

Contribution from the member organisations of The Swedish Rural Network to the public debate about the future CAP

The Swedish Rural Network is composed of about 100 member organisations. They are national authorities as The Board of Agriculture, The Swedish National Heritage Board etc. and large national organisations like The Federation of Swedish Farmers (LRF) the village group association All Sweden Shall Live and the Federation of Rural Economy and Agricultural Societies. But the network contains also actors like The Association of Bee Keepers, The Association for Traditional Seasonal Migrating Agriculture, The Association for Breeding of Warm Blood Race Horses and the National Federation of Community Halls.

Thus the variation and width of the network is large, which also is reflected in the large variation of opinions about the future CAP post 2013. Another source of variation in the answers is that some have given a personal individual view and some have given a view as representative for their organisation, a more formal official view. As a total there have been more than 30 actors contributing to the debate.

With the short time available to gather comments and opinions within the network we have tried to use different sources. Besides advertising the use of the open forum at the EU Com website we have also collected opinions from the members in three different ways:

1. At the Rural Parliament with about 1100 participants we advertised the Public Debate and had flyers with the questions where the participants could write their suggestions and answers. The flyers were collected in the NRN exhibition stand.
2. We have also asked the member organisations to send their opinion and suggestions by mail to the NRN.
3. During 2009 we used our method of telephone workshops to discuss the future CAP post 2013 with the members. About 10. telephone workshops were arranged with of about 6 participants in each. As a total 56 members participated in the workshops. The suggestions from this activity have also been used here.

The questions we gave in our flyer and in the request for answers by e-mail were:

1. What do you think should be the goals and targets for agriculture and rural development in society?
2. Do you think agricultural policy and rural development policy still should be handled at EU level?
3. How can the ways and methods used to handle agricultural and rural issues be refined in order to better meet the needs and expectations from society?
4. How can the measures in the Rural Development Programme be better and more effective?
5. How do you think the Rural Development Programme should be organised, managed and monitored?

We have tried to make sub groups to categorise the suggestions and answer to each question in order to make it more visible and more clear. The first part of our document contains these categorised answers. The second part is the result of the telephone workshops in 2009 and the

third part is a full text version of the answers sent in by e-mail. It has only been possible to translate the condensed report with the categorised answers into English. The rest is sent in Swedish. If needed, we will provide the rest of the documents also in English when they have been translated.



1. What do you think should be the goals and targets for agriculture and rural development in society?

Category	Answers (the amount of similar answers is indicated by the Roman numbers before the answer)
Agricultural structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • V It is important that it is possible to operate smaller farms and small-scale diversified agriculture • IV Organic production cycles and climate-neutral production should apply - it can also promote rural development through green jobs • Food safety is an important issue - even with regard to environmental and climate change • III Domestic production needed - self-sufficiency should be at 60% - 75%, also reduced food stuff imports to agricultural production is necessary. • II local production should be promoted • IV Actively farmed land should be reserved for future needs of food security but also for other production of goods and services where energy production is one of the most important. • II It is important to enhance and support the competitiveness of the farms • II Agriculture (especially animal husbandry) is important for biodiversity and an open landscape • II The environmental quality objectives should be of great weight (rich farmland, no fertilization and a rich flora and fauna, etc.), environmental benefits are important to this, important also to allow for "atypical" soil types and species • There must be a balance between animal husbandry and plant cultivation - the ceiling of livestock units per hectare must be reduced to solve the water issue • Technology, Environment and Sustainability should be the basis for agricultural development and also be reflected in the education and training • The Rural Development Program should be used to compensate for agriculture's natural disadvantages, the agri environment payments and public goods. If the principle of public goods shall work, it must be possible to compensate the farmers for more than only lost revenue and increased costs and it must be possible to let the demand direct the measures for compensation. • Extended LFA payments are important means of strengthening competitiveness and should be done through higher reimbursement rates, expanded areas and more crops to compensate
Structure of the business fabric, preconditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • II In order to increase the population in rural areas there is a strong need for increase employments and a wide spectrum of rural

