

Promoting the Transition to a Green Economy ENRD Thematic Group on Resource Efficiency

Case studies on the implementation of resource efficiency of soils and water





Thematic Group activities

Three related but distinct strands of work in the context of the TG activities to address resource efficiency through rural development policy:

- **1.** Framing background analysis of the content and focus of RDPs across the EU;
- 2. A comparative regional analysis in different RDP regions;
- 3. Identification and collection of good practice examples.

Objectives of the comparative regional analysis

- 1. To investigate the approaches taken in different RDP regions
- 2. Identify possible success factors or bottlenecks specific to the region
 - 3. Identify recommendations from the regional perspective



Research focus

Thematic priorities

Soils and nutrients: To encourage the resource efficient use

of nutrients, reduce water pollution, prevent soil compaction and erosion and approaches to increase ecosystem

resilience and improve productivity.

Soils and carbon: To improve the carbon conservation and sequestration potential of soils to improve soil health and contribute towards climate mitigation and adaptation.

Cross cutting challenges



Funded by the



Case studies







Finland



- Agricultural land covers 7,6 % of the land area
- Water cover 22 % of the total territory
- 50 000 farms (average farm size 45 ha)
- The worlds northernmost agricultural country
 - Short growing season (length of growing period 110-180 days)
- Of arable fields, 58% have subsurface drainage and 27% open drains.
- Irrigation is only used in horticulture
- Nutrient loading from agriculture is considered a major problem
 - The ecological status of surface water bodies is satisfactory in 54 % of the coastal waters, passable in 20 % and poor status in 1 %.
 - The share of agriculture in N loading 56 % and P loading 69 %
- The regional concentration of livestock farming and increased unit size is a challenge for sustainable nutrient management
- Organic carbon content of soils is decreasing





Measures & Priorities



4B: improving water management 4C: soil (erosion, management) 5A: efficiency in water use 5E: carbon conservation

> and sequestration



M01 Knowledge transfer and information actions M02 Advisory services, farm management and farm relief service M04 Investment in physical assets M10 Agri-environment-climate M11 Organic farming M13 Payment to areas facing natural constraints M16 Co-operation.

M01 Knowledge transfer and information actions M02 Advisory services, farm management and farm relief service M16 Co-operation.





Frequent water imbalances – droughts, floods, inland inundation

Organic production – on 2.7% of UAA

Average farm size – 8.1 hectares, average age of farmers – 56 years

CO2 emission from agriculture in 2010 was 7 716.4 (1000 tonne CO2 equivalent, 12.1% of total) – carbon capture by forests in Hungary 13% of total

Hungary

Total UAA = 4 656 520 hectares (81.6% arable land)

52.3% of UAA managed at low intensity

538 876 hectares for management contracts under agri-environment-climate



Funded by the

Rural Development n Network for Rural Development

4A: biodiversity 4B: improving water management 4C: soil (erosion, management) 5A: efficiency in water use 5E: carbon conservation and sequestration

Measures & Priorities

- M01 Knowledge transfer and information actions
- M02 advisory and farm management services
- M04 physical assets
- M10 agri-environment-climate
- M11 organic farming
- M12 Natura 2000
- M13 areas facing natural or other specific constraints
- M16 cooperation
- M04 physical assets
- M01 KT&I
- M02 advisory and farm management services
- M16 cooperation



Rural Development n Network for Rural Development



Measures & Priorities

- M01 Knowledge transfer and information actions
- M02 Advisory services, farm management and farm relief services
- M04 Investments in physical assets
- M07 Basic services and village renewal in rural areas
- M08 Forest investments
- M10 Agri-environment-climate
- M11 Organic farming
- M12 Natura 2000 and Water Framework Directive payments
- M13 Payments to areas facing natural or other specific constraints
- M16 Co-operation
- M01 Knowledge transfer and information actions
- M02 Advisory services, farm management and farm relief services
- M04 Investments in physical assets
- M16 Co-operation
- M01 Knowledge transfer and information actions
- M02 Advisory services, farm management and farm relief services
- M04 Investments in physical assets
- M08 Forest investments
- M10 Agri-environment-climate
- M16 Co-operation

Erosion

"le plat pays" prone to erosion end mud flows because of intensification and high sealing (roads, residence) which reduces infiltration possibilities.

Cyprus Malta Netherlande Gelgium Luxembourg Norway Germany Denmark Czech Republic Slovenia Itały United Kingdom Switzerland Greece Poland Croatia

France

Slovakia

Finland Ireland Austria

Hungary Spain

Portugal Lithuania

> Sweden Latvia

> Estonia Bulgaria

Romania

0

20

40



Gross Nutrient Balance (kg N/ha) 2013

Nutrient pressure

After 20 years of severe manure policy, the problem of nutrient leaching to surface water and in soils remains due to the intensive livestock sector.

