The Agri-environmental Unmanned aerial Resource Assessment Project:

AURA workshop review & routes forward for technology adoption in agriculture

The following is based upon an analysis of the two AURA project workshops, with a practical adoption roadmap and current UK economic context

The AURA Workshops were held:

Thursday 5th March 2026,

The Main Hall, Blackmore Farm

Blackmore Lane

Cannington

BRIDGWATER

Somerset TA5 2NE

Friday 6th March 2026,

The Boardroom

Clinton Devon Estates Rolle Estate Office

Bicton Arena

East Budleigh

Budleigh Salterton

Devon EX9 7BL

Geographic lens: Devon / Somerset workshops, with wider England and UK policy and market context

Evidence base: workshop transcripts [W1-W2] and current official UK sources on farm income, policy, grants, regulation, inflation and biodiversity markets [E1-E11].

Funded by UK Government

Somerset Council

UNIVERSITY OF PLYMOUTH

Executive summary

1. The strongest message from both workshops is that farmers and land managers do not want technology for its own sake. They want specific problems solved - at the right time, in the right format, and at a cost that makes commercial sense. The repeated test was practicality rather than novelty. [W1-W2]
2. The most credible near-term adoption model is not a single platform. It is a layered stack: satellite and historical baseline data to flag change, drones to inspect or intervene where timing and access matter, and ground sensing or robotics only where the problem is high value, high risk or hard to reach. [W1-W2]
3. The highest-potential use cases discussed were: access-constrained field operations; prescription-based variable treatment; pasture, soil moisture and land-performance alerts; habitat and hedgerow baseline mapping; natural flood management and wetland monitoring; and evidence creation for agri-environment, biodiversity net gain and other forms of private nature finance. [W1-W2]
4. The workshops were equally clear about barriers. Adoption will stall where systems create more data than action, rely on unreliable connectivity, demand large upfront capital, or fail to fit into agronomic and operational decision-making. Concerns about regulation, trust, and 'Big Brother' monitoring also need active management. [W1-W2]
5. The current economic backdrop reinforces a selective adoption strategy. UK farm profitability remains volatile and uneven by sector; crop returns were hit by wet weather and softer cereal values, while agri-environment income is becoming more significant in overall business returns. Capital remains relatively expensive, so cash-light service models and outcome-led pilots are preferable to broad hardware roll-outs. [E1-E5]
6. The external policy signal is still supportive of practical adoption. England continues to offer grant routes for equipment and technology, the new 2026 Sustainable Farming Incentive offer is live, biodiversity net gain remains mandatory, and government continues to position sustainable farming and nature recovery as major funded priorities. [E6-E11]
7. The recommended route forward for AURA is therefore a staged programme built around: (1) evidence-first mapping and alerts; (2) targeted drone-enabled intervention pilots; (3) limited but robust robotics and edge-processing demonstrations in high-value cases; and (4) a regional ecosystem model that links farms, agronomists, colleges, regulators and technology providers in a living-lab format. [W1-W2][E3][E6]

1. Purpose and method

This review synthesises the two AURA workshop transcripts into a single strategic document. It focuses on three questions:

- What the workshops actually revealed about need and readiness.
- Which agricultural technology pathways appear most viable in the short to medium term.
- How those options sit within the wider economic, policy and regulatory context in England and the UK. [W1-W2]

Workshop findings are treated as qualitative evidence of user need, adoption friction and opportunity - not as a formal market survey. Wider context has been added only from current official sources. [W1-W2][E1-E11]

Interpretation note. *Where the report refers to farmers, land managers or workshop participants, it is summarising the tenor of discussion across both sessions.*

2. What the workshops revealed

Across both sessions, the workshops consistently framed technology adoption as a practical land-management question rather than a hardware question. The facilitator repeatedly positioned the events as problem-discovery sessions rather than sales events, and speakers from drones, satellite analytics and robotics all converged on the same message: the technology only matters if it helps somebody do a real job better. [W1-W2]

2.1 The core principles heard in the room

- Problem-led, not tech-led. Participants wanted tools anchored to jobs-to-be-done: timing of interventions, access to wet or difficult ground, proof of environmental outcomes, detection of change, and better prioritisation of scarce labour and machinery. [W1-W2]

- Actionable outputs beat raw data. Several speakers explicitly warned that 'pretty pictures' are not enough; value appears only when observations turn into prescriptions, alerts, or decisions in the field. [W1-W2]

