

Successful mainstreaming of climate action into post-2013 Rural Development Policy

Peter Wehrheim Climate Finance and Deforestation , DG Climate Action

Workshop on Environment and Climate in post-2013 Rural Development Brussels, 7 December 2012

Why *mainstreaming* of climate into EU's rural development programmes?

- Agriculture and forest world wide account for about 30% of <u>emissions</u>;
- Agriculture and forests have significant potential to be a <u>sink</u> and reduce athmospheric carbon by increasing carbon pools in wood, biomass, and soils;
- Agriculture and rural areas obviously also exposed to risks, have to <u>adapt</u>!

Objective: Make EU agriculture and rural areas more climatefriendly and resilient!

Question: Is that possible? Can the CAP make a difference?

Yes, Change is possible and the CAP/Rural Development can make a difference!

Example 1: CH4 emissions from enteric fermentation significantly declined between, 1990 – 2008, milk production increased, example for increased resource efficiency



Example 2: N2O emissions from EU agricultural soils significantly declined between, 1990 – 2008,



Important links between CAP/rural development and other EU policies: climate policy, renewables, biofuels, adaptation strategy (2013), bio-economy...



4



Emissions inventory for sectors in 2010



Sectors "Agriculture", "Energy" and "LULUCF", EU-27, 2010 (source: DG AGRI)

EU's Climate regulation related to Agriculture

Timber

Carbon in perennial

energy crops

accounted as emission

harvested

when





Annual crops

Carbon in annual crops not accounted.



Energy crops





Wetlands

Manure management





N2O in agricultural soils



Effort Sharing Decision (part of EU's reduction target)

Biogas on farm

How can climate objectives be mainstreamed into rural development programs?

OSCAR – Study aims and objectives

- DG CLIMA has launched this project to provide guidance material for the design of climate action in RDPs post-2013:
 - **Support tool** for the identification of optimal strategies to address climate change objectives in rural areas
 - Assessment of national/regional climate
 "hotspots" mitigation and adaptation
 - Estimates of **cost and effects** of different RDP operations in view of potential **climate benefits**
 - Due to substantial amount of data and calculations: design of a SOFTWARE tool replaces a 'paper' manual
 - Geographical Information System (GIS) used to generate Regional Variation Categories (RVCs), assess different impact



Project Summary

The OSCAR Project

Climate change is now widely recognised as one of the greatest threats facing the world today, with human activities making a significant contribution to increased concentrations of atmospheric greenhouse gases (1963), with serious implications for our future climate, food and water security, as well as disease pressures and biodiversity impacts. As a result it has become imperative that the twin objectives of climate change policy, namely mitigation and adaptation, are taken into account during the development of policies and programmes of all sorts, not least those with implications for the rurul all environment and communities.



Chief amongst these over the next few years will be the Rural Development Programmes (RDP3) being developed for implementation in the post-2013 period X as result, D6 CUMA of the European Commission engaged an international team of researchers, led by the Agriculture and Environment Research Unit (AERU) at the University of Hertfordshire, to develop procedures for integrating dimate change policy objectives into those for rural development. The OSCAR project team has therefore completed an extensive review of publicated an other sources, together with case-studies in the UK, France and Poland, to develop a Manual and complementary Decision Support Tool to assist Managing Authorities in the development of climate change sensitive porgrammes.



The OSCAR Manual & Software The OSCAR Manual and Software have been developed to serve as practical tools which Managing Authorities may make use of whilst formulating their RDPs, such that as well as fulfilling a rural development role, they can make vital contribution towards Member State greenhouse gas emission targets and wider climate change objectives. A step-by-step procedure for achieving this is both described and thily supported by an extensive decision support system, allowing complex environmental interactions to be assessed and considered within high level policy development procedures Both the Manual and Software are free to download, and can be obtained by visiting the OSCAR website.





