

## **TASK FORCE ON AGRI-ENVIRONMENTAL MEASURES**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

This Task force has been created on the framework of the European Regional Focal Point for Animal Genetic Resources (ERPF) which activities are carried out based upon a Multiyear Programme of Work (MYPOW). Task Forces are established by the Assembly of the ERPF or by the Steering Committee on a temporary basis to solve specific tasks.

MYPOW 2010-2014 includes two Working Groups and three Task Forces among which is included The Task Force on Agri-environmental measures.

This Task force is led by Spain with Isabel García, Head of the group, assisted by Maite Peracho, Carmen Zomeño, Montserrat Castellanos, and María Luisa Ballesteros. Besides there are members from 7 different countries:

- Finland: Prof. Dr. Asko Mäki-Tanila
- France: Ms Lucie Markey
- Germany : Dr. Hermann Schulte-Coerne
- Montenegro : Dr Milan Markovic
- Serbia : Prof. Dr. Suzana Djordjevic Milosevic
- Slovenia : Ms Marija Klopčič
- Turkey: Dr. Yasemin Oner.

### **2. OBJECTIVES**

This Task force aims to analyse the current situation of the agri-environmental measures and the problems faced in their implementation. In view of the results of this survey, TF would like to propose more effective and cost-efficient schemes towards sustainable use and conservation of local breeds with new actions which could be aimed at developing the self-sustainability of local breeds so that they could be maintained without the need for external economic support. In the development of strategies, a combination of production, multi-functional, market and non-market values, including eco-system services, should be a target towards achieving increased profitability within local breeds.

Finally, the TF will analyse the proposal of the new EU Rural Development Regulation, where agri-environmental measures are included, in order to achieve a framework helping to maintain the powerful support for local breeds with encouragement towards higher degrees of self-sustainability.

### **3. METHODOLOGY**

A questionnaire was sent to all members of the TF containing questions aimed to analyse the current status of agri-environmental measures, both within and outside the EU. Finland, Serbia, Slovenia, and Spain sent by email the answer to the questionnaire, Turkey and Germany gave a presentation while attending the meeting of the Task Force in Spain during September 2011. During this meeting (19-20 September), with representatives from Finland, Germany, Slovenia, Turkey and Spain, the different answers to the questionnaire were reviewed, while the agri-environmental measures within the new proposal for a EU Rural Development Regulation were discussed.

We are presenting below a comprehensive summary of the replays to the questionnaire. The original questionnaire, as well as the answers from different countries will be enclosed as Annexes to this report.

#### **4. QUESTIONNAIRE OUTCOME**

##### **4.1. Please, define the main objectives of agri-environmental measures in your country. Order these objectives prioritising their importance:**

Usually, the priorities of the agri-environmental measures objectives are related to the main environmental problems of different countries, such as soil conservation, farm sustainability, sustainable use of natural resources, mountain areas, etc. In EU Member States these priorities are included within CAP objectives. Thus agri-environmental measures are aimed to build a farming system where the sustainable use of natural resources is the central axis. Even countries outside the EU, will direct agri-environmental measures in view of this first goal.

Biodiversity conservation is usually incorporated to agri-environmental measures, although not as a top priority, and is often regarded as one of the best ways to attend the “*sustainable use of natural resources*”, including climate change. However, most countries described the current framework as helpful in order to keep biodiversity. Only Germany specifically highlighted Animal Genetic Resources, in view of keeping its biodiversity and maintaining strategic reserve for future breeding.

##### **4.2. Describe the legal frame for the agri-environmental measures.**

For EU Member States Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 of 20 September 2005 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD), and Commission Regulation No 1974/2006 of 15 December 2006 laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD).

Within Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005, article 39 on Agri-environment payments. Paragraphs 39 (1) – 39 (4), have a general environmental scope, helping farmers “*who make on a voluntary basis agri-environmental commitments*” and they have been used by Member States such as Spain and Germany, to support their local breeds, while covering other environmental objectives.

On the other hand, paragraph 39 (5), where “*Support may be provided for the conservation of genetic resources in agriculture for operations not covered by the provisions under paragraphs 1 to 4*”, is regarded as suitable for support to Farm AnGR. However many countries, like Finland, have not exploited it because of possible overlap in funding, while, other countries (i.e. Spain and Germany) have implemented it to cover specific cases.

Slovenia has based its rural development program in compensatory payments for less favoured areas and agri-environmental measures are instruments which significantly contribute to environmentally, socially and economically sustainable development of rural areas in Slovenia. Thus many of the described measures are based on the four Axis of the Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005, looking for this objective (i.e. article 20 *on measures improving the competitiveness of the agricultural and forestry sector*).

Besides, some EU countries have developed specific national programs; compatible with EU subsidies, while implemented outside Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005, in order to cover special needs.

Non EU countries have developed their own specific legal framework:

- Serbia is providing support to farmers who keep autochthonous breeds, helping organic farmers where subsidies are area or per-head based, and piloting measures for maintaining highland pastures and support to grazing practices in pilot area of West Balkan Mt.
- Turkey has several laws especially for the identification, planning, management and protection of biological diversity as well as natural and cultural assets (i.e. Decree on the Establishment of Environment Protection Institution). Besides, there are some EU funded programs and projects implemented in order to support changes in regulation and increasing the capacity of Turkey on the way to harmonization with EU legislation on development of Rural areas (IPARD (Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance Rural Development)). However, agri-environmental Measures concept is quite new for Turkey. It is still intending to constitute effective legal frame works. Presents legal frameworks focused on conservation of plant genetic resources and landscape organization.

#### 4.3. Describe the main actions within the agri-environmental measures,

This section was aimed to have a view over the main actions but also over definitions used to adopt these measures, and therefore involving criteria for eligibility.

According to answers provided, there is no uniform definition for local or autochthonous breed. Finland, for instance considers **local breeds** “*adaptations of populations stemming from the original populations which were moved to the country. There are also breeds which have been imported to Finland over 100 y ago and which have under intensive selection developed to Finnish breed with a well established population and breeding programme*”, while the Spanish legislation defines **autochthonous breeds** as “*originated in Spain*” while **integrated breeds** “*have been completely integrated to the Spanish animal farm heritage*” (Royal Decree 2129/2008, establishing the breed catalogue and dividing them in different categories).

As for **endangered or not endangered breeds**, at least when related to the access to payments, EU Member States follow rules given in the Commission Regulation No 1974/2006.

Serbia does not provide any specific definition, but says that they are using the same since 2004, when starting with the subsidies program.

As a general rule, in order to be eligible for these payments animal pedigree information is required, through registration systems. Namely, EU countries, Commission Regulation No 1974/2006 directs these measures “*to rear farm animals of local breeds indigenous to the area and in danger of being lost to farming*” (article 27), and “*Number, calculated for all Member States, of breeding females of the same breed available for pure-bred reproduction registered in a herd book kept by an approved breeding organisation recognised by the Member State in accordance with Community zootechnical legislation*” (Annex IV). Support is limited to 200 €/head (including national aids when given outside the EU framework).

Species having access to agri-environmental measures in EU countries are listed in Annex IV of Commission Regulation No 1974/2006 (cattle, sheep, goat, equidae, pigs and avian). In non-EU countries eligible species would be decided according to country priorities and budgetary resources. For instance, Serbia gives access to breeds of cattle, buffalo, horse, donkey, pig, sheep, goat and poultry. Support limits vary from 350 €/LU of Podolian cattle to 2.5 €/LU in poultry.

Agri-environmental measures “*support under Article 39(5) of Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 may cover operations carried out by other beneficiaries than those referred to in Article 39(2) of that Regulation*” (article 28.1 of Commission Regulation No 1974/2006). Besides, “*activities entering in agri-environmental commitments referred to in Article 27(4) of this Regulation shall not be eligible*”

for support under Article 39(5) of Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005”, and “No support shall be granted under Article 39(5) of Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 for activities eligible under the framework programme of the European Community for research, technological development and demonstration activities”. (article 28.2 of Commission Regulation No 1974/2006).

“The operations for the conservation of genetic resources in agriculture eligible for support under Article 39(5) of Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 shall include:

- a) *targeted actions: actions promoting the ex situ and in situ conservation, characterisation, collection and utilisation of genetic resources in agriculture, ...*
- b) *concerted actions promoting the exchange of information for the conservation, characterisation, collection, and utilisation of genetic resources in Community agriculture among competent organisations in the Member States.*
- c) *accompanying actions: information, dissemination and advisory actions involving non-governmental organisations and other relevant stakeholders, training courses and the preparation of technical reports”.*

(Article 28.3 of Commission Regulation No 1974/2006).

Therefore, agri-environmental actions carried out through paragraph 39 (5) can be very useful for the conservation of animal breeds, as proven by Germany that has developed its possibilities, but can be rather confused, especially in terms of subsidy compatibility (as stated by Finland).

Both EU and non-EU countries laid down rules concerning other factor for eligibility such us farm size, number of livestock units per hectare, etc.

#### **4.4. Describe the main results attained by these measures**

Results vary from countries, and even, as explained by Slovenia, by areas, depending on specific circumstances. However, most countries claim that these measures have helped to stop the decline of endangered breeds, and even contributed to increase the number of populations in most of the breeds included in these subsidies.

#### **4.5. Describe the involvement of different stakeholders, administrations, rural communities, etc. in the implementation of these measures**

In most countries administrations (both central and regional) are involved in the implementation and control of these measures. Usually, breeding organisations are involved (in EU countries, for instance, they have to maintain the herd book).

Besides, Serbia mentions local associations and community and Serbia civil society and individual farmers.

#### **4.6. Main factors helping to the success of these measures?**

Most countries relate the success of agri-environmental measures to the subsidy amount and also to the farmer commitment both to the endangered breed and his rural community.

