

## Final Minutes

### Civil Dialogue Group Environment and Climate Change

9 June 2017

CCAB – 1C

#### 1) Adoption of the agenda and of the minutes of the meeting of 10/11/16

**The Chair:** We will start by adopting the minutes from the previous meeting. Any comments? If not, then the draft minutes are adopted.

This time we come together a few days after Trump has pulled the US from the Paris agreement. I want to appreciate that we're coming here as different stakeholder, yet in this room nobody is questioning our objectives, and we're working here towards a solution.

Now to give the floor to Director-General Jerzy Plewa and Director General Daniel Cailleja Crespo for their presentations today.

#### 2) Sustainability of agriculture and the future of the CAP – (possible presentation by AGRI) + Speeches by Director-General Jerzy Plewa (DG AGRI) and Director General Daniel Cailleja Crespo (DG ENV) + Q&A

**Jerzy Plewa (DG AGRI):** Thank you very much; I would like to thank you for giving us this opportunity, not just to talk to you, but to hear you too. I think the purpose of this meeting is to listen to you and work with you to see how CAP can improve civil society as a whole.

I would like to thank you and your members for your contribution to the consultation on the future CAP.

We have received a lot of replies, but we are sorting through them to find out the opinion of citizens and stakeholders across the EU.

We are using all available channels to get the opinions of Europe to make a change by improving efficiency and the use and management of natural resources, reducing emission, and contributing to strengthen the social economic fabric of areas including generational renewal. The CAP must contribute to the rural areas, to assisting young people with finding jobs, and to essential structural services.

The future CAP should also be simpler; we know how complex it currently is. Some rules are too complex for both farmers and national administration. We know this complexity is not only coming from European level, but because of the flex given to member states, and some elements provided at a national level.

There have been calls out co-op a strategic partnership, but I think this needs to be stressed to our stakeholders too. As such, I would like to invite this group to work together. It is only through discussions over the coming years that we can ensure a sustainable environment.

**Daniel Cailleja Crespo (DG ENV):** Today we are discussing a very important issue, and I think it is important that we work together, it's important not only that the Commission work together, but that we listen. Today we are in a listening mood.

We're here to deal with an issue which is important. The amount of replies we received to the CAP consultation shows this. There is something here to reflect on and this is why we believe that today gives us a strong basis to discuss.

However, these discussions take place in a wider context.

We're aware of the debate on the future of Europe. The CAP is an integral part, and must be considered as such in the debate over the future of Europe.

No matter which scenario you look at, we need a CAP which works for a multitude of reasons. It's impossible to see a future of Europe without taking into account what the CAP supplies.

As Mr Plewa said, we have good cooperation, but it's not enough that two services co-operate. We have seen good, noble objectives fall apart or weakened once they come out.

Maximising the contribution of the CAP to sustainable development requires us to look at the limitations and contributions of the current CAP. As we are here to listen, I want to put some questions to you.

How can we make sure measures which are meant to deliver environmental improvements can be taken?

We are reaching the limit in many areas. Farmers are suffering in their daily lives from many angles. We need investment in rural areas, and this we have included in our action plan. We have attached this to our sustainable development goals, but how can we ensure coherence between policy directives, and the future.

Nobody is more for sustainable agriculture than the farmers themselves.

Something very important is 'the buy in', and without the 'buy in' there is no success. We need to inquire more on the opinions of farmers, stakeholders and citizens to ensure this works. Is it going to be possible?

What about simplifications. We would both like a cap which is simpler, but simpler should be more coherent. Is it possible?

Mr Plewa has also mentioned rewarding performance on result based performance, but how do we measure it? How do we make sure that performance is compensated.

How do we make sure farmers don't have to wait to get paid for results that may take years to become visible?

Today, the Commission has more questions than answers, and I would like to tell you that today we want to work together to create a very good package.

If we know the direction we are heading, we can have the instruments, and I believe we can improve in the overall public interest.

**The Chair:** Thank-you, as said before, today is a chance to explain our views to each other, and I would like to open the floor to questions for the two speakers.