	<p>businesses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Rural Development Programme should promote increased competitiveness by stimulating business development and market orientation • Both The Rural Development programme and the structural funds programs shall lead to improved profitability of individual businesses. This means that if general implementation models will be used (i.e. Leader), they must become better in supporting entrepreneurship and that the broader rural development measures (such as village development) should be given a lower priority • Local processing of biological raw materials should be stimulated to increase the profitability of enterprises, strengthen the local economy and reduce the vulnerability of society • Wind and solar energy production are important rural industries • Remove unnecessary rules • Remove the regulations, taxes and fees that constrains the business competition.
Service and infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High level of service should be available at a reasonable distance in rural areas. A minimum level of service should be guaranteed, in most areas. it is also important for tourism industry • Good infrastructure should be available in all areas (road, railway, airport, IT) • Small rural schools are to be protected and preserved. • Broadband is needed to promote growth of service businesses. • Rural areas´ role as providers of recreation areaa must be considered
Economic structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IV Local economy and increased self-sufficiency, such as on food and energy (locally and nationally) • Economic growth should not longer be the cornerstone in society development. Instead the concept of "Resilience" (Recovery and balance of natural resources and society) should be promoted. • The concept of "Family Farms" (smaller holdings) should be promoted instead of large cereal production companies that does not have interest in contributing to local development • It should be possible to make a living in rural areas, so that new industries and businesse should be encouraged
Demographics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • II Stimulate a slow population growth by encouraging attractive living environments for urban populations and "new Swedes" (immigrants) • The population should increase to ensure a basement of working force for the future expansion and future green industries and other industries • Prepare rural areas for a possible expansion of population due to the global population growth, changing climate and the natural environments that we have in North

<p>General remarks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IV Promote viable and sustainable rural areas where agriculture is a central part • The objectives of sustainable development should consider all three dimensions: economic, ecological and social sustainability • The importance of cooperation with other Baltic countries for a clean and healthy Östersjö • II Promote attractive countryside as a good living environment (housing with employment, service and meaningful leisure activities) • Important to work closely with representatives of the voluntary sector • Promoting a sustainable Europe where rural areas are contributing Food and energy • III Addressing the civic engagement • Increase attention to the general community development. • Peri-urban rural areas should be promoted as an added value to the city - the integration of urban and rural • Rural areas should be developed hand in hand with urban areas • Improving the understanding and knowledge of rural development, preferably as a separate topic • Housing in rural areas should be on the conditions of the rural society • Societal goals should include a change of consumer's habits in which vegetarian diet is favoured at the expense of meat • It is important that the different parts of the Cohesion Policy and The Rural Development Programme are complementary. Nevertheless, The Rural Development Programme is a part of the common agricultural policy and, therefore, the remuneration in the RDP and the Single Payment Scheme are strongly interlinked, making it important to the The Rural Development Programme, taking into account the changes in the Single Payment Scheme. • Local Development / village development should be a new first pillar of CAP, which also should change its name to The Common Rural Policy. The second pillar should then be agriculture and the third pillar should then be the environment. The first pillar should be broad and include services, such as infrastructure. broadband, the development of local economy and small businesses, small holdings etc. but also the Leader • The implementation of the RDP and the SF:s has the objective to improve the profitability of individual businesses. This means that the general implementation models (eg Leader) must be used in a much better way to support entrepreneurship. This also means that more general non-business oriented rural development measures (eg village development) should be given a lower priority.
------------------------	--

2. Do you think agricultural policy and rural development policy still should be handled at EU level?

Category	Answers (the amount of similar answers is indicated by the Roman numbers before the answer)	
	Yes	No
Environmental and animal protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To increase the opportunities to handle issues affecting the whole European agriculture • II, many issues such as the environment should be solved jointly among the member states. Working together within the EU is the best opportunity you have to save the global environment 	
Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • II In order to ensure a high level of quality in all production in agriculture 	
Promoting exchange of experiences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • II, the EU is a tool for transmitting ideas across borders, so that good practice can be disseminated 	
Trade issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reduce the amount of constraints and hurdles for trade between the respective EU countries and between Europe and the world • The rules should be similar for competitive reasons • To prevent “bad” competition in food production. • To make the competition more even and to show that it is possible to combine high environmental standards with good profitability • Both the Rural Development Programme and the Structural Fund Programmes should be applied within the EU common regulatory framework and objective criteria in order not to distort competition within the common market 	
Subsidies and financing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As an additional source for funding of local development 	☒

	<p>efforts in which the nation determines the guidelines for all levels in the country (central, regional, local)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EU subsidies should be given with large flexibility to the Member States to decide how to use • II payments will be targeted but the conditions suited to local / national context • Less of direct farm subsidies and more money for development projects • The payments should be funded by the EU to greater extent. • A national co-financing of the Single Payment Scheme should be introduced as long as that form of subsidy remains 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leader LAG:s should be allowed themselves to build their administrative systems
<p>General remarks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To add a bottom bar of the legislation for organic production • For collaboration in the Baltic Sea • Good with a common policy that call also for a national Rural Development Policy and a national strategic plan, which is broken down to regional programmes on the basis of common EU objectives and guidelines - it gives a clearer rural policy if the cross-cutting issues are handled at European level. • Rural issues are too important to be handled by the national government which during an election period controls a country • II To promote a uniform approach and even out inequalities and inequities between and within countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not detailed regulations, which will ultimately jeopardize the transition to Resilience as a focus • II What can be done should be located close to the people there, at the local level. • II The mandate and power to form the CAP should be placed in each country where different conditions and cultural differences create specific needs • A successful rural policy requires interaction between the local population and its organizations, municipal, regional and national bodies. Collaboration is vital and it is not

