

OUR LAND
AND WATER

Toitū te Whenua,
Toiora te Wai

Farm Certification Scheme Baseline Survey, 2020

Report Produced for Our Land and Water National
Science Challenge

Bruce Small, Bill Kaye-Blake and Annabel McAleer

December 2021

Contents

Introduction	1
Background.....	1
Research purpose.....	1
Methods	1
Sample.....	1
Survey instrument.....	1
Procedures	2
Analysis.....	2
Results	2
Summary data table	2
Main survey questions	3
Demographics	11
Discussion.....	12
Study limitations.....	13
Appendix 1 - Sampling and collector information	13

Introduction

Background

Our Land and Water (OLW) is the National Science Challenge established to invest in research and related activities to improve land use and freshwater management, and to support the vitality of te Taiao, in Aotearoa. The OLW challenge goal of Wai ora, Whenua ora, Tāngata ora looks to a future in which all New Zealanders can be proud of the state of our land and water, while sharing in the economic, social and cultural values that te Taiao offers.

Research purpose

The purpose of this research and report is to collect baseline Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to measure the impact of the OLW program on the Challenge goal of increasing farm participation in agribusiness, quality assurance, accreditation, and farm certification schemes (hereafter referred to as, 'farm certification schemes', for brevity). In particular, the study provided data regarding the on-farm use of environmental, social, cultural, and economic dimension metrics in such schemes. The baseline survey focussed on farmer participation in farm certification schemes during the 2020 year (i.e., 1/1/20 – 31/12/20). Future survey(s) will be required to estimate the increase in farm uptake of these schemes and the metrics used. The OLW Challenge will use the data gathered in this research to report to the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) on its progress towards the goals specified above.

Methods

Sample

The survey target population was all land-based producers in New Zealand (e.g., agriculture, arable, horticulture, viticulture etc.). The sample was recruited via advertisements in social media (Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter), advertisements in the Farmer Weekly web-page, and through OLW and industry groups contact email lists (full details of effective collectors are provided in Appendix 1). Potential respondents were informed of the purpose of the survey and were required, in the first survey question, to give their informed consent for participation. They were also informed that participation was voluntary and that the privacy and confidentiality of their individual responses would be maintained, with only group data reported.

Survey instrument

The survey instrument was created, using the SurveyMonkey platform, to ascertain the relevant baseline KPI measures for the OLW Challenge. The draft survey was forwarded to the OLW Challenge for peer approval before being finalised for release. All questions (except for informed consent) were voluntary - participants were able to choose not to answer any specific questions by skipping them or opt out of the survey at any point by leaving the browser. Most questions were closed ended and suitable for statistical analysis. A couple of open-ended response questions were also included, and a minimum of relevant demographic information sought (i.e., farming sector, region, and age).

Respondents who had not participated in a scheme, or who were unsure if they had (second question in survey), skipped the questions regarding the schemes and went directly to the demographics page of the survey. The survey instrument was brief with a maximum of 17 questions (for those for whom the survey skip logic did not skip any questions) and on average took between 3-6 minutes to complete. The instrument was piloted on a small sample of

volunteers from different industry sectors (N = 5). Feedback from test-pilots resulted in a couple of minor changes to the survey before public release. The finalised study procedure and survey design was submitted to, and approved by, the AgResearch Human Research Ethics Committee (#20.21).

Procedures

The survey went live Monday 1st November, using the aforementioned collectors, and was held open for response for three weeks, closing on Friday 19th November. There were further rounds of advertising in social media and via email contact (to those who had not responded to previous emails) during the second and third weeks in which the survey was open.

Analysis

Some data analysis was conducted in Survey Monkey and the data was also exported to MS Excel for further analysis. As requested in the project brief, analysis was kept at a simple level with the main results being expressed as frequencies or averages. Open-ended questions were analysed by grouping similar statements or responses together and conducting counts of statements in each group.

Results

As this report is a baseline analysis of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for OLW, for ease of comparison with future iterations of the survey, and to measure progress against the KPIs, each survey question is specified and brief results from the baseline survey are presented. However, prior to the full results, a summary table of the main results is provided (Table 1).

Summary data table

Table 1 presents a summary of the main results from the study.

