

**UPDATED INVITATION FOR PROPOSALS**

In response to feedback, we have provided some updates to our original Call for Proposals, which are described below.

**Update 1** – We have increased the budget of the original Call for Proposals, described in PART 1, on the basis of feedback that the original budget of £20-30,000 was not sufficient in comparison with the scope of work. In response to this feedback, we have increased the budget of this element of the project to £40-50,000 (including VAT).

**Update 2** – We have been approached by the Oxford Farming Conference to collaborate on an additional, but related project. Where our original project sought to consider the credibility and feasibility of agri-sequestration opportunities, their proposal considers the ethics, governance and dynamics of power in these emerging markets. In conversation with Directors of the Oxford Farming Conference, we saw benefits in combining proposals to ensure one consultant/consortium completed both elements. This work is described in PART 2. Therefore, within this Call for Proposals, there are two distinct elements of work under one combined budget. WWF-UK will remain the contracting party, and WWF-UK Terms and Conditions would apply to both elements. We encourage prospective bidders to look at both PART 1 and PART 2, and highlight in any bids how the workplan will maximise synergy and minimise overlap between both parts. The budget for PART 2 of the project to is £10-15,000 (including VAT).

The total maximum budget for both PART 1 and PART 2 is £60,000 (including VAT). To reflect the updates, we have adapted the expected timelines, key documents and general information requirements.

**PART 1 – For the WWF-UK / Tesco Partnership**

**CARBON SEQUESTRATION IN UK AGRICULTURAL LANDSCAPES – POLICY AND PRACTICE**

**INTRODUCTION**

In the context of a rapidly growing market for agri-carbon credits, the potential of farmers to tap into this market, and interest from food and drink retailers in using such mechanisms for offsetting/insetting carbon emissions through their supply chains, WWF is seeking to understand farm-level sequestration opportunities for agriculture in the UK, and how current carbon sequestration market mechanisms (both in the UK and elsewhere) could be applicable in a UK agriculture context. We also seek to further understand the detail behind proposed technological and innovative carbon sequestration solutions (such as BECCS and Biochar), regarding issues such as scientific rigour, credibility, feasibility, timescales, costs and environmental (and other) trade-offs.

In broad terms, we are looking for clarity around the real-world opportunity for on-farm carbon sequestration in the UK and the credibility of the science that underpins this opportunity. Building on from this, we are also seeking to understand how the growing agri-carbon credit/on-farm carbon sequestration market can help to accelerate the transition to net zero in a manner that is based on scientific rigour, and ‘best practice’ principles that support a just transition to a 1.5 degree world. In addition, we want to develop an understanding of the key barriers, challenges and opportunities for carbon sequestration on UK farms as well as for the accompanying market mechanisms that seek to monetise these as carbon credits.

We are seeking an experienced consultant to help us develop this work which could serve as an initial externally sharable scoping document, and help inform our engagement with actors across the food sector as part of the aspiration of the WWF and Tesco partnership to halve the environmental impact of Britain’s shopping basket by 2030. In particular, the WWF/Tesco Basket Metric has a specific objective on sequestration[[1]](#endnote-2) to *“…increase the amount of agricultural land that is put into long-term carbon sequestration initiatives”[[2]](#endnote-3).*

**CONTEXT**

There is growing interest in carbon markets. Farmers are increasingly being targeted for these markets, via public or private mechanisms. Yet, the governance, economics, science and verification of these mechanisms is often not clear.

Over [1,000 firms world-wide](https://www.cdp.net/fr/articles/companies/worlds-top-green-businesses-revealed-in-the-cdp-a-list) have made pledges to [align their emissions](https://sciencebasedtargets.org/resources/legacy/2017/04/SBTi-manual.pdf) with recommendations set out in the Paris Agreement – reducing their emissions to net zero by 2050[[3]](#endnote-4). This could bring an increase in demand for offsets. A recent report[[4]](#endnote-5) projects that the carbon offsets market could be worth between $90-480 billion by 2050 – at least a 200-fold increase on the $0.4bn spent in 2020. This same report also argues that the market could be flooded with poor quality credits[[5]](#endnote-6). Mark Carney suggests the unified market for carbon offsets could be worth $100 billion by the end of the decade, up from about [$300 million](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-08-15/why-carbon-offsets-don-t-do-all-that-they-promise-quicktake?sref=GBEdnt3o) in 2018[[6]](#endnote-7). There is an ongoing debate about the credibility of carbon markets. For example, analysis of one programme suggested that a large fraction of the credits in the program did not reflect real climate benefits[[7]](#endnote-8) and another review of more than a hundred carbon capture projects showed the voluntary carbon market is riddled with severe integrity issues[[8]](#endnote-9).