In a lesser extent related research and promotion actions are also listed, as well as support given from “outside” the measures themselves, such as the work of advisory boards and NGOs.

#### **4.7. Main problems making these measures to fail, or at least contributing to a lesser success than expected**

First of all, we should reflect upon the fact that endangered breeds usually have lower economical performances than other breeds. Therefore, agri-environmental measures, at least within the EU, are conceived as voluntary and designed to compensate the farmer for the loss of incomes when choosing one such a breed.

Due to this; farmers should be sure of their final income, therefore they want to be sure that these measures will be long term, ensuring the subsidies. Uncertainty might result in many a farmer retreating from these programs. This problem is clearer in non-EU countries or within the EU, when facing a new proposal for rural development regulation.

In the case of EU subsidies, "*commitments shall be undertaken as a general rule for a period between five and seven years*". This requisite is often regarded by farmers as a problem, especially, when talking about endangered breeds. In this case the need to maintain a fix number of heads can be very difficult, since the substitution of a dead animal can be very difficult.

On the other hand, sometimes, farmers and associations don't want to increase the census in order to maintain subsidies due to the existence oh a maximum limit. Thus consequences are negative because long term the objectives for these breeds should be to have higher census so, the environmental effect will continue. This is one reason why other criteria besides census should be considered.

Lack of collaboration among different stakeholders (i.e. administration and breeding associations), and difficulties for Administration to check if the farmers comply the requirements can also result in the failure of the measures.

#### **4.8. Do you think that the criteria limiting agri-environmental measures recipients to endangered breeds are adequate?**

There is no uniform answer. Some countries find adequate to limit these subsidies to endangered breeds, since farmers rearing them usually face more difficulties. However, other countries believe that other breeds not yet endangered, but not belonging to mainstream production should also benefit from at least some of these measures, since this would help to diversify production and protect the environment.

#### **4.9. Do you think that any autochthonous/local breeds, regardless its census, should become recipient of agri-environmental measures when it fulfils any other requirement demanded to have access to theses measures?**

All countries answer positively to this question. Local breeds in extensive systems equally contribute to the environment. Besides, many farmers of these breeds have very small farms and this would help them. However, this support could depend on the budget (maybe prioritize endangered breeds). Some countries suggest support for engagement in a selection scheme, breed specific product program, breeding program, etc.

However, the question remains, whether subsidies to non-endangered breeds would agree with WTO commitments

#### **4.10. Which criteria could be used to prioritize the recipients of agri-environmental measures?**

Criteria would depend very much on the objectives aimed by these measures. Environmental criteria (related to specificities of countries such as water management, soil erosion, etc.), participation in breeding programs, traditional farming systems, diversification, nature protected areas, total population, are some of the criteria listed by countries.

**4.11. Does your country have indicators to evaluate the success of these measures? Describe them.**

In the EU Rural Development programs have to periodically inform the Commission, and there are evaluations (before, during and after the program). Usually countries use:

- Number of farms
- Number of animals
- Number of programs
- Trends

**4.12. Estimation on the cost and benefit ratio of these measures**

Countries do not have any estimation of the cost/benefit ratio. Although most of them think it could be useful there is no methodology available to calculate it and it seems difficult to develop it. For this, one should to identify all possible costs and benefits and their conversion to a monetary value could be very difficult.

**4.13. How can agri-environmental measures contribute to attain the self sustainability of autochthonous breeds? Which other mechanisms would you implement to support the breeds looking for their sustainability?**

Breed self sustainability is related to its profitability. Usually, endangered breeds are economically less productive and thus they are substituted by foreign more productive breeds.

. Therefore agri-environmental measures should ensure long-term farmer income, via subsidies or through models of balanced farming systems with added value, finding breed-specific products (quality food products, traditional processing methods, rural tourism, or link with other economic activities to provide economic valorisation). In this research programs can be very helpful, and also measures aimed to gain better access to market (i.e. promotion, marketing, etc.).

Breeding programs could also contribute to this goal.

**4.14. Does your country support research, development and innovation programs within Agri-environmental measures?**

Within EU agri-environmental measures cannot support research “*for activities eligible under the framework programme of the European Community for research, technological development and demonstration activities*” (article 28.3 of Commission Regulation No 1974/2006). Article 39 (5) of Regulation No 1698/2005, however can give support to certain operations aimed to the conservation of FAnGR.

Outside agri-environmental measures some countries have developed programs (i.e. breeding, conservation, product specification, traditional farming systems, etc.)

#### **4.15. Agri-environmental measures should be developed in the future within the new CAP (beyond 2013)**

During the TF meeting in Madrid in September this issue was broadly discussed. In general, countries agreed that agri-environmental measures should be kept in the new Regulation on Rural Development.

In view of the different scenarios that can be considered depending on every country and its specificities, they agreed that these measures should be as flexible as possible, allowing Member States to develop the most effective framework for every one.

Countries considered also advisable that when developing the criteria, guidelines, etc. for the implementation of these measures, the point of view of all Member States should be taken into account in order to consider all these specificities.

The group considered also that the ERFP could be very useful to advise the Commission in matters related to the FAnGR and specifically on how agri-environmental measures can contribute to the conservation of these resources.

Finally, the TF found very interesting to explore deeper the possibilities of Article 39 (5) of Regulation No 1698/2005.

The proposal that Commission has submitted, in principle, maintains these measures and the TF group agreed to submit a letter to the Secretariat ERFP explaining the point of view of the TF and suggesting the Secretariat to circulate the letter among the countries for its consideration and to decide on the possible submission of the letter to the appropriate EU organisations.

### **5. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE MEASURES**

1. Agri-environmental measures are generally regarded as helpful for the conservation of FAnGR.
2. However, in most countries conservation is not their first objective, since environmental priorities are the driven force behind them.
3. Countries applied them quite different according to their specificities. It is important to signal that not objectives, prioritising criteria, but also some of the definitions (i.e. local autochthonous breed) vary among countries.
4. Flexibility in the EU framework, in order to adapt the measures to country specificities and priorities are essential to ensure the success.
5. Very strict commitments difficult to fulfil, such as maintaining a fix number of animal of breeds with a very low census, during 5-7 years or complicated administrative documentation to apply to receive subsidies, can make many farmers to retreat, therefore should be revised.
6. There can be some difficulties for the Administration to attribute the relatively small payments to many farmers and to control the compliance in farms. So different options could be explored (for instance subsidies through associations of breeders).
7. The involvement of administrations, associations, farmers, and all stakeholders in general is important, together with the existence of good communication channels among them. There should be also a link in E.U between the STAR Committee and the Zootechnical Committee to define technical criteria on breeds and between the rural and agro-zootechnical legislation.
8. Breeding programs should be used as prioritising criteria to gain access to these measures, in two ways: for the conservation of endangered breeds or for the improvement of other local breeds if possible.

9. The possibility of all local breeds even if they are not endangered having access to some of these measures together with the criteria to classify endangered breeds should be considered, since this would diversify production from mainstream breeds and help environmental commitments.
10. In order to achieve *breed self sustainability* it is important to ensure sufficient farmer incomes, therefore, agri-environmental measures framework should contribute to this long term stability (therefore measures should cover long periods of time).
11. It is important to focus the subsidies on active farmers, maintaining the breeds in production, to find a necessary balance between the conservation of breeds and environment and the profitability of holdings orientated to the market.
12. To achieve this *breed self sustainability* it is important to explore different options: quality breed specific products (investigating food, and other possibilities), marketing, promotion, traditional farming systems, breeding
13. Indicators are usually based on numbers of census, farms, etc. and they do not consider other benefits (such as improvement of environmental conditions by keeping these breeds together with traditional farming systems).
14. Therefore, there are no studies on cost/benefit ratio, since it is very difficult to calculate, although it could be useful.
15. Research may help to make these measures more successful (i.e. by finding better farming systems, quality products, breeding programs).

As a general conclusion, more work could be done on finding specific ways to attain breed sustainability and to focus properly the future CAP. There are several possibilities that could be explored; three can be suggested as starting points:

1. Develop measures, normative and methodology allowing making policy and comprehensive studies to identify "*breed specific quality products*"; and the best way (marketing, promotion, breeding programmes, etc.) to use them to maintain or reach self-sustainability
2. Develop benefit/cost studies to identify benefits generated by local breeds and traditional farming systems, quantify them and explain to consumers and civil society to make them demand local breed products, helping to their self-sustainability.
3. Active participation in the framework of EU from the ERF for the future measures first to remind EU of the necessity of continuous and long-term support for many endangered breeds, and then to help to maintain the adequate support of breeds with a coordinated policy without overlapping.



#### 4. ANNEX 1 QUESTIONNAIRE

##### Questionnaire on Agri-environmental measures

1. Please, define the main objectives of agri-environmental measures in your country. Order the objectives prioritising their importance:
  - a. Farm sustainability
  - b. Biodiversity
  - c. Land organisation
  - d. Rational use of natural resources
  - e. Climate change: Adaptation and mitigation
  - f. Others (specify)
2. Describe the legal frame for the agri-environmental measures
3. Describe the main actions within the agri-environmental measures, including
  - a. Breed definitions
    - i. local breed,
    - ii. autochthonous breed,
    - iii. etc
  - b. Species having access to these measures
  - c. Requisites to benefit from these measures:
    - i. Farm: size, land availability, having animal health programs, etc.
    - ii. Farmer
    - iii. Breed
    - iv. Breed associations and logbooks
    - v. Animals (Age, sex, etc). Please indicate how many animals having access to these measures
    - vi. Environment: Special land protection, mountains, wetlands, forestry, etc. Please indicate total surface eligible
    - vii. Breeding programs
    - viii. Others (specify)
  - d. Obligations that should be signed/agreed in order to be entitled to benefit from these measures
  - e. Support to the measures
    - i. Institutional and non-institutional
    - ii. Financial/non financial
4. Support to research, development and innovation programs within Agri-environmental measures:
  - a. Breeding
  - b. Conservation: in farm, ex situ, etc.
  - c. Product diversification
  - d. Others: describe
5. Describe the main results attained by these measures
6. Describe the involvement of different stakeholders, administrations, rural communities, etc. in the implementation of these measures.
7. Which are the main factors helping to the success of these measures? Please, describe whether there are actions/measures not included within the agri-environmental but related to them and contributing to achieve objectives listed in number 1.
8. Which are the main factors making these measures to fail, or at least contributing to a lesser success than expected?
9. Does your country have indicators to evaluate the success of these measures? Describe them.

