

Crop diversification and low-input farming across Europe: from practitioners' engagement and ecosystems services to increased revenues and value chain organisation





This project has received funding from the *European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme* under grant agreement No 728003

Copyright © DIVERFARMING Project and Consortium www.diverfarming.eu





Document summary		
Document title	Cross-case study comparative policy analysis	
Authors	Barbara Pancino, Chiara Monotti, Eleonora Sofia Rossi	
E-mail of principal author	bpancino@unitus.it	
Lead beneficiary	Barilla	
Deliverable No.	D9.1	
Work Package	WP9. Framework for relevant policies	
Dissemination type	Report	
Dissemination level	Public	
Deliverable due date	31/07/2019 (month 27)	
Release date	30/07/2019 (month 27)	
Copyright	© 2019 DIVERFARMING Project and Consortium	



List of Diverfarming participants

No	Name	ACRONYM	COUNTRY
1	Universidad Politécnica de Cartagena (Coordinator)	UPCT	Spain
2	Consiglio per la Ricerca in Agricoltura e l'Analisi dell'Economia Agraria	CREA	Italy
3	Agencia Estatal Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas	CSIC	Spain
4	Universita degli Studi della Tuscia	UTu	Italy
5	Asociación Regional de Empresas Agrícolas y Ganaderas de la Comunidad Autónoma de Murcia	ASAJ	Spain
6	Consorzio Casalasco del Pomodoro Società Agricola cooperativa	CCP	Italy
7	Arento Grupo Cooperativo Agroalimentario de Aragón	GA	Spain
8	Barilla G.E.R. Fratelli SPA	Bar	Italy
9	Disfrimur Logistica SL	DML	Spain
10	Universidad de Córdoba	UCO	Spain
11	Wageningen University	WU	Netherlands
12	Firma Nieuw Bromo van Tilburg	NBT	Netherlands
14	Industrias David S.L.U.	InDa	Spain
15	University of Portsmouth Higher Education Corporation	UPO	United Kingdom
16	Universität Trier	UT	Germany
17	Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich	ETH	Switzerland
18	Weingut Dr. Frey	WDF	Germany
19	University of Exeter	Exeter	United Kingdom
20	Pecsi Tudomanyegyetem - University of Pecs	UP	Hungary
21	AKA Kft	AKA	Hungary
22	Nedel-Market Kft	NMT	Hungary
23	Luonnonvarakeskus	Luke	Finland
24	Paavolan kotijuustola	PK	Finland
25	Polven juustola	PJ	Finland
26	Ekoboerderijdelingehof	Eko	Netherlands



Executive summary

This report describes the activities carried out in task 9.1 "Cross-case study comparative policy analysis" of Diverfarming project and refers to the period October 2018 - July 2019. The aim of the task is to understand the policy framework (incentives and constraints for crop diversification practices) where the case studies of the project take place.

The document contains a brief review of the Common Agricultural Policy with a particular focus on the Rural Development Programs (RDP) and the results of the case study policy analysis. More specifically, the analysis consisted of a survey, with case study mangers and farmers, investigating about drivers and constraints in implementing crop diversification practices and in a deep analysis of the rural development programs currently in force in the regions of the case studies.

The analysis of the RDPs of the regions involved in the project, with the aim of searching for tools and measures that promote crop diversification, has been carried out starting from the study of the EU Regulation 1305/13, which establishes the guidelines governing European support for rural development. We focused on how the European fund for rural development (EAFRD) finance the different RDPs, what the objectives are and the method of operation. From the analysis it comes out that even if RDPs could include measures promoting crop diversification practices, this is not often case. This is probably due to the fact that their control would be really hard because there is a lack of definitions about the measurable features of the crop diversification practices. Thus, measuring 10 features on Agri-environment-climate is not as suitable as it might be measuring 16 features about cooperation, which is more flexible in this sense, since the budget is allocated to a project and not to an agronomic practice.

The survey about drivers and constraints in implementing crop diversification practices was made on 15 case studies spread in 6 different countries (Spain, Italy, Netherlands, Finland, Hungary and Germany) and covering 9 different Rural Development Programs. As it concerns the diversification practices, among the 15 case studies used for the survey, crop rotation is the most common one being implemented in 9 case studies, followed by intercropping (7 case studies), while multiple cropping is done just in one case study.

Survey results show that farmers often ignore that public measures and tools financing crop diversification exist. Indeed, 44% of respondents stated that there are policies promoting the type of crop diversification implemented in the case study, but there is a slight discrepancy about the information level on local policies between farmers and case study managers. With regard to the drivers, case study managers believe that the strongest drivers are either coming from the market, especially consumer demand, or it should be mandatory; while ethics seems to be not too relevant. Also farmers perceive the market (also business to business) as the most important driver. In both cases, public support is not considered a strong driver. For the constraints to the diffusion of the diversification practice, the perception of the two sub-sample is quite different: for case study managers the most relevant constraints seem to be the economic and commercial ones, followed by a cultural issue; for farmers it does not emerge a clear view, and all constraints seem to be a bit relevant.





Table of Contents

1.	INT	RODUCTION1	•
1.	.1. OI	bjective1	
1.	.2. W	ork activities and partnership1	
2.	CO	MMON AGRICULTURAL POLICY AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM EVOLUTION	
2,	.1. Tł	ne CAP overtime	2
2.	.2. Ri	ural Development Program4	ļ
2.	.2.1.	Aim and principles4	ŀ
2.	2.2.	Overview of the RD planning periods4	ŀ
3.	CRO	OSS CASE STUDY ANALYSIS	,
3,	.1. Sı	urvey7	,
3.	.1.1.	Method and data collection7	,
3.	1.2.	Results and discussion	;
3.	.2. RI	DP analysis	!
3.	.2.1.	Methods and data collection12	:
3.	.2.2.	Results and discussion13	6
4.	FUF	RTHER STEPS	\$
5.	REF	ERENCES	ļ
6.	ΑΡΓ	PENDIX 1	;
6	.1. Ca	ase study questionnaire	;





1. Introduction

1.1. Objective

In recent years, European crop systems have changed dramatically, increasingly converging towards intensive monoculture agriculture with a high use of external inputs. This has developed processes of soil degradation, biodiversity reduction and an increase in economic risk by farmers. Diversified agricultural systems can be the answer and the solution to these problems. Diversification, specifically intended as crop diversification, therefore practices of rotation/intercropping of crops combined with a set of low input practices (such as minimum tillage, mulching, integrated pest management) brings significant benefits to the farm system. There is a lower risk of crop failure (and therefore a reduction in economic risk by the farmer), an increase in environmental benefits (such as improving the quality and soil structure that generate positive impacts on productivity), and in some cases also a reduction in production costs. The synergistic effect triggered by diversified and sustainable agricultural systems is important and attention needs to be paid to why it is not yet so widespread in Europe.