Current best practice in non-agricultural offset mechanisms, (for example the Gold Standard scheme) helps to reduce some of the well-known risks associated with existing offsets (e.g. improper carbon accounting, re-release of stored carbon, negative unintended impacts on humans or ecosystems, etc.), but is unlikely to deliver the types of offsetting needed to ultimately reach net zero emissions[[9]](#endnote-10). We’d like to know how well these best practice principles translate to agricultural offset opportunities, where are the limitations and can these limitations be overcome.

The science on sequestration itself is often debated, unclear and evolving. Innovative technology such as Bio-Energy Carbon Capture and Storage (BECCS) has become a cornerstone for many Net-Zero scenarios at the IPCC and government level (BEIS). It forms a significant part of the NFU net-zero solution but there are many unknowns regarding feasibility, sustainability and roll out of BECCS. It could be part of the sequestration mix, however, actual implementation needs to be explored further. Moreover, it needs to be weighed against other more widely accepted nature-based solutions (NBS) regarding feasibility, impact, cost, and timing.

Recent strategies proposed by the NFU, Climate Change Committee (CCC) explore a range of options and scenarios that have low, middle-road and high ambition sequestration pathways, as well as those that explore widespread engagement across the supply chain and greater uptake of technical innovations. There is a need for a deeper understanding of how this impacts collective ambitions to reach net-zero and how it applies to the agricultural sector.

UK farmers and retailers need to understand their role and impact in sequestering carbon, and there seems a collective desire for more information on the role that current and future carbon markets may play in this space. This has increased significance for UK farmers, as on-farm carbon offset markets are increasingly seen as an opportunity to mitigate against the financial impact of the upcoming reduction of area-based subsidies (BPS).

As we leave the EU and host the COP26 climate negotiations, we have a moment to define the political, policy and legal frameworks needed to align with net zero.

**MAIN PURPOSE AND SCOPE**

We require a highly experienced consultant or consortium to provide a scoping stage analysis of the available information on the current and future potential practices that deliver carbon sequestration on UK farms. Then to combine this analysis with a review of carbon credit market mechanisms that could be applicable in a UK agriculture context, to help answer the question of how a UK food business could and should a UK food business offset/inset their carbon emissions within the UK agricultural supply chain. An additional element of this work would then seek to review the opportunities and risks of technological carbon sequestration solutions (such as BECCS and Biochar).

Within the work, it would be important to define the scope of on-farm sequestration opportunities. WWF-UK’s initial thinking is that this definition is based upon the sequestration opportunities available to farmers/land managers whilst still performing a ‘farming operation’ as a core element of their business. For example, the complete afforestation of a farm would not fall under on-farm sequestration, whereas agro-forestry would. However, we are open to be challenged on this definition.

The scope of the work is UK wide (but can include global examples that could be applicable in a UK context). Suggested stages 1-4 are set out below:

**Stage 1 – Review of on-farm carbon sequestration opportunities.**

A review of where the science currently stands on farm-level carbon sequestration opportunities (for both nature-based and technical/innovative solutions such as BECCS and Biochar). Within this, some initial points to consider could be:

1. What is the scale of opportunity for on-farm carbon sequestration? Can the opportunity be achieved in the timescales that important and influential agricultural/land use net zero pledges have committed to?
2. Which farming practices can deliver sequestration? How does the ability to sequester carbon vary between farming system? Are there opportunities for a landscape scale carbon sequestration approach for farmers or are they limited to a farm by farm approach?
3. How aligned/standardised are measurement approaches for on-farm sequestration, and are they credible? If not, how could this be improved in future?
4. Soil carbon sequestration is not covered within the Committee on Climate Change analysis – is this a missed opportunity or a fair assessment? Are there other on-farm sequestration opportunities that have been potentially missed?
5. How do on-farm sequestration opportunities impact farm businesses, food production and public goods such as biodiversity or water quality? What are the relative costs and benefits, to the farmer, to the environment and to society?
6. How important is uptake a factor in reaching the potential opportunity for on-farm sequestration? Is there any literature that models uptake scenarios, or discusses farmers appetite/perceptions on-farm sequestration and agricultural sequestration markets?
7. Are there any case studies that demonstrate good/not so good practice?

The proposed structure of this review should be defined in proposal. Examples could be analysis split on the basis of these points, by on-farm intervention or by sector. These seven points are meant to give prospective consultants an idea of what we are seeking to achieve. As a result, we welcome challenge to these points and encourage different approaches to addressing our overall objectives within the stated budget.

**Stage 2 – Analysis (based on stage 1) of technological and innovative solutions to on-farm carbon sequestration.**

A semi-distinct part of the analysis will be to provide clarity on the credibility, feasibility and impacts (in relation to current climate targets in particular) of technology and innovation to deliver carbon sequestration on farm. The outcome of this analysis should help WWF create a policy position on technological and innovative carbon sequestration solutions, but may also serve as an advocacy tool to influence policy makers and other actors on the most effective approaches to sequester carbon on farm. In particular, we would like to know more about BECCS and Biochar, as these are referenced in the Committee on Climate Change sequestration analysis and are important elements of the NFU Net Zero by 2040 strategy.

For these technological and innovative solutions:

1. How credible and robust is the science behind these opportunities? In simplistic terms, how do they sequester carbon? How certain are we that they will work?
2. How feasible is the development, uptake and implementation of such technologies within the CCC’s and NFU’s timeframes?
3. What are the important consequences of such technologies? How would they impact farm businesses, landscapes, biodiversity, soil and other public goods? What are the economic and financial impacts to key stakeholders?
4. What are the drawbacks, implications and trade-offs of these approaches? And in general terms, how do they compare with more nature-based approaches?

**Stage 3 - Review of carbon sequestration market mechanisms.**

A review of existing and near-to-market carbon sequestration offset/inset mechanisms (both UK and globally) that are, or could be relevant to, on-farm sequestration in UK agriculture. To include:

1. The potential scale of the market both globally and in the UK.
2. Assessment of current or potential issues impacting the credibility of on-farm sequestration markets, and how these could be addressed. For example, challenges regarding additionality, permanence, accounting and double counting, reporting, verification, carbon leakage (e.g. lowering methane but increasing herd sizes) and greenwashing. Within this, specific topics to explore could be the difference between gross or net carbon sequestered at a farm level, and emissions reduced versus carbon sequestered.
3. Assessment of current or potential issues relating to ethics, fairness and a just agricultural transition, and how these could be addressed. For example, paying a farmer for implementing good practice for the first time but not paying a farmer who has been implementing good practice for a long time.
4. What are the challenges with pricing agri-carbon credits and how do we ensure the market is fair for farmers and buyers?

Assessment of any perverse or unintended consequences of on-farm carbon sequestration markets, and how these could be addressed. For example, will a voluntary system of carbon credits allow companies that should be reducing their emissions first to buy offset’s that should be reserved for those companies/organisations that have reduced their emissions as far as possible? Is there a risk of secondary markets for carbon certificates developing, in a similar fashion to the renewable energy sector where certification becomes more valuable than action?

What are the barriers to entry for farmers and UK food businesses? How can both farmers and UK food businesses be best supported if they decide to enter an offset/inset scheme?

How could/do on-farm sequestration markets impact agricultural systems? What are the potential impacts on food production, financial performance of agricultural businesses and the public goods associated with farming?