OSCAR study: conceptual framework

Assessment of rural development operations in terms of its "**MAPP criteria**":

- <u>Mitigation potential</u> via the quantification of the change in GHG emissions it causes.
- <u>Adaptive Capacity impact</u> via a description of its potential to affect the ability of an ecosystem service to adapt under climate change stresses.
- **<u>P</u>roductivity impact** via the affect it will have on agricultural production within a specified area.
- **<u>Practicality assessment</u>** via the identification of factors which will influence the climate change benefits realised

File Explore





FR - France LU - Luxembourg PL - Poland SI - Slovenia UK - United Kingdom	000 - ALL UKC - North East (England) UKD - North West (England) UKE - Yorkshire And The Humber UKF - East Midlands (England) UKG - West Midlands (England) UKH - East of England UKI - London UKJ - South East (England) UKK - South West (England) UKK - South West (England) UKK - Wales UKM - Scotland UKN - Northern Ireland	000 - ALL UKJ1 - Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire UKJ2 - Surrey, East and West Sussex UKJ3 - Hampshire and Isle of Wight UKJ4 - Kent	UKJ11 - Berkshire UKJ12 - Milton Keynes UKJ13 - Buckinghamshire CC UKJ14 - Oxfordshire UKJ21 - Brighton and Hove UKJ22 - East Sussex CC UKJ23 - Surrey UKJ24 - West Sussex UKJ31 - Portsmouth UKJ32 - Southampton UKJ33 - Hampshire CC UKJ34 - Isle of Wight UKJ42 - Kent CC
<u> </u>			
NUTS Code Name		Defining Regional Characteristics: Selecting regions to	Area
		assess the impact of RDP operations	



Potential 'hotspots'

Mitigation

Adaptation

Minimize emissions from:

- livestock manure and enteric fermentation,
 - manure management,
- grassland nitrogen fertilizer use,
- drainage of high soil organic carbon,
- peatland under agricultural production
 - soil erosion
 - soil management

Removals from:

- increase soil organic matter
- preserve soil carbon stock

Increase resilience against:

- drought,
 - hail,
- water stress,
- temperature increase,
- habitat fragmentation,
 - loss of biodiversity

OSCAR study can generate "hotspot" reports at national and regional level (NUTS 1 to NUTS 3)

👒 RVC Browser

<u>File</u> <u>T</u>oolbox

~

Regional hotspots Average values for region |

Hotspot Report: test1 Risk of nitrate leaching NATURA 2000 The table below shows the Risk of forest fires It falls into the risk band for the criterion of the criterion															
NUTS3	CFF	CST	DEN	DLA	FFR	FLO	LAN	LER	N2K	POL	SER	SOS	FLA	WPS	SCS
Ariège	10	0	0	0	100	0	0	52	100	0	0	11	0	0	0
Aveyron	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	100	0	0	4	0	0	0
Haute-Garonne	32	0	0	0	100	0	0	13	40	0	0	4	0	0	0
Gers	35	0	0	0	100	0	0	20	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lot	32	0	0	0	100	0	0	36	75	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hautes-Pyrénées	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	50	85	0	0	17	0	0	0
Tarn	23	0	0	0	100	0	0	31	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tarn-et-Garonne	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	50	0	0	0	0	0	0
RVC Key						1	$\widehat{\mathbf{k}}$							1	

RVC Key

Code	Short name	Description	✓ Identifying Issues of ↓
CFF	CO2 Fossil Fuel	Carbon dioxide from field operations	Concorn
CST	CO2 Soil Tillage	Carbon dioxide release from soil due to tillage	concern.
DEN	Denitrification Risk	N2O from denitrification	Identifying 'hotspots'
DLA	Dilution_A	Water quality (average/typical quality data) dilution	within a region
FFR	Forest Fire	Risk of forest fires	
FLO	Flooding	Flooding: Projected change in damage of river floods with a 100-year return pe	riod between 2071-2100 and 1961-1990
LAN	Landscape	Impact on nationally designated areas of landscape value (National - CDDA) fr	om soil erosion and forest fires
LER	Leaching Risk	Risk of nitrate leaching	
N2K	Natura 2000	Risk to biodiversity in Natura 2000 sites from temperature increase	
POL	Pollination	Risk to pollinators	
SER	Soil Erosion	Soil erosion increase due to increase in rainfall and increase in heavy rainfall	
SOS	SOM Stress	Loss of Soil Organic Matter due to hotter and drier conditions	
EL A	Triber a	the second	



Combination of measures - examples:

P5D: Reducing CH₄ and N₂O from agriculture

P5B: Increasing efficiency in energy use P5E: Fostering carbon sequestration in agriculture and forestry

- Investments in physical assets (art. 18) - Farm and business development (art. 20) - AECM (art. 29) - Organic farming (art. 30) - Restoring agricultural production potential damaged by natural disasters and catastrophic events and introduction of appropriate prevention actions (art. 19) Prevention and restoration of damage to forests from forest fires and natural disasters and catastrophic events (art. 25) Advisory services, farm management and farm relief

services (art. 16)