10. Does your country have any estimation on the cost and benefit ratio of these measures?

Taking into account the assessment of the current Agri-environmental framework, how do you think Agri-environmental measures should be developed within the new CAP?

1. Lines/measures that should be kept. Justify your answer.
2. Lines/measures that should be deleted. Justify your answer.
3. Lines/measures that should be incorporated. Justify your answer.
4. Lines/measures that should be kept but have problems and, therefore, should be change. Please, describe these problems and possible solutions.

From your point of view, how can agri-environmental measures contribute to attain the self sustainability of autochthonous breeds?

ANNEX II SPAIN

## **CUESTIONARIO SOBRE MEDIDAS AGROAMBIENTALES** **(SG de Programas y Coordinación)**

---

**Se entiende que la encuesta va dirigida a las medidas que tienen que ver con razas autóctonas, no obstante en algunos apartados se proporcionará información sobre medidas agroambientales de manera general, todo ello dentro de la política de desarrollo rural europea.**

**1. Por favor, defina los principales objetivos de las medidas agroambientales en su país, priorizando su importancia:**

De carácter general: los que se establecen en el Reglamento (CE) 1698/2005 y sus modificaciones, sobre ayudas al desarrollo rural con cargo al FEADER, así como en el Reglamento 1974/2006 y sus modificaciones, por el que se establecen disposiciones de aplicación del anterior.

De carácter particular: los principales objetivos para España de las medidas agroambientales, tal y como se establece en el "Plan Estratégico Nacional de Desarrollo Rural 2007/2013", son los siguientes:

- ✓ Ahorro y mejora de la calidad del agua
- ✓ Protección y conservación el suelo
- ✓ Conservación y mejora de la biodiversidad
- ✓ Lucha contra el cambio climático y el fomento de las energías renovables
- ✓ Mantenimiento del paisaje agrario

Posteriormente, las Comunidades Autónomas fijan en sus PDRs las prioridades que corresponda en función de las características físicas, biológicas y sociales de sus territorios.

En concreto, las medidas sobre razas autóctonas en peligro de extinción van dirigidas hacia la biodiversidad.

A continuación se incluyen algunos comentarios sobre los puntos a que hace referencia la encuesta:

a. Sostenibilidad de la explotación agraria: las medidas agroambientales pretenden, en general, introducir en las explotaciones agrarias métodos de producción compatibles con el medio ambiente y la conservación del campo.

b. Beneficios ambientales (prevención de incendios, la erosión del suelo, etc): se contemplan medidas específicas orientadas a conseguir estos objetivos a través del fomento de sistemas de explotación agrícola y manejo ganadero sostenibles: rotación de cultivo, agricultura de conservación, potenciación de la agricultura y la ganadería extensivas, etc., control de las cargas ganaderas, etc.

c. Biodiversidad (teniendo en cuenta los recursos genéticos tanto de carácter general o de los animales): todos los PDRs contemplan sub medidas destinadas a la conservación de los recursos genéticos ganaderos, dirigidas apoyar las razas locales que se encuentran en peligro de extinción, definidas conforme a lo establecido en el anexo IV del Reglamento (CE) 1975/2006.

d. Ordenación del territorio: las medidas agroambientales se circunscriben a la explotación agraria por lo que entre sus objetivos principales no figuran aquellos que están relacionados con la ordenación de territorio. Tampoco tienen especial relevancia en este ámbito el fomento de las razas autóctonas en peligro de extinción.

e. Uso racional de los recursos naturales: en todos los PDRs existen actuaciones encaminadas a promover el uso racional de los recursos naturales, principalmente de agua, suelo y aire, a través de medidas tales como las de agricultura ecológica, de producción integrada, de lucha contra la erosión, etc.

f. El cambio climático: adaptación y mitigación: el Marco Nacional de Desarrollo Rural Español, a partir de su última modificación y como consecuencia del Chequeo Médico de la PAC, contempla, fundamentalmente en el ámbito del eje 2, dar respuesta a los retos que plantea el previsible cambio climático, principalmente a través de las ayudas sobre mitigación de la desertización y la prevención de incendios forestales.

No obstante, diversas medidas agroambientales que se vienen aplicando prácticamente desde el inicio de estos programas, allá por el año 1994, tienen una repercusión muy directa sobre este objetivo, tales como aquellas que tienen que ver con la lucha contra la erosión y la introducción de nuevos sistemas de manejo de suelo y del agua: extensificación agrícola y ganadera, producción ecológica e integrada, fomento de la biodiversidad, etc.

## **2. Describe el marco jurídico de las medidas agroambientales.**

a) Legislación Comunitaria:

- Reglamento(CE)1698/2005, del Consejo y sus modificaciones
- Reglamento (CE) 1974/2006 y sus modificaciones, de aplicación del anterior
- Reglamento 1975/2006 y sus modificaciones, de aplicación del Reglamento (CE) 1698/2005 en materia de controles y de la condicionalidad en materia de desarrollo rural

- Directrices estratégicas comunitarias de desarrollo rural (Decisión 2006/144/CE)

b) Legislación nacional:

- Plan Estratégico Nacional de Desarrollo Rural para el período de programación 2006/2013
- Marco Nacional de Desarrollo Rural 2007/2013
- 17 Programa de Desarrollo Rural, uno por Comunidad Autónoma.
- Normativa de las Comunidades Autónomas que desarrolla lo establecido en los PDRs en materia de gestión, verificabilidad y controles de las distintas medidas de desarrollo rural, que contemplan cada uno de los PDRs.

Nota: no se entiende bien lo referente a las medidas para coordinar los dos sistemas y la forma de controlar la aplicación y los mecanismos para evitar la superposición de acciones y sobrefinanciar sobre todo en las razas de animales. Todos los PRDs recogen las posibles incompatibilidades que puedan existir entre sus medidas entre sí y entre otros programas y fondos. En concreto, la naturaleza de la medida de razas ganaderas en peligro de extinción impide la existencia de incompatibilidades con otras líneas de ayuda.

En todo caso, la Comisión se asegura (en lo que tiene que ver con desarrollo rural) durante la aprobación de los programas de desarrollo rural que no exista duplicidad de ayudas. Es decir, se debe de dejar claro en los propios programas la imposibilidad de una posible doble financiación por dos fuentes distintas, no sirven medidas de tipo cruce de base de datos, puesto que no puede existir la posibilidad de doble "ventanilla".

**3. Describir las principales acciones incluidas dentro de las medidas agroambientales, en el caso de que existan:**

- a) Las definiciones de raza: las se definen como tales en los respectivos PDRs. El peligro de extinción se define en función de los efectivos totales de hembras reproductoras y se fijan en el anexo IV del Reglamento (CE)1974/2006, de aplicación del Reglamento 1698/2005.
- b) Especies y razas que tienen acceso a estas ayudas: todas aquellas consideradas en peligro de extinción, conforme a lo que se especifica en el anexo IV del Reglamento (CE)1974/2006 y que figuran en cada uno de los PDRs.
- c) Requisitos para beneficiarse de esas medidas: los que se establezcan en el PDR, entre los que destacan por su importancia los siguientes:
  - Estar catalogada como raza autóctona pura
  - Pertener a una asociación ganadera cuyos fines sean la mejora y conservación de las razas autóctonas.
  - Inscripción en el Libro de Registro Oficial de la Raza correspondiente o, en su defecto, certificación por la Asociación de Ganaderos reconocida oficialmente.

- Mantener en pureza los efectivos reproductores machos y hembras de estas razas.
- Participar en un programa de mejora genética, con la obligación de aportar información para seguimiento de la raza, así como para elaboración de valoraciones.
- Explotación: cada documento de programación define los requisitos para beneficiarse de estas ayudas, salvaguardando siempre lo establecido al respecto en la legislación comunitaria, nacional y regional.
- Agricultores (edad, sexo, ...): las ayudas a razas autóctonas en peligro de extinción no limitan o priorizan su acceso por la condición del agricultor.
- Asociaciones de criadores y libros genealógicos de la raza: condición imprescindible para acceder a estas ayudas es la pertenencia de la ganadería beneficiaria a una asociación de criadores y la inscripción de los efectivos auxiliables en el Libro Genealógico de la raza correspondiente.
- Medio ambiente: protección especial de la tierra, montañas, humedales, bosques, etc. Por favor, indique la superficie total elegible: los PDRs definen los efectivos mínimos de ganado y exigen el mantenimiento de esos efectivos durante toda la vigencia del contrato agroambiental. También pueden incluir compromisos relacionados con el manejo de pastizales y ganados.
- Programas de mejora: Uno de los compromisos suele estar relacionado con la participación en programas de mejora genética, con la obligación de aportar información para seguimiento de la raza, así como para elaboración de valoraciones.

d) Compromisos que deben ser firmados / acordados a fin de tener derecho a beneficiarse de estas medidas: cada PDR establece los compromisos generales y particulares de cada una de las medidas agroambientales. El beneficiario firma un contrato agroambiental con una duración mínima de cinco años, esta duración mínima es una exigencia reglamentaria.

e) Apoyo a las medidas:

La ayuda viene especificada en cada uno de los PDRs, debiendo ser siempre inferiores a las que fija el Reglamento (CE)1698/2005. El cálculo se hace por lucro cesante y pérdida de ingreso, como también especifica la reglamentación comunitaria.