Table 1. Summarised results

Data collected	Result
Percentage of respondents with farms participating in farm certification schemes	54.4%
Percentage of farmers measuring wellbeing dimensions	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economics dimension 	13.3%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental dimension 	82.8%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social dimension 	53.7%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cultural dimension 	27.5%
Average number of metrics per wellbeing dimension of respondents	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic 	2.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental 	6+ ¹
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social 	~5 ¹
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cultural 	2.1

Percent of respondent farms audited in 2020 year	76.4
Average number of times farms audited in 2020 year	1.33
Average level of satisfaction with main scheme	4.7²

¹ Note: Due to responses in the categories of 6-10 and 11+ indicators it is not possible to exactly calculate an average for the count of environmental and social indicators. Future comparisons of these wellbeing dimensions will need to compare the frequencies of responses to these two wellbeing dimensions (see Tables 8 (environmental) and 12 (social))

² Scale: 1 = very dissatisfied, 4 = neutral, 7 = very satisfied

The above results are presented in greater detail in the next section. The full results, as presented below, will aid the comparison of performance on the OLW KPIs over time against this baseline. Results from two qualitative questions, what farmers 1) liked, and 2) disliked about their farm certification schemes, are also reported below. Results and study limitations are briefly explicated in the Discussion section (p.12)

Main survey questions

1. Do you give your consent to participate in this survey?

A total of 310 persons opened the survey, seven refused consent and were immediately taken to the survey exclusion page, leaving 303 survey respondents (Table 2).

Table 2. Consent to participate in survey

Consent	Number	Percentage
Yes	303	97.7
No	7	2.3
Total	310	100

Answered 310, Skipped =0

2. During 2020, did you participate in any farm certification scheme(s)?

Of the 303 respondents who consented to participate in the survey, 283 responded to the question asking them whether they had participated in farm certification schemes during the 2020 year. Over half of these respondents (154) said they had participated in such schemes during 2020 while 37.5% (106) said that had not done so and 8.1% (23) replied they were unsure (Table 3).

Table 3. Number and percent of farmers participating in farm certification schemes in 2020

Participated in Scheme in 2020	Number	Percentage
Yes	154	54.4
No	106	37.5
Unsure	23	8.1
Total	283	100

Answered 283, Skipped =27

3. What is the name (or names) of any such farm certification scheme(s) that you participated in during 2020? Please list schemes in order of importance to yourself - most important scheme first to the least important scheme last.

Of the 154 respondents who participated in a farm certification scheme in 2020, 127 named at least one farm certification scheme in which they participated. Fifty Percent of these respondent (64) also participated in a second scheme, while nearly a quarter of them (30) also participated in a third scheme (Table 4).

Table 4. Number and percent of farmers in a scheme who participated in 1, 2 or 3 certification scheme(s)

Scheme(s)	Number	Percentage
1	127	100
2	64	50.4
3	30	23.6

Answered 127, Skipped =183

Respondents were requested to rank the farm certification schemes (in which they participated) in order of the schemes' importance to themselves. Table 5 shows the schemes that farmers participated in and the number of respondents who rated different schemes at the 1st 2nd and 3rd ranks. GAP (NZGAP, Global GAP) and NZ FAP were the most frequently used schemes with both used by one fifth of respondents. These two schemes were followed in frequency by Silver Fern Farms FAM (7.69%), Fonterra (6.25%) and Merino NZ (4.33%).

Table 5. Farm certification scheme participation

Farm certification schemes	No. of respondents ranking scheme most important	No. of respondents ranking scheme 2 nd most important	No. of respondents ranking scheme 3 rd most important	Total no. of respondents using scheme	Percent of total responses
GAP	36	6	1	43	20.67
NZ FAP	32	8	3	43	20.67
Silver fern farm FAM	9	3	4	16	7.69
Fonterra	11	2	-	13	6.25
Merino NZ	6	2	1	9	4.33
Farm environment plan	2	4	1	7	3.66
Organic/biogrow	5	2	-	7	3.66
Councils	1	-	6	7	3.66
Synlait - lead with pride	5	-	-	5	2.40
Alliance FAP	-	2	3	5	2.40
GRASP	-	5	-	5	2.40

Firstlight	2	2	-	4	1.92
Assure Quality NZ	2	1	-	3	1.44
MPI	1	2	-	3	1.44
Affco	1	2	-	3	1.44
Zespri	-	1	1	2	0.96
Overseer	-	1	1	2	0.96
Food safety act	-	1	1	2	0.96
Combined unique cases	9	13	7	29	13.94
Total	122	57	29	208	100

Answered 127, Skipped =183

There were a further 29 unique responses for farm certification schemes each of which was only mentioned once. These included actors such as: Tesco, Unilever, Anzco, Open Country Dairy, Ovation meat quality assurance, PG Wrightson, A2, Sustainable Wine NZ, Te Ara Miraka, and DINZ.