- Complementarity matters. The room did not see satellite, drones, sensors and robots as substitutes for one another. The strongest use case was a sequence: broad baseline from space, targeted inspection or intervention from air, and selective on-ground sensing or robotics for validation or specialised tasks. [W1-W2]

- Service models are more realistic than universal ownership. Much of the practical discussion implied that many farms will buy services or outcomes before they buy complex hardware. This is especially important for low-margin systems. [W1-W2]

- Environmental value is now commercial value. Participants repeatedly linked technology to BNG, carbon, water, flood management, and proof for public or private environmental payments - not just to crop yield. [W1-W2]

2.2 Jobs-to-be-done that repeatedly surfaced

Need area	What was discussed	Technology combination	Near-term fit
Timeliness and access	Applying seed, nutrients or treatments when soil is wet, travel is limited, or windows are narrow; early cover crop establishment and hard-to-reach terrain were strong examples.	Drone service + multispectral survey + agronomic interpretation + prescription file	High
Land-performance baselines	Persistent historical baselines, sub-field performance, soil moisture proxies, pasture and change detection over time.	Satellite EO + modelled baselines + targeted ground-truth	High
Environmental evidence	Wetlands, hedgerows, trees in boundaries, natural flood management, runoff and BNG-related mapping; evidence for public and private schemes.	Satellite EO + drone validation + habitat metrics workflow	High
Targeted interventions	Variable-rate or spot application; targeted scouting instead of blanket action; investigate anomalies first.	Alerts + drone inspection + variable treatment	Medium-High
Remote livestock / asset monitoring	Interest in livestock monitoring, remote areas, and safer observation without always going on foot.	Drone platform + RFID / vision + edge processing	Medium
High-resolution soil / plant diagnostics	Compaction, gas emissions, chemistry, plant-level and leaf-level diagnosis, especially in difficult or research-intensive areas.	Robotics + custom sensor clusters + local processing	Medium
Broadacre replacement of conventional machinery	Whether drones can replace large field sprayers or conventional machines at scale for lower-value crops.	Large drone + refill logistics + regulatory approvals	Low-Medium

Table 1. Repeated jobs-to-be-done and likely technology combinations emerging from the workshops.

2.3 What the workshops imply about each technology layer

Satellite and Earth observation

The workshop evidence points to Earth observation as the entry layer for adoption, not because it answers every agronomic question, but because it creates continuity, history and triage. The ability to build a multi-year baseline, detect change, compare seasons, and direct attention to anomalies was repeatedly presented as the core value proposition. Participants also saw strong potential in using this layer for habitat evidence, land-use options appraisal, pasture monitoring and water-related monitoring. The main caveat raised in discussion was resolution: remote sensing can power alerts and prioritisation, but mixed species systems, exact composition questions and depth-specific soil diagnostics still require ground-truth and cautious interpretation. [W1-W2]

Drones and aerial operations

Drones were discussed in the most operationally mature terms. Practical examples included cover crop establishment, foliar nutrition, seeding in inaccessible areas, habitat or wetland work, monitoring difficult terrain, and the creation of prescription maps for targeted application. The critical insight was that drone value is highest where access, timing or disturbance reduction matter more than raw area covered. The workshops also recognised hard limits: payload, refilling, commercial scale in broadacre systems, insurance and authorisation requirements, and restrictions on certain crop-protection uses mean drones should currently be viewed as a complementary tool rather than a blanket replacement for conventional machinery. [W1-W2]

Ground sensors, robotics and edge processing

The robotics discussion was more exploratory but still highly relevant. The Plymouth University work showed a credible pathway for mobile sensing, local processing in poor-connectivity environments, and detailed inspection in challenging areas where field-scale averages hide real problems. This part of the workshop is especially important for AURA because it moves the conversation from 'remote sensing as monitoring' to 'on-site systems as diagnostics and intervention support'. In the near term, these tools look strongest for research plots, high-value systems, difficult topography, environmental monitoring and demonstration use rather than mass-market deployment. [W1-W2]

Dashboards, alerts and the last mile

Perhaps the most commercially important message in the transcripts is that the final mile - getting the right signal, in the right format, to the right person - may matter more than sensor sophistication. Several speakers highlighted dashboards, mobile delivery, field-side processing and simple relative-change visualisations. This implies that user experience, agronomic integration and workflow design are not secondary issues; they are central to adoption. [W1-W2]