#### **4. Describe los principales resultados alcanzados por estas medidas:**

La submedida de razas autóctonas en peligro de extinción se viene aplicando en España desde el primer momento de la puesta en marcha de este tipo de programas y medidas, esto es, desde la entrada en vigor del R.D.51/1995, lo que supuso un apoyo cierto a las ganaderías que conservaban efectivos de estas razas como a las asociaciones y a los libros genealógico, que, de lo contrario, hubieran estado expuestos a la desaparición, a favor de otras especies y razas más productivas.

A finales del año 2006, fin del período de programación anterior, los efectivos acogidos a esta submedida alcanzaban la cifra de 42.759 UGMs, en 2.709 explotaciones.

**5. Describa la participación de los diferentes actores, las administraciones, las comunidades rurales, etc, en la aplicación de estas medidas:**

Las ayudas a razas autóctonas en peligro de extinción se conceden a los ganaderos que explotan las razas que, a tal efecto, se contemplan en cada uno de los PDRs y que cumplen con los compromisos establecidos. La gestión de estas medidas corresponde a la Autoridad de Gestión del PDR, órgano constituido en el seno de cada una de las Comunidades Autónomas.

De manera general, y aunque esta pregunta debería ser formulada a las autoridades de gestión de las CCAA, existe un Comité de Seguimiento que debe aprobar las modificaciones de los programas de desarrollo rural. En dichos comités forma parte además de las administraciones implicadas, las organizaciones agrarias más representativas, entre otros. Por lo que son consultados respecto a todo lo que tiene que ver con los programas de desarrollo rural.

**6. ¿Cuáles son los principales factores que ayudan al éxito de estas medidas? Por favor, describa si existen acciones / medidas no incluidas dentro de las agroambientales, pero que estén relacionadas con ellas y que contribuyan a alcanzar los objetivos enumerados en el número 1:**

Se desconoce. Deberían responder los gestores directos de las mismas en las CCAA y los agricultores/ganaderos a los que van dirigidas su opinión. En todo caso, la medida agroambiental dentro de la reglamentación comunitaria no determina requisitos y compromisos concretos en ningún tipo de actuación, corresponde a la autoridad de gestión competente el diseño de la submedida que mejor se ajuste a sus necesidades, siempre cumpliendo la reglamentación existente, por lo que las mismas se pueden ir modificando o adaptando.

**7. ¿Cuáles son los problemas principales que hacen que estas medidas fallen, o al menos tengan a un éxito menor de lo esperado?:**

Además de remitirnos a lo dicho en el apartado anterior, un problema general para el mantenimiento de este tipo de razas, que las administraciones lo fomentan con el objetivo de conservar la biodiversidad, es, exclusivamente, de rentabilidad, por lo que siempre estará en función de que la prima concedida compense las diferencias de rentabilidad existentes entre este tipo de explotación y otros alternativos.

Hay que considerar que las medidas agroambientales son de carácter voluntario para el agricultor, éste decide si acogerse o no a las mismas. En este sentido, recordar que el cálculo de la prima se basa en el análisis del lucro cesante o pérdida de ingreso que el agricultor/ganadero asume al acogerse a la medida en cuestión.

**8. ¿Cree usted que los criterios de limitaciones agroambientales a los destinatarios de las medidas de las razas en peligro son los adecuados?**

**9. ¿Cree usted que cualquier raza autóctonas/locales, independientemente de su censo, debe convertirse en destinatario de las medidas agroambientales cuando se cumple cualquier otro requisito exigido para acceder a esas medidas?:**

Las ayudas que se conceden a través de esta vía están condicionadas a lo que al respecto del número de efectivos se establece en el anexo IV del Reglamento (CE) 1975/2006, que tiene como objetivo el mantenimiento de la biodiversidad. No obstante, existen otras medidas agroambientales, relacionadas con el mantenimiento de los ecosistemas y la lucha contra la erosión, por ejemplo, que se fundamentan en el aprovechamiento racional de los recursos naturales con razas autóctonas, por ser las mejor adaptadas a esos ecosistemas y, por tanto, las más idóneas para cumplir esos fines.

**10. En su opinión, ¿qué criterios se podrían utilizar para dar prioridad a los destinatarios de las medidas agroambientales?:**

Dependerá, como se ha dicho anteriormente, de los objetivos que se pretendan alcanzar, todos ellos relacionados con la conservación del medio ambiente y el mantenimiento del campo: biodiversidad de fauna y flora, doméstica y salvaje, lucha contra la erosión, contaminación de suelos y agua, cambio climático, etc. Así como, también, es necesario tener en cuenta, de cara a optimizar los recursos, las características de los actores encargados de ponerlas en marcha. También hay que considerar donde se ubica la explotación, en zonas desfavorecidas, en zonas Natura 2000, etc.

**11. ¿Tiene su país indicadores para evaluar el éxito de estas medidas? Describirlo.:**

Cualquier medida de desarrollo rural tiene una serie de indicadores, los cuales están establecidos en la reglamentación comunitaria y de los cuales hay que informar periódicamente a la Comisión. Además hay que recordar que los programas de desarrollo rural se vienen evaluando desde hace años. Existiendo evaluaciones ex - ante, intermedias y ex – post, para hacer un seguimiento en la ejecución y conocer los impactos de las medidas sobre el territorio.

Los indicadores principales para la evaluación del éxito de la medida a las razas autóctonas en peligro son, fundamentalmente los principales los siguientes:

- Número de explotaciones agrarias que reciben ayudas
- UGM auxiliados por pagos ambientales
- Número de animales en el programa
- Número total de contratos

**12. ¿Tiene su país alguna estimación sobre el costo y beneficio de estas medidas?:**

No. Se desconoce sin alguna CCAA lo ha realizado

**13. Desde su punto de vista, ¿cómo pueden las medidas agroambientales contribuir a alcanzar la auto sostenibilidad de las razas autóctonas? ¿Qué otros mecanismos a implementar para apoyar a las razas en busca de su sostenibilidad?:**

En primer lugar, lo que sería necesario plantearse es por qué existen las razas autóctonas y el interés por su mantenimiento; posteriormente, habría que analizar cuál es el motivo por el que

puedan estar siendo sustituidas por razas foráneas y, finalmente, establecer un programa integral que tienda a conseguir la auto sostenibilidad y en qué medida. Las medidas agroambientales no pueden conseguir este objetivo por sí solas.

**14. ¿Apoya su país la investigación, desarrollo e innovación dentro de medidas agroambientales:**

No se entiende bien que se pregunta. Las medidas agroambientales no pueden apoyar temas relacionados con la investigación, aspecto que se escapa de la propia aplicación de las medidas agroambientales, pero si puede contemplarse bajo lo que determina el reglamento operaciones de conservación de recursos genéticos mediante actividades de fomento de la conservación, que fomenten el intercambio de información, actividades divulgativas, etc.

**15. Teniendo en cuenta la evaluación del actual marco de medidas agroambientales, ¿cómo cree que medidas agroambientales deben desarrollarse en el futuro dentro de la nueva PAC (más allá de 2013)?:**

Las medidas agroambientales vienen aplicándose en la UE desde la reforma de la PAC del año 1992, manteniendo prácticamente desde entonces el mismo formato: pagos para compensar las pérdidas de ingresos y los incrementos de costes. La reglamentación comunitaria, como es lógico, no entra en la clase de medida a aplicar, pues esta circunstancia está en función de las características físicas y biológicas que se dan en un estado o en una región determinados, que son los responsables de fijarlas.

Por tanto, para el diseño de una medida agroambiental, únicamente será necesario tener en cuenta lo que se establece al respecto en la Reglamentación comunitaria al respecto (en este periodo de programación en los Reglamentos 1986/2005 del Consejo y 1974/2006 de la Comisión) y en la Decisión del Consejo sobre las directrices estratégicas comunitarias de desarrollo rural para el Período de programación de 2007–2013: mantenimiento de la biodiversidad y la preservación de los sistemas agrarios y forestales de gran valor medioambiental, agua, y cambio climático, traducido en las siguientes recomendaciones:

- Fomentar servicios medioambientales y prácticas agropecuarias respetuosas con los animales.
- Proteger los paisajes rurales.
- Luchar contra el cambio climático
- Reforzar la aportación de la agricultura ecológica.

Parece claro que de la Comunicación de la Comisión sobre la PAC en el horizonte 2020, la medida agroambiental seguirá siendo una medida importante dentro de la programación de desarrollo rural para el periodo 2014-2020 y que seguirá correspondiente al Estado miembro o región de que se trate el diseño de las submedidas que consideren básicas para seguir desempeñando una función importante a la hora de apoyar el desarrollo sostenible de las zonas rurales y responder a la demanda cada vez mayor de servicios medioambientales por parte de la sociedad.



En este sentido, y de manera general para todas las submedidas, hay que indicar que el cambio que se produzca en la aplicación de la PAC a nivel de primer pilar afectará al diseño de las posibles submedidas agroambientales puesto que el pago “greening” del primer pilar supondrá un cambio en lo que desde las agroambientales se considera la “baseline” y un cambio, por tanto, en la prima a considerar bajo la medida agroambiental.

A esto habría que unir la aplicación del futuro artículo 68 dentro de la parte ambiental que ha estado causando problemas de delimitación entre primer y segundo pilar en este periodo de programación y que habrá que tener en cuenta de cara al futuro de la PAC.