In this panorama, public intervention and therefore agricultural policies play a decisive and fundamental role for the introduction and diffusion of diversified production systems. It is necessary to investigate the current agricultural policies to understand how the theme of diversification is dealt with and what are the tools that policy makers have "devised" to encourage the adoption of certain practices. As it is evident, indeed, the crop diversification practices are not so widespread in Europe despite the obvious advantages outlined above. In order to have a broad understanding of the situation, it is therefore necessary to understand the barriers that hinder adoption and to take action initially also through the help of public intervention to eliminate them. We must also add that European policies are developed at a supranational level, but their implementation should take into account the different territorial contexts. There is therefore a further step to do that consists in understanding which tools are currently used or implemented ex novo which allow policies to act in an efficient and functional way for the diffusion of sustainable and diversified agricultural systems.

1.2. Work activities and partnership

Diverfarming Workpackage 9 "Framework for relevant policies" is made out of three tasks. This report describes the activities carried out in task 9.1- Cross-case study comparative policy analysis (October 2018 - July 2019) by all the partners involved, which are Barilla (task leader), Università della Tuscia, Universidad Politécnica de Cartagena and Luonnonvarakeskus. More specifically, the activities consisted of a document review about the Common Agricultural Policy with a particular focus on the Rural Development Programs, aiming at highlighting the progressive shift towards policies that promote sustainability. In order to understand if these policies are effective, the cross case study analysis regarded a survey investigating about drivers and constraints in implementing crop diversification practices and a deep analysis of the rural development programs actually in force in the regions of the case studies. The outcomes of these activities are described in the following chapters.



2. Common Agricultural Policy and Rural Development Program evolution

2.1. The CAP overtime

Launched in 1962, the EU's common agricultural policy (CAP) is a partnership between agriculture and society and between Europe and its farmers. The CAP is a common policy for all the countries of the European Union. It is managed and funded at European level from the resources of the EU's budget.

The EU supported farmers with about 59 bn \in in 2018 (out of a total EU budget of 160 bn \in), 41 bn \in of which with measures targeted at income support, 14 bn \in with measures for rural development, 3 bn \in with measures tailored at market support.

The CAP aims to support farmers and improve agricultural productivity, ensuring a stable supply of affordable food through technical progress, thus ensuring the rational development of agricultural production along with the best use of production factors, especially labour. As it regards farmers, the aim is to safeguard them in order to make a reasonable living ensuring an adequate standard of living thanks to income improvement. Furthermore, wider objective of the CAP is to help tackle climate change and the sustainable management of natural resources, to maintain rural areas and landscapes, to keep the rural economy alive by promoting jobs in farming, agri-foods industries and associated sectors and to stabilise markets and ensure reasonable prices to consumers.

Actions are related to:

- income support: through direct payments, ensures income stability and remunerates farmers for environmentally friendly farming and delivering public goods not normally paid for by the markets, such as taking care of the countryside;
- market measures to deal with difficult market situations such as a sudden drop in demand due to a health scare, or a fall in prices as a result of a temporary oversupply;
- rural development measures with national and regional programmes to address the specific needs and challenges facing rural areas.

The CAP is made of two Pillars. The 1st Pillar is the section funding the "direct payments" to farmers and the "management measures of the agricultural markets" included in the CMO (Common Market Organisation). The 2nd Pillar is the section devoted to funding "rural development".

A CMO is a set of measures allowing the EU to manage a defined agricultural product (in terms of both production and trade). The aim of such market management is to guarantee farmers a final destination for their production and to stabilise their income; also, to assure consumers food security at reasonable prices. Since when CAP came into force, the CMO system progressively substituted national market organisations allowing fixing unique prices for agricultural products for all European markets (through the definition of indicative price, entry price, intervention price); providing support to producers and sector operators, introducing production control mechanisms and regulates trade with Third countries.

Amongst CMO measures, direct payments to farmers were initially introduced to compensate income losses linked to support prices reduction. Prior to the 2003 Reform, direct payments were provided according to the number of animals or cultivated hectares; currently, this support is decoupled from production and included into the unique farm payment regime.



The CAP at the beginning allowed the EU to rapidly reach self-sufficiency; however, after some time it became quite expensive because of over production and of the too high European prices compared to world market prices.

The Mac Sharry Reform (1992) corrected the situation by guaranteeing agricultural price reduction compensated by payments linked to production factors and to the so called 'accompanying measures'.

The Agenda 2000 Reform confirmed 1992 amendments and identified food security, environmental protection and the promotion of sustainable agriculture as priorities. Objectives not belonging to market policy were included in the "rural development" package, which became the 2nd CAP Pillar. The reform foresaw the increase in competitiveness of agricultural products, the simplification of agricultural legislation, the reinforcement of the EU position in the World Trade Organisation and budget stabilisation. To this purpose, a reduction in intervention prices was introduced, compensated by an increase in support to farmers.

The Fischler Reform (2003) regarded the simplification of market measures and of direct support through the decoupling of direct payments from production; the reinforcement of rural development thanks to funds transferal from the 1st CAP Pillar to rural development via 'modulation', the limitation of expenses in terms of market support and direct support to farmers from 2007 to 2013. In 2004, a further reform package was introduced: the support to Mediterranean products (tobacco, cotton, olive oil, hop plants) followed, in 2006, by the reform of the Sugar CMO.

In 2005, a fundamental reform in the Policy of rural development for the period covering 2007-2013 was adopted, including a new regulatory framework. The CAP Health Check (2009) recognised a set of new challenges (climate change, bio-fuels, biodiversity, water management and innovation) in Rural Development programming. The Member States were obliged to incorporate in the Rural Development Programmes operations related to these new challenges.

The CAP Reform 2014-2020 included a system of direct payments that substituted, starting from the 1st January 2015, the unique farm payment. The system included 7 support components. Some of these components, must be run by each Member State (basic payment, green payment and payment for young farmers). The other components are voluntary: aid for first hectares, aid for areas with natural constraints, voluntary coupled payment and payment for small farmers. All support measures are funded through the national fixed maximum amount available for each Member State.

On the 1st June 2018, the European Commission presented the legislative proposals on the future of the CAP for the period after 2020. CAP post-2020 consists into maintaining the current structure with the 2 pillars. The direct payments are renamed 'income support for sustainability', without a real change in nature from the current support per hectare. To keep the highest possible value of direct payments, following upon the total CAP budget cut, the highest sacrifice in terms of financial availability regards the rural development policy. Nevertheless, a minimum 30% of Pillar 2 funding will be spent on climate and environment-related measures. The 40% of the CAP overall budget is expected to contribute to climate action.

In the proposal for 2021-2027, the obtainment of all CAP direct payments will be conditional to enhanced environmental, climate change, public health, animal and plants health requirements. In line with the EU's ambitious environmental and climate objectives, the mandatory requirements with which farmers have to comply will be further strengthened. These norms include, according to a consolidated scheme, a list of compulsory management criteria and of 'good agronomic and environmental conditions" (GAEC).

For the first time a unique reference scheme is built which includes all CAP intervention measures, under a single programming structure and coordination. This allows that, as for rural development, Pillar 1 payments and good agronomic and environmental conditions will have to undergo the EC approval. The proposal



consists into a shift of decisions under each Member State responsibility through the institution of CAP strategic plans.

The obligation of crop diversification included in the greening becomes "crop rotation". It is, in this case, an environmental commitment clearly reinforced compared to 2014-2020, because it has the potential of impacting multi-annual farm programming. However, crop rotation might be lightened by enlarging such commitment versus "other good equivalent practices", beyond the strict rotation rule.

