

Objectives

- > To share latest insights of MultiAgri on how to better LINK
 - AGRICULTURE
 - TR
 - 3
- > To e
- > To id



Governing multifunctional agriculture in the EU – how can policies benefit both biodiversity and agriculture?

MULTAGRI WORKSHOP SUMMARY | 2016



Issue

- ↳ other administrative boundaries?
 - ↳ effects of collaboration too small for farmers
- ↳ Collaborative Approach
 - ↳ more for Innovation
 - ↳ already existing (Pilot, etc)
 - ↳ how do we make farmers collaborate into the long of ES provision?
- ↳ might lead to larger scale failures
- ↳ How to transfer the knowledge?

Conclusion

- >> Better Spatial Targeting of EFA/Greening measures, at Regional level would help both agriculture & biodiversity
- >> Decision on EFA-measures is also affected by business-interest
- >> currently discussion on pesticides → in EFA
- >> Keep IT Easy
- > Greening Evaluation: how points can be calculated? budget
- > Link to Climate Change Policy!



What was the workshop about?

On October 12, 2016, the members of the interdisciplinary research project MULTAGRI organised a workshop at the Skåne European Office in Brussels, Belgium. MULTAGRI investigates how governance of agricultural landscapes can promote rural development by harnessing landscape and biological diversity as assets that synergistically promote the production of public goods and sustained intensive agricultural production. The researchers invited selected EU and national experts from government and civil society who are active in the areas of agriculture and nature conservation to a workshop. The purpose of this workshop was to present the results of the project to these experts in order to

conduct a “reality check” by discussing the practical relevance of the research findings to actors who are involved in higher level decision-making.

What came out of the workshop?

The workshop started with an introductory round of all participants and then proceeded with alternating presentations of research results of the different MULTAGRI work packages followed by discussions of these results by all participants. The following table summarises the main findings of the research project.

PRESENTATION	MAIN FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS
MULTAGRI – AN ERANET EFFORT TO ADDRESS SPATIAL CHALLENGES	
<i>Prof Henrik G. Smith (Centre for Environmental and Climate Research (CEC) & Department of Biology, Lund University, Sweden)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Complex ecosystem service cascades are affected by multiple ecological and social processes, each with their own scale relationships. ➤ One size does not fit all.
GOVERNING BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES IN FARMLAND – WHY IS A LANDSCAPE PERSPECTIVE NEEDED?	
Ecological interventions: Why scale matters, and how a landscape perspective helps <i>Dr Juliana Dänhardt (Centre for Environmental and Climate Research (CEC), Lund University, Sweden)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ecological (but also decision-making) processes are complex and occur at multiple scales. → There is no golden scale! ➤ To develop cost-efficient interventions and policies, multiple scales must be taken into account. → We need a landscape perspective! ➤ Both ecological and decision-making processes should be taken into account when developing policies.
IMPACTS OF THE COMMON AGRICULTURAL POLICY (CAP) ON AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND PROVISIONING OF PUBLIC GOODS	
Allocation of support under the CAP: income support, ecosystem services and public goods <i>Prof Felix Schläpfer (Kalaidos University of Applied Sciences, Switzerland)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Currently about 50% of the money spent for the provision of public goods ends up as pure income support to farmers → There is large potential to increase the delivery of public goods – or to reduce spending. ➤ In spending for public goods, principles of public finance should be followed (e.g. matching scale of financial responsibility with the scale where benefits of public goods accrue).
Impacts of Ecological Focus Areas on regional development <i>Dr Amanda Sahrbacher (Leibniz Institute of Agricultural Development in Transition Economies (IAMO), Germany)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ecological Focus Areas (EFAs) fail on delivering environmental benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to flexible rules while implementing EFA measures, EFAs have minor impacts on farms and the environment. • Farmers tend to choose least costly EFA measures and those that are compatible with current agricultural practices. • EFAs are mainly implemented on less productive, marginal fields, which might lead to an additional intensification in productive areas. ➤ What is needed: more ambitious Greening or replacement of Greening by agri-environmental measures (AEM): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greening measures need to be spatially targeted. • The landscape scale needs to be considered → farmer coordination has to be encouraged. • So far, Pillar 2 AEMs allow for better tailoring measures to local conditions.
ALTERNATIVE GOVERNANCE APPROACHES TO ADDRESS SCALE ISSUES IN AGRICULTURAL LANDSCAPES	
Biodiversity in agricultural landscapes: Limitations of the Common Agricultural Policy <i>Prof Julia Leventon (Leuphana University Lüneburg, Germany)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CAP supports fragmentation of actors instead of facilitating ecologically-informed biodiversity management through actor coordination and collaboration. ➤ There is a need for fundamental change in CAP.
Thinking about alternatives: Scenarios for governing biodiversity management <i>Sarah Velten (Leuphana University Lüneburg, Germany)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Alternative approaches for governing biodiversity management are possible, at least theoretically. ➤ Alternative approaches could be different combinations of top-down/centralized or bottom-up/decentralized decision-making and administrative districts vs. ecologically defined areas as physical areas for which decisions are made.
Ways forward: What could be acceptable alternative approaches for governing biodiversity management? <i>Tamara Schaal (Leuphana University Lüneburg, Germany)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In an acceptable alternative governance system, different approaches/scenarios need to be combined. ➤ To make alternative governance approaches acceptable, issues that are relevant to the stakeholders need to be addressed. ➤ Collaboration between different kinds of actors (farmers, researchers, decision-makers, land-use planners etc.) needs to be fostered.