**Copa:** Thank you very much for giving us the chance to come today

As both of you mentioned we are facing many challenges in the coming years. The farmers are also facing other challenges springing from climate change, such as drought. This is the context from which we need to create the future CAP. We need to build the future cap from this.

It is our position to be part of the solutions, not the problem.

To meet the challenges in the future it is important that we meet the challenges of the future.

I think that a strong economy of the future is key, but we also need a strong budget for a continued strong budget of the cap. We see the first pillar as a key part of the future.

Referred to the challenges that farmers face which are linked to the Paris Agreement, the SGDs but also include soil and water. However, there also linked challenges such as droughts and other adverse weather events. Farmers are willing to contribute to the solutions and for that we need an adequate and common CAP budget to contribute to the economy on farms. This is a precondition for investments. A strong I pillar is an important tool for climate change risks. Farmers are at the forefront of high standards and because of that the next steps are more difficult than the last decade. Last but not least we need synergies between the climate, the environment and productivity, and to optimise those outcomes according to local conditions.

**IFOAM:** Mr Plewa and Crespo, you are correct it is possible to combine environment and nature. However, the truth is today that the CAP does not support this kind of agriculture. It supports cheap food to stay on the market, and surely the gap has widened over the past. Organic farming is proof the method we want works. We believe the cap should move towards a more targeted, system approach, based on a whole farm system approach. We see a multi farm technique. As such e farm EU would like to see a system which incentives and produced policy for farmer who support this kind of agriculture. We need CAP which works to create a cap which allows this.

We believe the cap should focus on whole farm approaches. We believe the way the current cap is structured does not allow for this. We need to support this

**Cogeca:** Critically we ask that research is bottom up. Farmers need to be covered with filling gaps in our knowledge. It must be collaborative. Linked to this, advice is very important. This isn't just a role for government, but for the future, but the more targeted the advice the better. We recognise we need to

build, but also that we don't need to overlook. We need to capture what farmers are doing outside of the CAP. We need to know where we are coming from, and where we are going.

**EEB/BEE:** It's great we have a chance to discuss, and as with agriculture and environment to make these decisions. We need a strong budget, yes, but first we need to find out what we are aiming to achieve. We need to work out the challenge first, not the other way round as Copa have suggested.

We should move away from the two pillar system, as we believe the good of one pillar can be crossed out by the work of the other. This policy should be coherent with other policy, and we need to have a good monitoring system which includes key stakeholders

**Plewa:** First of all, thanks for the contributions

I want to start first but clarifying some things.

I would say that it was said CAP is not supporting only organic farming, but all food production but in the RDP we have broad support for organic farming. This is an important sector, a booming sector, and the commission would like to continue providing the framework to make this sector more sustainable and successful. All this is about confidence of consumers. We would like to meet consumer expectation.

On budget, it was mentioned that we are at the beginning of the discussion. By the end of this month there will be a new commission paper on European finance. I need to assure you that there is no way we would divide our resources and then see what can be done with it. Of course, there are some things in the pipeline, such as Brexit, and less money in the budget of 27 member states, but there should be no doubt that the commission is doing things in a certain order.

I have to mention that in this forum we need to discuss what we do together. Without farmers in a good shape we will not be able to achieve objectives related to nature and environment. It's not true that society is against a CAP, I don't know where this is sourced from, but we have results every year from euro barometer, and the CAP support is really stable. We know this policy has shortcomings, that it's evolving, and that adjustments to new challenges should be quicker, but to achieve more we have to see what is doable also politically, to address this issue in a pragmatic way.

I would like to thank you for the more practical suggestions about the pillars, and we have received similar statements in our consultation. It is very valuable, and I would like tell you we are also trying to improve the delivery model of the CAP. To farmers it isn't important what it is called, as long as it delivers. We are working on a future model, but your inputs are welcome.

**Cailleja:** I think it's important we realise we need a CAP which is able to continue delivering.

It has to be part of the solution to problems. We have to make it work together. We have to highlight the budget, but it is something at the service of a goal.

On that basis, we work it out and say this is the budget we need. This is how we do it, but we have to be aware there is a discussion ongoing on this. This is why this discussion is somewhat important; it's why we are here. If we don't know what to do, we can't discuss the budget.