Madrid, 7 de julio de 2011

## QUESTIONNAIRE ON AGRI-ENVIRONMENTAL MEASURES

1. Please, define the main objectives of agri-environmental measures in your country. Order these objectives prioritising their importance:
  - a. Farm sustainability
  - b. Environment benefits: Fire prevention, soil erosion, etc.
  - c. Biodiversity (considering both general or animal genetic resources)
  - d. Land organisation
  - e. Rational use of natural resources
  - f. Climate change: Adaptation and mitigation
  - g. Others (specify)

The main objectives of agri-environmental measures in Serbia are:

1. To organize farm sustainability in mountain and rural area. Sustainable use of animal genetic resources for agriculture and food production, is proposed as the best strategy for preserving their diversity. The concept of sustainable use has economic, ecological and socio-cultural dimension and contributes to food security, rural development, increase employment opportunities and improving living standards of people.
  2. Conservation animal genetic resources and protecte biodiversity. Preservation and protection of biodiversity, in addition to preserving the environment, is undoubtedly the most important - a strategic task in the global protection of nature and the environment.
  3. Rational use of natural resources, especially natural pastures in protected areas.
2. Describe the legal frame for the agri-environmental measures.

For European Member States both Regulation (EC) 1698/2005, and any national complementary provision, should be considered. Then, comment on the measures to coordinate both systems and how to control implementation and mechanisms to avoid overlapping actions and overfund particularly on animal breeds.

According to the Serbian Buget Law, Serbia is providing support to farmers who keep autochthonous breeds (subsidies programme per head). The second measure is targeting organic farmers where subsidies are area or per-head based. Serbia also piloted measures for maintaining highland pastures and support to grazing practices in pilot area of West Balkan Mt. The masures drafted for the future implementation in IPARD also tackle in addition to existing measures, support to HN VF.

3. Describe the main actions within the agri-environmental measures, including, when you have them:
  - h. Breed definitions (when you have and include your opinion on the value of these terms as implementing criteria)
    - i. local breed
    - ii. autochthonous/native breed, (we use these definitions from 2004 years, when we started with the subsidies programme)

- iii. endangered/at risk breed, (we use these definitions from 2004 years, when we started with the subsidies programme)
- iv. etc
- i. Species and breeds having access to these measures
  - Cattle: Podolian cattle, Busha cattle
  - Buffalo: Domestic buffalo
  - Horse: Domestic-Mountain Pony, Nonius
  - Donkey: Balkan Donkey
  - Pig: Mangalitsa, MORavka, Resavka
  - Sheep: Pirot sheep, Karakachan sheep, Krivovirska sheep, Lipska sheep, Bardoka sheep, Vlashko-vitoroga sheep, Chokan Tsigai sheep
  - Goat: Balkan goat
  - Poultry: Svrlijig Hen, Banat Naked Neck Hen, Sombor Kapava Hen
- j. Requisites to benefit from these measures:
  - i. Farm: size (400 average number), land availability (not available), having animal health programs (all animals are under veterinary control and have health programme through the annually vaccinations) , etc.
  - ii. Farmer (Age, sex, ... not available)
  - iii. Breed associations and genealogical herd books (there are several breed organisation and main so called "Association of the Old Breeds in Serbia". The herd book is managed by the institutions authorized and controlled by the Ministry of Agriculture)
  - iv. Animals (Age, sex, etc). Please indicate how many animals having access to these measures

In 2010 the following number of animals has had access to these measures:

Breed	No of animals
Podolian cattle	190 (cattle and bulls)
Busha cattle	240 (cattle and bulls)
Domestic buffalo	65 (cattle and bulls)
Domestic Mountain Pony	70 (mare, stallions and foals)
Nonius	20 (mare, stallions and foals)
Balkan Donkey	155 (mare and stallions)
Mangalitsa pig	245 (sows and boars)
Moravka pig	25 (sows and boars)
Resavka pig	20 (sows and boars)
Pirot sheep, Karakachan sheep, Krivovirska sheep, Lipska sheep, Bardoka sheep, Vlashko-vitoroga sheep, Chokan Tsigai sheep	1600 (sheep and rams)
Balkan goat	170 (goats and capricorns)
Poultry: Svrlijig Hen, Banat Naked Neck, Sombor Kapava	170 ( hens and roosters)

- v. Environment: Special land protection, mountains, wetlands, forestry, etc. Please indicate total surface eligible (Based on the applied measures of the institutional nature conservation during more than six decades, the conserved areas in Serbia currently spread on 518,003 ha, or 5.86 percent of the territory of Serbia. The Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia ("Official Gazette of Republic of Serbia" no. 88/10) predicts that about 10% of the total area of Serbia is to be conserved by 2015. and in 2021. about 12% of the territory of Serbia should be under some kind of protection).
- vi. Breeding programs (breeding programme exist and implemented by responsible institutions and farmers)
- vii. Others (specify)
- k. Obligations that must be signed/agreed in order to be entitled to benefit from these measures
  1. Farmers must be registered in main Register of Agriculture Farms
  2. Animals must be controlled by the breeding organizations who are responsible for the manage of the herd books
  3. Animals must be registered in the main Register of Autochthonous breeds
- l. Support to the measures
  - i. Institutional and non-institutional
  - ii. Financial/non financial (including Euro/UGM) (amount in Euro/per head in 2010 year)
    - Podolian cattle 350
    - Busha cattle 200
    - Domestic buffalo 90
    - Domestic Mountain Pony, Nonius 200
    - Balkan Donkey 35
    - Mangalitsa pig 40
    - Moravka pig 80
    - Resavka pig 100
    - Sheep 24
    - Goat 20
    - Poultry 2,5
- m. Your opinion about census limits (both maximum and minimum) and financing/UGM of the breed to benefit from these measures.
 

Minimum breeding animals for financial support:

  - Cattle 5
  - Buffalo 3
  - Horse 1
  - Balkan donkey 5
  - Pig 10
  - Sheep 20
  - Goat 20
  - Poultry 50

Adequate for the moment. No possibility to increase limits

4. Describe the main results attained by these measures

We have increased the number of the populations in all breeds.

5. Describe the involvement of different stakeholders, administrations, rural communities, etc. in the implementation of these measures.

Main role belong to the Ministry of agriculture, individual farmers and few branch organisations of the civil society

6. Which are the main factors helping to the success of these measures? Please, describe whether there are actions/measures not included within the agri-environmental but related to them and contributing to achieve objectives listed in number 1.

Subsidies provided is the driving force; also previously existing support to research; finally media and promotion in media

7. Which are the main problems making these measures to fail, or at least contributing to a lesser success than expected?

There is a lack of multiannual planning for offering firm support to farmers. That makes them unsecure, and from time to time we are losing them, since Government is changing amounts for support every year. Uncertainty is creating lost of problem to make conservation programs sustainable. From 2004 until today for which period Serbian ministry of agriculture was implementing these measures the results are more than expected considering the money invested and uncertainty mentioned.

8. Do you think that the criteria limiting agri-environmental measures recipients to endangered breeds are adequate?

Yes

9. Do you think that any autochthonous/local breeds, regardless its census, should become recipient of agri-environmental measures when it fulfils any other requirement demanded to have access to these measures?

It should, but that depend of available budget.

10. In your opinion, which criteria could be used to prioritize the recipients of agri-environmental measures?

The total number of population.

Nature protected areas and farmers growing autochthonic animals and maintaining HNMF areas

11. Does your country have indicators to evaluate the success of these measures? Describe them.

We have monitoring system mostly following change in number of protected breeds populations every year

12. Does your country have any estimation on the cost and benefit ratio of these measures?  
No
13. From your point of view, how can agri-environmental measures contribute to attain the self sustainability of autochthonous breeds? Which other mechanisms would you implement to support the breeds looking for their sustainability?  
Support to research which will provide models for balanced farming systems with added value through high quality processing of products, rural tourism or link with other economic activities to provide economic valorisation
14. Does your country support research, development and innovation programs within Agri-environmental measures:
- n. Breeding (government support breeding programme)
  - o. Conservation: in farm, ex situ, etc. (government support in situ conservation. Ex situ programme is not used at the moment)
  - p. Product diversification
  - q. Others: describe
15. Taking into account the assessment of the current Agri-environmental framework, how do you think Agri-environmental measures should be developed in the future within the new CAP (beyond 2013)?  
Hard to estimate, having poorer measures in Serbia than CAP itself provides to EU members
- a. Lines/measures that should be kept. Justify your answer.
  - b. Lines/measures that should be deleted. Justify your answer.
  - c. Lines/measures that should be incorporated. Justify your answer.
  - d. Lines/measures that should be kept but have problems and, therefore, should be change. Please, describe these problems and possible solutions.
  - e. In the case of EU Member States, considering international agreements or commitments subscribed by the EU (i.e. FAO/CBD), which are the lines/measures that should be set up to support animal genetic resources taking into account their advantages/add value, within the following legal frames:
    - a. CAP-Rural development?
    - b. Guidelines for aids to livestock?
    - c. Commission Regulation 1857/2006?
16. Do you have any other comments?

## QUESTIONNAIRE ON AGRI-ENVIRONMENTAL MEASURES

### *comments by Asko Mäki-Tanila, MTT Agrifood Research Finland*

1. Please, define the main objectives of agri-environmental measures in your country. Order these objectives prioritising their importance:
  - r. Farm sustainability
  - s. Environment benefits: Fire prevention, soil erosion, etc.
  - t. Biodiversity (considering both general or animal genetic resources)
  - u. Land organisation
  - v. Rational use of natural resources
  - w. Climate change: Adaptation and mitigation
  - x. Others (specify)

The Rural Development Programme has been prepared to implement Finland's Rural Development Strategy. Measures have been drawn up at the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry by broadly based working groups, and circulated widely for comments among stakeholders and the public.

The objectives of the EU-cofinanced Rural Development Programme for Mainland Finland 2007-2013 is to keep the Finnish countryside viable and active, to improve the environment, and to ensure the sustainable use of renewable natural resources. During the programming period 2007-2013 rural development will take place under a single programme. So far the same measures have been implemented under six different programmes.