1. Identification of notable carbon offset/inset mechanisms and codes that are, or could be, relevant to on-farm carbon sequestration markets in the UK. This review to include both government (e.g. Woodland Carbon Code[[10]](#endnote-11)) and private schemes e.g. (Microsoft[[11]](#endnote-12), Gentle farming[[12]](#endnote-13)), and an assessment of their effectiveness as below:
   * What’s the science behind these schemes?
   * How credible are they and do they have a real-world impact?
   * How clear and robust are the methodologies?
   * Is there standardisation?
   * How financially impactful are they and is the value of the carbon shared ‘fairly’ between buyer and seller?
   * How are issues relating to governance and verification addressed?
   * What changes do they drive to agricultural systems?
   * Assurance – how are the different schemes assured?

The proposed structure of this review should be defined in proposal. Examples could be analysis split on the basis of these points or by analysis of individual mechanisms. These eight points are meant to give prospective consultants an idea of what we are seeking to achieve. As a result, we welcome challenge to these points and encourage different approaches to addressing our overall objectives within the stated budget.

**Stage 4 – Recommendations and next steps for building a credible on-farm carbon sequestration market in the UK**

1. Building on Stage 1, 2 and 3 we would like to explore what potential next steps or recommendations are required to create a credible and impactful on-farm carbon sequestration market in the UK for the actors listed below.
   * Retailers or food businesses (buyers of agricultural products) that are seeking to work within their own supply chain to achieve their own net zero aspirations
   * Buyers (actors in the market from other industries/sectors who may wish to purchase on-farm carbon offsets)
   * Sellers (farmers)
   * Government and policy makers
   * Third party assurers/certifiers/verifiers

We are not seeking to create or facilitate a market ourselves, but are interested in highlighting to actors across the food sector what is missing in order to create a scientifically credible and ethically robust on-farm carbon sequestration market e.g. codes of best practice, government verification, transaction platforms etc., and proposed solutions to address the gaps and issues.

1. In particular, we would like to understand in further detail what governance structures would be necessary to facilitate this.
2. Suggested next steps to progress this area of work further.

**KEY OUTPUTS FOR PART 1:**

A comprehensive, externally shareable report in word and pdf format that covers stage 1, 2, 3 and 4.

A separate, externally shareable short summary document with key findings and recommendations.

A presentation of the findings internally to the WWF/Tesco partnership team.

An external webinar on the findings of the report – key audiences will be farmers, food businesses and retailers, the agricultural sector and policy makers.

**PART 2 – For the Oxford Farming Conference (work sponsored by Trinity Ag Tech, Savills and the WWF-UK / Tesco Partnership)**

**OFC 2022: Routes to Resilience**

The Committee of the Oxford Farming Conference wishes to commission a research paper to be presented at the 2022 Conference. The theme of the Conference will be ‘Routes to Resilience’, exploring the impact that the transition away from the Basic Payment Scheme will have on the ‘average family farm’, the bedrock of UK food and farming.

**Background to Study**

Anticipating stretched public finances for agriculture in all of the home nations, Government is seeking to improve private investment into environmental outcomes. At the same time, ‘nature-based solutions’ are rapidly gaining interest from private actors as a means of addressing crises in climate, water and biodiversity. This research request is to explore tensions in the development of private markets for ecosystem services, and seeks to do so from two core perspectives: that of the provider and that of the beneficiary.

In relation to providers, farming and land management provide a variety of things we value, but the land management sector is made up of a number of different interests – land owners, tenants, and the holders of profits a prendre. Private benefits, such as food, we pay for as individual consumers. However, there are the public benefits, such as managed biodiversity, for which there is no market and which government pays for (‘payment for public goods’). In both cases it is reasonably clear who the provider is, i.e. the land owner, the tenant or the holder of a profit, and so who should receive payment. There are also other benefits, generally combining public and private aspects, and generally environmental, where the identity of the provider is either unclear or involves a combination of interests. This raises numerous legal and practical considerations for the land management sector that require policy or market solutions. The first part of the project therefore aims to assess how the sector is currently structured and whether it is adequate for the efficient and equitable provision of ecosystem services.

