughterhouses and around slaughtering. Again, even if you sell direct to the abattoir, you’re still a bit of a price taker. Some of the livestock markets are located very adjacent to slaughterhouses and the slaughterhouse buyers are in the market. What do you do if you’re a farmer and you turn up with a bunch of sheep and the price is low, you don’t have to sell, you can take them back and the distances now because of the reduction numbers of abattoirs are so great and it becomes a major issue? You’ve not achieved the kind of price that you were expecting, do you incur the additional cost of taking them home again and bringing them in the following week, do you run the risk of in the interim them going fat and going above weight? There’s a whole set of factors and you’re in a really weak position, you either take the price you’re given at that point or you run other risks. So you’re running a risk when you go into the market with them and you’re running a risk if you decide not to sell.

CL How do you assess the feedback along the supply chain?

MW What sort of feedback do you mean? If you sell fat sheep in a market, the only feedback you get is the chitty that says they weighed this and this is the price you got, and this is the levy that was taken off for the levy board, and that’s about it. I guess there would be feedback if there was a problem with the carcasses or something like that subsequently.

What you have to remember is, there’s often a transaction that takes place between… If you sell fat sheep you don’t actually know who you’re selling them to, they probably do go straight to the abattoir but they might go in another hand, they might go through the hands of a dealer. I think if you sell direct to the abattoir you get a bit more information back about carcass quality and all that stuff but if you sell at auction, I’ve done this for many years, small numbers of sheep because I’ve had a smallholding for a long time, all I get back when I sell at auction is a chitty that tells me what the sheep weighed, how much I got for them…

CL Is feedback or lack of feedback helping the farmer to make his business resilient?

MW I guess I could get more… I do it as a hobby, it’s not big business to me, and I’ve never stayed for the sales so I just take the sheep in and find out a few days later what I’ve made for them. As far as I’m concerned it’s time for them to go and that’s the end of the matter so I’m a classic price taker, and if one or two of them make significantly less than some of the others then there’s presumably a reason which I’m not aware of because I’m not there to pick up the information and get the chit-chat at the marketplace as to why that was the case, what was wrong with that animal.

If I was a proper expert farmer you’d get more and certainly in the past when I’ve worked on other farms where they have been sold direct to a buyer, I know that he will come in and say I’ll have that half dozen, I think that one’s not quite right for this reason or that reason and you get bits and bobs of information. If you’re a proper professional farmer then you will be seeking to produce the animals that comply with the requirements they have.

I remember going through the phase back in… I’ve been involved in agriculture all my life, even though I’m an academic and certainly back in the 80s there was a big switch towards less fat and it became a real big issue to try and produce leaner animals. I remember all the stuff around that, trying to respond to that, and what happened then was primarily a shift in breed, a move towards a different kind of animal that would comply with those new market requirements. So yes, farmers do respond to that sort of thing, of course they do.

CL Farmers say the feedback doesn’t help them make decisions to produce a product that is valued by either the slaughterhouse or the retailer.

MW That’s absolutely right and I think that’s consistent with what I’ve just been saying. I’m sure there are people in my neck of the woods who are a little bit more sophisticated than I’ve been but I think most of them are, they produce their sheep, they know about lambing sheep and drenching sheep, doing all the things you have to do to sheep and at the end of the process you have a lamb that’s at the right weight and you send it off.

The main changes that have occurred have been through breed change and genetic changes, so you kind of pick up on the advances there so you’re getting a better animal because everyone’s saying you should be using a different bloodline so gradually there’s a change and that’s where it kicks in. A lot of the traditional breeds, certainly the lowland traditional breeds have much reduced in number as a result of that, nobody wants to buy fat Hampshire Down lambs, they want to buy leaner mules or whatever. Farmers respond to that but it’s a pretty unsophisticated response I agree.

CL They also look at prices, which is not a good indicator.

CL Brexit and subsidies. What are the side-effects of those subsidies?

MW It’s really difficult, when one’s spent time researching this, I will send you a reading list. I did vast amounts of work and wrote a book on [book name removed to maintain anonymity] and the impacts of shifting payments in the way that happened then. They all have different, clearly they have different impacts. The impacts of the basic payments scheme has been fossilising industry in certain ways, preventing innovation, acting as a kind of pension scheme; the impacts of the previous headage payments unless they were limited by quota as they were for a while, clearly encouraged overproduction. I could go on and on. Every single different policy has an impact.

CL I would be grateful if you could send me some of the links. Ideally what type of subsidies would you like to see in the future?

MW I think it’s quite clear which direction we’re going. Apart from the total lack of clarity when we’re actually going to have Brexit at all, there is quite a lot of clarity from government that we’re going in the direction of public money for public goods; we’re going in the direction of environment land management schemes of some description. I don’t think there’s any departure from that in the different countries, and it’s become almost a mantra that you don’t pay farmers to produce food, you don’t pay farmers just to be farmers you pay farmers for the environmental services they produce. Yes, there’s perhaps a lack of clarity about how those schemes will be designed or co-designed, about the relative merits or the relative values within them put on different aspects of public services but I think the general direction of travel is very clear.