2.4 Constraints and caution signals

Barrier	What was heard	Implication for design
Affordability and ROI	Participants explicitly asked whether they could afford the technology and whether it stacked up for lower-value systems.	Adoption should begin with service offers, pilots and clearly monetised use cases, not blanket capex.
Too much data, not enough action	Multiple speakers stressed that data only has value once turned into alerts, prescriptions or practical decisions.	Invest in decision layers and integrations before adding more sensors.
Connectivity gaps	Poor signal in the field was described as a real operating challenge for platforms and data transfer.	Use local processing, offline-first workflows and delayed sync where possible.
Regulation and risk aversion	Drone regulation, authorisation and safety requirements remain a structural constraint, especially for advanced operations.	Prioritise compliant use cases now; build future BVLOS capability through partnerships and testbeds.
Trust and governance	Some concern was expressed about external surveillance or data being used against land managers.	Create a clear farmer-facing data charter covering access, purpose, storage and decision rights.
Agronomic fit	Technology providers repeatedly noted they are not the agronomist; data has to fit existing advisory systems.	Embed agronomists, advisers and land managers into pilot design from day one.
Scale mismatch	Some drone use cases are compelling for difficult access or high-value crops, but weaker for very large low-margin field operations.	Segment use cases by margin, access difficulty and speed sensitivity rather than applying a one-size-fits-all model.

Table 2. Adoption barriers heard in the room, and the resulting design responses AURA should build into its next phase.

3. The wider economic picture

The workshop emphasis on practicality is reinforced by the current economics of farming. The sector-level numbers do not suggest a single, uniformly investable market. They show a sector with highly uneven profitability, greater importance of agri-environment income, continuing exposure to weather and price volatility, and a still-relevant cost of capital. That combination favours selective, outcome-led adoption rather than broad indiscriminate spending on technology. [E1-E5]

Current signal	What official sources say	What it means for AURA
Profitability remains uneven	UK total income from farming rose in 2024, but crop output fell and cereal values were hit by lower prices and poor weather. In England, provisional 2024/25 farm business income ranged from about £27k on cereal farms to about £176k on dairy farms. [E1-E3]	There is no generic willingness to invest. Adoption offers must be segmented by farm type, margin and cash-flow tolerance.
Environmental income is more material	Average net income from agri-environment activities on English farms rose to about £21.1k in 2024/25, around 30% of total Farm Business Income across all farms. [E2]	Technology that proves delivery, speeds approvals or strengthens habitat evidence can now sit in the core business case, not just the compliance case.
Capital still has a cost	UK CPI inflation was 3.0% in January 2026 and Bank Rate was held at 3.75% in February 2026. [E4-E5]	Borrowed money still needs to work hard. Subscription, managed-service and pilot-first approaches are more attractive than speculative equipment purchases.
Grant support is still active	FETF 2026 opens on 17 March 2026 with support for productivity, slurry and animal health and welfare items; England's wider funding pages and capital grants remain active. [E6-E7]	Adoption pathways should be built to align with current grant windows and scoring criteria, especially where productivity and environmental benefit can be evidenced.
Nature and land markets are growing	BNG remains mandatory at 10% in England, land managers can sell off-site biodiversity units, and government aims to grow annual private investment flows to nature to at least £500m by 2027 and more than £1bn by 2030. [E8-E10]	Baseline creation, habitat monitoring and verification are not side markets - they are becoming investable service lines.

Public schemes remain important	Government has committed more than £2.7bn a year to sustainable farming and nature recovery from 2026/27 to 2028/29, while the 2026 SFI offer contains 71 actions. [E11-E12]	AURA should explicitly map technologies to payment pathways and scheme actions, not treat them as separate domains.

Table 3. Wider economic context and the strategic implications for agricultural technology adoption.

Implication

In commercial terms, the workshops and the external data point in the same direction. The most attractive adoption propositions are those that do one or more of the following:

(a) protect or improve margin through timing, targeting or access;

(b) reduce unnecessary inputs or field operations;

(c) convert environmental performance into provable and therefore bankable value; or

(d) reduce the labour and transaction burden of monitoring, reporting and compliance.

Technologies that cannot clearly fit one of those pathways are likely to remain demonstration tools rather than adopted tools. [W1-W2][E1-E12]

4. Recommended routes forward

The workshops do not support a single all-purpose programme. They support a portfolio approach with a clear progression from low-friction adoption to higher-complexity demonstration. Four routes stand out.