The second interrelated part of the project seeks to ask whether the beneficiary of the ecosystem services is clearly enough defined. ‘Public goods’ are the benefits that society derives from the management of natural assets, but as private markets are created and supply chain and investor motivations evolve to meet new goals, increasingly private actors are seeking to appropriate the value of environmental goods for their own purposes. The relative roles and responsibilities that supply chains, society and land managers have in the area of environmental investment is poorly articulated. Where government is seeking to encourage these new markets to enhance the income derived by land managers and farming businesses, the role and behaviour of dominant market actors in this emerging space is an important area of enquiry.

**Request for Research Report**

The Committee would like to commission a report entitled: “Natural Capital: the battle for control”. The report is intended to synthesize the current understanding of natural capital opportunities in the four home nations, and the compatibility of these policies with the prevailing model and structure of the ownership and occupation of land and supply chain relationships. We expect the report to be guided by the following questions, but we welcome innovation in how the report should be structured and the specific questions it should address:

Background review: What are the current patterns of farm ownership and occupation in each home nation, and who are the decision-makers in these businesses? What are the policy drivers operating and being considered for the development of private markets to supplement farm business income in the agricultural transition in each home nation? Who are the main players interested in the development of natural capital marketplaces and what threats and opportunities do they pose to existing farmers? (20%)

Land tenure: Monetising natural capital offers new earning opportunities for farmers, but tenants could be at risk of not having access to the same opportunities. Have landowners and tenants got mutually beneficial or competing interests in environmental management? How can public and private investment in ecosystem services be developed to avoid excluding tenants? Should natural capital be owned, and if so by who and how? What innovations in tenure could enable a more equitable approach to natural capital income for both existing tenants and land owners and new occupiers? Will the creation of private markets encourage better tenancy terms? Are there other ownership or tenure structures that may merit attention? (30%)

Fair dealing: Supermarkets, supply chains, agencies, land owners and investors are all seeking to appropriate the value of natural capital for their own corporate objectives – what options are available to farmers to ensure that the value of their environmental investment is retained fairly within the farming business? How can the competing demands be fairly managed by farmers with the need to produce food? (30%)

Recommendations: What policy direction should Government take as it seeks to bring private investors into the development of private markets for environmental investment on agricultural land? (20%)

We expect the report to be no more than 12000 words long weighted roughly in the proportions indicated, and to produce a series of policy recommendations that address the equity and efficacy of the development of private markets for land management outcomes. We expect the research to be primarily literature review and welcome global perspectives on market development.

**KEY OUTPUTS FOR PART 2:**

A report to be no more than 12,000 words long weighted roughly in the proportions indicated

A series of policy recommendations that address the equity and efficacy of the development of private markets for land management outcomes

A presentation of the findings at the Oxford Farming Conference in January 2022

**TIMELINE FOR PARTS 1 AND 2:**

Deadline for proposals: 15th August 2021 (6pm).

Review bids: w/c 16th August and notify the successful bidder by the end of the week

Kick off meeting: w/c 23rd August 2021

Draft report: w/c 17th October 2021

Final report: w/c 8th November 2021

**REPORTING TO:**

Responses and questions should be sent to Callum Weir, Sustainable Agriculture Specialist ([cweir@wwf.org.uk](mailto:cweir@wwf.org.uk)) and Zoe Draisey, Water and Agriculture Policy Officer, ([zdraisey@wwf.org.uk](mailto:zdraisey@wwf.org.uk)).

For specific questions relating to PART 2 of this work, these should be sent to Emily Norton, Director of Rural Research at Savills ([emily.norton@savills.com](mailto:emily.norton@savills.com)), Liz Bowles, Associate Director Farming and Land Use at Soil Association ([LBowles@soilassociation.org](mailto:LBowles@soilassociation.org)) and Callum Weir, Sustainable Agriculture Specialist ([cweir@wwf.org.uk](mailto:cweir@wwf.org.uk)).

We recommend that proposals are limited to ten sides in length. In your proposal, please include the following:

* A method statement to explain your proposed approach to carrying out the work. In particular, highlighting how PART 1 and PART 2 will be approached in order to maximise synergy and minimise overlap.
* A brief project plan, showing key milestones and any interdependencies.
* Details about similar projects you have undertaken or your relevant experience in this field.
* A fee proposal including resource allocations and charging rates for all individuals, and any third-party costs. As part of the fee proposal, please highlight how the proposed cost is split between PART 1 and PART 2.
* Confirmation that you would be to accept the WWF Standard Terms and Conditions as the basis for contracting.

