



# Proposals for discussion

Guy Beaufoy  
[www.efncp.org](http://www.efncp.org)

May 2011



EUROPEAN FORUM ON  
NATURE CONSERVATION  
AND PASTORALISM



# Permanent pasture definition for CAP – proposed wording

- ❑ *Land used to grow grasses or other ~~herbaceous~~ forage naturally (self-seeded) or through cultivation (sown) and that has not been **ploughed or reseeded** ~~included in the crop rotation of the holding~~ for five(?) years or longer*



# Eligibility criteria for CAP direct payments

- No quantified rules at EU level, for example on tree density, shrub cover, hedge width
- Land and features should be eligible if under minimum level of active use to be defined by national authorities in accordance with local conditions
- State of vegetation should be part of check list to determine if use and maintenance are sufficient
- But *presence* of certain types of vegetation should not *a priori* be sufficient to determine ineligibility



# Eligibility criteria for CAP direct payments

- ❑ Pro-rata reductions of eligible area should be ONLY for elements that are completely separate from farming of the land, e.g. bare rocks and roads are separate, tree canopy in wood pastures is not.
- ❑ Simple and effective mechanisms are needed to allow an increase in the area of eligible land, where farmers claim that land is in active use.



# GAEC minimum maintenance and avoiding deterioration of habitats

- ❑ Rules on « unwanted vegetation » should NOT be obligatory for Member States
- ❑ Rules on minimum maintenance and habitat quality SHOULD be obligatory, in terms of grazing pressure, mowing, habitat condition
- ❑ Vegetation type and structure are useful indicators, especially *evolution* of vegetation, but not simple presence or absence of species



## **If a parcel has shrubs and trees that raise questions for authorities, IT IS BETTER TO:**

- Allow time for farmer to correct the condition of the land, under GAEC (with time and advice)
- Rather than exclude this land from payments and penalise farmer's application under eligibility rules



# Control of permanent pasture area - ratio to UAA

- ❑ All Member States to establish an accurate baseline extent of permanent pasture including all extensive types, and land not included in payment claims
- ❑ Exclude PP that has been reseeded within 5 years
- ❑ Monitor trends at an appropriate regional level (national level can hide « movements » of PP)



# Pillar 1 « greening » options for permanent pasture (PP)

- ❑ Intensive PP can be included in « agronomic package » for all farmers, alongside crop rotation, soil cover, buffer strips, etc.
- ❑ PP of most environmental value needs an economic incentive for maintaining in low-intensity use.
- ❑ Introduce Pillar 1 top-up payment for these permanent pastures, obligatory for Member State to implement, voluntary for farmers.



## Pillar 1 top-up for permanent pasture – conditions for farmer

- No ploughing or reseedling (light surface harrowing allowed to control weeds and pests)
- No inorganic fertiliser application (possible derogation up to 50kg N/ha for meadows)
- Minimum management requirement to maintain environmental value to be defined by Member State (may vary according to type of vegetation)
- Option for Member States to apply maximum livestock density per hectare of forage.



# Pillar 1 top-up for permanent pasture - principles

- ❑ Payment approx 100 euros/ha, degressive
- ❑ Farmer chooses which land to enter in the scheme.
- ❑ Logically this will be the less productive pasture, under less intensive management, and of potentially higher environmental value.
- ❑ Any land registered as PP in 2010-11 can be entered automatically. Other land can be entered on basis of field inspection to confirm as PP.
- ❑ If land is withdrawn from the scheme, it cannot be re-entered (without field inspection).