The Rural Development Programme consists of four axes:

- Axis 1) Improving the competitiveness of the agricultural and forestry sectors
- Axis 2) Improving the environment and the countryside
- Axis 3) Improving the quality of life in rural areas and encouraging diversification
- Axis 4) Applying the Leader approach

Key actions in Axis 1 include training provided for agricultural and forestry producers, payments to young farmers, agricultural investments, innovations as well as developments in the food, wood and bioenergy sectors.

welfare of production animals.

Axis 2 comprises natural handicap payments (LFA), agri-environmental measures, non-productive investments and animal welfare payments. Among all this would include also the promotion of environmental protection in agriculture and forestry, biodiversity and welfare of production animals.

Axis 3 covers the diversification and development of economic activities on farms and in other rural microenterprises, as well as the development of rural tourism, services and villages.

The activities of Leader local action groups (LAGs) in relation to issues specified in the other axes, including regional and international cooperation, take place under Axis 4.

The total funding allocated to Finland from the EAFRD (the European

Agricultural Fund for Rural Development) is about 2,1 million euros. Total public funding for rural development should rise to about 6,6 million euros. Together with an additional sum of about 547 million euros originating from private sources, this means that the programme's total budget will be approximately 7,2 million euros.

According to the Finland's Rural Development Strategy, the key areas are promoted in the programme by improving the competitiveness of agriculture and forestry (minimum of 11% of EAFRD contribution), by improving the environment and the countryside (maximum of 76% of EAFRD contribution) and by diversifying economic activities and improving the quality of life in rural areas (minimum of 11% of EAFRD contribution). The Leader approach is applied in all priority areas (at least 5% of the EAFRD contribution).

## 2. Describe the legal frame for the agri-environmental measures.

For European Member States both Regulation (EC) 1698/2005, and any national complementary provision, should be considered. Then, comment on the measures to coordinate both systems and how to control implementation and mechanisms to avoid overlapping actions and overfund particularly on animal breeds.

General rules governing support for rural development are laid down in Council Regulation (EC) N:o 1698/2005 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD).

In the current Council-regulation 1698/2005, the special area devoted to development work on genetic resources, e.g. No 5 in Article 39 of the regulation, is not exploited in Finland because of possible overlap in funding.

## 3. Describe the main actions within the agri-environmental measures, including, when you have them:

- y. Breed definitions (when you have and include your opinion on the value of these terms as implementing criteria)
  - i. local breed
  - ii. autochthonous/native breed,
  - iii. endangered/at risk breed,
  - iv. etc

Local breeds are adaptations of populations stemming from the original populations which were moved to the country. There are also breeds which have been imported to Finland over 100 y ago and which have under intensive selection developed to Finnish breed with a well established population and breeding programme, such as Ayrshire dairy cattle and Landrace and Yorkshire pigs. The status endangered or at risk is defined by the number of reproducing females –



either less than a minimum number (< 1000) or declining number (< 10,000). The attributes local, autochthonous and native are used as synonyms.

The Finnish definitions are working well. There has been some discussion about the risk status of Finnsheep where the females' number has increased quite a bit recently. Still the number of purebred recorded females is rather low.

z. Species and breeds having access to these measures

Native breeds	No. females	Breeding/register organisation	In situ – programme	Semen cryobanked	Embryos cryobanked
Eastern Finncattle	>1 000	FABA	v	v	v
Northern Finncattle	>1 100	FABA	v	v	
Western Finncattle	<3 000	FABA	v	v	v
Finnsheep	< 10 000	ProAgria	v	v	
Åland sheep	>1 500	ProAgria		v	
Kainuu grey sheen	>1 500	ProAgria	v	v	
Landrace chicken	>3 000	MTT	v		
Finngoat	<6 000	ProAgria			
Finnhorse	>2 300	Hippos			

aa. Requisites to benefit from these measures:

- i. Farm: size, land availability, having animal health programs, etc.

Land area under cultivation > 3 ha

Pedigree information kept by the animal register is required, in sheep also performance recording is compulsory.

- ii. Farmer (Age, sex, ...)

Age between 18 and 65 y.

- iii. Breed associations and genealogical herd books

See Table above

- iv. Animals (Age, sex, etc). Please indicate how many animals having access to these measures

Altogether 5,000 livestock units at 1,200 farms.

- v. Environment: Special land protection, mountains, wetlands, forestry, etc. Please indicate total surface eligible

Traditional biotopes 28,000 ha  
Biodiversity and high nature value agriculture/forestry 26,000 ha

- vi. Breeding programs

When the population size allows and there is a recording scheme in place, a coordinated breeding programme is in use, esp. in Western Finncattle, Finnsheep and Finnhorse.

- vii. Others (specify)

- bb. Obligations that must be signed/agreed in order to be entitled to benefit from these measures

5 y contract

- cc. Support to the measures

- i. Institutional and non-institutional

- ii. Financial/non financial (including Euro/UGM)

The subsidies to rare local breeds is altogether 1 mill €.

- dd. Your opinion about census limits (both maximum and minimum) and financing/UGM of the breed to benefit from these measures.

The population size criteria are sensible. Possibly on top of the pedigree information, it is important to require also the collection of performance records and thereby involve the keepers in the development schemes for the breed.

- 4. Describe the main results attained by these measures

The decline in most of the breeds has been stopped, only the Western Finncattle population is still shrinking. On the other hand in all the other breeds the numbers are increasing. A new kind of observation is the undesirable trend in performance, esp. in Eastern Finncattle, which has been used in landscape management and green care while the breed originally has been used in milk production.

- 5. Describe the involvement of different stakeholders, administrations, rural communities, etc. in the implementation of these measures.

The programme is administrated by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. The breeding organisations are keeping the animal registers. The local administration and contracting with the farmers is done by Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment (ELY in Finnish), there being altogether 15 centres in the country.

6. Which are the main factors helping to the success of these measures? Please, describe whether there are actions/measures not included within the agri-environmental but related to them and contributing to achieve objectives listed in number 1.

7. Which are the main problems making these measures to fail, or at least contributing to a lesser success than expected?

The main element in the programme is collaboration with the existing organisations, such as breeding organisations in different species. At the beginning there was some tension between persons responsible of selection and conservation schemes. Now the synergy benefits have been widely recognised.

8. Do you think that the criteria limiting agri-environmental measures recipients to endangered breeds are adequate?

No

9. Do you think that any autochthonous/local breeds, regardless its census, should become recipient of agri-environmental measures when it fulfils any other requirement demanded to have access to theses measures?

The engagement in a selection scheme or development of a breed-specific product or alike would be such.

10. In your opinion, which criteria could be used to prioritize the recipients of agri-environmental measures?

On top of the census numbers, I would include the participation in breed development.

11. Does your country have indicators to evaluate the success of these measures? Describe them.

Not explicitly, but the census size, performance level, rate of inbreeding (effective population size), new products etc. appear in discussions.

12. Does your country have any estimation on the cost and benefit ratio of these measures?

No

13. From your point of view, how can agri-environmental measures contribute to attain the self sustainability of autochthonous breeds? Which other mechanisms would you implement to support the breeds looking for their sustainability?

The participation in breed development, utilisation of breed specific properties, marketing, publicity, etc.

14. Does your country support research, development and innovation programs within Agri-environmental measures:

- ee. Breeding
- ff. Conservation: in farm, ex situ, etc.
- gg. Product diversification
- hh. Others: describe

No

15. Taking into account the assessment of the current Agri-environmental framework, how do you think Agri-environmental measures should be developed in the future within the new CAP (beyond 2013)?

- a. Lines/measures that should be kept. Justify your answer.

Subsidies to rare breeds. Also Art 39, para 5 should be there with possible encouragement to utilise it better.

- b. Lines/measures that should be deleted. Justify your answer.

-

- c. Lines/measures that should be incorporated. Justify your answer.

Something about the development of breeds and their products to gain self-sustainability for them.

- d. Lines/measures that should be kept but have problems and, therefore, should be change. Please, describe these problems and possible solutions.

Art 39, para 5 – see above.

- e. In the case of EU Member States, considering international agreements or commitments subscribed by the EU (i.e. FAO/CBD), which are the lines/measures that should be set up to support animal genetic resources taking into account their advantages/add value, within the following legal frames:

- d. CAP-Rural development?
- e. Guidelines for aids to livestock?
- f. Commission Regulation 1857/2006?

Anything applicable.

16. Do you have any other comments?

ERFP should try to influence when the draft on the new programme is available – both in going to Brussels and in informing important persons in each country.

The collaboration between different sectors in EU Commission and also in the national ministry could be better. There should one single office in the Commission taking care of animal genetic resources and breeding. Now so many issues are processed quite separately. At home, the breeding organisation status (keeping animal registers) is given by one group, the agri-environmental measures is coordinated by another group and animal genetic resources are discussed yet another board. I have tried to put them into the same working groups but they are like the same poles of magnets repelling each other.

**QUESTIONNAIRE ON AGRI-ENVIRONMENTAL MEASURES - SLOVENIA**

1. Please, define the main objectives of agri-environmental measures in your country. Order these objectives prioritising their importance:

**ii. Farm sustainability**

The majority of agricultural land (72.5 percent) is situated in less favoured areas. The unfavourable conditions do not make agricultural activity entirely impossible, but they cause lower production capacity of the farms, narrow down the choice of crops, production management and demand technology adaptation, which again causes a more expensive production. Farms in these areas are less competitive and, due to the reflection of specific natural conditions under the agricultural land use structure, less adaptable. In spite of lower production potentials in these areas agriculture plays an important role in the maintenance of the settlement and cultural landscape as well as ecological balance. In Slovenia agriculture is predominantly founded on family farms, representing 99.8 percent of the total number of agricultural holdings and utilising 94.8% of the total utilised agricultural area (2005). The 1990s changes have accelerated the concentration and specialisation process in agriculture, but the average holding size still remains small (6.3 ha of agricultural land).