If we don't have coherence, we have duplication and fighting legislation.

Is it possible to align better? This would avoid a lot of regulations, a lot of rules. How do we do it?

We need to have more sustainable agriculture, but what I like is that it was said there is a need for no contradiction. Create a sector which produces high quality food, and protects the environment. We need to have a way to reward farmers who are contributing to this.

It was said there should be less bureaucracy, less confusion, but let me say. Any time the commission puts forward a proposal it ends up more complicated, so here, you have to help us. We have to work together. Let us see if we are able to make this happen this time, but we have to acknowledge that when legislating for so many countries we realise it gets confused fast, but we have to strike a budget.

Farmers do need to have support, they have to deliver new solutions, and this has to be an important part of the future. There has to be new methods, new ideas, which work together for the future.

And finally, to face the last comment, we are working together. I have been in meetings where it has happened, and while we might not always agree it allows us to understand each other's views. You made a point to involve environmental authorities more, I agree.

There should not be contradiction when it comes to sustainability. At the end of the day, what we are doing is for the good of all. If you go for the quick win, you do not survive. It's in the interest of long term performance to be sustainable

**Plewa:** I would like to add on the comment of knowledge transfer that this is something we are working towards, not only focus of new research, but on the previous research and its dissemination too.

It will be the focus of the new commission of the coming period, taking into account new technology and methods to take the strain off of farmers.

We cannot forget that a lot of this policy comes from member states, and there is a role from the commission to be played.

**Chair:** Thank you, now on to more questions.

**WWF:** For us biodiversity isn't just an important issue for nature. Environment depends of it.

For example, for Dutch agriculture it is very resource efficient, but our biodiversity is performing really badly.

We need an integrated and focused approach. We need biodiversity to function and integrate. For us, the CAP is important to ensure targeted schemes, but also to create a pathway for transition. Furthermore, coherence is important. Not only coherence is important, but a vital governed structure in line with the CAP.

**Greenpeace:** Everybody has mentioned it, but we need a policy which is result orientated.

I think there is a consensus on that. The big debate will be on the objectives, and how to get there.

The two pillar structure is not working. The first pillar causes problems, the second pillar is meant to address them. Every penny spent of this should be focused forward, not on fixing problems in other parts of the budget.

there has to be incentives created to reward farmers which are already doing more than what they do but also to allow them to get into a transition path. Many have land, but find it impossible to change even if there is willingness. How can farmers press forward should this area should be at the centre of the policy.

New challenges are in front of us, and consumption should be at the forefront, not just a measure of the policy.

What we would like to see is a and of relevant people in agricultural and environmental ministers

**Europabio:** We have made some mistakes implementing the CAP, and we need to make changes going ahead, and I agree we need to improve the performance of the CAP. We need to work on this as there is a need for decision makers.

I think if you want to meet the expectations of the citizens you have to create three pillars. Budget- a proper CAP budget

Consistency and coherence - there is a need to highlight this. Decisions should be based on an agronomic logic, real expertise, which was missing in things such as greening.

There needs to be a third pillar, all difference policies working tougher. CAP cannot do all alone. There should be a real commitment here.

Let me finish on innovation. There is a need to say we need new tech to provide some solutions, we don't need to produce more, but to improve environmental and sustainability, and biodiversity. We really think we can produce this through different models of agriculture.

**CEJA:** Spain has been suffering a lot through climate change, and a lot of difficulties have taken place.

Referring now to the lack of farmers we need to look at the problems of the CAP. Income depends on CAP.

The problem is not the product, but the market. This refers to the market. They can't go forward, they can't innovate if the economy at farm is problematic and that is a problem.

Another problem is water. In the south of Spain water is limited, real problems, it's all about the use of very scarce resources such as water. We need to have access to water to produce, and if we are looking if we're going to hit the targets of the sustainable Development Goals for 2030 we're going to have to increase productivity and reduce cost using the same product we are now.

**ECVC:** It seems important to take into account the impact of the whole supply chain, to implement a short supply chain.