2.2. Rural Development Program

2.2.1. Aim and principles

Rural development emerged in the late 80's in the EU with a double objective: improving the CAP perception by Third Countries and proposing measures to mitigate internal socio-economic effects of a needed CAP reform.

The EU's rural development policy helps the rural areas to meet the wide range of economic, environmental and social challenges of the 21st century. Frequently called "second pillar" of the CAP, it complements the system of direct payments to farmers and measures to manage agricultural markets (the so-called "first pillar"). Rural Development policy shares a number of objectives with other European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF).

The CAP started evolving by including complementary aspects to those traditionally linked with regulation of prices and markets, which led to the 2000 Agenda, thus converting Rural Development into Pillar 2 of the CAP. Main principles are: multifunctionality of agriculture, integrated approach of rural economy, flexibility of rural development support based on the principle of subsidies towards the decentralisation of decisions. Interventions introduced were:

- measures to improve agricultural competitiveness;
- measures with environmental objectives;
- measures of diversification of rural economy and support to rural communities.

2.2.2. Overview of the RD planning periods

The Rural Development policy 2007-2013 focused on three themes (known as "thematic axes"). These are:

- improving the competitiveness of the agricultural and forestry sector;
- improving the environment and the countryside;
- improving the quality of life in rural areas and encouraging diversification of the rural economy.

To help ensure a balanced approach to policy, Member States and regions were obliged to spread their rural development funding between all three of these thematic axes. A further requirement was that some of the funding must support projects based on experience with the Leader Community Initiatives. The LEADER Community initiative, approved in 1991, was the first tool for a true territorial development policy in the EU. The "Leader approach" to rural development involves highly individual projects designed and executed by local partnerships to address specific local problems.



As before 2007, every Member State (or region, in cases where powers are delegated to regional level) must set out a Rural Development Programme, which specifies what funding will be spent on which measures in the period from 2007 to 2013.

A new feature for the 2007-2013 period is a greater emphasis on coherent strategy for rural development across the EU as a whole. This is being achieved through the use of National Strategy Plans which must be based on EU Strategic Guidelines. This approach was thought to help to:

- identify the areas where the use of EU support for rural development adds the most value at EU level;
- make the link with the main EU priorities (for example, those set out under the Lisbon and Göteborg agendas);
- ensure consistency with other EU policies, in particular those for economic cohesion and the environment;
- assist the implementation of the new market-oriented CAP and the necessary restructuring it will entail in the old and new Member States.

The EU's Rural Development policy 2014-2020 is funded through the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) worth €100 billion from 2014-2020, with each EU country receiving a financial allocation for the 7-year period. This will leverage a further €61 billion of public funding in the Member States.

There are 118 different rural development programmes (RDP) in the 28 Member States for this period, with 20 single national programmes and 8 Member States opting to have two or more (regional) programmes.

Member States and regions draw up their rural development programmes based on the needs of their territories and addressing at least four of the following six common EU priorities:

- fostering knowledge transfer and innovation in agriculture, forestry and rural areas
- enhancing the viability and competitiveness of all types of agriculture and promoting innovative farm technologies and sustainable forest management
- promoting food chain organisation, animal welfare and risk management in agriculture
- restoring, preserving and enhancing ecosystems related to agriculture and forestry
- promoting resource efficiency and supporting the shift toward a low-carbon and climate-resilient economy in the agriculture, food and forestry sectors
- promoting social inclusion, poverty reduction and economic development in rural areas

The rural development priorities are broken down into "focus areas". For example, the priority on resource efficiency includes focus areas "reducing greenhouse gas and ammonia emissions from agriculture" and "fostering carbon conservation and sequestration in agriculture and forestry". Within their RDPs, Member States or regions set quantified targets against these focus areas. They then set out which measures they will use to achieve these targets and how much funding they will allocate to each measure. At least 30% of funding for each RDP must be dedicated to measures relevant for the environment and climate change and at least 5% to LEADER.

The implementation and impact of the rural development policy is monitored and evaluated in detail, as Rural development is part of a broader EU investment strategy. From 2014 onwards, Member States have to establish a partnership agreement which requires a coordination of all EU structural investment funding



(ESIF) within each country. The European Commission and its Member States are also working with the European Investment Bank (EIB) on establishing Financial Instruments under the EAFRD.



3. Cross case study analysis

3.1. Survey

3.1.1. Method and data collection

In order to analyse if the policy framework where the case studies take place is effective, a survey among the case studies managers and farmers has been carried out. The main objective is to test the awareness of farmers and technicians about the policies that promote crop diversification practices. Furthermore, drivers and constraints to the adoption and diffusion of these practices have been also investigated.

The questionnaire has been sent by e-mail, together with guidelines and an example, to the Case Study (CS) managers of the 15 case studies involved in WP 9. They had approximately 6 weeks (30/11/2019 - 15/01/2019) to fill it themselves and to provide the questionnaire to the farmer/technician responsible for the case study and to explain her/him the procedure. The survey will be repeated each year in order to monitor if the information and perceptions may change over time. The questionnaire¹ is made of eight questions divided in five sections as summarized in Table 3.1.

Section	Questions	Issues	Type of answer
1.General information	1	Case study localization; main crop; CAP reference territory; contact person.	Pre-filled in section; respondent only needed to check the data.
2.Diversification practices	2,3	Type of diversification implemented; expected impact of the diversification.	Multiple choice.
3.Diffusion and influence	4,5	Local level of diffusion of the diversification practice; reason for choosing the diversification practice	Multiple choice.
4.Policy	6	List of available policies, instruments and measure that support crop diversification	Open
5. Drivers and constraints	7,8	List drivers and constraints for the implementation and diffusion of the diversification practice	Multiple choice with Likert scale.

Table 3.1. Questionnaire structure.

¹ The complete version of the questionnaire is available in Appendix 1.



3.1.2. Results and discussion

The information given by the respondents has been elaborated as one sample for sections 1, 2 and 3; while for sections 4 and 5 we considered two sub-samples, which namely are case study managers and farmers. Out of the 15 possible respondents for each group, 13 case study managers and 14 farmers answered the questionnaire. Unfortunately, it was not possible to have the questionnaire filled in by the managers of case study 8 and 10 and by the farmer of case study 12.

The 15 case studies are spread in six different countries (Spain, Italy, Netherlands, Finland, Hungary and Germany) and cover nine different Rural Development Programs, an overview of the general information about them is given in table 3.2.

Case study	Country	Crop diversification	RDP	Respondent
1	Spain	intercropping	Murcia	manager+farmer
2	Spain	intercropping+ crop rotation	Murcia	manager+farmer
3	Spain	crop rotation multilple cropping	Aragon	manager+farmer
4	Spain	intercropping	Andalucia	manager+farmer
5	Italy	crop rotation	Lombardia	manager+farmer
6	Italy	crop rotation	Emilia Romagna	manager+farmer
7	Italy	crop rotation	Lombardia	manager+farmer
8	Netherlands	crop rotation	National	farmer
9	Germany	intercropping	Rheinland- Palatine	manager+farmer
10	Hungary	intercropping	National	farmer
11	Hungary	intercropping	National	manager+farmer
12	Finland	crop rotation	Mainland	manager
13	Finland	crop rotation	Mainland	manager+farmer
15	Netherlands	crop rotation multiple cropping	National	manager+farmer
16	Spain	intercropping	Murcia	manager+farmer

Table 3.2. Case study general information.