	<p>and that can not be justified from a societal perspective</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • III The principle of subsidiarity should be applied • The Swedish countryside will benefit from having the rural policy at a European level since many European countries are looking more positively on rural development. • III Yes but only if the administrative burden and complicated regulations are decreased. The EU bureaucracy is a strong disincentive to rural development policy and should be replaced by a system that Swedish people have confidence in and which promotes a rapid and non-bureaucratic development process among concerned citizens • CAP should focus only on remuneration for public goods and other social development goals. 	<p>appropriate to control such processes at EU level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No to the current regime with strong EU rule, which inhibits more than it promotes
--	--	---

3. How can the ways and methods used to handle agricultural and rural issues be refined in order to better meet the needs and expectations from society?

Category	Answers (the amount of similar answers is indicated by the Roman numbers before the answer)
3:1 Legitimacy/ trust/ knowledge within the population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • III The taxpaying public must learn more about the value of "common goods", ecosystem services, rural development in general and how the CAP's various measures contribute to achieving common objectives <p>It is important to define what is to be regarded (and paid for) as public goods (both in The Rural Development Programme and CAP) to clarify and promote understanding of the multifunctional agriculture. The definition should be broad. In Sweden the following topics are part of the multifunctionality: biodiversity, water quality, soil fertility, climate: mitigating greenhouse effect and carbon storage, farmland landscape including cultural sites, food safety and also animal welfare and thriving rural villages.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus food production so that consumers have confidence in the food, ie. organic / locally produced • The actors, the final beneficiaries must be given clear, logical and long-term frameworks for delivery of environmental services, i.e. the agri environment payments. • Faster approval and decisions for the programmes and regulations that need continuity - do not force actors (i.e. farmers and other applicants) to work on an unfinished regulatory framework • Agricultural and rural issues should be given higher priority • No exemptions for agriculture for carbon tax or similar costs just with reference to the fact that agriculture contributes to public goods • Capacity building of key support functions - everything from county boards to excellence - should be promoted
<p>3:2 Holistic views, Partnership, decentralisation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many policies require better coordination of actions that should not work against each other and a better use of resources • II Rural development is not just about agriculture. It have to have a broader approach. As for example small businesses in the hospitality industry and commuter housing. Agriculture is an important component, but environmental measures and actions in other areas, such as service and infrastructure, should be given greater weight • II Local and regional partnerships between public, voluntary and private must have a greater influence in both planning and implementation • IV As much as possible must be decided in a dialogue with local people and local representatives and not at national or European level
<p>3:3 Simplification of rules</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • V The work with simplification of the regulations must continue at all levels • The desire to ensure transparency and monitoring has a self-generating force that creates more management and control and administrative burdens. • It must be possible to take local and regional concerns into the regulatory framework. The legitimacy is suffering because of an excessive administrative overcoat
<p>3:4 Infrastructure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should be easier for businesses in rural areas by society investments in good infrastructure • If there are goals for thriving rural communities and an active agriculture, it should also be discussed if it is the responsibility of producers and consumers to bear the costs for the business infrastructure.
<p>3:5 General remarks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agricultural and rural policy should be separated, because the latter is broader and should not be different from the development and growth in general, nor if the development takes place in an urban or rural setting. • The allocation of financial resources the varying regional conditions should be taken into account and more resources should be allocated to

	<p>the sparsely populated and vulnerable areas such as forest and mountain regions and parts of the archipelago</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An improved local general advice service is needed
--	--