Investments in physical assets (art. 18)
Farm and business development (art. 20)

- Basic services and village renewal in rural areas (art. 21)

- Advisory services, farm management and farm relief services (art. 16)

- Knowledge transfer and information actions (art. 15)

 Afforestation and creation of woodland (art. 23)
 AECM (art. 29)

- Establishment of agro-forestry systems (art. 24)

- Investments improving the resilience and environmental vale of forest ecosystems (art. 26)

- Forest-environmental and climate services and forest conservation (art. 35)

- Investments in forest area development and improvement of the viability of forests (art. 22)

- Knowledge transfer and information actions (art. 15)

Evaluating Climate Change Impact:

Selected operations – ranked by MAP criteria

Search ...

- My Operations...

Afforestation to buffer watercourses or to preven Ancient trees in arable fields Ancient trees in intensively managed grass (cattle Ancient trees in intensively managed grass (shee Arable reversion to lowland semi-improved grassl Arable reversion to permanent unimproved (unfer Archaeology: Arable reversion to lowland semi-im Archaeology: Protection of archaeological featur Archaeology: Reduce cultivation depth on arable Ban on cutting vegetation on set-aside land Beetle banks on arable land Brassica fodder crops followed by over-wintered Buffer strips on cultivated land during the nesting Buffer strips on cultivated land next to a hedgero Buffer strips on cultivated land next to a waterco Buffer strips on cultivated land to reduce bystanc Buffer strips on semi-improved grassland (cattle) i Buffer strips on semi-improved grassland (sheep) Buffer strips on temporary grassland (cattle) next Cattle grazing (replacing sheep) on upland moorl-Coniferous forest management: control of deer ar Coniferous forest management: grey squirrel conf Conservation headlands in arable fields Conservation headlands in arable fields (unfertilis Conservation of blanket bogs, heaths and uplan-Creation of new wooded meadows from arable la Creation of traditional orchards from lowland sem Creation of traditional orchards from lowland sem Creation of wood pasture from arable land Creation/restoration of grassland for birds from up Creation/restoration of grassland for birds from up Creation/restoration of grassland for birds from up

- 2 2

Ranked Mitigation Adaptation Production Operations Aggregated

My Operations

2

Ranked by total regional impact using the 250 year time horizon.

Operation name 月	Mitigation 💐	Adaptation 💐	Production 💐	Combined 💐	Data Quality
Pollen and nectar seed mixtures in lowland unimproved grassland (sheep)	0	100	0	33	al
Pollen and nectar seed mixtures in lowland unimproved grassland (cattle)	0	100	-1	33	al
<u>Wild bird seed mixture in</u> grassland (sheep)	-3	100	0	32	al
<u>Wild bird seed mixture in</u> grassland (cattle)	-3	100	-1	32	al
Brassica fodder crops followed by over- wintered stubbles	53	0	0	18	91
Buffer strips on semi- improved grassland (sheep) next to a hedgerow	0	54	-2	17	a
Buffer strips on semi- improved grassland (cattle) next to a hedgerow	0	54	-4	17	a
Forestry: Improvement of forest infrastructure including that to address fire fighting	0	49	0	16	a

test3.osc

Y





'Climate' potential of LEADER? examples

- Example: Energy efficiency of street lights Modernization of about 120 points of light in the community (Sachsenwald-Elbe, DE)
 - Contribution to climate protection
 - Lower costs and usage of energy
 - Improved lighting quality
- **Example**: Zero emissions region Implementation concept for Regenerative Self-Generation of Electricity in Dörpum (Schleswig Holstein, DE)
 - Generation of electricity from biogas, wind and photovoltaic innovative energy management and self-sufficiency
 - To provide long-term benefit for private households, companies and local authorities



Thank you for your attention!

"We can bail out banks. We can bail out states. But no one can bail out the climate, if we don't get our act together." Climate Commissioner Connie Hedegaard International climate negotiations in Doha, 4 Dec. 2012

Further information on:

Commisioner for climate action, Connie Hedegaard:

• <u>http://ec.europa.eu/commission 2010-2014/hedegaard/</u>

EU Climate Action:

<u>http://ec.europa.eu/clima/</u>

On forests, agriculture and climate:

<u>http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/forests/</u>