4. During 2020, how many times were you audited for compliance with the farm certification scheme(s) in which you participated?

Of the 154 respondents who participated in a farm certification scheme, 125 gave interpretable responses to the question regarding the number of times their schemes were audited during 2020. While 13.6% of farmers (17) participating in farm certification schemes did not get audited during 2020, the majority (60%) were audited once with 16% being audited twice. Fourteen farms (11.2%) were audited 3 or more times. Mean no. of times respondents were audited in 2020 = 1.33, SD = 1.06, Min = 0, Max = 6 (Table 6).

Table 6. Number of times and percent of respondent farms audited in 2020

Number of times farm compliance audited during 2020 (x)	Number of farms audited x times during 2020	Percent of farms audited x times during 2020
Nil	17	13.6
Once	74	59.2
Twice	20	16.0
Three times	8	6.4
Four times	3	2.4
Five times	2	1.6
Six times	1	0.8

Answered = 125, skipped = 185

5. Did the farm certification scheme(s) that you participated in during 2020 include financial indicators?

More than 77% of respondents claimed there were no financial indicators in the farm certification schemes in which they participated. A further 9.4% of respondents who participated in farm certification schemes were unsure if their schemes included financial indicators, while only 13.3% stated their schemes included financial indicators (Table 7).

Table 7. Number and percent of farmers with and without financial indicators in their schemes

Financial indicators included in schemes?	Number	Percentage
Yes	17	13.3
No	99	77.3
Unsure	12	9.4
Total	128	100

Answered =128, Skipped = 182

6. How many financial indicators were included in your farm certification scheme(s)?

Of the 17 farmers with financial indicators in the farm certification scheme 16 responded to the question regarding the number of financial indicators. The average number of financial indicators for these 16 farms = 2.2 with 43.8% having only 2 financial indicators (Table 8).

Table 8. No. and percent of farms with x number of financial indicators

No. of financial indicators in schemes (x)	Number of farms with x financial indicators	Percentage of farms
1	4	25
2	7	43.8
3	4	25
4	0	0
5	1	6.2
6-10	0	0
11+_	0	0

Answered = 16, Skipped = 294

7. Did the farm certification scheme(s) that you participated in during 2020 include environmental indicators?

More than 82% (106) of the 128 farmer respondents who participated in farm certification schemes claimed their schemes included environmental indicators. Just 12.5% (16) participated in schemes without environmental indicators and 4.7% (6) were unsure whether the scheme in which they participated included environmental indicators (Table 9).

Table 9. Number and percent of farmers with and without environmental indicators in their schemes (Answered =128, Skipped = 182)

Environmental indicators included in schemes?	Number	Percentage
Yes	106	82.8
No	16	12.5
Unsure	6	4.7
Total	128	100

8. How many environmental indicators were included in your farm certification scheme(s)?

Of the 106 respondents with environmental indicators in their farm certification schemes, 94 responded to the question regarding the number of environmental indicators. Approximately one quarter of respondents (23) claimed to have 11+ environmental indicators in their certification schemes while another quarter claimed to have between 6-10. Thus, approximately 50% of respondents who participated in farm certification schemes had 6 or more environmental indicators in their schemes (Table 10).

Table 10. No. and percent of farms with x number of environmental indicators

No. of environmental indicators in schemes (x)	Number of farms with x environmental indicators	Percentage of farms
1	5	5.3
2	6	6.4
3	13	13.8
4	14	14.9
5	10	10.6
6-10	23	24.5
11+_	23	24.5

Answered = 94, Skipped = 216

9. Did the farm certification scheme(s) that you participated in during 2020 include social indicators?

Over 53% (66) of farmers participating in farm certification schemes claimed that social indicators were included in their schemes. Nearly 32% (39) said there were no social indicators in their scheme while 14.6% (18) were unsure (Table 11).

Table 11. Number and percent of farmers with and without social indicators in their schemes

Social indicators included in scheme?	Number	Percentage
Yes	66	53.7
No	39	31.7
Unsure	18	14.6
Total	123	100

Answered =123, Skipped = 187

10. How many social indicators were included in your farm certification scheme(s)?

Of the 66 respondents with social indicators in their scheme 61 responded to the question regarding the number of social indicators in their scheme. Approximately 36% (22) had 6 or more social indicators in their scheme while 64% had between 1-5 social indicators (Table 12).