As it concerns the diversification practices, among the 15 case studies used for the survey, crop rotation is the most common one being implemented in 9 case studies, intercropping follows (7 case studies), while multiple cropping is done just in 2 case studies.



According to both case study mangers and farmers, the positive impact of the diversification practice carried out in their fields is mainly on biodiversity (96%) and soil organic matter (93%), followed by weed management (59%), soil erosion (56%), water quality (44%) and greenhouse gases emission (41%).

Moving to the local level of diffusion of the diversification practice, it seems like all kind of practices implemented are either at an experimental level or at an early stage. Indeed, the 69% of the respondents indicated these two answers, while only the 7% states that the practice is widely diffuse. Furthermore, inspiration about the crop diversification practice to be implemented derives mainly from technical or research advices mixed with territorial practices.

To understand if and where policies are present and the information level among stakeholders, in section 4 we asked to consult the Rural Development Program of the related Region and check on the eventual presence within the agro-environmental measures of tools promoting crop diversification. 44% of respondents stated that there are policies promoting the kind of diversification practice implemented in the case study, but there is a slight discrepancy about the information level in local policies between farmers and CS managers.

Finally, in section 5 we investigated on the drivers and constraints to the adoption and diffusion of the diversification practices. As it regards the drivers, case study mangers and farmers indicated the possible impact level of the five proposed drivers (mandatory, public support, ethics, market-consumer demand and market-business to business). Case study managers believe that the strongest drivers are either coming from the market, especially consumer demand, or it should be mandatory; while ethics seems to be not too relevant. Also farmers perceive the market (also business to business) as the most important driver. In both cases, public support is not considered a strong driver. The detailed results are shown in Figure 3.1.







Figure 3.1. Drivers to the adoption and diffusion of diversification practices.

Also for the constraints to the diffusion of the diversification practice respondents were asked to indicate the level of the constrain for all the five proposed options (agronomic, economic, commercial, political and cultural). The perception of the two sub-sample is quite different: for case study managers the most relevant constraints seem to be the economic and commercial ones, followed by a cultural issue; while for farmers it does not emerge a clear view, all constraints seem to be a bit relevant. Figure 3.2 shows these results.







Figure 3.2. Constraints to the adoption and diffusion of diversification practices.

It is important to stress that the survey was carried out after one year of the implementation of the diversification practice, so case study managers and farmers opinion may change in the next years. We will repeat the survey every year, so to monitor these eventual changes.



3.2. RDP analysis

3.2.1. Methods and data collection

The analysis of the RDPs of the regions involved in the project, with the aim of searching for tools and measures that promote crop diversification, starts from the study of the EU Regulation 1305/13, which establishes the guidelines governing European support for rural development. We focus on how the European fund for rural development (EAFRD) finance the different RDPs, what are the objectives and the method of operation.

The objectives of RDPs are pursued through 6 different priorities (P) which are divided into 18 specific Focus Area (FA) of intervention. Looking for measure promoting crop diversification, we bordered the analysis on P4: Restoring, Preserving and Enhancing Ecosystems and P5: Resource-efficient, Climate-Resilient Economy, and their related FA, which are those that directly concern the environmental theme.

FA related to P4 and P5 are:

- FA 4A: Restoring, preserving and enhancing biodiversity;
- FA 4B: Improving water management;
- FA 4C: Preventing soil erosion and improving soil management.
- FA 5A: Increasing efficiency in water use by agriculture;
- FA 5B: Increasing efficiency in energy use in agriculture and food processing;
- FA 5C: Facilitating the supply and use of renewable sources of energy;
- FA 5D: Reducing greenhouse gas and ammonia emissions from agriculture;
- FA 5E: Fostering carbon conservation and sequestration in agriculture and forestry.

For these priorities and focus area, we made a budget analysis, looking at the percentage of the budget allocated to them for each CS region. Then, we focus on searching for specific interventions dedicated to crop diversification among measures. More specifically, since within the EU Regulation 1305/13 there are 12 articles that are directly or indirectly connected and deal with environmental issues, thus eventually somehow promoting crop diversification, we investigated the following:

- ART. 17 Investments in physical assets
- ART. 20 Basic services and village renewal in rural areas
- ART. 21 Investments in forest area development and improvement of the viability of forests
- ART. 23 Establishment of agroforestry systems
- ART. 25 Investments improving the resilience and environmental value of forest ecosystems
- ART. 26 Investments in forestry technologies and in processing, in mobilizing and in the marketing of forest products
- ART. 28 Agri-environment-climate
- ART. 29 Organic farming
- ART. 30 Natura 2000 and Water Framework Directive payments
- ART. 31 Payments to areas facing natural or other specific constraints
- ART. 34 Forest-environmental and climate services and forest conservation
- ART. 35 Co-operation

These articles are convert into a diversified series of incentive and support measures for both public and private beneficiaries. The list of intervention measures that address environmental and climate issues is the following:

- M4 (art.17 reg.EU 1305/2013) → Investments in physical assets
- M7 (art. 20 reg EU 1305/2013)→ Basic services and village renewal in rural areas
- M8 (art. 21-26 reg EU 1305/2013) → Investments in forest area development and improvement of the viability of forests
- M10 (art. 28 reg EU 1305/2013) → Agri-environment-climate
- M11 (art. 29 reg EU 1305/2013)→Organic Farming



- M12 (art. 30 reg EU 1305/2013) → Natura 2000 and Water Framework Directive payments
- M13 (art. 31 reg EU 1305/2013) → Payments to areas facing natural or other specific constraints
- M15 (art. 34 reg EU 1305/2013) → Forest environmental and climate services and forest
- conservation
 M16 (art. 35 reg EU 1305/2013) → Co-operation

From this first list, given the focus of the project on crop diversification and the objective of task 9.1, which is the state of the art of current policies that favor diversification, a further restriction was made by focusing the study mainly on Measure 10-Agri-environmental-climate, given that it is the one that most directly controls and supports crop diversification. M11-Organic farming has been also investigated, since organic farming often leads to diversification practices even if they are not always explicit in the RDPs.

Once determined in which priorities, focus areas and measures of the RDPs it was appropriate to investigate for crop diversification, we carried out the analysis on the 10 RDPs related to the CS of the Diverfarming project, that is:

- Andalucía (Spain)
- Aragon (Spain)
- Murcia (Spain)
- Emilia-Romagna (Italy)
- Lombardia (Italy)
- Puglia (Italy)
- Rhineland Palatine(Germany)
- Hungary
- Mainland (Finland)
- Netherlands

Each partner was asked to analyse the RDP of their own country/region (depending on whether it was national or regional) and collect information regarding the possible presence of an intervention/operation that concerns the implementation of one of the cultivation diversification practices foreseen by the Diverfarming project (intercropping, multicropping, crop rotation, cover crops). Furthermore, if the intervention exists, the partner also furnished a brief description of it containing details on the beneficiaries and the related payment. This specific analysis, unfortunately, could not be carried out for all 10 RDPs, since partners of case studies of Andalucia, Hungary and Rhineland – Palatine are not directly involved within task 9.1.