I would say one of the key ways to face climate change is biodiversity; we need to take into account the debate on seeds, and GMOs, which to use to not represent a way to biodiversity

When it comes to innovating we can't just have farmers overly dependent on it solutions. Knowledge transfer is key here, and if we can work on this it is truly innovation

**Cailleja:** We have had some very strong comments here.

A few of you made a similar point. Is it possible in the cap to have some way to ensure a transition, a mechanism to move to new methods?

We have to take into account all other policy in this area

The issue of coupled payments is something I think should be up for discussion. Is the CAP imbalanced?

You were saying the 2 pillar structure was imbalanced, this could change, we need to wait and see.

I also like the idea of having the Council working together. In some cases this is already settled, but not in the commission. There are different perspectives, but for informal Councils this issue should be something which we need to discuss.

There was a discussion on what is innovation, I think in the sense of sustainability is a way to be circular. To reduce, reuse, recycle. To reactivate circular economy through innovation towards sustainability

Another important point was the problem was the price of product. When prices fall subsidies go towards assisting a farmer's income. It would be possible to try and address this, but then how do we create a balance?

It was also very important what you said about the SDGs, and the future of the CAP will have to take into account these. We need a way to create a balance. We need to hear from others, from other sectors.

We need to find a way to make the CAP more sustainable, no matter what you call it. In the end we are trying to work out what kind of CAP we want. Can we continue as we are? Cause if not we need to make some changes.

**Plewa:** I would like to draw attention to the plea to explain and expand the objective of the policy. We need to address many issues including health, environment and more.

We have to be realistic, we have to see the function of the EU, of the CAP, and ensure we meet these objectives. The CAP has to aim to produce food at affordable price, and to assist the farmers earn a decent income.

We also have new elements related to competitiveness; these are important objectives to keep European agriculture as a competitive sector. We cannot create policy which will be isolated from a farming sector. More can be improved of course.

We have to see the big picture, and one of the sustainable development goals is food security for the world. I think that despite some difficulties in some part of Europe we have the best conditions to produce food in a sustainable way.

CAP distribution is not ideal to some, some say it is unfair, and that it goes to a small part of farmers. What the commission can do is provide a new framework, but then it becomes a co-decision with member states.

We also have to have your voice aimed not just at us (the commission,) but at stakeholders, at a local level. There have already been steps to improve this, but the political reality is different.

It is always important to improve co-ordination and coherence, and that is something I'm strongly for.

We cannot underestimate the complexity of the situation, in order to have coherent outcome.

Regarding the first proposal of the commission on matter such as greening, you can understand that at the moment we have tried to simplify it.

I think it is a very important to bring forward the discussion together today, because we sometimes have new ideas, but in the end they may hit a barrier.

Sometimes if we want to aim for the sky we might not make it. We need to be pragmatic without thoughts, and I appreciate the discussion going forward.

**European Agriforestry federation:** I want to say a complex CAP is both bad and good.

Bad, because of the contradictions we have faced in the forestry sector, but good because I'm grateful for the flexibility in the CAP.

The vast variety of methods which have been used allows us to look and see the very innovative methods used across Europe, flexibility can be very good, but only if the information is freely disseminated from Brussels.

We need information to be made freely available, and openly searchable database available for all members stated, and all of pillar 2 so it can be seen on the budget allocated to the area so that decision and outcomes can be made on what has gone well, and what has gone wrong.

There is standardisation clearly needed, but not complete standardisation

**Beelife:** There's a cross between what it means to support the environment, and what it means to support production. As a beekeeper this does not exist in beekeeping because life produces life.

We have fruit, veg and the bees pollinating them.

What we are seeing in Europe is a need to improve.

I think a lot of the opposition to measures is because they have been poorly communicated, not just to stakeholders, but to different levels. These measures have been proposed, but then there is no way to know how to do it well

I want the commission to work on communication at all levels, this would be crucial. Stakeholders do their best, but information flies in all directions. One of the biggest problems we are facing is a lack of communication between levels.

We have seen in recent reports from the UN that there is a need to look into how we can protect biodiversity, and they need to be taken into account.

In terms of innovation, we can be very creative to succeed. There are different things on part, innovation is long standing, and we all need to agree the difference between a short term innovation, and a long term one which may be used for good.

