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The premise of last CAP reform

• Public money for public goods
• Budget versus delivery:
  – 2: sustainable growth of natural resources
• Lift the baseline
• Context
  – EU biodiversity strategy – target 3 agriculture
  – first time co-decision with 28 Member States
Our vision for the new CAP

In 2009:
« We still need a CAP …
but a different one »

« We need a CAP …
that rewards valuable farming systems such as HNV, organic, … »
The outcome

EU agriculture fails on biodiversity

Extra steps by Member States to protect farmed and grassland


In December 2013, the European Union (EU) enacted the reformed Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) for 2014-2020, allocating almost 40% of the EU budget and influencing management of half of its terrestrial area. Many EU politicians are announcing the new CAP a “greener,” but the new environmental prescriptions are so dilute

higher environmental impact policies and directives [supplementary (SM) part A]. Recognition of the CAP for biodiversity, the Biodiversity Strategy for 2020 sets maximise areas [...] covered -related measures under the CAP reform does not fulfil

N OF AMBITION. When the mission launched the latest 2010, it outlined three main targets to security, environment and 2, and maintaining the territory and diversity of rural areas. Address the second challenge, payments to farmers (“Pillar some conditional on compli- text “greening measures”: ecological Focus Areas (EFAs) bed area, maintaining exist- grassland, and growing a three different crops on any ha of arable land. Yet after station (I0), these measures roughly 50% of EU farmland,ers are exempt from deploy-
What it meant for wooded pastures

• More openness to woody pastures in the rules

• But:
  – Trees are still not seen as fundamental part of the productive system
  – rules are poorly conceived, not based on good science or on farming realities, complex, not fully clear, contradictory...
  – problems with the way some Member States and auditors interpret the rules.

➢ System could lead to failure of policy objectives for large areas of farmland, many farmers, and EU environmental priorities.
Can the policy still do it?

YES, WE CAN
How can we improve the system?

1. Evaluation of the CAP eligibility rules for permanent pastures
   - Effects of the CAP rules on the ground
   - Coherence between CAP and other (environmental) policies
   - Study options for improvement: e.g. harmonize rules between different policies (CAP, B&HD) in Natura 2000 farmed areas

2. All wooded pastures in active use should be eligible for direct payments
   - Trees and shrubs are not a priori “non-productive”
   - Recognise forage value of fallen fruits and leaves, and other agronomic functions of trees and shrubs
   - Activity to be a determining criterion for eligibility. MS should define acceptable levels of activity (maintenance, production)
   - Grazing should be recognized as an option for “maintenance of the agricultural area” as it can be important from an environmental perspective
2. Eligibility (continuation)

- Removal of concepts that cannot be practically defined/checked, such as a “grazable tree for its full area”
- No arbitrary tree/shrub limit should be set if there is an acceptable level of farming taking place
- No requirement for pro-rata reductions except for features that clearly are not part of the forage system
- Auditors change their thinking: a lot of trees and shrubs does not mean less/not eligible per definition
- Do not favour afforestation of pasture above continuation of grazing on wooded pasture land
Improving the system – part 3

3. Rural Development Programmes as extra support system
   ❖ Agri-Environment Climate measures should be used much more actively in these areas – especially in Southern Member States
   ❖ RDP support for afforestation on grassland should not be more attractive than incentives to continue farming wood pastures

4. Consider a fundamental revision of the 2 pillar system as per our original NGO proposal
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