

Benchmarking Member states ambition in CAP Strategic plans

Proposed framework for an evaluation of draft CAP strategic plans

Country:	
Name/Organisation	

Background and objective:

European Commission committed to ensure that new CAP strategic plans will be ambitious and will deliver for biodiversity and climate. Member states are in full swing preparing their drafts, which they are discussing with the European Commission in the framework of the so called “structured dialogues”. Our aim is to do a quick screening of the draft plans and see whether they are likely to deliver on the stated objectives. This template has been designed to guide this screening/evaluation.

Heading/question	Assessment
<p>Minimum 10% of “space for nature”</p> <p>1.Has your country set a target (R.29 or I.20) to reach at least 10% of agricultural area under high diversity landscape features, and are there adequate measures (conditionality + voluntary) to reach it?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Unambitious target and insufficient measures 2. Adequate target but measures are unlikely to deliver 3.Adequate target and good measures in place 4. Information on this target not available 5. Other (<i>explain</i>)
<p>Protection of grasslands and peatlands as key carbon sinks & habitats for biodiversity</p> <p>2.Does your country provide effective protection of peatlands and grasslands in and outside of Natura 2000? (conditionality+ voluntary)</p>	<p>2.1 Does you country provide effective protection of permanent grasslands outside Natura 2000 (GAEC1)? (for example by defining the maximum conversion rate at regional/local level, not allowing ploughing and reseeding, and/or implementing a robust system for authorising conversion)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No. 2. Somewhat 3. Yes 4. Information on GAEC 1 design is not available 5. Other (<i>explain</i>)

	<p>2.2. Does your country provide strict protection for grasslands in N2000 areas (GAEC 9)?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No, the definition of “environmentally sensitive permanent grasslands” (ESPG) excludes vast areas of N2000 grasslands 2. Not enough, ESPG don’t cover all relevant grasslands in N2000 areas 3. Yes, ESPG cover all grasslands in N2000 areas 4. Information on GAEC 9 design is not available 5. Other (<i>explain</i>) <p>2.3. Is your country taking strong action to protect and restore peatlands through the CAP? (GAEC 2)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No, GAEC 2 won’t make any significant difference 2. Not enough, GAEC 2 may slow down ongoing degradation due to drainage but it won’t stop it. 3. Yes, it will be implemented in an effective way. 4. Information on GAEC 2 design is not available 5. Other (<i>explain</i>) <p>2.4. Bonus points: [mark all relevant ones]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> +Effective measures in place to support management of semi-natural grasslands +Effective measures in place to support restoration of grasslands +Effective measures in place to support restoration of peatlands +Effective measures in place to support paludiculture
<p>Money for nature</p> <p>3. Are the proposed voluntary measures (ecoschemes, AECM) for biodiversity sufficient and likely to halt and reverse the biodiversity loss in your country?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No, proposed management schemes for biodiversity (ecoschemes, AECM) are insufficient 2. Not enough, there are some good schemes, but they are not on sufficient scale and lack funding 3. Yes, effective schemes in place with adequate funding. 4. Information on voluntary schemes for biodiversity is not available. 5. Other (<i>explain</i>)

<p>Climate</p> <p>4. Are the proposed voluntary measures related to climate objective likely to reduce GHG emissions? (ie. by helping to reduce livestock numbers and fertiliser use, rewet peatlands, establish and maintain agroforestry systems, maintain semi-natural grasslands, restore healthy soils)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not at all, there are no measures to tackle the main GHG sources in my country, and the 'climate measures' won't deliver change (too little budget, paying for business as usual or techno-fixes...) 2. Somewhat, there are several well-targeted and well-designed measures, but some key GHG sources remain completely unaddressed and/or the budget allocations are not sufficient. 3. Yes, (almost) all GHG sources are addressed with well-designed and well-funded measures 4. No information on this available 5. Other (<i>explain</i>)
<p>5. Harmful CAP subsidies</p> <p>How worried are you about environmentally harmful subsidies in your national Plan (both livestock and cropping)?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very worried, there are risky measures and no safeguards at all 2. Quite worried, there are risky measures and the safeguards are too weak 3. Not worried, there are no risky measures, or strong safeguards are present to mitigate risks 4. No information on this available 4. Other (<i>explain</i>)
<p>6. Public participation</p> <p>How would you rate your government's efforts in involving environmental stakeholders in the preparation of CAP Strategic Plans?</p>	<p>6.1. Quality of stakeholder process</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very poor 2. Poor 3. Good 4. Other (<i>explain</i>) <p>6.2. Into what extent did your government take into account your views/concerns</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not at all, our concerns are not acknowledged nor addressed 2. To a certain extent, our concerns are mostly acknowledged, but only very partially addressed 3. To a large extent, most concerns are fully addressed 4. Other (<i>explain</i>)