**Pan Europe:** We all hear there is a disparity on how aid is spent, and we know it's not logical, but another area is that of the use of pesticides in EFAs.

The CAP more and more often has a tendency to be inconsistent, for instance direct payments. The member states with the biggest direct payment per hectare are the same ones who use the largest pesticides per hectare.

What I am asking is when we will stop reforming; it's not easy for farmers to keep reforming.

Let's try and make some real options here we really propose changes.

I hear agriculture nowadays is becoming more of a sellable product; we need to make agriculture in Europe big again.

We cannot just continue with an increasingly standardised sector, we need to make agriculture diverse again.

**Copa:** agriculture depends on ecosystem services. But ecosystem services depend also on agricultural sector. In some countries we need to make sure it's clear this is a real problem. As we land abandonment is also negative for ecosystem services and this is more evident in southern EU Members, like Spain, where the danger of decertification is imminent. In many countries there is a clear connection between agriculture and the provisions it provides.

We know that Europe has to contribute to food security, we can't just consider the Paris agreement 'a la card'. It is clear that whatever action we pursue towards 2 or 1.5°C it must be done 'in a manner that does not threaten food production'. Europe cannot wash its hands from its responsibility to contribute to this global challenge of growing population and need for safe and wholesome food. Also adaptation needs to be linked with productivity. At the moment we only talk about mitigation and we forget that agriculture is at the forefront of the climate change impacts and that it is the only sector that while it

adapts it mitigates also climate change. There are win-win situations; but we need to keep always in our minds that farmers are not there for hobby, but to have a business and make a living.

Consistency is needed - for instance soil, where one time we discuss biodiversity and another climate change, but never both of them and their win-win links with productivity. Coherence is not a matter of urgency, but a necessity for the creating of a science based approach.

We are aware of different initiatives, but we are also aware that any decision has to be science based. Climate change does influence agriculture; it does influence the future of the sector.

We need a long term approach to a sustainable carbon emission future.

**Plewa:** We have new challenges which are very clear, including the Paris agreement, and there will be much more effort done to face the goals we have now. ]

There is a lot of interest to be more efficient in the face of biodiversity, and the contribution to the environment and the climate fight.

We have one barrier to face, and that is gathering appropriate data to measure this. Member states have decided in past years to cut funding for the collection of such data, so I have to say biodiversity will help sustainability. We are trying to use the available data, but sometimes it's not enough to truly follow the situation in the face of new challenges.

The points made on communication I took very seriously. We do have regular meetings, but I'm not sure it spreads enough, especially to the lower levels.

I would like to thank you for your contributions, and to assure you this is not the end of our discussions. The plan is that by the end of the year there will be communications by the end of the year on the modernisation and simplification of the CAP.

To summarise, I would say we have developed a message throughout today.

Let's make agriculture big again.

**Calleja:** today was to gain your input, and I think that has happened.

Today we have received a strong message. It is possible to work together, to ensure we can make the CAP better. It's not going to be the same depending on all different positions, we have worked together to create a proper reform.

We can't make a new one every year, it would be impossible. Let's try very hard to make this one the real one. We need good proposal, stability, to integrate climate change.

I want to improve on the last conclusion.

Let's not just make environmental big again

Let's make it better, and let's do it together.

### **3) Climate change adaptation and mitigation**

#### **Presentation and discussion of 2 studies:**

##### **a) Report on 'Climate Change Impacts and Vulnerability in Europe in 2016' published by the European Environmental Agency ( see slides)**

- Both globally and in Europe there has been a record breaking high in climate in Europe
- Exceptionally warm days, such as happen during heatwaves have increased, so have heavy daily precipitation.

