HOW CAN THE NEXT CAP BE A DRIVER FOR SUSTAINABLE FOOD AND FARMING IN EUROPE AND ABROAD?

December 6th 2017 Copenhagen, DK





OUTLINE

The EEB
State of play
The current CAP: fit or not?
A call for a living land
The next CAP



WHO ARE WE?

- •Europe's largest network of environmental citizens' organisations
 - around 140 civil society organisations... including a growing number of European networks
 - ...from more than 30 European countries
- •Over 40 years of EU environmental policy expertise



WHAT ISSUES DO WE FOCUS ON?

- •EEB tackles **Europe's most pressing environmental problems** by agenda setting, monitoring, advising on and influencing the way the EU deals with these issues.
- •We also lead on overarching issues as sustainable development, good governance, participatory democracy and the rule of law in Europe and beyond.
- •To summarize, our areas of work include:
 - Climate and Energy
 - Nature and Sustainable Agriculture
 - Industry and Health
 - Resource Efficiency
 - Sustainability and Governance
 - Global and Regional Policies



STATE OF PLAY

The challenges

BIODIVERSITY

- 60% of protected species and 77% of habitat types: unfavourable conservation status
- 57% decrease in farmland birds since 1980
- Close look at 10 Member States (CZ, DE, FR, HU, IT, PL, RO, ES, UK, NL): low level of biodiversity in 95% of all landscapes
- **Insects:** decline by three quarters of flying insects within less than 30 years

WATER

90% of river basin districts, 50% of surface water bodies-33% of groundwater bodies affected by pollution from farming

AIR

Over **400,000 early deaths** in the EU every year due to air pollution-Farming representing **90%** of ammonia – Methane: **40%** of EU agricultural emissions

CLIMATE

More than 10% GHG emissions from farming

...AND THE COSTS on the environment? Industrialized farming: 3 trillion of EUR a year in the world On average 1,5 billion in France alone



The 'official' numbers, statements

"CAP being 155% greener"!

Around 12 bln a year for greening (30% of Pillar 1)

The CAP "prioritises sustainable food production systems and resilient agricultural practices to improve the ecological performance of EU agriculture"



The 'official' numbers

In Pillar 2:

+/- 50% of Rural Development budget for ecosystems services

17.7% of agricultural land and 3.45% of forest area under management contracts supporting biodiversity and/or landscape



Is greening...green... light green... or grey...?

How much of greening?

50% of land exempted from Ecological focus areas (EFAs), 1/3 of arable land exempted from meaningful (3) crop diversification

Greening in our fields?

More than 70% of EFAs are crops maize monoculture "green"!?

Flexibility used by MS for business as usual and for the least environmental ambitious measures



In Pillar 2:

A 1/3 of 'ecosystem budget' -> Going to non targeted measures 'ANCs'



Pesticides and water legislation.....

OUT of cross compliance!



NOT FIT FOR PURPOSE?

The need for a Fitness Check

Request from over 200 Civil society organisations

Request from the scientific community

Request from 16 MEPs

Request from Juncker's advisor on sustainability



EEB and BirdLife's study

To assess whether the CAP fulfils

- its own objectives
- the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDG 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15)



EEB and BirdLife's study

- •Literature screening: peer-reviewed scientific literature from 2006 onwards, only if directly assessing the CAP and/or specific instruments therein
- Call for evidence via an online survey
- ☐ 864 relevant "candidate" publications enlisted
- \square > 450 publications scanned and inserted into the database



EEB and BirdLife study

Effectiveness: Have the objectives been achieved? Which significant factors contributed to or inhibited progress towards meeting the objectives?

- Efficiency: Are the costs reasonable and in proportion to the benefits achieved? Also considering other, comparable mechanisms?
- Internal Coherence: Do the CAP instruments agree or conflict with each other in terms of objectives, institutions and/or effects?
- External Coherence: Do other policies agree or conflict with the CAP in terms of objectives, institutions and/or effects?
- Relevance: Is the CAP relevant to the challenges faced by EU citizens, farmers and policy makers? Is it using (and supporting) the most updated criteria, tools and knowledge?
- EU Added Value: Does the CAP address challenges better than national-, regional- or local-level solutions?



EEB and birdlife study

Current trends and CAP's performance indicate that sustainability, along the axes of social, ecological and environmental dimensions, has not been achieved and is unlikely to be achieved under current conditions.

Direct Payments as income support receive the largest budget allocation without sufficient justification or clear links to CAP objectives. High criticism is also directed towards inefficiency and inequity of DP distribution, which **do not reflect farmers' needs and the public opinions** as expressed for example in the 2017 Public Consultation.



A CALL FOR A LIVING LAND

Consultation on the future of the CAP



Europe's food and farming system is broken and **258,708** citizens agreed with us in the EU public consultation about reforming the CAP.



THE NEXT CAP

> 60% of the farmers responding to the consultation asked for the agriculture policy to deliver more for the environment and climate change

THE INGREDIENTS FOR THE FUTURE CAP?

Cosmetic changes: NOT enough

Include consumption in the CAP (food)

polluter pays principle

New contract between farmers and society



THE NEXT CAP: RIGHT INGREDIENTS

Gradually phase out Direct Payments and replace by ecosystems' instrument and transition instrument

- + Rural development instrument
- + Sustainable and Healthy Consumption instrument

THE COMMISSION'S COMMUNICATION

- •No recognition of the decline of natural of resources in farming in the state of play
- •Very focused on intensive farming (mandatory components: precision farming, nutrient management plan)
- •Direct Payments still at the core of the proposal (no recognition of the 80% of the responses in the consultation)

THE COMMISSION'S COMMUNICATION

Results based focus

But.....

Lots of flexibility given to the Member States and weak/vague accountability mechanism

Not clear how Member States will set the targets

CONCLUSIONS

Cosmetic changes are not enough

Governance, proper Member States' accountability are necessary for success

THANKS!

HTTP://EEB.ORG/

LINK TO THE FITNESS CHECK STUDY:

HTTP://EEB.ORG/NOT-FIT-FOR-PURPOSE-NGOS-PRESENT-FITNESS-CHECK-OF-THE-COMMON-AGRICULTURAL-POLICY/







