Between new eligibility rules and new result-based agro-environment schemes, HNV pastoral farmers in southern France try to get a place
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HNV pastoral farming in Languedoc-Roussillon

Total cultivated area: 880,400 ha
Permanent Pastures: 491,600 ha (65%)

(Mediterranean climate)

Pyrenees
Collective summer pastures

Cevennes
Collective summer pastures

4,000 breeding farms

Total cultivated area: 880,400 ha
Permanent Pastures: 491,600 ha (65%)

(Sources: RA & DRAAF 2010)
Great diversity of productions and of feeding systems

Mediterranean specificity: large part of non-herbaceous forage

Ovines (for meat)

Cows (for meat)

Goats (for Milk)
... And a large diversity of nature conservation issues

About 60% of rare species in Languedoc-Roussillon live on permanent pastures (DREAL LR 2009)

102 Natura 2000 sites

And issues of fire prevention
The recent saga of the permanent pastures where grass is not predominant (with the french touch)

2013 - Level 1:
After long negotiations, UE allows member states to include non herbaceous forage in permanent pastures
Spring 2014: no geographical reduction coef. in France

October 2014: France chooses the prorata as an alternative to the density of trees (100 trees/ha)

France also gives the right to farmers to determinate the prorata according to the reality on the ground (under the trees)

In a context of convergence (1st pillar)
A five class prorata system in France

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% surface with non-admissible elements (stones, non edible bushes...)</th>
<th>Admissible surface</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10 %</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ha réel = 1 ha admissible = 1 DPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-30 %</td>
<td>80 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,25 ha réel = 1 ha admissible = 1 DPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-50 %</td>
<td>60 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,66 ha réel = 1 ha admissible = 1 DPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80 %</td>
<td>35 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,85 ha réels = 1 ha admissible = 1 DPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 80 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite EC recommandations
The farmers choose their proratas with the help of a national photo-referential and draw themselves their homogeneous parcels organized by “natural regions”:

- Dry mountains
- Dry plain and hills
- Wet mountains
- Wetlands

With special rules to consider the edible, accessible (and so grazable and eligible bushes):

- National list of non-edible shrubs
- Criteria of bushes profile and density
- Proof of real grazing

Difficulty: *national criteria but local practices*
The principles

Extrait guide admissibilité MAAF (avril 2015)

- Edible but non accessible (diameter > 4m)
  - Non edible
    - Ex: *Buxus sempervirens*
  - Stones, bare ground

- Edible and accessible shrubs
- Grass

Prorata
The illustration
To accept the wooded pastures and the pastures with edible shrubs, the ministry asked for a monograph in each natural region to **prove the reality of the “traditional established practices”**...

... In other words : to prove the existence of mediterranean pastoralism !
Hoo! What are those green and rough stuff?

Leaves! It grows naturally and tastes very good!

And what about you? What kind of grey powder are you eating? Do you like it?

Not really... But no monograph was requested to prove it is edible!

The monograph: HNV pastoral system have to prove their existence.
Simple in theory... but with great implementation issues on the farms

Photo-referential full of errors because of the timing (3 month)

Difficulties of interpretation in the field

Issues due to the season of the control

The formation of the controllers?

http://www.observatoire-eau-paca.org

© G. Paulus - CEN-PACA
A very complex declaration scheme, not adapted to heterogeneous permanent pastures

I thought I had a good permanent pasture
Now I realize that I have a gruyere cheese...
And the administration considers I haven't got enough holes!
Maybe I could change my production?

Despite the prorata, controllers tend to draw additional zones excluded from the declaration

Out of the cultivated area
Prorata on the rest
What will be the impacts of that new rules on the pastoral farms in south France?

Mostly all the pastoral farms depend on the CAP payments. With the convergence and despite the prorata, they should globally get more money from the 1st pillar. BUT an increasing of inequality between farmers and between territories.