Flanders





Organic matter

Soil organic matter is low and because of stringent nutrient application standards, difficult to counter.





Measures & Priorities



- M01 Knowledge transfer
 - M02 Advisory services
 - M04 Investments in Physical assets
 - M07 Basic services
 - M08 Investment in forest areas & agroforestry
 - M10 Agri-environment-climate
 - M11 Organic farming
 - M16 Cooperation

No direct measures

• M08 - Investment in forest areas & agroforestry







Emilia Romagna





- Regional territory occupies about 22.500 Km², and it is about 48% plain, 27% hilly and 25% mountainous
- Rural areas cover 60% (47% UAA) and the majority of population lives in rural municipalities (76.7%)
- Overage farm size is 15 ha (7.9 ha Italian overage)
- Agriculture represents the 3.8% of the regional GDP
- The 22% of the forests area is affected by regional instability phenomena (landslides, water erosion, flooding, landslides and avalanches) (INFC 2005)
- 42,1 % of UAA classified as HNV farming and 6% of UAA classified as Natura 2000
- Forests cover 49.6% of the total surface
- Nitrate Vulnerable Zones cover the 28% of Regional territoriy
- Main pressure relate to the externalities of intensive farming in the plain areas:
- high concentration of nitrates and phosphorus in freshwater and groundwater
- soil erosion around 6 t/ha/year





4B: improving water management

4C: soil (erosion, management)

5A: efficiency in water use

5E: carbon conservation and sequestration

Measures & Priorities

- M01 Knowledge transfer and information actions
- M02 advisory and farm management services
- M04 physical assets
- M07 Basic services and village renewal in rural areas
- M10 agri-environment-climate
- M11 organic farming
- M12 Natura 2000
- M13 Areas facing natural or other specific constraints
- M16 cooperation
- M01 Knowledge transfer and information actions
- M02 advisory and farm management services
- MO4 physical assets
- M16 cooperation
- M01 KT&I
- M02 advisory and farm management services
- M04 physical assets
- M08 Forest investments
- M10 agri-environment-climate
- M16 cooperation



Lower Saxony



Funded by the



- 60 % agricultural area (2.6 million ha), 1 million ha of forest and other wooded lands
- Structural change:
 - Number of farms is decreasing, more specialized large-scale farms (now about 42 000 agricultural holdings, decline of about 2.2 % per year)
 - Average farm size: 65,2 ha and in Germany 61,3 ha (Farms > 50 ha 45 % of all farms (in Germany: 28.5 %)
- 2.8 % of all farms are registered as organic farms, (below the national trend of 9 %)

- High level of (diffuse) water pollution
- High regional concentration of livestock production (very high regional nutrient surplus)
- Ongoing land use change with decreasing area of pasture lands
- Moors only account for 5 % of the total area, ongoing activities of draining the moors (→ up to 30 % of the total emissions)
- Soil erosion, soil loss and high diffuse pollution
- Coastal areas suffer from eutrophication
- In some regions, groundwater use is increasing as they highly depend on irrigation water (use of groundwater)
 - Organic farming is still below its potential

Rural Development n Network for Rural Development



Measures & Priorities



Funded by the

- M01 Knowledge transfer
- M04 Investments in Physical assets
- M07 Basic services
- M10 Agri-environment-climate
- M11 Organic farming
 - M13 Payments to areas facing natural or other specific constraints
- M16 Cooperation

 M04 - Investments in Physical assets



Summary of measures and public expenditure

Percentage of RDP total public expenditure allocated to key measures in P4 and Focus Areas 5A and 5E

| | Emilia- Romagna / Italy | Finland | Flanders / Belgium | Greece | Hungary | Lower Saxony / Germany | EU-28 |
|--|-------------------------------|---------|-----------------------|--------|---------|------------------------------|-------|
| M01 - Knowledge transfer and information actions | 0.9% | 0.2% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.4% | 3.3% | 0.4% |
| M02 - Advisory services | 0.3% | 0.3% | 1.3% | 2.6% | 0.3% | | 0.3% |
| M04 - investments in physical assets | 2.2% | 0.1% | 0.5% | 12.1% | 1.5% | 1.5% | 3.8% |
| M10 - agri-environment-climate | 15.0% | 19.4% | 18.8% | 7.7% | 15.7% | 10.9% | 16.6% |
| M11 - organic farming | 8.5% | 4.0% | 1.1% | 9.1% | 5.1% | 4.3% | 6.2% |
| M12 - Natura2000 and WFD payments | 0.7% | | | 0.2% | 4.1% | | 0.5% |
| M13 - payments to areas facing natural or other specific constraints | 7.7% | 45.6% | | 19.2% | 1.9% | 4.4% | 16.9% |
| M16 – cooperation | 1.9% | 0.2% | 0.1% | 1.1% | 0.4% | 0.5% | 0.4% |