The guidelines and the worksheet to be filled in were sent on 03/04/2019 to all partners involved, asking them to return the output by 10/05/2019. During the General Assembly (21-24/05/2019) there was then the opportunity to meet the partners and discuss about their outcomes.

3.2.2. Results and discussion

Budget allocation regarding P4 and P5 for each CS region is reported in Figure 3.3. For P5 it is also possible to distinguish the budget for single FA, as shown in Figure 3.4.





Figure 3.3. Public support for P4 and P5.

Among the ten CS region analysed, the Netherlands has the only RDP not activating priority 5, allocating 56.25% of the budget to priority 4. All the other regions show a consistent prevalence of loans granted to P4. Among the most virtuous, in general terms, there is Finland, which allocates more than 70% of its budget to the two priorities (69.14% to P4).

Looking at the RDPs of the three Italian regions (Lombardia, Emilia Romagna, Puglia), we can notice that the budget allocated is about 42% for all three and it is also distributed in a very similar way even between the two priorities.

The situation is different when looking at the three Spanish RDPs (Andalucia, Aragon, Murcia), where there is a big difference, in terms of budgets allocated to the 2 priorities as a whole and also if considered separately. Indeed, Murcia is the most virtuous one allocating 57.57% of its budget to the P4-P5, immediately followed by Andalucia (51.30%) and far ahead by Aragon with 36.43%.

Hungary, which has a national RDP, is the one allocating the highest percentage of its budget to P5 (15.08%), on the contrary of Rhineland – Palatine that allocates only 2.81% to P5.





Figure 3.4. Public support for the Focus Area of P5.

As it regards the detail of priority 5, the picture of the budget allocation among the CS regions is very different. The Netherlands has no budget allocated at all. There are only three RDPs that have activated all 5 FA foreseen by priority 5 (Murcia, Hungary, Rhineland-Palatine). In general, Hungary (15.08%) and Murcia (13.89%) are the two RDPs that have the highest percentage of their budget allocated to P5, and also the ones who pay great attention to the FA5A-Water efficiency, with respectively 9.65% (Hungary) and 8.55% (Murcia).

Lombardia and Andalucia are the most concerned about Carbon conservation and sequestration (FA5E), both allocating almost the 9.0% of their budget to this FA.

Focus area 5A and 5E are the ones with the most relevant percentage of budgets. In Aragon, these are even the only two FA activated. Thus water efficiency and carbon conservation and sequestration seems to be the most relevant issues in all the CS region but Finland, where the budget is mainly dedicated to focus area 5C -renewable energy and 5D - reducing GHG/ammonia emissions.

The results of the analysis of the content of Measure 10 and Measure 11 (made by each partner) together with the budgets allocated are summarized in individual data sheets for each of the RDPs examined. Data sheets of Andalucia, Hungary and Rhineland – Palatine are not complete since partners of these case studies are not directly involved in task 9.1 and due to language difficulties the other partners could not make the content analysis of the measures.



ARAGON

The RDP of the Aragon region allocates a sum of $302,606,560 \in$, which represents 32.06% of the total budget. Of this, 10.34% is given to M10 (Agri-environmental-climate), 9.01% to M08 (Forest) and 8.49% to M13 (Payments to areas facing natural or other specific constraints).



Figure 3.5. Public support for P4 distinguished by measure-ARAGON region.

The Aragon region allocates 4.37% of its RDP budget to priority 5 with a cost of 41,243,247 €. Figure 3.6 illustrates what measures impact on each individual FA in terms of budget, considering that in the specific case the FA5D is activated thanks to the M10 but since some hectares are also affected by the P4 and therefore the programmed schemes are designed to contribute jointly to the 5Ds and at P4, then these are counted directly in priority 4 without making further distinctions.

Aragon activates the FA5A through measures M04 (with an allocation of 19,513,213 €, which corresponds to the 2.07%) and M16 (with a budget of 6,230,034 €, corresponding to 0.66%); while the FA5E is activated via M08 which provides for an expenditure of 15,500,000 €, corresponding to 1.64% of the budget.





Aragon - Budget allocation measures vs FA P5

Figure 3.6. Public support for P5 distinguished by FA and measure-ARAGON region.

The most funded measures by the RDP of the Aragon region turn out to be:

- 364 million € allocated to Measure 4: Investments in physical assets
- 113 million € allocated to Measure 19: LEADER and CLLD
- 101 million € allocated to Measure 8: Forestry
- 99 million € allocated to Measure 6: Farm and business development

Thus two (M04, M08) of the four measures appear to be on the list of intervention measures that address environmental and climate issues.

Table 3.3. Measures description-Aragon region.

Measure	Brief description	Beneficiaries
M10	Subsidies for crop rotation and biodiversity, compensation for production losses due to damage caused by wildlife.	Natural or legal persons, who develop their business activity (agrarian, livestock or forestry) in Natural protected areas
M11	Organic farming. Farmers that accepted a natural way for their farms.	Organic farmers



MURCIA

Murcia allocates in its RDP a sum of $152,062,482 \in$ to priority 4, which represents 43.68% of the total budget. As shown in figure 3.7, the preponderant measures in terms of budget are the M08 (Forest) to which 24,990,000 € are allocated (7.18%), the M10 (Agri-environmental-climate) that with 59,797,452 € has the 17.18% of the budget, while the most funded in terms of priority 4 is the M11 (Organic farming) with 64,503,831 € (18.53%).



Figure 3.7. Public support for P4 distinguished by measure-MURCIA region.

The region of Murcia, among the RDPs analysed, is the second in terms of funding for priority 5 with a budget of 48,351,000 €, which corresponds to 13.89% of the total.

Figure 3.8 shows that all five FAs are activated, but with different spending levels. The FA5A is the main one with a predominant role of M04 (8.39%), while the M01 and M02 have allocated the same budget levels for each of the FAs, respectively M01 180,960 \in (0.05%) and M02 146,080 \in (0.04%).

In the FA5E, on the other hand, the M13 has the greatest impact with 13,426,000 € corresponding to 3.86% of the total budget.



Murcia - Budget allocation measures vs FA P5

Figure 3.8. Public support for P5 distinguished by FA and measure-MURCIA region.



The four measures most funded by the RDP of the Murcia region are:

- 111 million € allocated to Measure 4 Investment in physical assets
- 65 million € allocated to Measure 11 Organic farming
- 61 million € allocated to Measure 10 Agri-environment-climate
- 27 million € allocated to Measure 6 Farm and business development (business start-up aid for young farmers)

Three of these measures are included on the list of intervention measures that address environmental and climate issues.

 Table 3.4.
 Measures description-Murcia region.