Example of simulation

- Average farm with herbaceous pastures
- Small farm with a lot of wooded pastures and without cattle drove on collective pasture

Hectares activated thanks to the collective pasture
To sum up for the 1st pillar in France

- No geographical ponderation
- Possibility of declaration related to the reality on the ground
- Wooded and/or ligneous pastures can be partly eligible although they wouldn't be eligible according to a satellite
- A lot of HNV farms *should* benefit from the convergence of the base payments

- Very complex administrative mechanism
- A French method still very fragile toward the exigences of the UE
- Strong difficulties of administrative validation and control and very stressed farmers
- Fruits (chestnuts, acorn) are considered as edible only in a part of the region and only for sheeps and goats
The second pillar: zoom on the French new result-based operations

Measure: “Grass-based and/or pastoral systems”

For individual farms and for collective pastures
A mesure for the “systems” with fixed engagements on the whole farm for 5 years

The whole farm:
- Permanent pastures > 70%
- Extensivity (< 1,4 UGB/ha)
- Result-based engagement on a percentage of the farm (usually > 50%), called the “target surfaces”

On the whole permanent pastures:
- No plowing
- No destruction of hedges, ponds, isolated trees...
- No pesticide

On “target surfaces”
- Results on the vegetation

Difficulty: no pastoral farmer owns all the land he uses (precarious verbal authorizations) / necessity to be sure to use the same lands for 5 years
The result based engagement on the target surfaces

On the permanent meadows:
Diverse flora

On the raw permanent pastures:
No under grazing
No degradation
You have to find 4 plants of the list in each part of the parcel.

Result-based engagement on the permanent meadows.

/local adaptations of the list.
Result-based engagement on the raw permanent pastures

0  No grazing
1  Very light grazing
2  Light grazing
3  Irregular grazing
4  Important grazing
5  Total grazing

No undergrazing
No degradations
Eutrophication
Overgrazing
The calculation of payments and engagements

Parcours

Parcours coll.

SAU

SAU proratisée

SAU proratisée

Parcours

Parcours coll.

Part de surface en herbe >70%

Taux de SC : 50%

A localiser x 58€

A localiser

STH

STH Rémunérée (selon foncier ou plafond)

SC = 50%
Adaptation for the common pastures

Same result-based engagements

Number of animals to maintain for each pasture (adapted to the pastoral ressources) and number maximal of animals : to avoid desertification and overgrazing

No percentage of engagement : the collectives responsibles can choose where they can respect the engagement

Much more simple : 1 ha engaged = 1 ha payed

→ a simple measure, rather adapted to the common summer pastures
What kind of future for the common pastures?

1st pillar: more money
The whole surface is shared and activates DPB for each individual farm. No payment for the collective pastoral manager.

→ How will it be possible to install new farmers and let them drive cattle on the common pastures?

2nd pillar: less and less money
For measures to sustain collective good practices → How will the collective pastoral manager go on paying shepherds, cowboys, pastoral works...?

Balance?
To sum up for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} pillar in France

Political will to create new measures to sustain HNV systems

Simple measures for the common pastures

A long experience with the mobilisation of agroenvironmental measures

A lot of organisms (parks...) which sustain pastoralism and ask for the concretisation of those measures

Big ambitions...

Very complex administrative mechanism for the agro-environmental measures

Additional regional criteria (ex: obligation to have other agro-environmental measures -which need an expensive diagnostic- to have the right to do a “system” measure)

Regional call for projects → competition between the territories and large inequality of opportunity

... But less and less money!
Perspectives and propositions

CAP rules on european and french level:
Simplify the rules for the raw heterogeneous pastures
“no gruyere cheese on our proratas”
Make authorities accept that fruits (chestnuts, acorn...) are a part of the pastoral resources

Common pastures:
Get a european recognition of those specificities
In France we are implemeting a network of “sentinel common pastures” to follow the impact of great changes (climat, CAP...) and share those observations: could it become a european network?
Thank you for your attention!
Hey mad sheep! Haven't you read the last guidance document? Chestnut tree is not grazable, Let's go home!