4. How can the measures in the Rural Development Programme be better and more effective?

Category	Answers (the amount of similar answers is indicated by the Roman numbers before the answer)
4:1 Financing and cash flow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • III Better possibilities for advance payments to reduce the liquidity problems • Cooperation with banks for guarantees, etc. to projects that have been approved for funding. • Regional design should be applied when selecting policy instrument for economic aid in consultation with local level actors • A limited transfer of funds from the CAP's Pillar I to Pillar II can be made if it is done in a balanced and thorough manner
4:2 Cooperation and holistic cross sectoral views	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rules should reward collaboration solutions and cross-sectoral work • The agri environment payments will be more effective if it is possible to cooperate more between forest policies and agriculture specific measures at the intersection of farmland and forest. • Environmental improvements in agriculture need to get started so that ecosystem services are not compromised • II Review of the ownership of agricultural holdings so farm houses are not blocked by people who do not cultivate the land thus stopping those who do want to find somewhere to live in rural areas. • Smaller units II and more people cultivating land should be promoted
4:3 More targeting and less fixed measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Division and restricting the budget to the various measures risk to complicate the management and targeting within the agri environment payments and Leader • It is more important to achieve the goals than that the individual budgets for each measure are met • Increased flexibility as a complement to global grant type of measures • The Rural Development Programme should focus on agri environment payments and entrepreneurship and therefore the current structure with three axes and the Leader model should be reviewed • The design of measures need to be developed, mainly on the

	<p>following issues: should there be investment support or annual payments, ie. Should the programme support the balance sheet or the profitability? Develop new climate-and water measures in the light of the water and nitrate directives? Should the allocation of resources for enterprise and skills development take place through organizations or directly to individual businesses?</p>
4:4 Simplification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • III More flexible regulatory framework so as not to impede local commitment and dedication. • II More information about The Rural Development Programme opportunities also in urban regions • Easier application and accounting procedures
4:5 Administrative resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In parallel with regulatory reform, the programme should also be given sufficient administrative resources • Simplify the administration of project funds • More money for the administration of Leader LAGs
4:6 Investments and project support in axis 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is need for greater opportunities for investment and project support to general rural development even in the voluntary sector. • More support for broadband - everyone should have access. • More resources for village development, etc.
4:7 Environmental measures in axis 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agri environment payments to pay for public goods that the market does not want to pay for • Clearer management measures targeting the biodiversity and natural values in areas where they are most needed or are most effective, so that the compensation paid to the environmental benefit correspond to what society wants. • Regional free to give immediate priority is to be maintained, but with greater demands on the environmental aspects into account. • The economic compensation must be built on better demand and perceived relevance among users, which is not only about simplification, but more about clarity, legal certainty and market adjustment.
4.8 Leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leader has become an administrative morass and should not be a mandatory requirement in the rural program. Instead there should be possibilities for local players, who are interested in jointly developing rural areas, to choose the model most appropriate (Leader or otherwise). If the leader should be an EU common and obligatory methodology, it should be included in the cohesion policy. • Leader must be further developed and given more resources. The Leader-principle should pervade the entire program and should focus on to build a sustainable society, and not unilaterally promote entrepreneurship. • We propose a "Leader4users" where the administrative base

	<p>resources is determined by the overall budget, but where all the Leader office are guaranteed at least two full-time positions, a director and an economist and one more "project sponsor" for every 15 000 inhabitants. It is both a democracy - and fair question and it would also reduce the number of unsuccessful applications and poorly presented project.</p>
--	---

5. How do you think the Rural Development Programme should be organised, managed and monitored?

Category	Answers (the amount of similar answers is indicated by the I-number before the answer)
5:1 Increased regional and local steering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VI The Municipalities together with regional authorities and non-profit and private sector should be given as much power as possible. • III A partnership in which the municipal level have an important role to play. Efforts to increase partnership and create continuity in their interactions. • III Important to involve the voluntary sector at local level. • Collaboration between stakeholders groups should be created early. • The LEADER approach seems promising, although it can be improved
5:2 Simplification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IV Simplification of administrative structures. • II The boundaries between the regional level, county administrative boards and the National Management Authority Board of Agriculture needs to become clearer. Ideally, only one government agency should be involved.
5:3 Coaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • II In the matter of application, monitoring and management there is a need of more organized support at the local level.
5:4 Monitoring and continuous review for learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • III The monitoring of the program should be ongoing as a kind of learning process where it is clear that the results are returned quickly so that the programme continually works better. • Regular reporting through a common template..
5:5 General remarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The idea of openness and transparency should be further strengthened. • The Monitoring Committee should be increasingly used for future strategic discussions. • More comprehensive information is desired, so that it is easier to get an overview. • The Rural Development Programme should be organized, managed and monitored by the partnership between actors at the regional and local levels that are responsible for and involved in

	<p>issues concerning growth and development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Rural Development Programme should be guided by a target program and organized so that available funds will be distributed to innovators, motivators and entrepreneurs and not remain in administration.• More holistic competence and not dominant competence in agriculture.• Training for better knowledge and skills is necessary to ensure that LAG has competence as an employer, insurances, rules regarding the collective employments contract etc.• The Rural Development Programme must be better linked to other programs and funds and not consolidate downpipes policy. The possibilities are small to free up resources to small local projects from the social and regional funds.
--	--