#### **Key message are that:**

- The area suitable for crops have already expanded northwards, and is expected to continue, but pest as soil issues may cause problems.
- Protected changes in crop phenology have already been observed
- Climate extreme are already threatening crop yields
- Irrigation demands are projected to increase
- Climate change is having an impact on wine production
- Overall, southern Europe is projected to be predominantly negatively effected
- Northern Europe is predicted to experience both positive and negative impacts

##### **b) Study from the European Parliament: Research for COMAGRI (EP) Committee - The consequences of Climate Change for EU Agriculture. Follow-up to the COP21, authored by the IEEP and published in February 2017 ( key message below, see slides)**

### **Interaction between Agriculture and climate**

#### **Agriculture:**

Is affected by climate - requiring Adaptation

Influences the climate - requiring mitigation

Has the potential to contribute to other sectors

Contribution likely to be more significant over time

#### **What is agriculture depends on the perspective**

Findings have found that the farmer sees a field and his work, while policy sees systems, policy directives.

### **EU climate action and agriculture**

EU 2030/ cop21 Paris agreement

New global climate commitment

Integration of Lulucf into CC&E package

Flexibility between ESR sectors and LULUCF sectors,

## **Mitigation in agriculture**

Actions available are wide ranging, and well tested  
Have environmental and economic co-benefits  
And can be supported through the CAP

**Chair:** Now I would like to take some questions.

**Lawson:** What scope is there for the national scope of data being available at a farm by farm level?  
Can we link individual farmer's efforts to the national reports that are produced?

**Simon:** Where do you include techniques for developing biodiversity in emissions issues? Are there actions being supported?

**Fuessel:** We are looking at climate change impacts on biodiversity. The best data in Europe is available for birds, not bees.

**WWF:** We already have some years behind us where climate change has been confirmed, but the data you show are projections. Do you have any data based on actual current production levels over the past few years?

**Fuessel :** Almost all of our indication has observations, but they are a lot harder to display on a single map. I would recommend diving into the data

What you see in the field is mixtures of development, technology and others on how they impact, which makes it farm more different to untangle the different factors to get a key answer.

Yes there already are key effects recorded, but they are too hard to summarise all at once

**WWF:** What is the scope for making data available at a farm level?

**Allen:** It requires collation, but even that only shows member state level at best, if not farm level. One way to ensure

**Question -** Uncertainty factor... what is the uncertainty when it comes to carbon storage underground?

In your calculations is it possible to look at what efforts are, and within the carbon storage in the agricultural sector?

**Allen:** yes I think it is. We've done it in part with reference to wood. There are tools available. However, coming up with it as a whole is beyond my ability.

Do you have an overview for Europe as a whole of the availability of water?

**F -** We don't have data on that. The projections I showed used non irrigated areas

Regarding the adaptation report, adaptation does not exist within the policy, Agriculture needs much more than has been presented so far, not just 10%, but a whole report. We are talking about agriculture, and not about more.

### **Lunch break**

#### 4) Nature Directives Action Plan, Q&A on the state of play ( see slides)

- The plan has 4 priority areas of action
- 15 actions in total. ( See slides for full list of areas)
- It has set out an ambitious work programme for the next two and a half years
- Natura 2000 day has been proclaimed as 15 may

**Copa Cogeca:** We welcome many parts of the action plans it targets some of the main areas we want to focus on. For us it is crucial that there is an involvement of farmers, not just in a hearing, but in as early a phase as possible.

With involvement we can end up in an optimal situation where the farmer feels ownership of their specific actions.

The directives' very broad formulations create a great range of interpretations which make very difficult for farmers to foresee the consequences, both in general and specific cases. We therefore hope that the new guidelines will better incorporate economic socio-economic aspects and a more inclusive approach overall.

**WWF:** The latest assessment we have shown an important financial gap, it shows us how we pay for the things we want

The latest estimation we have of the cost of this shows that the EU budget is not providing enough for this.

As such, I want to ask if you think it is necessary to update the costs before we enter into budgetary discussions.

Are you expecting Member States to come up with something similar to an Action Plan at an MS level?

**Copa:** It is important for farmers to be involved in the implementation of Natura 2000. We especially have to take into account socioeconomic factors.

For biodiversity it is essential to keep our landscapes open. In this context livestock delivers important benefits to biodiversity. But large carnivores are more and more becoming a problem for livestock farmers. We therefore hope that the Action Plan will give new impetus to the large carnivores' platform.

We have to discuss the active management of species, not only preventative measures and awareness raising actions.