In 2000, family farms and agricultural enterprises, surveyed within the framework of the census of agriculture, owned 848,058 ha of land in total. Calculated per holding unit family farms own nearly 10 ha of land on average, which is more than five times less than agricultural enterprises. Among family farms medium sized holdings prevail, the major share (27.3 percent) of which represent farms with 5 to 10 ha of land owned. In the size structure of agricultural enterprises nearly fifty percent are captured by holdings owning over 20 ha of land. Agricultural holdings let out more than 8,000 ha or 9.3 percent of the total land owned on lease to other users. The majority of land (98.5 percent) is let out on lease by family farms.

The main objectives:

- Improving the competitiveness of agricultural and forestry sector
- Enhancing environment friendly farming
- Improving the economic and social status in the countryside
- Enhancing the local development initiatives

**jj. Environment benefits: Fire prevention, soil erosion, etc.**

Agricultural land and forests in Slovenia cover nearly 92 percent of the surface and have an important environmental, aesthetic and spatial function. The nature and environmental protection have a common social value in Slovenia, which also reflects in the policies concerned. Slovenia's forest management is sustainable and has a relatively high standard as its policy is often serves as an example to others.

In agriculture the wide-ranged implementation of agri-environmental measures helps maintain the utilisation of agricultural areas. In less favoured areas and the preservation of the multifunctional role of agriculture other measures for rural development are important as well. These measures have been the key element of the rural development policy so far and are well accepted by the beneficiaries and by the public.

**kk. Biodiversity (considering both general or animal genetic resources)**

Less favoured areas cover 85 % of the whole national territory, whereof nearly 72 % are mountain areas. Within the less favoured areas are mountain areas with typical steep slopes and high altitudes, making agricultural production more difficult, areas with frequent floods and strong winds, the Ljubljansko barje marsh and the Karst areas restricting the agricultural land use due to their specific natural elements, i.e. limestone terrain, different soil depth, dissected micro relief, sinkholes, flood fields and other karstic features, as well as erosion threatened hills in the central and north-east Slovenia. Agricultural holdings in these areas are less competitive and due to the reflection of specific natural conditions in the agricultural land use structure also less adaptable. In spite of lower production potentials agriculture in these areas plays an important role in maintenance of the settlement and cultural landscape as well as ecological balance.

Due to the specific natural features various ecosystems and habitats have been established in these areas which depend on the cultivation of agricultural areas. A wide-ranged set of environmental characteristics and high share of utilised agricultural land in these areas indicate a high level of biodiversity conservation and confirm the efficiency of the current measures for less favoured areas in prevention of the abandonment of agricultural activity and the marginalisation of these areas.

The trend of increasingly overgrowing areas, present in the past decades, is in decline since 2003. Hence, the total surface of agricultural land has not changed significantly in the last three years.

The commitment to the conservation of habitats and biodiversity reflects in the high share of protected areas. As much as 47.7 percent of the whole national territory was designated as ecologically important areas covering 202,000 hectares of agricultural land and 660,000 ha of forests. Ecologically important areas cover habitat types, parts of habitat types or larger ecosystem units which substantially contribute towards the conservation of biodiversity.

Due to the high level of conservation of biodiversity, variety, habitats and landscape specifics in Slovenia there is a need for further preservation of these conditions. The best possible method to achieve this is by maintaining the utilisation of agricultural land in an environment-friendly manner, by maintaining agricultural activity in marginal areas and in areas unfavourable for agriculture, where great risk of land abandonment and overgrowing is present, and by sustainable forest use.

Agriculture plays an important role in the habitat, biodiversity and landscape conservation. Areas, such as permanent grassland, areas with low production intensity and mosaic-like structure, and areas with endangered species and high biodiversity cover 300,000 ha of Slovenia. This is over fifty percent of all agricultural land, which is mainly located in marginal and natural handicap areas. Abandonment of agriculture in these areas and reduction of open area would mean a serious environmental hazard and potential loss of cultural landscapes.

Therefore, agricultural activity in these areas must be maintained to prevent the loss of habitats and reduction of animal and plant biodiversity as well as to preserve the landscape diversity and the recognisability of Slovenian landscape.

The high level of biodiversity, preservation of habitats and other natural and landscape diversity emerges also from the split up agricultural land and forest structure. The dispersed agricultural parcel structure preserves the mosaic-like landscape where the semi-natural areas are interwoven with other utilised areas. In high nature value areas the split up land structure must be preserved and support to farmers must be secured to compensate for the economic shortcoming emerging from such structural conditions.

**The Natura 2000** sites cover 36 percent of the Slovenian territory (thereof forests represent 71 percent), which is 30 percent of agricultural and forestry areas and one of the

highest shares of protected areas in Europe. The favourable natural status with high level habitat and biodiversity conservation in Slovenia needs to be preserved by way of appropriate strategic guidelines and measures.

Nevertheless, it must not restrict too severely the optimal utilisation of economic potentials of agriculture and forestry in these areas. The measures under the RDP 2007-2013 putting special focus on the agri-environmental measures represent an important contribution towards achieving favourable farmland bird population status.

## **II. Land organisation**

### **mm. Rational use of natural resources**

#### **nn. Climate change: adaptation and mitigation**

The most important greenhouse gases in agriculture are methane and dinitrous oxide. In 2004 Slovenian agriculture released 1,973,000 tons of equivalent carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane and dinitrous oxide, which is about 10 percent of the total greenhouse gas releases in Slovenia.

Considering the base year 1986, which is a baseline for the calculation of Slovenia's commitments for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, by 2004 the releases in agriculture were reduced by 14.4 percent. Given the Kyoto Protocol commitments for Slovenia (8 percent by 2008-2013), this is favourable. The reduction is mainly a result of reduced cattle and poultry production and new waste treatment plants on large pig farms. Greenhouse gases are also a result of the fossil fuel use in agriculture. Mobile users of fossil fuels in agriculture, forestry and fisheries (tractors, mobile agricultural machinery and others) contribute approximately 1.3 percent of the total greenhouse gas emissions in Slovenia.

Bio gas facilities can considerably contribute to the methane emissions in livestock manure storing.

According to raw estimations only 10 percent of the potential in cattle production and one third in pig production are realised due to the dispersed agriculture. In plant production it is most important to promote a technically founded fertilisation by applying adequate input technologies emphasising efficient nitrogen cycle in agriculture.

Although agri-environmental submeasures in the programme are not directly aimed at reducing the greenhouse gas emissions, their indirect effect is considerable. In the light of the reduction of the greenhouse gas emissions the following agri-environmental submeasures are crucial:

- integrated fruit production,
- integrated vine production,
- integrated horticulture,
- mountain pastures,
- Sustainable rearing of domestic animals,
- extensive grassland maintenance,
- permanent green cover in water protection area and
- organic farming.

#### **oo. Others (specify)**



2. Describe the legal frame for the agri-environmental measures.

For European Member States both Regulation (EC) 1698/2005, and any national complementary provision, should be considered. Then, comment on the measures to coordinate both systems and how to control implementation and mechanisms to avoid overlapping actions and overfund particularly on animal breeds.

**AXIS 1 . Improving the competitiveness of the agricultural and forestry sector:**

1. Competence raising and strengthening of human potential in agriculture and forestry
  - Setting up of young farmers
  - Early retirement of farmers
2. Restructuring of physical capital in agriculture and forestry and promoting innovation
  - Modernisation of agricultural holdings
  - Improving the economic value of forests
  - Adding value to agricultural and forestry products
  - Improving and developing infrastructure related to the development and adaptation of agriculture
3. Improving the quality of agricultural production and products
  - Participation of farmers in food quality schemes
  - Supporting producer groups for information and promotion activities for products under food quality schemes
  - Supporting setting up of producer groups

Code	Measure	Regulation (1698/2005)	Measure description
<b>Axis 1</b>	<b>IMPROVING THE COMPETITIVENESS OF AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY SECTOR</b>		
	<b>Measures to raise the competence and strengthen human potential in agriculture and forestry</b>		
111	Training for persons engaged in agriculture and forestry	Article 20 (a) (i), Article 21	Defraying training costs
112	Supporting young farmers	Article 20 (a) (ii), Article 22	Defraying the costs of farm transfer and structural adaptation of the holding after the transfer
113	Early retirement of farmers	Article 20 (a) (iii), Article 23	Financial aid to farm transferors
	<b>Measures for restructuring of physical capital in agriculture and forestry and for promoting innovation</b>		
121	Modernisation of agricultural holdings	Article 20 (b) (i), Article 26	Co-financing investments in primary production
122	Improving the economic value of forests	Article 20 (b) (ii), Article 27	Co-financing investments in extraction and primary production of wood
123	Adding value to agricultural and forestry products	Article 20 (b) (iii), Article 28	Co-financing investments in production and marketing of agricultural and forestry products
125	Improving and developing infrastructure related to the development and adaptation of agriculture	Article 20 (b) (v), Article 30	Co-financing land consolidation, hydro-meliorations and infrastructure
	<b>Measures to improve the quality of agricultural production and products</b>		
132	Participation of farmers in food quality schemes	Article 20 (c) (ii), Article 32	Defraying costs emerging from participation in quality schemes
133	Supporting producer groups for information and promotion activities for products under food quality schemes	Article 20 (c) (iii), Article 33	Co-financing promotion costs
142	Supporting setting up of producer groups	Article 20 (d) (ii), Article 35	Co-financing establishment and operation costs

**AXIS 2 . Improving the environment and the countryside**

1. Preserving agriculture in less favoured areas
  - Compensatory allowances to farmers in less favoured areas
2. Enhancing nature friendly agricultural practices
  - Agri-environmental payments

