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Our Challenge

- Use the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) to implement Natura 2000
  
  - Integration strategy of the Commission to finance Natura 2000

- But: „…the use of different EU instruments is still very significantly below the financial needs of Natura 2000…“ (COM 2011).
What is necessary?

- From a farmer’s economic point of view, management of environmentally sensitive grassland is a problem -> a lot of work but very low income

- EU says „public money for public goods“ -> how can we pass this money to our farmers?

We have to use first and second pillar payments of the CAP:

- First pillar in Bavaria: decoupled basic payment per hectare (189 €) + greening (87 €) + some additional payments for the first hectares and young farmers

- Second pillar in Bavaria:
  - payments for less favoured areas (maximum 200 € per one hectare of meadow in mountain areas)
  - Agri-environment-climate payments
First pillar payment and LFA

Art. 4 of Regulation 1307/2013:

…
"permanent grassland and permanent pasture" (together referred to as "permanent grassland") means land used to grow grasses or other herbaceous forage naturally (self-seeded) or through cultivation (sown) and that has not been included in the crop rotation of the holding for five years or more; it may include other species such as shrubs and/or trees which can be grazed provided that the grasses and other herbaceous forage remain predominant as well as, where Member States so decide, land which can be grazed and which forms part of established local practices where grasses and other herbaceous forage are traditionally not predominant in grazing areas”

…

[In Germany heathland is added as traditionally grazed]
First pillar payment and LFA


Article 9

Determination of areas where the agricultural parcel contains landscape features and trees

1. Where certain landscape features, …, are traditionally part of good agriculture cropping or utilisation practices on agricultural area …, Member States may decide that the corresponding area shall be considered part of the eligible area of an agricultural parcel … provided that it does not exceed a total width to be determined by the Member State concerned. That width … shall not exceed 2 metres. …

2. Any landscape features subject to the requirements and standards listed in Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 1306/2013 which form part of the total area of an agricultural parcel shall be considered part of the eligible area of that agricultural parcel.

3. An agricultural parcel that contains scattered trees shall be considered as eligible area provided that the following conditions are fulfilled:

The maximum density referred to in point (b) of the first subparagraph shall be defined by Member States and notified on the basis of traditional cropping practices, natural conditions and environmental reasons. It shall not exceed 100 trees per hectare. …

Article 10

Pro-rata system for permanent grassland containing landscape features and trees

1. As regards permanent grassland with scattered ineligible features, such as landscape features and trees, Member States may decide to apply a pro-rata system to determine the eligible area within the reference parcel.

The pro-rata system referred to in the first subparagraph shall consist of different categories of homogeneous land cover types for which a fixed reduction coefficient based on the percentage of ineligible area is applied. The category representing the lowest percentage of ineligible area shall not exceed 10 % of ineligible area and no reduction coefficient shall apply to that category.

2. Any landscape features subject to the requirements and standards listed in Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 1306/2013 which form part of the total area of an agricultural parcel shall be considered part of the eligible area.

…

[not used in Germany, because too difficult to implement]
First pillar payment and LFA

- Is environmentally sensitive grassland eligible (first pillar and less favoured area payments)?
- Problem 1: „our“ areas are often small, steep, near forest edges (shadows!), not like a rectangle but „unformed“ -> difficult to measure -> sanctions
- Problem 2: integration of landscape elements
  - Part of Cross compliance -> eligible
  - That means: you have to digitize them
  - Nonsense in extensively grazed areas
- Problem 3: 100-tree rule per hectare
  - Nonsense in extensively grazed areas
- Problem 4: Definition of grasses and other herbaceous forage
  -> Molinia, Carex, …
Alpine pasture and landscape elements
Common pastures
Pasture for suckler cows (traditionally used)
heathland
Cross compliance and landscape elements: Where is the border?
What is an „EU-tree“?
First conclusions

- It is difficult to fully integrate environmentally sensitive grassland in the EU-agricultural system
  -> discrepancy between CAP and Natura 2000
- We try our best: in Bavaria most of the environmentally sensitive grassland gets first pillar and LFA-payments (but it is very difficult for farmers and administrations)
Bavarian conservation programme

- Agri-environmental climate payments, co-financed by EU
- Focus on high nature value areas (Natura 2000, etc.) -> only in priority areas
- For Farmers and other land users
- Modular construction systems for arable areas, meadows, pastures and ponds
- Pre-condition: counseling interview with the nature conservation administration -> agreement
- Evaluation -> success story
Bavarian conservation programme

You can combine about 50 different modules. For example:

- Mowing from the first of July: 350 € / ha
- No fertilizers and pesticides: 150 € / ha
- Additional requirements: 400 € / ha,
  - Sickle bar mower: 270 €, 5 – 20% fallow land: 50 €, very wet area: 80 €

Sum: 900 € / ha

Advantage:
- Very good adaptation to local requirements, species, habitats, soils etc.
- Very targeted to Natura habitats and species etc.

Disadvantage:
- Commission wants easy measures
- Controllability and verifiability are more difficult
Bavarian nature conservation programme
Development of the area involved  2007 - 2015
Bayerisches Vertragsnaturschutzprogramm

See new brochure
http://www.bestellen.bayern.de
Restoration of SCA habitat types

Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Umwelt und Verbraucherschutz

INTERREG- Projekte (1998 – 2007)

• Planungsgrundlagen: Zustandserhebung im Vorfeld und Umweltverträglichkeitsstudie bei Projektbeginn.

• Im Projektverlauf wurden 110 ha zugewachsene Buckelwiesen und Heimweiden entbuscht und/oder aufgelichtet.

• – und danach wieder in traditionelle Nutzung genommen und somit ein wesentlicher Beitrag zum Erhalt dieses artenreichen Lebensraumes (Kalk-Magerrasen) geleistet.

• Nach der Erstpflege: i.d.R. Aufnahme ins Vertragsnaturschutzprogramm

Landschaftspflegemaßnahmen im FFH-Gebiet Mittenwalder Buckelwiesen bis einschl. 2013

- Landschaftspflegemaßnahmen innerhalb des FFH-Gebiets vor 2007: 187,30 ha
- Landschaftspflegemaßnahmen innerhalb des FFH-Gebiets 2007 - 2013: 58,09 ha
- FFH-Gebiet Mittenwalder Buckelwiesen
Restauration of SCA habitat types

Before:  

![Before image](image1.png)

after 3 years:

![After image](image2.png)

Measures:  
Scrub clearance of fallow embossment meadows, thinning

Funding:  
ERDF (INTERREG II+III), EAFRD, national funding
Management of SCA habitat types
Wishes

• Easier and fully integration of environmentally sensitive grassland in the CAP
  • Stop: 100-tree-rule, digitalization of CC landscape elements on extensively grazed pastures, …
  • Simplify rules: Where grazing is necessary for Natura 2000 there should be an easy way to include the whole area
• Better rules for agri-environment-climate payments
  • Better incentives for farmers
  • Better possibilities for result-oriented payments
  • Stronger focus on targets, not only on controllability
  • Nature conservation needs a lot of flexibility and differentiation

my personal opinion:
• Natura 2000 needs a better CAP
• But: there are a lot of opportunities for member states already