**Cogeca:**

There is no agriculture without biodiversity. Biodiversity is a precious resource that farmers are carefully preserving

**Copa/ Laengauer**

It is very difficult from a political perspective to look into the Action Plan, because that's what it affects. We don't support the designation of additional Natura 2000 areas. We especially see that the designation of Nature 20200 areas is being used to prevent certain economic activities and projects.

Like previous speakers I feel the Action Plan can improve the situation and make the situation less tense.

If the action plan means that certain regions can be encouraged to make sure there is an action taken when it comes to the land then this can be very positive.

A significant problem is causing Art 17 of the Habitats Directive. The reporting system is unfortunately always leading to a negative assessment of the habitat's status although significant progress has been made on the field. Art 17 reporting does not reflect reality. New guidance is therefore needed.

**EEB/ BEE Defossez**

This won't be enough to protect biodiversity. I echo the need for funding, and ask how the future CAP will support biodiversity, and not undermine it?

What is the commission planning to address the pressing issue of pollinators

**O'briain**

- Our view is we will not succeed without farmers. The way we have natured Europe requires input from all, to work together to achieve that. Unfortunately, the state of nature assessment shows there species and habitat in Europe are doing worse than others. The way we work together and assist in ecosystems is how we can create this.
- early interaction with farmers and foresters is vital
- In terms of member state level, we will have a bilateral process where we look at problems, and it might be a chance to flag up some of the concerns a colleague has mentioned. I think it's positive, and should be seen as such by you all.
- in terms of guidance, it must remain inside the scope of the legislation

For the financing gap, there is a duty of EU co-financing, and we shouldn't forget that. We are within a funding period, but there may be an area to improve in some of the longer reaching projects.

Member states are not being asked to prepare a separate plan. It is intended that the bilateral discussions should produce roadmaps, agreed with different Member States, that set out how key implementation challenges in those countries are to be addressed.

We recognise there is conflict in relation to coexistence of large carnivores and people, but we have to recognise there is a need to for dialogue and co-operation to address these challenges, and we regret that Copa-Cogeca is not at the table for this.

in terms of the experience and perspective, it appears that in some instances there has been a risk averse approach in relation to application of the Nature Directives. This is being looked at in the context of the follow up to the Nature Fitness Check.

The Natura 2000 network is based on a scientific basis, stakeholder consultation basis, where every country contributes for itself. From the early days of that Austria was seen as not making enough strides. It's not being singled out, it's equal treatment for all. That debate is trying to be continued proactively, and I hope it would continue along those lines.

This debate shouldn't be based on fear. These areas should be seen as an asset, not a liability.

In terms of the article 17 I take your point, maybe we don't pick up the improvements that are being achieved. We are looking at ways in which improvements to the conservation status of species and habitats can be better identified and recognised. In this context we have recently launched a study to look at the drivers of success, in order to be able to understand and show such improvements.

In terms of the point, there is a serious discussion on the future of the CAP. There are elements of the action plan which focuses on farming and nature which will play their part. They are extremely relevant in the future of CAP.

The pollinator wasn't covered in this action plan, but they provide a critical ecosystem service. It's in everybody's interest to ensure that such services continue. The fact it is not in the report doesn't mean we are not committed to working on this point in the future.

**5) Result-based payments: Outcomes of the conference "Farming for biodiversity – Result-based payments for biodiversity achievements in agriculture" – see slides.**

**1) Focusing on results has merit.**

The potential is there but it is certainly not a panacea.

Not a competition between result based and management based approach

It is clear from projects that this approach calls for a need to learn as we go

Focus on roll outs and more payments

**2) Complexity in the design, but simplicity in the implementation (the opposite of the current CAP)**

**3) Design is key to success, and this cannot be overstated.**

Time, resources, knowledge... but mostly in the initial phase, once the scheme is rolled out it can go much smoother.

Payment calculation can be challenging, but all projects exist within current framework

There is a need for a common design approach to be applied across different habitats

**4) Ensure guidance and training**

In this context lies farm advisory systems and self-assessment (stressed by farmers)

**5) Building trust**

With Advisers, authorities, local stakeholders and Leaders

**6) Farmers like RBAPS from flexibility and freedom, understanding and learning, ownership and recognition**

**7) But also point to obstacles such as risks, uncertainties, and self-assessment and short lived projects, and uncertainty.**

**8) Cost effectiveness is not equal to quick and easy audits,**

**9) Flexibility already exists in the current regulatory framework.**

**Chair:** Thank-you for your interesting presentation. I would now like to take this time to open the floor up to questions.