Table 12. No. and percent of farms with x number of social indicators

No. of social indicators in schemes (x)	Number of farms with x social indicators	Percentage of farms
1	4	6.6
2	11	18
3	11	18
4	7	11.5
5	6	9.8
6-10	13	21.3
11+_	9	14.8

Answered = 61, Skipped = 249

11. Did the farm certification scheme(s) that you participated in during 2020 include cultural indicators?

Approximately 28% (33) of respondents with farm certification schemes claimed to have cultural indicators in their schemes while 54% did not and 18% were unsure (Table 13).

Table 13. Number and percent of farmers with and without cultural indicators in their schemes

Cultural indicators included in scheme?	Number	Percentage
Yes	33	27.5
No	65	54.2
Unsure	22	18.3
Total	120	100

Answered =120, Skipped = 190

12. How many cultural indicators were included in your farm certification scheme(s)?

Of the 33 respondents with cultural indicators in their schemes 30 replied to the question regarding the number of cultural indicators. Fifty percent of respondents (15) with cultural indicators included in their schemes had only one cultural indicator, 23.3% had two cultural indicators and 13.3% had three. The average number of cultural indicators per farmer respondent was 2.1 (Table 14).

Table 14. No. and percent of farms with x number of cultural indicators

No. of cultural indicators in schemes (x)	Number of farms with x cultural indicators	Percentage of farms
1	15	50
2	7	23.3
3	4	13.3
4	1	3.3
5	2	6.7
6-10	1	3.3
11+ <u> </u>	0	0

Answered = 30, Skipped = 280

13. What did you like about the farm certification scheme(s) that you participated in during 2020?

Ninety-five respondents replied to the question regarding what they **liked** about their farm certification scheme contributing 99 responses (a few respondents contributed more than one aspect). Of these, 72 (72.7%) responses mentioned aspects that they considered positive. These positive aspects fell under 7 broad categories. Table 15 below shows the broad categorisation of these aspects and the number of farmers liking each aspect. Note however, a further 27 (27.3%) respondents claimed that there was nothing they liked about their scheme, that it was a waste of time, and a financial and time burden which caused farmers' stress.

Table 15. Number of farmers who reported liking particular aspects of their farm certification scheme(s)

Aspects farmers liked about farm certification schemes	Number of farmers liking aspect	Percent of farmers liking aspect
Quality assurance enabled premium market access (tells our story)	19	19.2
Ease of use	15	15.2
Increased farmer knowledge /improved farming practice	14	14.1
Broad scheme coverage of relevant farming areas	8	8.1
Enabled price premium	8	8.1
Talking to auditors helpful	4	4.0
Brings regulation together and set quality standards	4	4.0
Nothing, don't like it, waste of time, compliance cost	27	27.3
Total	99	100

Answered = 95, Skipped = 215

14. What did you dislike about the farm certification scheme(s) that you participated in during 2020?

Ninety-three respondents replied to the question regarding what they **disliked** about their farm certification scheme contributing 102 discernible responses (a few respondents contributed more than one aspect). Of these, 90 responses mentioned aspects of the schemes that they considered negative. These negative aspects fell under 10 broad categories. Table 16 below shows the broad categorisation of these aspects and the number of farmers disliking each aspect. Note however, a further 12 respondents claimed that there was nothing they disliked about their schemes.

Table 16. Number of farmers who reported disliking particular aspects of their farm certification scheme(s)

Aspects farmers disliked about farm certification schemes	Number of respondent farmers disliking aspect	Percent of respondent farmers disliking aspect
Compliance costs -time, effort, money	19	18.6
Replication/duplication of information requirements and data entry	18	17.6
Tedious, useless or irrelevant questions	13	12.7
Too much paperwork	8	7.8
No direct benefit for farmer	8	7.8
Stressful and invasive	7	6.9
Compliance with rules and regulation	5	4.9
The lack of environmental and/or social considerations	4	3.9
Everything (about schemes disliked)	4	3.9
Auditors and consultants	4	3.9
Nothing (about schemes disliked)	12	11.8
Total	102	99.8

Answered 93, Skipped 217

Note: some farmers contributed more than one aspect, thus total number of aspects (102) is greater than the number of farmers who answered the question (93).

15. Thinking of the main farm certification scheme in which you participated during 2020, how satisfied/dissatisfied were you with it?