Code	Measure	Regulation (1698/2005)	Measure description
<b>Axis 2</b>	<b>IMPROVING THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE COUNTRYSIDE</b>		
211	Natural handicap payments to farmers in mountain areas	Article 36 (a) (i)	Compensation due to natural handicaps in area concerned
212	Payments to farmers in areas with handicaps, other than mountain areas	Article 36 (a) (ii)	Compensation due to natural handicaps in area concerned
214	Agri-environmental payments	Article 36 (a) (iv)	Compensation due to stricter farming requirements

**AXIS 3 . Improving the quality of life in rural areas and the promotion of economic diversification**

1. Improving employment opportunities in the countryside
  - Diversification into non-agricultural activities
  - Support for the creation and development of enterprises
2. Improving the quality of life in the countryside
  - Village renewal and development
  - Conservation and upgrading of rural heritage

Code	Measure	Regulation (1698/2005)	Measure description
<b>Axis 3</b>	<b>QUALITY OF LIFE IN RURAL AREAS AND DIVERSIFICATION OF RURAL ECONOMY</b>		
	<b>Measures to diversify the rural economy</b>		
311	Diversification into non-agricultural activities	Article 52 (a) (i), Article 53	Co-financing investments in diversification of economic activities in the countryside
312	Support for the creation and development of micro enterprises	Article 52 (a) (ii), Article 54	Co-financing investments in micro enterprises and training costs
	<b>Measures to improve the quality of life in rural areas</b>		
322	Village renewal and development	Article 52 (b)(i),(ii), Article 56	Co-financing the arrangement of areas in public use and buildings
323	Conservation and upgrading of the rural heritage	Article 52 (b) (iii), Article 57	Co-financing renewal costs of cultural heritage facilities and areas of natural values

**AXIS 4 . LEADER**

1. Implementing local development strategies
  - Implementing local development strategies
2. Running local action groups and encouraging cooperation
  - Running local action groups and animating cooperation
3. Promoting inter-territorial and transnational cooperation
  - Promoting inter-territorial and transnational cooperation

Code	Measure	Regulation (1698/2005)	Measure description
<b>Axis 4</b>	<b>LEADER</b>		
41 (411, 412, 413)	Implementing local development strategies	Article 63 (a), Article 64	Co-financing implementation projects
421	Promotion of inter-territorial and transnational cooperation	Article 63 (b), Article 65	Co-financing LAG cooperation projects
431	Running local action groups, skills acquisition and animation of the territory	Article 63 (c)	Co-financing animation, establishment and operation of LAGs

3. Describe the main actions within the agri-environmental measures, including, when you have them:

pp. Breed definitions (when you have and include your opinion on the value of these terms as implementing criteria)

- i. Breed

Is a group of geographically or regionally separated farm animals, originating from the same ancestors, sharing the same characteristics defined in breed standard. According to the adaptation to local environmental conditions the farm animals are classified to local (autochthonous, traditional) and foreign breeds.

**ii. local breed**

Farm animals of these breeds are reared in defined geographic area and are adapted to the climatic and feeding conditions, to the structure and configuration of the land. They are divided into **autochthonous** and the **traditional** breeds.

**iii. autochthonous/native breed,**

Farm animals of these breeds are, on the basis of historic sources, proven to originate from the Republic of Slovenia. The territory of the Republic of Slovenia was the prime geographic region for the development of these breeds. There exists the Slovene breeding documentation, where pedigree recording is found for at least five generations. Autochthonous breeds are under breeding and selection control.

**iv. endangered/at risk breed,**

**v. TRADITIONAL BREEDS**

The animals of these breeds do not originate from the Republic of Slovenia, or the origin has not been proven by the historic sources. The traditional breeds have been continuously bred on the territory of the Republic of Slovenia for more than fifty years (equines, cattle), or for thirty years (other farm animal species). In addition, the existing Slovene breeding documentation proves that the pedigree of a separate traditional breed had been recorded for at least five generations. They are under breeding and selection control. The term Slovene (Slovenian), or some other Slovene geographical term is included in the name of the traditional breed.

**vi. FOREIGN BREEDS (ALOCHTHONOUS, EXOTIC)**

To foreign breeds belong those farm animals that do not originate from the region of the Republic of Slovenia, or the animals which have not been continuously bred on the territory of Slovenia for more than fifty years (equines, cattle), or for thirty years (other farm animal species).

qq. Species and breeds having access to these measures

rr. Requisites to benefit from these measures:

**i. Farm: size, land availability, having animal health programs, etc.**

Minimum size of agricultural land of one use eligible for payment for one agri-environmental submeasure is 0.1 ha, provided that on agricultural holding at least 0.3 ha of agricultural land in total is available for this submeasure, unless defined otherwise under the conditions for individual submeasures (e.g. integrated fruit production).

ii. Farmer (Age, sex, ...)

iii. Breed associations and genealogical herd books

- iv. Animals (Age, sex, etc). Please indicate how many animals having access to these measures
- v. Environment: Special land protection, mountains, wetlands, forestry, etc. Please indicate total surface eligible
- vi. Breeding programs

vii. Others (specify)

Commitment duration

By entering the agri-environmental payments scheme, the beneficiary undertakes to implement the agri-environmental submeasures for the whole duration of the commitment (at least five years), in accordance with the conditions applied in obtaining payments for a particular submeasure. In cases of meteorological disasters (drought, hail, flood) the beneficiary may withdraw the implementation of the submeasure for the current year.

- ss. Obligations that must be signed/agreed in order to be entitled to benefit from these measures

Between farmers and Agency for agricultural market rural development (AAMRD)

tt. Support to the measures

i. Institutional and non-institutional

Ministry of Agricultural, Forestry and Food (MAFF), Faculties, Agricultural Institute, Agricultural Chamber

- a. With breeding programmes,
- b. Genetic bank for autochthonous and traditional breeds – as public service

ii. Financial/non financial (including Euro/UGM)

- uu. Your opinion about census limits (both maximum and minimum) and financing/UGM of the breed to benefit from these measures.

We have limitation 200 Euro/LU. In the case of rearing of autochthonous breed can be higher, but in our country is limited to 200 Euro/LU.

- 4. Describe the main results attained by these measures  
It is different in different environments; in different areas!
- 5. Describe the involvement of different stakeholders, administrations, rural communities, etc. in the implementation of these measures.
  - a. Breeding organisations
  - b. Local associations
  - c. Local community
  - d. LEADER
- 6. Which are the main factors helping to the success of these measures? Please, describe whether there are actions/measures not included within the agri-environmental but related to them and contributing to achieve objectives listed in number 1.
  - For Endangered/at risk breeds payment follow by Measure “De Minimis” for breeding / pedigree male animals

7. Which are the main problems making these measures to fail, or at least contributing to a lesser success than expected?  
Older and smaller farmers don't want to participate in these "Agri-environmental measures" because too many and too complicated administration work and too many control. This administration has to be more simple and user friendly – especially for older and smaller farmers. On this farms rear mostly autochthonous/native or even endangered breeds. It means, that we lost these breeds and these farmers because these reasons.
8. Do you think that the criteria limiting agri-environmental measures recipients to endangered breeds are adequate?  
YES, because many farmers (recipients for endangered breeds) are older, smaller and more conservative breeders.
9. Do you think that any autochthonous/local breeds, regardless its census, should become recipient of agri-environmental measures when it fulfils any other requirement demanded to have access to theses measures?  
YES! Some farms are so small that till now they did not participate in these programmes of rural development and they did not ask for payment from these programmes.  
Some farmers with autochthonous breeds are so called "amateurish breeders".
10. In your opinion, which criteria could be used to prioritize the recipients of agri-environmental measures?
- Breed in autochthonous environment
  - Traditional farming systems
  - Diversification
  - (we have to protect that will be not only "one" big farmer because subsidies – but has to be dispersed!
11. Does your country have indicators to evaluate the success of these measures? Describe them.
- e. Number of animals by breeds and farmers with these animals
  - f. Trends
12. Does your country have any estimation on the cost and benefit ratio of these measures?  
YES – we calculated the difference between income and costs for farmers with autochthonous breeds in comparison with farmers which keep (rear) traditional breeds. This was base for negotiation with Ministry of Agricultural for level of subsidies for breeders with autochthonous breeds. Subsidies need to cover the difference!
13. From your point of view, how can agri-environmental measures contribute to attain the self sustainability of autochthonous breeds? Which other mechanisms would you implement to support the breeds looking for their sustainability?
- Support of traditional way of production
  - Support of traditional processing methods (e.g Alpine dairying, pasture of pigs in forest)
14. Does your country support research, development and innovation programs within Agri-environmental measures:
- vv. Breeding

Yes (inside financial support of breeding programs are some funds for research for support and improving breeding programs)

ww. Conservation: in farm, ex situ, etc.

YES! Also from Animal Genetic Resources programme. (Seven year Program of work (2010-2016))

xx. Product diversification

Yes – with support of certification for producers included in Quality schemes (PDO/PGI/TSG products)

yy. Others: describe

Yes - with CRP projects

15. Taking into account the assessment of the current Agri-environmental framework, how do you think Agri-environmental measures should be developed in the future within the new CAP (beyond 2013)?

a. Lines/measures that should be kept. Justify your answer.

b. Lines/measures that should be deleted. Justify your answer.

c. Lines/measures that should be incorporated. Justify your answer.

d. Lines/measures that should be kept but have problems and, therefore, should be change. Please, describe these problems and possible solutions.

e. In the case of EU Member States, considering international agreements or commitments subscribed by the EU (i.e. FAO/CBD), which are the lines/measures that should be set up to support animal genetic resources taking into account their advantages/add value, within the following legal frames:

g. CAP-Rural development?

h. Guidelines for aids to livestock?

i. Commission Regulation 1857/2006?

16. Do you have any other comments?

ANNEX V GERMANY

ANNEX VI TURKEY