Route 1 - Evidence-first adoption

Build a common baseline-and-change service for participating farms, estates and landscape projects. Start with satellite-derived land performance, habitat and moisture or saturation indicators, then trigger drone flights only where anomalies or priority questions appear. This route is attractive because it lowers the cost of observation, creates continuity over time, and supports both production and environmental reporting. It is also the easiest route to align with BNG, SFI, water and natural flood management use cases. [W1-W2][E8-E12]

Route 2 - Intervention-first adoption

Prioritise drone-enabled operations where access, timing and disturbance reduction create clear value: cover crop establishment, targeted foliar or nutritional application, wet or difficult ground, habitat seeding, selected forestry and environmental restoration tasks, and spot treatment based on prescription maps. This route should be sold as a targeted service for specific situations, not as a universal replacement for conventional machinery. [W1-W2][E6]

Route 3 - High-resolution diagnostics and robotics

Use robotics, mobile sensing and edge processing where the problem justifies the complexity: research plots, demonstration farms, hard-to-access areas, compaction or erosion diagnostics, plant-level inspection, and integrated environmental monitoring. The purpose here is not rapid mass adoption. It is to create validated evidence and robust operational concepts that can later be simplified and commercialised. [W1-W2]

Route 4 - Regional ecosystem and capability building

Treat AURA as more than a set of tools. The workshops show the need for a regional system: farms and estates willing to trial, agronomists to interpret, colleges to train operators and technicians, local authorities and regulators to shape enabling conditions, and a light-touch governance framework for data and trust. That cluster logic is central if Devon and Somerset are to turn isolated pilots into repeatable regional capability. [W1-W2][E3]

What not to do

- Do not start with a hardware procurement mindset. Start with services, evidence and defined outcomes.
- Do not attempt to prove every possible use case at once. The transcripts repeatedly warn against lack of focus.
- Do not promise fully autonomous, routine field operations ahead of regulatory, insurance and workflow readiness.
- Do not assume farmers want another dashboard unless it reduces workload and supports real decisions.
- Do not treat production and environmental value as separate. The strongest business cases combine both.

5. Suggested pilot portfolio

The next phase should consist of a small number of tightly-defined pilots, each with a lead user group, a baseline, a success metric and a route to continuation. A six-pilot portfolio would be large enough to demonstrate range, but focused enough to manage.

Pilot	Primary outcome	Core stack	Readiness	Suggested success metric
1. Baseline and change alerts	Give mixed farms and estates a common, low-friction monitoring layer.	Historical EO baseline + alert matrix + mobile delivery	High	Decision or inspection triggered from alert within same week
2. Access-constrained drone interventions	Prove value where timing and ground access are limiting yield or establishment.	Multispectral survey + prescription + drone service	High	Cost per treated hectare and measured operational gain vs conventional approach
3. Pasture and soil moisture validation	Test whether pasture, grass-height and moisture indicators can support grazing and forage decisions.	EO + selected ground-truth + farm records	Medium-High	Forecast accuracy and number of management decisions supported
4. Water, wetland and flood evidence package	Support natural flood management, runoff, wetland and watercourse work with better evidence.	EO + drone verification + environmental reporting template	High	Time and cost saved in evidence collection; acceptance by scheme or project partners

5. Habitat / BNG landscape package	Create a faster route to baseline and change evidence for hedgerows, wetlands, trees and habitat condition.	EO classification + targeted drone capture + metric-ready outputs	Medium-High	Reduction in survey or approval friction; number of usable habitat units or cases
6. Edge-processing robotics demonstrator	Show value in difficult terrain or high-value plots where field averages hide problems.	Robot or dog platform + local processing + sensor cluster	Medium	Problem detected or intervention justified that would otherwise have been missed

Table 4. Suggested pilot portfolio for an AURA next phase.

Each pilot should be scoped as an adoption experiment, not just a technical test. That means collecting not only technical outputs, but also: user effort required, quality of decision support, timeliness, agronomic confidence, insurance or authorisation friction, data handling burden, and whether the user would pay for it at the end. [W1-W2]

6. Implementation roadmap

0 to 6 months - establish the adoption spine

- Agree a short list of priority use cases and stop trying to cover every possible application.
- Recruit a small cohort of pilot farms, estates and landscape projects with different operating conditions.
- Create a simple data charter covering ownership, access, storage, alert thresholds and use in reporting.
- Set up a common reporting template: baseline, intervention, outcome, cost, time saved, evidence created.
- Align pilot timing with 2026 funding windows where relevant, especially FETF and environmental scheme activity. [E6-E12]

6 to 18 months - run pilots and validate business cases

- Operate the six-pilot portfolio with regular review points and cross-comparison of results.
- Standardise outputs into farmer-friendly formats: one-page summaries, map layers, mobile alerts, and prescription files.
- Embed agronomists or trusted advisers into the interpretation stage so technology supports real decisions.
- Create a small regional special-interest group or user panel to challenge assumptions and improve relevance.
- Capture economic evidence carefully: avoided passes, protected yield, reduced input, faster evidence, and payment unlocked.