Responses to the call for proposals will be judged on:

• Ambition related to the brief and the best proposal for meeting the objectives

• Timing

• Value for money

• Understanding of the project brief

• Rigour of proposed methodology

• Relevant experience demonstrated

• Sustainability credentials of the solution and the consultancy.

**BUDGET RANGE:**

The budget for PART 1 of the project is £40-50,000 (including VAT) and represents approximately 75% of the budget.

The budget for PART 2 of the project to £10-15,000 (including VAT) and represents approximately 25% of the budget.

**The maximum combined budget for this work is £60,000 (including VAT).**

WWF-UK will be the contracting party for both PART 1 and PART 2, and both parts will use WWF Standard Terms and Conditions as the basis for contracting.

Thank you for expressing an interest in working with and supporting WWF-UK with this important piece of work.  We look forward to receiving your response.

## **GENERAL INFORMATION REQUEST:**

## The successful organisation shall be expected to provide the following additional information prior to any contracts being agreed. Please either provide the following information with your response, or confirm that this can be provided prior to contracting:

* Details of two clients who would be prepared to provide a written reference for your organisation.
* Copies of your two most recent sets of Audited Accounts and company registration information.
* Copies of relevant insurance polies held by your organisation, including details of sums insured.
* Details of the number of employed staff at your organisation, including an overview of the structure and roles.
* Licenses, professional registrations and accreditations relevant to this service.
* Copies of any of the following policies (or similar) that your organisation has:
  + Anti-Fraud,
  + Data Protection,
  + Quality Management,
  + Environmental Management
  + Disaster Recovery
  + Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Policy
* We issue the Sustainable Procurement Questionnaire (attached) to explore the environmental, social and economic credentials of suppliers.

**RELEVANT WWF SUPPORTING MATERIAL**

* [Carbon Credit Guidance for Buyers (Phase 1)](https://www.worldwildlife.org/publications/what-makes-a-high-quality-carbon-credit) (2020)– What makes a high quality carbon credit
* [WWF Position and Guidance on Voluntary Purchases of Carbon Credits](https://www.worldwildlife.org/publications/wwf-position-and-guidance-on-voluntary-purchases-of-carbon-credits) (2020)
* [Beyond Science-Based Targets: A Blueprint for Corporate Action on Climate & Nature](https://wwf.panda.org/?1172766/Blueprint-Corporate-Action-Climate-Nature=&utm_source=social&utm_medium=social&utm_campaign=blueprint) (2020)
* [WWF’s Position on International Compliance Carbon Markets](https://d2ouvy59p0dg6k.cloudfront.net/downloads/wwf_positions_on_international_compliance_carbon_markets.pdf) (2019)
* [WWF expectations for UNFCCC COP26](https://wwfint.awsassets.panda.org/downloads/wwf_cop26_expectations_paper.pdf) (including Article 6) (2021)
* Other publications on [panda.org](http://panda.org/) – see the [Forests publications here](https://wwf.panda.org/discover/our_focus/forests_practice/forest_publications_news_and_reports/) and [CEP publications here](https://wwf.panda.org/discover/our_focus/climate_and_energy_practice/reports_policies/)
* [farming\_with\_biodiversity\_towards\_nature\_positive\_production\_at\_scale.pdf (panda.org)](https://wwfint.awsassets.panda.org/downloads/farming_with_biodiversity_towards_nature_positive_production_at_scale.pdf#:~:text=FARMING%20WITH%20BIODIVERSITY%2010%20WWF%20recognizes%20the%20central,the%20crucial%20ecosystem%20services%20nature%20provides.%20Our%20goal)
* [Bringing It Down To Earth: Nature Risk & Agriculture | WWF (panda.org)](https://wwf.panda.org/wwf_news/?2660466/nature-finance-risk-and-agriculture#:~:text=A%20new%20WWF%20report%2C%20%27Bringing%20It%20Down%20To,practices%20can%20unlock%20benefits%20for%20people%20and%20planet.)

