Group 3 2nd TG Meeting | 15 December 2022

How can CAP interventions best be used and schemes designed to lead to an enhancement in the condition and diversity of LFs?

Annual / multiannual schemes

LFs viewed as constraint by farmers take time, effort. investment

Considering to best remunerate farmers as well as control system where pay for what present, not punish for what's missing (and eliminating all)

Importance of flexibility in implementation and control

Eligibility conditions for BE-Wallonia - plus if go beyond conditionality in quality, can pay

Avoids the double funding by having an additional constraint - difference between maintenance and management

Connectivity at landscape scale rather than just farm-scale

Hedges - view by EC is that non-productive, if used for agroforestry cannot be used for GAEC 8 then

7 years though from time that establish to when cut, so in the time are providing important ecosystem services so need broader view

FR - declared all trees I Fs mapped all and hedgerows, entered into LPIS systems farmers shown boundaries and given the opportunity to move

Same in BE-Wallonia. not for every LPIS across MS

Longer features are there - benefits better for biodiversity tension of yo-yo effect

How avoid? Budget in BE-Wallonia - budget satisfactory for farmers (Art. 102 - allow more flexibility in payments)

Incentivise declaration - popup system for parcel, ask farmer do they want to declare in eco-scheme, or only in GAEC, or at all

Long-term scheme - results will take time



What needs to be put in place to increase engagement and action to maintain, restore and create LFs?

Market measures used in combination with CAP schemes?

Building regional identity within the landscape with LFs as well as food producer

Economic measures complexity may disincentivise. NL national deltaplan on biodiversity

extra costs rather than service you provide (e.g. company getting money for road they build, farmer similar)

How are AECM and ecoscheme different? Reasoning and language used is different, get farmers to include within business plan then get a different mindset

42 AECM advisors trained to go to the field and show the farmers establish networks

Need botantical training for AECM advisors? Help with results-based payment scheme uptake?

Training all farmers as well very helpful in supporting LF management

Productive trees in agroforestry:

need to have goal that can make

income out of it eventually but

in the meantime provides

biodiversity benefits

So controllable but flexible for farmers - difficult balance

Allows for peer-to-peer - training, support, demonstrations

3 universities of advisory association to consistently upskill on technical knowledge and they support the farmers' management based on scientific basis

Rules for CZ was difficult to set for agroforestry (1st year implementing) - still arable land, trying not to define lines of trees to give flexibility

Payment agencies struggle with how to control if too flexible

New CSPs need to wait and see what lessons to learn from in implementation

Need ton-down and hottom-up approaches - avoid 'tree corners' in terms of administration by MAs, MS did not allow line of trees, would have had to divide parcel to be edges

> allow realistic accounting by farmers

Productive should be

considered LFs? Not flexible

at the moment, but start

reflecting for the future

IE have done beyond GAEC requirements - how to deal with quality is the big question - Pillar 2 results-based element for cooperation

Agroforestry on parcels, have been defined as forestry if above a number of trees, negative view by farmers

But problem of thresholds as to what you define as a tree

Similar to other MS, forestry outside the CAP, so reporting and result indicators not included, affects agroforestry

> LF (lines of trees) would be within another system

But agroforestry not defined as LF - productive instead

If could retain as ag

parcel, would be more

likely to increase

uptake

vs. non-productive, system