Measure	Brief description	Beneficiaries
M10	Agro-environmental and climatic aid contribute to the conservation and improvement of biodiversity and the environment. This is achieved through the commitments received by the beneficiary of the measure, some of which also improve soil management and, therefore, its ability to retain carbon, which is why this measure contributes to the mitigation of the change climate.	Farmers and farmers' groups are the main beneficiaries of agri-environmental and climate aid, however, rural development programs may include, justified for environmental reasons, other land managers or groups of land managers as beneficiaries of a type of agro- environmental operation in particular. In the case of collective beneficiaries, in addition to groups with legal personality, rural development programs may also consider eligible groups formed "ad hoc" to perform the agri- environmental operation. Each collective beneficiary makes a single common request for assistance.
M11	The excessive use of synthetic chemicals (phytosanitary products, herbicides and fertilizers) in agriculture is an important environmental problem. Excessive use of these products results in biodiversity loss and contamination of soil and water. This measure will fundamentally respond to the identified need to improve and expand the use of soil conservation techniques.	Farmers or groups of farmers who undertake to voluntarily adopt or maintain organic farming practices and methods defined in Council Regulation (EC) 834/2007, June 28, 2007, may benefit from the aid to organic farming, about production and labeling of organic products. The beneficiary of the aid must be an active farmer. In addition to the regulatory requirement of being an active farmer, the beneficiary must be registered with a certification body authorized by the autonomous community. In the case of collective beneficiaries, in addition to groups with legal personality, rural development programs may also consider eligible groups formed "ad hoc" to carry out the operation. Each collective beneficiary will make a single common request for assistance



EMILIA-ROMAGNA

In its RDP, Emilia-Romagna assigns a budget of 466,131,316 € to priority 4, representing 36.60% of the total. Figure 3.9 shows that the prevailing measure in P4 is the M10 with an expenditure equal to 16.92%, corresponding to 204,365,950 €, followed by the M11 which with its 117,359,342 € occupies 9.72%, to be reported also the M13 with 7.44% (89,872,378 €).



Figure 3.9. Public support for P4 distinguished by measure-EMILIA ROMAGNA region.

The Emilia Romagna RDP for priority 5 allocated a budget of 73,804,837 €, corresponding to 6.11% of the total. Figure 3.10 shows how the activated FAs have almost similar financing, with the M04 that in the FA5A, FA5C and FA5D appears preponderant with a budget of around 1%, while in the case of the FA5E it is the M08 to always prevail with an expense just above 1%.



Figure 3.10. Public support for P5 distinguished by FA and measure-EMILIA ROMAGNA region.

The four measures most funded by the RDP of the Emilia-Romagna region are:

- 347 million € allocated to Measure 4 (Investments in physical assets)
- 190 million € allocated to Measure 10 (Agri-environment-climate)
- 100 million € allocated to Measure 11 (Organic farming)
- 98 million € allocated to Measure 6 (Farm and business development)



On the top four, three are included on the list of intervention measures that address environmental and climate issues.

 Table 3.5. Measures description-Emilia Romagna region.

Measure	Brief description	Beneficiaries
M10.1.1.	IPM, including crop rotation (5years), compulsory, and cover crop use as voluntary measure.	farmers and their associations, including coops
	IPM, including crop rotation (5years), compulsory, and precession to prevent mycotoxins in durum wheat (voluntary measure)	
M10.1.4	conservative agriculture and organic matter increase	Farmers
M10.1.6	agricultural crop biodiversity: indigenous varieties protection if under risk of genetic erosion	Farmers
M10.1.7	sustainable management and keeping of extensive grassland (with particular reference to those with mixed plant species).	Farmers and their associations, including coops, other land managers, including Collective Properties, limited to agricultural land
M10.1.10	scrub clearing complex, keep vegetative cover	Farmers and their associations, including coops, other land managers, including Collective Properties, limited to agricultural land
M11.1.01	conversion to organic agriculture	farmers and their associations, including coops
M11.2.01	organic agriculture maintenance	farmers and their associations, including coops



LOMBARDIA

Lombardia in its RDP allocates funding for 369,200,000 € to priority 4, equal to 32.30% of the total budget. As can be noticed from figure 3.11, the M10 is the most impacting measure in P4 with an expenditure of 196,900,000 € (17.23%), followed by the M13 with 78,00, 000 €, which represents 6.82%.



Figure 3.11. Public support for P4 distinguished by measure-LOMBARDIA region.

Lombardia in its RDP assigns to priority 5 funding for 119,75 million € corresponding to 10.48% of the total budget. Figure 3.12 shows that the FA5E is the most funded with a budget of 8.83%, with the M08 occupying 5.48% alone. The M01 and M02 measurements are both present in all 4 FAs, with a constant funding of 0.02% for the M01 and 0.01% for the M02.



Figure 3.12. Public support for P5 distinguished by FA and measure-LOMBARDIA region.

The four measures most funded by the RDP of the Lombardia region are:

- 413.5 million € allocated to measure 4 (Investments in physical assets)
- 240.3 million € allocated to measure 10 (Agro-environment-climate)
- 103.6 million € allocated to measure 8 (Forestry)
- 78 million € allocated to measure 13 (Areas facing natural constraints)

All four measures are on the list of intervention measures that address environmental and climate issues.



 Table 3.6.
 Measures description-Lombardia region.

Measure	Brief description	Beneficiaries	
M10.1.01	IPM: optional commitment: autumn/winter cover crop realization with legume crops (also in intercropping)	farmers and their associations, other land managers	
M10.1.02	crop rotation or diversification with legume fodder crops	farmers and their associations, other land managers	
M10.1.03	biodiversity conservation in paddy fields (optional commitment: autumn/winter cover crop realization with legume crops, also in intercropping)	farmers and their associations, other land managers	
M10.1.04	conservative agriculture (optional commitment: autumn/winter or summer cover crop)	farmers and their associations, other land managers	
M10.1.06	maintenance of linear vegetative structures and wooden stopgap strips	farmers and their associations, other land managers	
M11.1	Payment in order to adopt organic production practices and methods. Support for the conversion from traditional to organic agriculture, by compensating for higher costs and lower revenues which entails the transition from a more productive intensive system to a more sustainable system from an environmental point of view, but less economically profitable, due to the risks related to the limitations in terms of use of fertilizers and plant protection products and the consequent loss or reduction of production.	farmers and their associations, including coops	



PUGLIA

The Puglia region in its RDP assigns a budget of 556,287,316 € to priority 4, corresponding to 34.41% of the total. As shown in figure 3.13, the M10 and M11 are the predominant measures on the P4, in particular the M10 with 192,000,000 €, or 11.88%, and the M11 with 249,000,000 € with 15.4%.



Figure 3.13. Public support for P4 distinguished by measure-PUGLIA region.

The RDP of the Puglia region provides for a budget of \in 131,000,000 for priority 5, representing 8.1% of the total. From figure 3.14 it can be seen that the measures concerning priority 5 are only three:

- M04 affecting the FA5A with 1.73% and the FA5C for 0.37%
- M08 present only in the FA5E but at a cost of 4.02% (65,000,000 €)
- M16 with 1.24% in FA5A, 0.62% in FA5B and only 0.12% in FA5E



Figure 3.14. Public support for P5 distinguished by FA and measure - PUGLIA region.