The CAP's objectives

In the discussions of the research findings a great variety of issues was raised. One prominent topic was the question whether the CAP is the right instrument at all to foster biodiversity and ecosystem services management in agricultural landscapes. The reason for the doubts about the usefulness of CAP was that although CAP does include the objective of sustainable natural resource management its main focus is on improving agricultural productivity to support a stable supply of affordable food to consumers as well as ensuring a fair standard of living for the rural community. One suggestion to make the CAP useful for biodiversity and ecosystem services management was to link research findings about and approaches to biodiversity and ecosystems management to the main objectives of the CAP. Another option – which would be more far reaching but also more difficult to achieve – is to try and balance economic stability and the provision of environmental public goods in the objectives of the CAP.

The potential of increased collaboration

Furthermore, the pros and cons of collaboration for biodiversity and ecosystem services management were also discussed, as were knowledge and information needs for these purposes. Collaboration of farmers and other actors and coordination at a landscape scale were mentioned by both the researchers and the invited experts as a possibility to address current shortcomings in biodiversity and ecosystem services management. However, there were also doubts about its feasibility and necessity. These were answered with suggestions of ways to address possible risks of collaborative decision-making for biodiversity and ecosystem services management (e.g. facilitation of collaborative processes by knowledgeable coordinating actors, pre-defining conservation goals and collaboration only for implementing these objectives). It was acknowledged that there already exist promising practical examples of farmer collaboration in the EU that support the provision of environmental public goods. However, it was argued that the CAP does not particularly aim at bolstering the emergence of these initiatives and that they often occur on a voluntary basis. Therefore, the aim is to foster such schemes on a broader scale, as part of the system.

Providing knowledge for decision-making

Regarding information and knowledge needs for biodiversity and ecosystem services management, it was stressed that farmers need clear and concrete information about which type of management or which measures are useful, and where. However, since the necessary knowledge for biodiversity and ecosystem services conservation often is still scarce, such concrete information would be difficult to provide for researchers. As one possible solution, the researchers suggested an approach where different kinds of knowledge are provided at different scales: On the higher levels, decisions would consider mainly general

principles and the more local the scale of decision-making gets, these general principles have to be refined into more detailed and specific knowledge.

Considering the needs of the local and regional level

Other topics mentioned in the discussion were the watering down of policies through competing (national) interests and calls to transfer budget from pillar 1 to pillar 2 of the CAP to be able to design measures better adapted to national and regional contexts. Moreover, it was emphasized that farmers are also driven by motivations other than pure economic gains. Therefore, not only economic aspects need to be considered when assessing farmer uptake of conservation measures but also the local acceptability of these measures and the administrative burdens for farmers.

Better connecting research findings with decision-making

Last but not least, the invited experts gave insights into discussions around CAP that are currently taking place in the policy sphere (such as discussions to remove the ban on pesticide use on EFAs and the upcoming Greening evaluation). Additionally, they offered recommendations as to how MULTAGRI and other research findings can be better communicated to decision-makers. These recommendations included:

- being aware of the policy-cycle and taking advantage of emerging opportunities;
- improving personal contacts and using interactive settings to discuss research results;
- linking research findings and implications to arguments that can help CAP to secure budget;
- also linking biodiversity and ecosystem services management to climate change.

What happens next?

The researchers will write an academic article which will synthesize the results of the different MULTAGRI work packages. The discussions in the workshop will be taken into account in this synthesis paper. Additionally, the MULTAGRI researchers will seek ways to make use of the recommendations of the invited experts in order to make the research results accessible and relevant to decision-makers.

The MULTAGRI team thanks all participants for their participation and valuable contributions!

Contact

Dr Juliana Dänhardt, Centre for Environmental and Climate Research (CEC), Lund University (Sweden)

Prof Julia Leventon, Leuphana University Lüneburg (Germany)

MULTAGRI IS FUNDED BY