**WWF:** Very interesting presentation. In the Netherlands we are working on many similar schemes, are you working on any others which could maybe be compares to this one?

**Kov:** In the conference we didn't just include the pilot projects, we also had other projects who presented their experience. We already learned a lot from other case (Dutch, Irish) the idea of this conference was not to repeat older examples, but to show new insights, and connect them with existing experiences. We had colleagues from France and Germany who presented their experience in rolling out these schemes.

**Question2:** Why just give farmers cost replacement if they are doing something for public good - why not actually pay for them?

**Kov:** Yes, we want to tackle the culture of fear when it comes to finance. We didn't have anyone from the court of auditors there, and we wish we did. We want to invite them and see how we can work with them constructively, to discuss, and build confidence in member states. We need auditors on our side to enforce our schemes. The EU budget id focused on results, and we expect support.

As for the reward, it's one of the key questions for the post 2020 CAP; it's a matter of how much we value them. That's a question which goes beyond this scheme, but even with the current framework there has been a sign it works.

**Ifoam:** You said what is important is the design phase, could you elaborate on this?

**Euraf:** Could you talk more about management based results? Are their more countries regions willing to start with this kind of pilot? Is this connected to EIP agri?

**Kov:** Within the project schemes we have been looking at how to nest different elements into the scheme. We can have a scheme which starts with a management based direction, then grows.

How do you think this is going to work in the future CAP, do you think it could match pillar 1/ 2 approach

There should be coherence, and you should be proving more in pillar than pillar 2

**Copa:** Farmers of course have to be involved from the start, especially in the design of the schemes. We cannot accept that risks are being shifted to the farmers and forest owners. We especially need continuous support in order to include the payments into the long term planning of the farm.

What happens to those who did not get their self-assessment right? If not, do they end up on their own?

In principle Copa and Cogeca are open to schemes that further contribute to biodiversity, but first we have to overcome many uncertainties linked to result-based schemes.

Furthermore we need pilots that are being applied on larger parts of the farms. Pilots that are implemented on 0, 5 ha of a farm are unfortunately not representative.

**Kov:** Self-assessment is not the basis for payment. It's the first stage to train a farmer to see how the process works. We cannot accept that 100% of farmers will get it right first time.

Farmers have to keep doing what they have been doing for centuries.

Some farmers did decide not to participate, and the reasons will come out of the end result. 1 point I saw was in Spain, where farmers want to adhere to familiar practices, that's what we mention dealing with local leaders.

It's easy to attract farmers to regions which have experience in this sort of area, and the need to create a platform of peer to peer sharing of information.

Many of the farmers were small farmers of course.

**Chair:** Thank you, now I have a question.

On my farm, If I wanted to step into a project like this, using the best available practices, and I am faced by a disease outbreak of a climatically, what would happen to me?

**KOV** - if you produce crops you have risks, the same goes for improvements in biodiversity. The design of the schemes needs to ensure there are safeguards for what you do if these happen.

**Chair:** Thank you. Now we move on to the A.O.B – does anyone have anything they would like to discuss?

**Copa:** I want to thank everyone for today's talk. This goes especially point 2 and 4 on the agenda, allowing us to have our comments to be on the commission agenda

I would like to ask the commission to produce some short presentations so we can work on these things as a group for the future.

**Chair:** Thank-you. If no-one has anything else to add then I will close the meeting.

The next meeting will be provisionally for November of next year

Furthermore I would like to thank the translators, and to you all for playing a part in a constructive debate and pushing some important fact to the agenda, and to our speakers.

**Meeting closed 4:25pm.**

-----

*Disclaimer*

*"The opinions expressed in this report represent the point of view of the meeting participants from agriculturally related NGOs at Community level. These opinions cannot, under any circumstances, be attributed to the European Commission. Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of the here above information."*