The four measures most funded by the RDP of the Puglia region are:

- 525 million € allocated to measure 4 (Investments in physical assets)
- 249 million € allocated to measure 11 (Organic farming)
- 192 million € allocated to measure 10 (Agri-environment-climate)
- 170 million € allocated to measure 6 (Farm and business development).

All four measures are on the list of intervention measures that address environmental and climate issues.



 Table 3.7. Measures description-Puglia region.

Measure	Brief description	Beneficiaries
M10.1.01	IPM for olive trees, fruit trees, horticultural crops	farmers and their associations,
M10.1.03	conservative agriculture for arable land; excluding horticultural crops and arboreal (includes cover crops)	farmers and their associations,
M11	Indirectly the n. 18 - Support and further develop the diversity of native vegetable, animal and forest species typical of agro-forest and natural environments	Farmers and their associations



MAINLAND

Finland in the RDP of the Mainland region is the one that assigns a higher budget than the others to priorities 4 with an expenditure of $5,675,331,757 \in$, corresponding to 69.14% of the total. Measure 13 alone covers 44.5% and more priority impacts with a $3,652,800,000 \in$ funding, followed by the M10 with a budget of $1,656,331,757 \in$, or 20.18%.



Figure 3.15. Public support for P4 distinguished by measure-MAINLAND region

The RDP provides for a budget of 146,200,000 € for priority 5, which covers only 1.69% of the total. None of the measures affecting FA for P5 exceed the 1% threshold.



Figure 3.16. Public support for P5 distinguished by FA and measure - MAINLAND region.

The four measures most funded by the RDP Mainland are:

- 3.65 billion € allocated for Measure 13: Areas facing natural constraints
- 1.66 billion € allocated for Measure 10: Agri-Environment-Climate
- 901 million € allocated for Measure 4: Investments in physical assets
- 388 million € allocated to Measure 14: Animal welfare



Three of the four measures are present on the list of intervention measures that address environmental and climate issues with very important funding.

 Table 3.8. Measures description-Mainland region.

Measure	Brief description	Beneficiaries
M10	In Finland, most farms participate the agri-environmental schemes. In 2016, 43,935 farms had made the agri-environmental commitment that is around 86% of farmers. In the current scheme, farmer may choose a selection of parcel-specific measures besides the measures that concern similarly all the farms. Many of these measures are favoring permanent grass lands. Such are buffer zones, grassland for green manure, nature management field grassland or perennial environment grasslands for ground water areas. In addition, parcel-specific measures include the plant cover on arable land in winter time. Target areas of most measures have been achieved or even exceeded. However, grassland for green manure could be still increased especially with monotonous cropping areas of Southern Finland. Cover crops are also included by the scheme. They were at first adopted by great number of farmers, but later on, the area was halved being now 123 200 ha (2018). Main reason for the dropout was certain administrative restrictions that had to be made because of the budget reasons. Also certain challenges were met by the pioneering farmers who had to cope with exceptional weather conditions. Most of the farmers of cover crops are clearly motivated by the programme compensation while certain individuals may exist also, that are acknowledging the benefits for soil improvement. Advisory project of Natural Resources Institute Finland with several on-farm pilots found to be important, while it could interact with farmers and consolidate the knowledge about appropriate cultivation practices. Cultivation of old conservation varieties is supported in the programme. However, the amount of these contracts have still remained low. Increase of compensation levels have been suggested for the measure. Currently, there are 24 varieties that have been registered as valuable genetic plant resources and can be supported be the programme. Only plant species with high rarity can be accepted.	farmers
M11	Payments for organic production can be considered as one of the main tools for promoting diversified crop production and farming. This is because crop rotation is an essential element of farming. It is used for fertilizing and keeping the optimal structure of soils. Multicropping is also utilized especially with legumes. They are able to rise the protein level of cereals by nitrate fixation. Flowering plants are useful for pollinators and certain plants may also provide means for ecological pest management. In 2017, organic farming took place around 11% of the total cultivation area whereas the national target is to increase the cultivation up to 20% by 2020. Even though the area of organic farming has been increased, the market share of organic products is still low (around 2.5% in terms of the value of production). Therefore, it is most important to develop also the functioning of food production chains. Most common plant for organic farming is grass forage (77 000 ha), mainly used for animal feeding, but also for green manuring.	Organic farmers



NETHERLANDS

The Netherlands in its RDP allocates a budget of 948,770,000 \in to priority 4, corresponding to 56.25% of the total. There are only two measures that affect the priority, the M04 with an investment of 430,320,000 \in equal to 25.51% and the M10 which represents 30.74% with an expense of \in 518.45 million.²



Figure 3.17. Public support for P4 distinguished by measure-NETHERLANDS region.

Netherlands in its RDP does not provide for investments for priority 5. The four measures most funded by the Dutch RDP are:

- 791 million € allocated for Measure 4: Productive and non-productive investments
- 518 million € allocated for Measure 10: Agri-Environment-Climate
- 113 million € allocated for Measure 19: Leader/CLLD
- 84 million € allocated for Measure 16: Cooperation.

it can be observed that three of the four measures are present on the list of intervention measures that address environmental and climate issues. Note that the Netherlands does not activate the M11- Organic farming.

 Table 3.9.
 Measures description-Netherlands region.

Measure	Brief description	Beneficiaries
M10	This measure aims to support agricultural practices that have positive effects on the environment, landscape, soil, natural resources and biodiversity. It is especially aimed at the maintenance of biodiversity on agricultural lands and adjacent lands. Only activities that go beyond the implementation of regulations can be supported.	(Groups of) farmers or managers of agricultural lands, agricultural collectives.

² <u>https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/rural-development-2014-2020/country-files/nl/factsheet_en.pdf</u>



ANDALUCIA

As a region Andalucia allocates 38.43% (940,895,752 €) of its RDP budget to finance priority 4. Figure 3.18 show the details concerning the distribution of budgets for the measures related to P4. They predominantly impact the M10 (Agri-environment-climate) with 319,674,162 €, representing 13.06%, and the M11 (Organic farming) with 228,965,064 € occupying 9.35% of the P4.



Figure 3.18. Public support for P4 distinguished by measure-ANDALUCIA region.

To priority 5 is allocated a total budget of 315,188,375 € which represents 12.87% of the total RDP funding. Figure 3.19 shows for each single Focus Area activated in P5 which measures affect the FA of reference, considering that the costs for the measures are allocated based on how much they impact on the FA.

Andalucia places greater attention on FA5 (Carbon conservation and sequestration) through the M08 - forest (with a budget of 199,457,924 \in , corresponding to 8.15%) and the M15(Forest environmental and climate services and forest conservation) to a limited extent since it represents only 0.45%. The M04 (Investment) covers the activation of the FA5A (water efficiency) at a cost of 102,500,000 \in , which represents 4.19%.



Figure 3.19. Public support for P5 distinguished by FA and measure -ANDALUCIA region.



The FA5C can be defined as the one of minor importance in terms of budget as only 0.9% of the loans have been allocated to the FA. The four measures most funded by the Andalucia RDP are:

- 679 million € allocated to Measure 4 Investment in physical assets
- 394 million € allocated to Measure 8 Investment in forest area development and improvement of the viability of forests.
- 320 million € allocated to Measure 10 Agri-environment-climate
- 258 million € allocated to Measure 19 LEADER

Three out of four are the measures that address environmental and climate issues.



