

French Ministry of Agriculture and Food

Ecoscheme: study case for France

Valérie Metrich-Hecquet

General Director

for Economic and Environmental

Performance of Enterprises



Zafra, 30th of may 2019

The position of France in PAC2020 negotiation

France globally supports the EC proposal on environment architecture

- ✓ Enhanced conditionality: conditionality 2014 2020 + greening 2014 2020
- ✓ Exclude GAEC 5 (nutrient management tool),
- ✓ Change GAEC 8 (return to diversification criterium rather than rotation)
- ✓ Features of the future Ecoscheme :
 - ✓ mandatory for MS and optional for farmers,
 - ✓ funding practices beyond EU minimal requirements (conditionality),
 - ✓ annual commitment
 - ✓ excluded from the capping of direct payments
- ✓ AECM shall be more demanding

Why is France supporting Ecoscheme?

1. Ecoscheme meets *a goal*

- Responds to environmental issues (climate /biodiversity/ water) and the expectations of consumers and citizens
- Accompanies farmers in the ecological transition, expected by citizens
- Enables them to be more competitive and less dependent on inputs

Therefore, it should reward practices that allow to address these issues, beyond the EU minimal requirements

Why is France supporting Ecoscheme?

2. Ecoscheme meets *a need*

- ➤ Need for a tool to support the maximum of farmers

 2d pillar in France =15% of UE budget 12% of areas covered by AECM or organic
- Need for a tool more demanding than conditionality but accessible to the greatest number to achieve a mass effect
- Need for a simpler tool: annual measurement, method of calculating aid (possible lump sum, not only compensation of additional cost and income foregone)
- Need for a progressive tool over time that pays farmers for the services / common goods they supply

Issues versus tools

Climate change = global challenge

- ✓ Reduce greenhouse gases (CH4 N2O) emissions: reduce nitrogen surpluses, improve livestock manure management
 - → other tools (coupled aids, 2nd Pillar)
- ✓ Develop carbon storage: preserve permanent grassland, increase crop diversification, protection of soils
 - → conditionality + ecoscheme?
- ✓ Develop biomass production
 - → other tools

Issues versus tools

Biodiversity = global challenge

- \checkmark reduce artificialization \rightarrow other tools
- \checkmark preserve the permanent grassland \rightarrow conditionality + ecoscheme?
- ✓ preserve landscape features → conditionality + ecoscheme?
- ✓ maintain particular practices → other tools
- ✓ Non productive agro-pastoral surfaces → definition of eligible areas + ecoscheme?

Issues versus tools

Water= local issue

- ✓ water quality: reduce the use of nutrients and pesticides
 - → rather other tools even if ecoscheme could contribute (crop diversification)
- ✓ access to the resource: 5% of UAA in France is irrigated but 14% in PACA region, 12% in Occitanie region
 - → territorial issue, other tools

An exercise in the process of co-construction

Many outstanding questions:

- ✓ remuneration for the service supplied or existing practices (e.g. grasslands)?
- ✓ obligation of means or result ?
- ✓ flat-rate annual aid for a practice, a set of practices verified by the PA *versus* a certification-based approach?
- ✓ at the level of the plot or the farm?
- ✓ obligations to define, level of criteria, ratchet effect ...
- ✓ budget management in the context of the annual performance clearance (risk of under-consumption if level of requirements and level of aid poorly calibrated)

An exercise in the process of co-construction

One certainty:

This Scheme must be simple to implement, meaningful for farmers and citizens, giving priority to administrative controls based on elements already declared by the farmer, without administrative burden

→ <u>Nothing decided at this stage :</u> <u>consultation with stakeholders only begins</u>