**RELEVANT EXTERNAL SUPPORTING MATERIAL**

* [Net Zero\_12pp\_v4.indd (nfuonline.com)](https://www.nfuonline.com/nfu-online/business/regulation/achieving-net-zero-farmings-2040-goal/)
* [Natural England publishes major new report on carbon storage and sequestration by habitat - Natural England (blog.gov.uk)](https://naturalengland.blog.gov.uk/2021/04/20/natural-england-publishes-major-new-report-on-carbon-storage-and-sequestration-by-habitat/)
* [Agriculture, land use and forestry - Climate Change Committee (theccc.org.uk)](https://www.theccc.org.uk/topic/agriculture-land-use-and-forestry/)
* [Sixth Carbon Budget - Climate Change Committee (theccc.org.uk)](https://www.theccc.org.uk/publication/sixth-carbon-budget/)
* [6 companies offering carbon-based payments to arable farmers - Farmers Weekly (fwi.co.uk)](https://www.fwi.co.uk/arable/land-preparation/soils/6-companies-offering-carbon-based-payments-to-arable-farmers)
* [How new carbon offset scheme for regenerative ag works - Farmers Weekly (fwi.co.uk)](https://www.fwi.co.uk/arable/land-preparation/soils/how-new-carbon-offset-scheme-for-regenerative-ag-works)
* [Carbon Offsetting: What You Need to Know and How You Can Get Involved (globalcitizen.org)](https://www.globalcitizen.org/en/content/carbon-offsetting-what-you-need-to-know/)
* [Climate Neutral Certified | FAQ](https://www.climateneutral.org/faq)

1. [How the basket metric works - Tesco PLC](https://www.tescoplc.com/sustainability/taking-action/environment/wwf/sustainable-shopping-basket/how-the-basket-metric-works/) [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
2. [Sustainable basket metric data - Tesco PLC](https://www.tescoplc.com/sustainability/taking-action/environment/wwf/sustainable-shopping-basket/sustainable-basket-metric-data/) [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
3. [Reforming the Global Voluntary Market for Carbon Offsets | Global Governance Institute - UCL – University College London](https://www.ucl.ac.uk/global-governance/news/2021/jan/reforming-global-voluntary-market-carbon-offsets) [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
4. [PowerPoint Presentation (trove-research.com)](https://trove-research.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Global-Carbon-Offset-Supply_11-Jan-1.pdf) [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
5. [PowerPoint Presentation (trove-research.com)](https://trove-research.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Global-Carbon-Offset-Supply_11-Jan-1.pdf) [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
6. [Carbon Offsets: New $100 Billion Market Faces Disputes Over Trading Rules - Bloomberg](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/features/2021-06-02/carbon-offsets-new-100-billion-market-faces-disputes-over-trading-rules) [↑](#endnote-ref-7)
7. [systematic over-crediting of forest offsets / research / carbonplan](https://carbonplan.org/research/forest-offsets-explainer) [↑](#endnote-ref-8)
8. [Only a few carbon projects meet basic criteria for climate integrity, human rights and more - Compensate](https://www.compensate.com/articles/whitepaper-carbon-projects-sustainability) [↑](#endnote-ref-9)
9. [The Oxford Principles for Net Zero Aligned Carbon Offsetting 2020](https://www.smithschool.ox.ac.uk/publications/reports/Oxford-Offsetting-Principles-2020.pdf) [↑](#endnote-ref-10)
10. [Home - UK Woodland Carbon Code](https://woodlandcarboncode.org.uk/) [↑](#endnote-ref-11)
11. [How an Australian cattle rancher sold Microsoft $500,000 of carbon credits - Agriland.ie](https://www.agriland.ie/farming-news/how-an-australian-cattle-rancher-sold-microsoft-500000-of-carbon-credits/) [↑](#endnote-ref-12)
12. [6 companies offering carbon-based payments to arable farmers - Farmers Weekly (fwi.co.uk)](https://www.fwi.co.uk/arable/land-preparation/soils/6-companies-offering-carbon-based-payments-to-arable-farmers) [↑](#endnote-ref-13)