Of the 154 respondents who participated in farm certification schemes during 2020, 109 replied to the question regarding their level of satisfaction with their main farm certification scheme. **With a mean of 4.66 and a SD of 1.53, farmers are, in general, neutral to moderately**

satisfied with their main farm certification scheme. Sixty-eight respondents commented on why they felt satisfied or dissatisfied with their main farm certification scheme. Altogether these respondents made 28 positive comments, 25 negative comments, 11 neutral or ambivalent comments and a few uninterpretable comments. Thus, the quantity of positive, negative, and neutral comments, of the qualitative responses, reflects well the finding from the quantitative satisfaction level question. In general, the negative comments reflected similar sentiments to the aspects of schemes that were disliked, while positive comments reflect similar sentiments to what respondents liked about the schemes. Table 17 shows farmers' level of satisfaction with their main scheme and the number and percent of farmers rating at each level.

Table 17. Level of satisfaction with main farm certification scheme

Level of satisfaction with main scheme	Number of farmers	Percentage of farmers
1 - very dissatisfied	7	6.4
2	4	3.7
3	7	6.4
4 - neutral	28	25.7
5	26	23.9
6	29	26.6
7 very satisfied	8	7.3

Answered = 109, Skipped = 201, 68 comments

Demographics

16. Which best describes the nature of your business? (Tick all that apply)

Of the 310 total respondents 224 replied to the nature of their business question. Over half of these respondents were sheep and beef farmers, while one quarter were dairy farmers, one fifth horticulturalists and 7.6% arable farmers. Twenty comments (i.e., Other, please specify) indicated a range of other activities including apiculture, forestry, dairy support, deer, manuka plantation for honey, and egg production (Table 18).

Table 18. Nature of respondents farming business: number and percent

Nature of business	Number of respondent farm types	Percentage of respondent farms
Agriculture – Sheep and beef	115	51.3
Agriculture - Dairy	58	25.9
Horticulture	48	21.4
Arable	17	7.6
Agriculture - Other	16	7.1
Viticulture	0	0
Total	254	113

Answered 224, Skipped 86, 23 other comments

Note: respondents could tick more than one option thus number of respondent farm types (and percent) is greater than the number of farmers who responded to this question.

17. Which region in New Zealand is your farm business located?

Of the 310 total respondents, 220 gave their regional location. Waikato (19%), Canterbury (15.0%) and Otago (10.5%) contributed the most respondents to the survey (Table 19).

Table 19. Region of respondents' farm location

Region of farm location	Number of farms	Percentage of farms
Northland	12	5.5
Auckland	10	4.6
Waikato	42	19.09
Bay of Plenty	16	7.3
Gisborne	8	3.6
Taranaki	11	5.0
Manawatu-Whanganui	14	6.4
Hawkes Bay	16	7.3
Wellington	11	5.0
Tasman	9	4.1
Nelson	1	0.5
Marlborough	1	0.5
West Coast	1	0.5
Canterbury	33	15.0
Otago	23	10.5
Southland	12	5.5
Total	220	100

Answered 220, Skipped 90

18. How old are you? Answered 205, Skipped 105

Of the 310 total respondents, 205 volunteered their age. These respondents' ages ranged between 27 and 89 with a mean of 56.9 yrs and a SD of 12.8 yrs.

Discussion

This is a baseline survey to measure KPIs for the OLW Challenge. The focus of the KPIs is measuring participation in farm certification schemes. The data tables in the Results section provide the baseline KPI data in a format suitable for comparison with follow-up surveys designed to measure progress from the baseline during the life of the program. There are numerous farm certification schemes available for farmers to participate in. Just over half of the survey respondents had participated in at least one such scheme during 2020. The environmental wellbeing dimension was the most measured dimension followed by the social dimension and then the cultural dimension. The least measured dimension in the farm certification schemes was the financial dimension. The number of metrics per wellbeing dimension also followed the same pattern with environmental wellbeing having the largest number of metrics followed by social wellbeing, cultural wellbeing, and finally financial wellbeing.

Respondents both liked and disliked numerous aspects of their farm certification schemes. The three most liked aspects were 1) quality assurance enabled premium market access (telling our story), 2) ease of use of scheme, and 3) increased farmer knowledge and improved farming practice. The three most disliked aspects of their schemes were 1) compliance costs (time, effort, money), 2) duplication of information and data entry, and 3) tedious, useless and irrelevant questions. Just over three quarters of respondent farmers, with a farm certification scheme, had an audit in 2020. Overall, farmers were neutral to moderately satisfied with the main scheme in which they participated.

