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Policy recommendations from the project “Reform of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) 2013 and achievement of the biodiversity and environment goals”

CAP from 2014 – Perspectives for more Biodiversity and Environmental Benefits of Farming

Research Project for the German Federal Agency for Conservation
Objectives

- Analysing situation of biodiversity in agricultural (grassland) ecosystems in Germany and EU
- Analysing effects of CAP objectives and measures as being supportive / contradictory / detrimental to ecological high value agricultural ecosystem
- Defining minimum CAP standards / instruments to achieve legally set EU-biodiversity benchmarks
Scientists usually do not like to deal with (agricultural) policies.
All (extensive) grasslands in (EU)-Europe rely on money to pay for public services / to compensate for economic, environmental and structural difficulties.
The present CAP in short
A system to allocate and distribute money within the EU.

About 400 Billion € will be turned out in the next 7 year period.
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Primary Objectives of Pillar 2
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Agri-Environment (AE) Schemes
Objectives 1

Situation of biodiversity in agricultural (grassland) ecosystems in Germany and Europe
Objectives 1

Situation of biodiversity in agricultural (grassland) ecosystems in Germany and Europe

RESULTS:

Frightening - almost everywhere in Europe!

Biodiv is in rapid decline!
Objectives 2

- Effects of CAP objectives and measures as being supportive / contradictive / detrimental to ecological high value agricultural ecosystem
Objectives 2

Effects of CAP objectives and measures as being supportive to ecological high value agricultural ecosystem

RESULTS:

None to little / - almost everywhere in Europe!
Efficacy of AE-Schemes in the EU

- < 1 % of all schemes in the cropping sector proved to have dark green effects.
- Only 5 to 8 % of all schemes in the grassland sector proved to have dark green effects.

DARK GREEN AE-SCHEMES:

= Beneficial for Biodiv.
Objectives 3

- Defining minimum CAP standards /instruments to achieve legally set EU-biodiversity benchmarks
The EU and all member states and most other European countries (even Switzerland and Norway and also Iceland) have signed the AICHI-targets in 2011.
2020 headline target: halt biodiversity loss – restore ecosystem services – global contribution
2020 headline target: halt biodiversity loss – restore ecosystem services – global contribution

- More sustainable agriculture and forestry.
- Better protection for ecosystems, and more use of green infrastructure.
- A bigger EU contribution to averting global biodiversity loss.
Which EU members pay and profit most from CAP money?
HNV farmland distribution based on the inventory of semi-natural grassland vegetation in the EU
HNV farmland distribution based on the inventory of semi-natural grassland vegetation in the EU

Member States facing economic problems / having budget constraints contribute a lot to European (global) biodiversity.
HNV farmland distribution based on the inventory of semi-natural grassland vegetation in the EU

The few big net payers have little anymore to contribute to European (global) biodiversity e.g. DE, F and UK.
Objectives 3

- Defining minimum CAP standards/instruments to achieve legally set EU-biodiversity benchmarks

GREENING THE CAP

- Minimum management requirements for pillar 1 to receive public funds = Public money only for public goods
Conclusions
Conclusions

- General budget declines:
  - Little in pillar 1.
  - But up to 20% in pillar 2 for some EU member states.
Conclusions

- Reduced co-financing rates for pillar 2:
  - Member states with budget problems will probably reduce offers for pillar 2 programmes significantly.
Conclusions

- Member States will get more flexibility regarding allocation of funds and definitions:
  - This might be positive or negative depending on national / regional policy objectives; e.g. how eligibility of grassland for payments / type of vegetation is defined.
Decoupled area based payments (flat rate) and dilution effects:
- If more grassland is eligible for area payments in a member state the per ha allotment in pillar 1 is reduced.
Conclusions

- Maintenance of permanent grassland obligatory but update to 2014 (reference year):
  - Decline within historic trends feasible.
No obligatory / enhanced co-financing of dark green (biodiv-oriented) measures in pillar 2.
Thank you for your interest!