You’re asking what the ideal scheme would be, my worry about all that is that it underplays the link between farming and the production of those environmental services. By trying to conceptually separate them in a sort of [person 3], if you’re familiar with [person 3, the Chair of organisation 2], by trying to conceptually separate them in that way you miss the linkages, you miss the notion of joint production, you miss the notion of multi-functionality. So, yes I want to see public money on the whole going for public goods within, it’s a bit daft to say anything else at one level, but I want to do it in a sophisticated way that acknowledges that in some cases that might mean just supporting farming systems to produce those goods.

If you take away all the money from farming subsidies and you just say we’re only going to reward you for the environmental aspects, you might end up not having a farming system at all, in which case you’ve got a tipping point. I’m co-author of a paper being prepared at the moment in which, as a tipping points paper one of the examples we look at is how far would you have to remove both market and policy incentives for farmers to farm on [area D] in this case, before they cease farming altogether and you therefore have a tipping point of a socio-ecological system where it moves from being a system that’s based on farming to a system that’s based on whatever replaces farming if farming doesn’t happen any more. That’s a tipping point from a move from one socio-ecological system to another.

CL I would also like a link for that tipping point paper.

MW That’s still in development at the moment.

CL It seems farmers will not be paid for producing food, what kind of threats can that create?

MW We’d lose entirely the joint production nature of the enterprise really. You’d lose all that joint-ness and you also lose I think the cultural value as well.

CL In Scotland the government considers food security as a public good, while in England it’s not very clear.

MW It isn’t considered as a public good in England in that way. I’m not aware, I’ve not followed debates in Scotland as much as I have in England but that’s not leading them to say that we would have public money for anything other than public goods, unless they’re saying food security is a public good, in which case we’d have a radically different agriculture in Scotland than in England.

CL What do you think the challenges would be?

MW That’s a really hard question. There’s a real tension in all that and I don’t know what the answer to that is, it’s got to be a bit of both in my view. You can’t just say you’re delivering this stuff already and therefore we’re not going to pay you because you’re doing it anyway because that wouldn’t be fair. But we do need to pay people to increase public goods where there is a potential to do so.

CL What do you think are the main barriers to make food production, especially in the upland areas, resilient?

MW The main barrier is the economic viability. I think there are lots of things but I think economic viability is the underlying fundamental issue there.

CL What type of changes do we need to overcome those barriers?

MW I don’t think you can alter fundamental economics around the production of upland livestock. What you have to recognise, coming back to what I said before, is the joint-ness, the fact that the environmental services are an outcome of systems producing upland livestock therefore you need support schemes that support the fundamental business in order to get the environmental outcomes. Farmers, you’re not going to change the economics… I know I said stuff about the retailers and I think a slightly more balance in that regard you might get slightly higher prices, yes, but fundamentally it’s got to be rewarding farmers for producing cultural landscapes of which agricultural production is part.

CL What trade-offs do farmers face to deal with all these different functions?

MW Clearly there’s a trade-off between some of those environmental services and maximising output of store lambs or fat lambs. So it is primarily a trade-off between agricultural production and those other services, and the fact that those other services are not readily, do not command a ready market price means that the balance sometimes goes too far in the one direction and the bluntness of the subsidies as well.

I don’t think farmers are thinking much about those trade-offs because they’re not having to make trade-offs in an economic sense because they get paid for the agri-environmental work that they do, that is clearly, and they make the decision as to whether it’s worth them doing that or not, and whether that’s going to impact on their agricultural production too much, most of them decide it’s absolutely fine. If it limits their food production it’s not so much a trade-off as an economic decision they’ve made, and then they produce as much agricultural output as they can within the rules of the system.

So they’re not actually making the decisions about what is the trade-off here between carbon storage and sheep, what is the trade-off between biodiversity and sheep because it’s set out in terms of the rules of engagement. We’re not getting an optimum outcome because a lot of that stuff is not sufficiently taken into account in the processes of decision-making because there is no market for some of that stuff at the moment, or no ready market.

CL What would be the impact if upland sheep and beef cattle farming is dramatically reduced or ceased altogether?

MW There would obviously be biological impacts of scrubbing over, that would be the most obvious sign. I think you would see significant economic impacts because of all the infrastructure associated with agriculture, so a lot of the secondary employment and activity would be stricter on those fragile rural economies. You would see an impact on tourism and recreation in terms of accessibility of those lands if they are scrubbed over. Largely negative but in places positive because there would be places that are so remote that there’s not much infrastructural impact, there’s not much economic impact, and where you get a bit more carbon stored and you’d get a wildness back into the landscape. So it’s largely negative but not entirely negative. What we want is a proper planned approach to work out what is the best, if we’re going to have a bit of rewilding where is it best to have it, if we’re going to have farmed landscapes how are we going to make sure they’re viable?

CL [organisation 1], how easy is it to set up this type of initiative and for the different stakeholders to understand the issues and challenges they are facing?

MW I think it’s very difficult indeed, and I think we were doing reasonably well until Brexit because the terms of engagement were absolutely clear, we were operating within a sort of CAP arena and there was room for incremental change. Very difficult to get consensus and we’ve had some real battles in the last few weeks because the old consensus around the Common Agricultural Policy, Pillar I and Pillar II has gone therefore we’re thinking new policy and therefore some of the challenges are very close. What we try and do as an [organisation 1] is talk a lot, we talk, talk, talk in order to try and understand each other and try and get some common ground.

CL Thank you very much for your time.

MW Send me an email reminding me to send you various Uplands things and I’ll dig them out.