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CAP reform 2013
last chance to stop the decline of Europe’s High Nature Value farming?
Some principles for the CAP at EU and country levels

• Set clear objectives
• Robust analysis of key challenges and best responses
• Long-term and joined-up thinking
• Real monitoring that informs policy improvement

Now it doesn’t work like this, but trying to get there
Natural resource and territorial challenges for the CAP

- Biodiversity 2020 + Natura 2000
- Water Framework Directive
- Soil Thematic Strategy

No quantitative analysis of needs or best approaches through CAP

So that instruments are used in ways that are insufficient and inconsistent
The challenges need to be analysed and quantified – including the biodiversity challenge for 2020

In broad terms, low-intensity farmland and intensified farmland represent very different challenges and need different responses.
Most of our farmland biodiversity is on land farmed at low intensity and with a high proportion of semi-natural elements – Wales.

- Biodiversity elements, e.g. big hedges
- Large % of unimproved pasture
Most of our farmland biodiversity is on land farmed at low intensity and with a high proportion of semi-natural elements - Romania
Most of our farmland biodiversity is on land farmed at low intensity and with a high proportion of semi-natural elements – Normandie
Low livestock density per hectare of forage at the farm level is a common characteristic of high-nature-value farming - Scotland
For olives and other orchards of high biodiversity, a semi-natural grass understorey is a common characteristic. Andalucía, Spain
... and in arable landscapes, a high density of semi-natural elements, such as field boundaries. Poland
Includes maybe 50 million hectares of farmland that is fundamentally different from mainstream intensified farmland:

- highest farmland biodiversity, public goods, ecosystems services
- lowest farm incomes
- highest threat of abandonment

Needs special attention from policy, consistently across EU [map to help thinking, not to target support]
HNV farming concept:

Some broad types of farming and farmland are inherently rich in biodiversity, and have common characteristics.

They are mainly on land with physical or structural limitations.

The main biodiversity challenge is to maintain them on a large scale, to change practices is not the aim.

Viability is a key concern.
Farm income south-west England. If we are thinking strategically, where is HNV farmland on this graph?
Sources of farm income – south-west England.

Beef, sheep and mixed farms have negative income from production, highest dependence on Pillar 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Income</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Agri-environment payments</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Diversification</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Single Payment Scheme</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Farm Business Income</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cereal</td>
<td>-£430</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>£7,596</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>£13,256</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>£34,871</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>£55,294</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>£52,005</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>£2,630</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>£400</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>£21,382</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>£76,417</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle and Sheep (Lowland)</td>
<td>-£1,832</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>£3,174</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>£3,502</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>£12,823</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>£17,668</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>-£3,186</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>£4,806</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>£2,129</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>£22,201</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>£25,950</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Farms</td>
<td>£8,146</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>£4,953</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>£5,364</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>£20,696</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>£39,082</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intensive irrigated olives € / ha</td>
<td>Marginal non-irrigated olives € / ha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net income without CAP</td>
<td>1 400</td>
<td>- 400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat-rate payment</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLFA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net income with CAP</td>
<td>1 870</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This lack of economic viability and support has serious natural-resource and territorial consequences.

Current schemes – Pillar 1, LFA and agri-environment – are failing to address this specific but large-scale challenge on the EU scale.
Abandonment - grasslands of most biodiversity value are dropping out of farming systems all over Europe. Natura 2000 and agri-environment are not stopping this on a sufficient scale, or with any consistency across the EU.
New livestock handling facilities on common land - an example of positive action, but not enough strategic thinking.
Income problem not addressed sufficiently by Pillar 1, nor by Natura 2000 and agri-environment...
Abandonment of traditional olive groves is a fire risk and very difficult to reverse.

Entire landscapes are under threat, but very few Pillar 2 schemes exist on the ground to stop this process.
Abandonment of low-intensity forest grazing and of traditional olive groves is a major cause of increased fire incidence
Agri-environment: A very important measure
But no consistency of use across EU
Same is true of LFA.

Source: EEA, 2009 (see Annex 6 for details on data and methodology).
Challenge for intensive farmland is different. Abandonment is not a threat. Remaining biodiversity should be retained through cross-compliance. Improvements are possible, but only so far. And it costs the tax-payer.
Agri-environment payments calculated on income foregone pay well in intensive situations, but are not ideal for rewarding existing farming systems with negative incomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement and objective</th>
<th>Payment / ha / year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-input arable management - carbon</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsprayed spring cereals with winter stubbles - biodiversity</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass buffer strips to prevent erosion on ploughed land - water</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced maize management - water</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimproved neutral grassland - biodiversity</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland calcareous grassland - biodiversity</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland wet heath - biodiversity</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Basis for HNV farming support at territorial level – a strategic approach for EU and member states

What are the broad farming types of most biodiversity value?
What values do they support and why?
What challenges do they face, and on what scale?

What measures are needed, and on what scale?
What measures work best, including delivery, integrated packages, etc.? Pillar 1 and Pillar 2 must work together.

What is it most useful to monitor and how? What data are needed?
Ensure that monitoring feeds back into policy development.
1) Pan-EU payment for unimproved permanent pasture, in recognition of high biodiversity and low farming returns. LU/ha criteria?

Include scrubby and wooded pastures, due to very high public goods – millions of hectares are excluded from payments today

2) Pan-EU payment for low-intensity olives/orchards with unsown grass understorey. Other criteria?
3) Pan-EU payment for “biodiversity features”. Farms with most features are unfairly burdened by cross-compliance – payment should reflect amount of features above a minimum of e.g. 10%.
LPIS-IACS system is essential as basis for effective payments and monitoring of effects

National inventories of unimproved grassland have been put on LPIS, e.g. Slovakia
Not just about payments – local projects involving farmers are critical.
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For more information on our projects
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