Summary of challenges

Factors

Risk Motivation 1. **Economics** 2. 3. Effort and engagement Understanding 4. Knowledge 5. Trust 6. Monitoring 7. Controls Policy 8. Working in isolation 9. The bigger picture

Challenges for RDP design / implementation

- Reduce or avoid risks to farmers
- Educate about positive impacts
- Generational change support those who are willing to change
- Tenancy is a challenge engage with owners
- Proactive engagement
- Training farm advisors
- Pilot and demonstration projects
- Chanel advice through industry
- Improved reporting requirements
- Results based / voluntary approaches
- How to achieve better join up
- RDPs as a tool for change collective approaches





Motivation

Factors

Risk

- Actions with high sanctions are avoided
- Safe option to maintain income
- Familiar / easily integrated practices favoured
- Semi-permanent transitions are a barrier
- Approach varies with age / farm size / value

Economics

- +ve impacts on business accepted but neutral impacts – why change?
- Some measures are seen as income support
- Env compliance a requirement not an objective
- Young / new farmers are reliant on RDP support
- Tenancy costs reduce ambition for high effort actions
- Effort and engagement
 - High compliance effort is a barrier
 - Some large land owners have no connection to their land

Challenges for RDPs

- Reduce or avoid risks to farmers
- Educate about positive impacts
- Generational change support those who are willing to change
- Tenancy is a challenge engage with owners





Knowledge

Factors

Understanding

- Resource efficiency for production not for environment
- Services are available but require effort.
- Farm business impacts / synergies

• Trust

- Those who advice on business are more trusted
- Advisors favour particular approaches
- Conventional approaches are more comfortable

Monitoring

- Local environmental conditions are still poorly documented
- Soil and water information could be improved

Challenges for RDPs

- Proactive engagement
- Training farm advisors
- Pilot and demonstration projects
- Chanel advice through industry
- Improved reporting requirements







Factors

• Controls

- Do not allow for measures that might be important for resource efficiency
- Voluntary approaches are sometimes favoured over regulatory ones

Working in isolation

- Some measures impact resource efficiency
- Ministries do not always work together / have different priorities
- Different farms types (crop/livestock) do not interact
- Policy implementation can run at different timescales
- The bigger picture
 - RDPs don't enable larger structural change
 - Many priorities many measures
 - Young farmers could play a key role.

Challenges for RDPs

- Results based / voluntary approaches
- How to achieve better join up
- RDPs as a tool for change collective approaches

Funded by the



Tailored advice packages for



measures/actions addressing soils & water to convey the benefits & risks of adopting resource efficient practices; the implications for farm businesses, & encourage uptake.



Compulsory training for advisors through continuous professional development to maintain up-to-date knowledge on best practice & support holistic advice across the farm.



Targeted support to areas and issues where improved resource efficiency is a priority & focus funding on priority actions to maximise impacts on the ground.



Good governance frameworks to provide coherence at the programming & implementation level to align environmental, economic & social objectives and outcomes.



Proactive engagement with farmers on the benefits of resource efficiency through the use of demonstration, peer to peer engagement & increasing the ratio of scheme/farm advisors to farmers.



Support famers willing to change through improved access to financial support, sharing ideas through cooperation (e.g. Operational Groups) & targeted advice/education packages.

Recommendations from the case studies



Transitional support in terms of financing and increased advice & capacity building during the implementation of resource efficiency actions and changing of farm practices.



Multi-stakeholder engagement between all actors within the rural economy, including farmers, from the start of the RDP measure design & implementation process to improve buy-in.



Improved accessibility of schemes, support & projects to farmers whose skills & in land management not in scheme applications.



Demonstrate long term impacts of resource efficiency actions on the environment & sustainability of the farm business through case studies & the development of reliable indicators.



Piloting new approaches by making the most of opportunities under the cooperation measure as well as LIFE to fund to pilot approaches that can then be mainstreamed into RDPs.



Flexible support systems and measures that allow farmers to adapt and tailor practices during implementation to the needs of their farm and to improve the delivery of results.





Further information on the ENRD TG on Resource Efficient Rural Economy can be found at:

https://enrd.ec.europa.eu/thematic-work/greeningrural-economy/resource-efficiency_en

ENRD Contact Point Rue de la Loi / Wetstraat, 38 (bte 4) 1040 Bruxelles/Brussel BELGIQUE/BELGIË Tel. +32 2 801 38 00 info@enrd.eu