Study limitations

The study has some limitations which need to be noted. Due to social science ethics procedures (voluntary participation) the survey cannot be considered random. Therefore, it is not possible to say how well the survey respondent data estimates the actual sample population data. To try to ameliorate for this data limitation when comparing future results with the baseline data presented here, it is important that future surveys use the same methodology and data collection techniques -so as to compare like with like. However, as the Farmers Weekly web-page collector did not receive any respondents (and was quite expensive), it would be acceptable to not use this particular collector in future surveys.

Another limitation is the small sample size of the response to some questions. This was due to funnelling effects where a response could only be made to some questions if a particular response had been made to a previous question. Although some questions had low response rates due to this reason, in general the vast majority of respondents eligible to respond to a question did so.

A third limitation to the quality and accuracy of the data is that farmers were asked to estimate the number of indicators in the scheme, in which they participated, for each of the four wellbeing dimensions. These were subjective estimates and the accuracy of the number of indicators is unknown. It may be of value to examine the most common farm certification schemes and count the actual number of metrics included for each dimension. This information could provide a check on the accuracy of the survey data.

Appendix 1 - Sampling and collector information

The following information was supplied by Annabel McAleer from the communication department of AgResearch and will be useful for ensuring that the same methodology and procedures used for collecting data in the current survey may be repeated with fidelity in follow-up surveys.

Known stakeholder shares of website collector:

Federated Farmers – Feds News x2

Young Farmers – email newsletter

Hort NZ and MPI indicated they would share but unclear whether this was the website collector or social media (both shared Tweet below)

Twitter

Tweet: <https://twitter.com/OurLandandWater/status/1456037824801611779>

Retweeted 9 times including by AgResearch, Potatoes NZ, MPI, Hort NZ

Spend:

1. \$100
2. 4 – 19 November
3. Cost per link click \$0.20

Impressions (times people saw tweet)

4. 13,348 total
5. 4110 organic
6. 9238 promoted

Total engagements (times people interacted with tweet)

1. 539 total
2. 38 organic
3. 501 promoted

Link clicks (clicks on URL)

1. 512 total link clicks
2. 11 organic
3. 501 promoted
4. Link click rate 5.42%

Facebook

Post:

<https://www.facebook.com/OurLandandWater/photos/a.1781300835529424/3130969303895897/> (6 November)

Shared 4 times including by AgResearch, and into 3 farming groups

Reach: 1905

Engagements: 51

Ad: <https://www.facebook.com/1451515485174629/posts/3129703930689101>

Spend:

1. \$97.22
1. 4 – 19 November
2. Cost per link click: \$0.80

Reach: 11,220

Link clicks: 122

LinkedIn

Post: <https://www.linkedin.com/feed/update/urn:li:activity:6861868780788817920>

Shared by AgResearch and Potatoes NZ

Impressions: 98

Clicks:

1. 2
2. 2% click-through rate

Email 1 [to those in the OLW databased tagged Farm Advisor OR Catchment Group OR Farmer / Grower OR where audience category is 'unknown']

Subject: Calling all land-based producers, farmers, growers! We invite you to participate in a survey

Sent date: 1 November 2021 12:47 PM

Sent to 711

1. SUCCESSFUL DELIVERIES 700
2. BOUNCES 11

Open rate 49.6%

1. Unique opens 347
2. Total opens 827

Click rate 8.9%

1. Unique clicks 62
2. Total clicks 67

Email 2 [to those who didn't open Email 1]

Subject: Calling all land-based producers, farmers, growers! We invite you to participate in a survey

Sent date: 8 November 2021 3:24 PM

Sent to 360

1. SUCCESSFUL DELIVERIES 360

Open rate 24.2%

2. Unique opens 87
3. Total opens 187

Click rate 6.7%

1. Unique clicks 24
2. Total clicks 26

Email 3 [to those who didn't open Email 2]

Subject: Reminder: We invite all farmers and growers to participate in a survey

Sent date: 15 November 2021 8:55 AM

Sent to 276

1. SUCCESSFUL DELIVERIES 276

Open rate 13%

2. Unique opens 36
3. Total opens 78

Click rate 2.2%

1. Unique clicks 6
2. Total clicks 9

Email 4 [to those who didn't open Email 3]

Subject: Closing today: We invite all farmers and growers to participate in a survey

Sent date: 19 November 2021 10:08 AM

Sent to 241

1. SUCCESSFUL DELIVERIES 241

Open rate 14.9%

1. Unique opens 36
2. Total opens 48

Click rate 1.7%

1. Unique clicks 4
2. Total clicks 4