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Threats

- Abandonment – the biggest threat that was, but somehow easier to tackle, CAP area based payments mixture are an efficient tool for tackling it.

- Competition on farmland – Land is more attractive and not only for pure farmers. Occurrence of opportunity driven “sofa farmers”. Access to land acquisition easier for big farmers.

- Changing land use and intensification.

- Broader, market driven competition. Higher incomes in cities or abroad, increasing demand for labour force coming from these sectors.

- Pressure from other economical activities INSIDE the countryside (e.g. constructions, tourism)

Overall, HNV systems are among the less competitive systems, this being the biggest threat.
HNV Grassland Designation

HNV Romania

Sursa: NADR - DGDR - AM PNDR
date: DG Agri - GIS Teams, LUC 2000
Romanian LFA designation

LFA România:

- 657 mountain ATU’s
- 24 significant handicaps ATU’s
- 293 specific handicap ATU’s
Bird conservation package (type 3)
Designation

• Follows Type 1 definition: “farmland with a high proportion of semi-natural vegetation”

• That does not mean that it excludes the other types of HNV, current designation also covers many Type 2 mosaics as well as most of Natura 2000 sites in Romania (which can be considered Type 3 HNVf)

• An estimation of 2,4 mil. hectares surface falling within the current HNV designation.
Designation

- Based on Corrine Land Cover approach
- Check Keys
  - average LSU in the area 0.4
  - almost inexistent chemical fertilisers/pesticides application
  - LFA layer
  - Natura 2000 sites layer
  - Rich cultural heritage

Existence of farm filter! And key species monitoring!
Is not “just a map”!

Grassland Characteristics

- Large species pool and very diverse
- High gamma diversity-species
- Grasslands sensitive to fertiliser and increased grazing
Romanian Designation

There is still room for improving. But currently represents best value for money by meeting targeting requirements.

Expert monitoring of species is in place and WILL prove it’s efficiency.

Things for the future, developing the concept:

EU wide definitions are NOT always the best definitions. A higher level of flexibility must be in place for the concept to be further successfully developed at each Member State level. Moving towards “result oriented” schemes, definitions less important.
National Cooperation

• Current designation made in close cooperation with Romanian Grassland Institute and Universities

• NGO’s were involved from the beginning of the designation process

• Farmers associations involved

• Other environmental institutions
Who are the farmers?
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