18 to 36 months - scale what works

- Convert the best-performing pilots into repeatable service offers, not one-off demonstrations.
- Build a regional training and skills offer with colleges and industry partners for operators, data technicians and advisers.
- Advance more complex drone and autonomous workflows only where pilots justify the effort and regulatory path.
- Publish case studies and standard operating models so adoption can spread through trusted local networks.
- Use the evidence to shape an AURA 2.0 proposition with a clear offer for farms, environmental projects and local authorities.

7. Governance, commercial model and success measures

AURA should position itself as a problem-solving and validation platform rather than a technology vendor. That implies a commercial model based around managed services, short pilots, shared evidence standards and partner delivery rather than bulk equipment sales. For many users, especially outside high-value systems, adoption will be faster if the first purchase is a service outcome: a map, an alert, a treatment, a baseline, or an evidence pack. [W1-W2][E1-E7]

Recommended operating principles

- Mobile-first outputs. Assume that many users will consume results on a phone, in a vehicle, or at the field edge.
- Outcome pricing where possible. Price against hectares monitored, interventions delivered, or evidence packs produced rather than against data volume alone.
- Trusted intermediaries. Use agronomists, farm advisers, estates and demonstration sites as adoption bridges.
- Explicit governance. Publish a short plain-English statement on what data is collected, who can see it, how long it is held and what it will not be used for.
- Common metrics. Judge pilots by time saved, avoided cost, protected output, payment unlocked, reduced reporting burden and user willingness to continue.

Suggested headline KPIs

Metric	Why it matters
Pilot-to-paid continuation rate	Measures whether the use case is genuinely adoptable rather than merely interesting.
Decision turnaround time	Tests whether technology is helping within real farm timing windows.
Input reduction or targeted treatment rate	Connects observation directly to efficiency gains.
Evidence package acceptance	Shows whether outputs are credible for schemes, BNG, habitat, flood or water use cases.
User effort score	Captures whether adoption increases or reduces workload.
Connectivity failure rate / offline recovery success	Important for field deployment outside reliable signal areas.
Regulatory friction log	Separates technical viability from authorisation, insurance or compliance barriers.

Table 5. Suggested KPI set for an AURA next phase.

8. Conclusion

The AURA workshops show that the region already has most of the building blocks needed for meaningful agricultural technology adoption: farmers and estates with live problems, drone and Earth-observation capability, robotics and sensor R&D, colleges and universities, and a regional innovation narrative that links aerospace, autonomy and land management. [W1-W2]

What is missing is not primarily invention. It is translation: from data to action, from demonstration to service, from interesting capability to trusted workflow, and from single-farm tests to a repeatable regional model. If AURA focuses on that translation task - and disciplines itself around a few high-value use cases - it can create something stronger than a one-off project. It can create a credible pathway for practical adoption in agriculture under current economic conditions. [W1-W2][E1-E12]

Appendix: evidence base

Workshop evidence

- [W1] Aura project meeting recording_original.txt (Workshop 1 transcript)
- [W2] Aura event day 2_original.txt (Workshop 2 transcript)

Current official sources used for wider context

- [E1] Defra, Agriculture in the United Kingdom 2024 / Chapter 3: Farming Income (2025).
- [E2] Defra, Farm Business Income by farm type in England 2024/25 (2025).
- [E3] Defra, Total income from farming in the UK in 2024 (2025).
- [E4] ONS, Consumer price inflation, UK: January 2026.
- [E5] Bank of England, Monetary Policy Summary, February 2026 (Bank Rate 3.75%).
- [E6] GOV.UK / RPA, Farming Equipment and Technology Fund (FETF) 2026 guidance and application pages (2026).
- [E7] GOV.UK, Funding for farmers, growers and land managers (updated 26 February 2026).
- [E8] GOV.UK, Biodiversity net gain guidance and Understanding biodiversity net gain.
- [E9] GOV.UK, Sell biodiversity units as a land manager (updated 18 June 2025).
- [E10] GOV.UK, Nature Markets Framework progress update (2024).
- [E11] Defra Farming Blog, Spending Review 2025: a commitment to farming.
- [E12] Defra Farming Blog / GOV.UK, SFI 2026 details and related 2026 funding announcements.