RHINELAND-PALATINE

Rhineland-Palatine assigns a budget of 8,850,000 € to priority 4, equal to a total of 43.54% of the RDP. Figure 3.20 shows the measures that most affect P4, which are the M10 with 23.55% (156,000,000 €) and the M11 with 122,000,000 €, corresponding to the 18.42%.



Figure 3.20. Public support for P4 distinguished by measure- RHINELAND-PFLAZ region.

Rhineland-Palatine region allocates to P5 funding for 18,500,000 €, corresponding to 2.79% of the total. As shown in figure 3.21 all five FAs are activated and for each one the measures M02 and M16 have always allocated the same budget, M02 0.06% (400,000 €) and M16 0.08% (500,000 €).

The FA5A also features the M04 with a larger budget that is just over 2%.





The four measures most funded by the RDP of the Rhineland-Palatine are:

- 212 million € allocated to M04 (Investments in physical assets)
- 156 million € allocated to M10 (Agri-environment-climate)
- 122 million € allocated to M11 (Organic farming)
- 71 million € allocated to M19 (LEADER / CLLD: community-led local development)

Three of the four measures are present on the list of intervention measures that address environmental and climate issues.



HUNGARY

Hungary in its RDP allocates 4,203,443,811 € to priority 4, corresponding to 28.83% of the total budget. As shown in figure 3.22, M10 is the measure that most interests the priority with an expense of $638,200,527 \in (15.29\%)$, while the others do not exceed the 5% threshold.



Figure 3.22. Public support for P4 distinguished by measure- HUNGARY region.

To priority 5 is allocated the 15.08% with a cost of $629,185,295 \in$, activating all the FA, even if with tight budgets in some cases. Figure 3.23 show that both the M04 that affects four of the 5 FAs and that the largest budget is allocated to the FA5B with an expenditure of $399,737,812 \in$, equal to 9.58% for the measure.



Figure 3.23. Public support for P5 distinguished by FA and measure - HUNGARY region.

The four measures most funded by the Hungarian RDP are:

- 1 425 million € allocated to measure 4 (Investments in physical assets)
- 638 million € allocated to measure 10 (Agro-environment-climate)
- 328 million € allocated to measure 6 (Farm and business development)

Three of the four measures are present on the list of intervention measures that address environmental and climate issues.



4. Further steps

In the next months, WP9 activities will continue focusing on the study of the win-win (farmer-society) situations and the most feasible and promising measures leading to farm productivity, revenues, competitiveness, environmental improvements, and other benefits for society and the environment, with a focus on robust and low-regret measures. This will permit to draw some recommendations to preserve the environment and the long-term agricultural viability and competitiveness. Recommendations will be then validated using a multi-actor approach, thus discussing them with actors operating in relevant European Innovation Platforms.

Furthermore, the survey on the perception of drivers and constraints to the implementation of crop diversification practice will be replied each year in order to monitor the eventual change of perceptions by farmers and case study managers.

The final aim is to utilise the outcomes of these further activities to update relevant EU policies and eventually to suggest new tools to be adopted within EU regulations.



5. References

- European commission, Agriculture and Rural Development". Previous rural development programming periods. Rural Development policy 2007-2013". <u>https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/rural-development-previous en</u>
- European commission, Agriculture and Rural Development "Rural development 2014-2020". https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/rural-development-2014-2020_en
- European Commission, Common agricultural policy at a glance. "The common agricultural policy supports farmers and ensures Europe's food security." <u>https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-fisheries/key-policies/common-agricultural-policy/cap-glance_en</u>
- European Commission, Common agricultural policy "The common agricultural policy is about our food, the environment and the countryside". <u>https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-fisheries/key-policies/common-agricultural-policy_en</u>
- Frascarelli A., 2019. La nuova struttura dei pagamenti diretti nella proposta di Pac 2021-2027. Agriregionieuropa anno 15 n°56.
- Marandola D., Vanni F., 2019. Le sfide della nuova architettura verde della Pac post 2020. Agriregionieuropa anno 15 n°56.
- Sotte F., 2019. Riflessioni sulla Pac nel futuro dell'UE . Agriregionieuropa anno 15 n°56.

RDPs FACTSHEET

- https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/rural-development-2014-2020/country-files/nl/factsheet_en.pdf
- https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/rural-development-2014-2020/country-files/hu/factsheet-hungary_en.pdf
- https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/rural-development-2014-2020/country-files/it/factsheet-emilia-romagna_en.pdf
- https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/rural-development-2014-2020/country-files/it/factsheet-lombardia_en.pdf
- https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/rural-development-2014-2020/country-files/it/factsheet-puglia_en.pdf
- https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/rural-development-2014-2020/country-files/fi/factsheet-mainland_en.pdf



https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/rural-development-2014-2020/country-files/de/factsheet-rhineland-palatinate_en.pdf



6.Appendix 1

6.1. Case study questionnaire



Work Package 9

Framework for relevant policies

Task 9.1

Analysis of relevant regional policies

Case study questionnaire



Please answer to the following questions after reading the attached guidelines. If you need further explanation you can contact the WP leader Barbara Pancino (bpancino@unitus.it).

1. General information about the case study. Please check the info in the table below and fill in the missing data.

Case Study n°	
Country	
Location	
Main crop	
Crop final use	
Region	
CAP reference territory	
Name and contact of the person filling out the questionnaire	



- 2. Please, describe the diversification practices implemented in your case study.
 - ___ Intercropping
 - __ Crop rotation
 - __ Multi-cropping
 - ___Other (specify): _____

Notes/comments:

- 3. The diversification practice of this case study has an impact on: (you can select more than one option)
 - ___ Soil erosion
 - ___ Soil organic matter
 - ___ Water quality
 - ___ Biodiversity
 - ___ Weed management
 - ___ Energy efficiency
 - ___ Greenhouse gases emissions
 - ___ Other (specify): _____



- 4. Considering the amount of adopters, in your opinion, at which step of diffusion is this diversification practice in your region?
 - ___ Research and field experimentation
 - ___ Early adoption
 - ___ Fairly common
 - ___ Wide diffusion

Notes/comments:

- 5. How did you get to know about the diversification practice implemented in your case study?
 - ___ Inspiration from your territory
 - ___ Inspiration from other territories
 - ___ Research advice
 - ____ Technical advice (agronomist, PO, etc..)
 - ___ Other (specify): _____

Notes/comments:

6. Currently, are there agricultural policies that support the implementation and diffusion of this diversification practice?

 No
V

___ Yes Which policies?



Which instruments and measures are used?

7. Which could be the drivers for the adoption/diffusion of this diversification practice? (please specify the level for each option)

	None	Low	Medium	High
Mandatory				
Public support				
Ethics				
Market-consumer				
demand				
Market – business				
to business				

Notes/comments:

8. In your opinion, after one year of experimentation, which are the kind of constraints to the diffusion of this diversification practice? (please specify the level for each option)

	None	Low	Medium	High
Agronomic				
Economic (at farm				
level)				
Commercial				
Political				
Cultural				



Notes/comments: