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Overview

• The resilience concept for farming systems
• Challenges and critical thresholds for EU farming systems
• Performance of EU farming systems
• Resilience strategies found in EU farming systems
• The CAP as part of the enabling environment
• Assessing how the CAP support the resilience of EU farming systems
• Conclusions and recommendations
Resilient and Sustainable Farming Systems in Europe

Summary and lessons from the SURE-Farm project.
Cambridge University Press, April 2022, open access, https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009093569
What is resilience?

- The capacity of individuals, businesses, communities, or systems to respond to perturbations (shocks or persistent stress, natural or anthropogenic origin),
- that can push a system towards a tipping point where it can no longer maintain its previous state and fulfil its functions (collapse).
Three dimensions of resilience

**Robustness:** the capacity of a system to resist(withstand perturbations and to maintain previous levels of functionality without major changes to its internal elements and processes

**Adaptability:** the capacity of a system to change internal elements and processes in response to changing external circumstances and thereby to continue its development along the previous trajectory while maintaining functionalities

**Transformability:** the capacity of a system to radically change, including its identity, paradigms and logics
SURE-Farm Adaptive Cycle framework concept

Source: Meuwissen, Feindt et al. (2019)
Characterization of a farming system and its enabling environment

Source: modified after Meuwissen, Feindt et al. (2019)
Framework to assess the resilience of farming systems

1. Resilience of what?

- Farming system
  - Farms
  - Other actors
  - Locality

2. Resilience to what?

- Challenges
  - Environmental
  - Economic
  - Social
  - Institutional

3. Resilience for what purpose?

- Functions
  - Private goods
  - Public goods

4. What resilience capacities?

- Resilience capacities
  - Robustness
  - Adaptability
  - Transformability

5. What enhances resilience?

- Resilience attributes
  - Diversity
  - Openness
  - Tightness of feedbacks
  - System reserves
  - Modularity

- + Interlinkages with broader food system, health, energy etc.
- Stress & shocks vs. noise & cycles
- Critical thresholds
- Empirically distinguished: 22 different functions
- + Anticipation
- + Vision, leadership, agility, shared learning and experimentation
- + Enabling environment

Source: Meuwissen, Feindt et al. (2019), Feindt, Meuwissen et al. (2022)
Impact of Covid-19 on farming systems through the lens of resilience thinking

Fig.: Combination of different approaches to assess the resilience of farming systems (FS) and to understand Covid-19 impacts.

Caveats and reflections (1)

- Resilience is a latent characteristic of a system. However, resilience attributes and critical thresholds are good predictors of resilience.
- Vision, leadership, shared learning and experimentation, and agility are important resilience attributes.
- General resilience in farming systems requires more than financial buffer resources.
- Non-resilience is difficult to study.
- Resilience is context specific, and so are resilience needs.
- Resilience capacities, needs and strategies differ across scales.

Source: Feindt, Meuwissen et al. (2022)
Caveats and reflections (2)

- A focus on farming systems rather than food systems risks reproducing the productivist fallacy.
- More need for a critical assessment of the functions provided by farming systems.
- Small number of indicators to measure the resilience of farming systems still missing.
- Scope for further methodological integration.
- Need to reflect and address how actors understand resilience – problem of “triple hermeneutics” (Giddens).
- Need to further develop foundations of resilience governance.

Source: Feindt, Meuwissen et al. (2022)
Case studies: 11 farming systems
Challenges of farming systems (1)

Table 17.1. Overview of the main challenges in the SURE-Farm case studies and their closeness to critical thresholds according to stakeholders’ perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Low prices and price fluctuation</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High production costs</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unbalanced value chain</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competition with foreign markets</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology adaptation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited use of insurance</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependency on alternative off-farm income</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Import competition</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production failure</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Climate change (extreme weather events)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plant or cattle diseases</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflicts with wild fauna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low soil fertility quality</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water scarcity</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excess of nutrients</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soil erosion</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Accatino et al. (2022)
### Challenges of farming systems (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Depopulation/lack of labour</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changing consumer preferences</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low attractiveness</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor infrastructure</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of successors</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High societal expectations</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor quality of life</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Continuous change of laws and regulations</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic laws and regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental and animal welfare regulations</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complicated administrative procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of long-term vision in policy</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High land prices</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Accatino et al. (2022)
Challenges pushing farming systems towards critical thresholds (based on stakeholder assessment) (1)

Economic challenges: critical for seven case studies

- Price fluctuations and low prices (all cases)
- Unbalanced value chains (8)
- International competition (7)
- Technology adaptation
- Inadequate insurance
- Dependence on off-farm income

Source: Accatino et al. (2022)
Challenges pushing farming systems towards critical thresholds (based on stakeholder assessment) (2)

Institutional challenges

• Changing policy regulations (10)
• High standards and strict regulations (5)
• Complicated administrative procedures and lack of long-term vision (4)
• High land prices (3)

Source: Accatino et al. (2022)
Challenges pushing farming systems towards critical thresholds (based on stakeholder assessment) (3)

Environmental challenges: critical for all case studies

- Climate change (all)
- Soil fertility, plant and animal diseases
- Soil erosion, water scarcity, nutrient excess

Source: Accatino et al. (2022)
Challenges pushing farming systems towards critical thresholds (based on stakeholder assessment) (4)

Social challenges: critical for five case studies

- Lack of successors
- Lack of labour
- Rural depopulation
- Changing consumer expectations
- Poor quality of life
- Insufficient infrastructure

Source: Accatino et al. (2022)
Further general findings on challenges

• Many resilience challenges have not been translated into manageable risks
• Financial risk management rarely linked to adaptation or transformation
• Attracting skilled, highly motivated and entrepreneurial people is a major challenge.
• Fewer farm successors and limited supply of qualified labour lead to adaptation in farm organization, production programme, IT, robotics
• Many EU farming systems are locked in on developmental trajectories that combine strong reliance on chemical and/or biological inputs with an orientation towards global commodity food systems.
  • Global competition reduces profitability
  • Response: Intensification with more external inputs → generally at the expenses of environmental sustainability

Source: Feindt, Meuwissen et al. (2022)
Performance of farming systems - overview

Perceived performance and importance of functions as assessed by stakeholders in the SURE-Farm case studies. Perceived performance is indicated on both the x- and y-axis to allow comparability among functions within a case study (vertically), and among case studies for a function (horizontally). The radius of the circles is proportional to the importance assigned. Source: Elaborated from Reidsma et al. (2020b)

Source: Accatino et al. (2022)
 Strategies to enhance resilience attributes for current and future alternative systems

The contribution to resilience attributes of the identified strategies implemented and proposed in farming systems. The green line shows the ratio of (past) strategies implemented for current systems contributing to an attribute, and the orange line the ratio of future strategies for alternative systems contributing to an attribute. Attributes are ordered, starting with the attribute to which most past strategies contributed (based on Reidsma et al., 2020a).

Source: Accatino et al. (2022)
Patterns in the enabling environment

Method:

• analysis of reactions of farming systems and their environments to resilience challenges
• pattern analysis (archetypes)
• cross-case analysis

Four recurring patterns (seen next slides):

• Shifting the burden
• Eroding goals
• Self-limiting solutions
• Success to the successful

Source: Mathijs et al. (2022)
Pattern 1: Shifting the burden

Problem: Delay of suitable action; deepening of lock-in

Source: Mathijs et al. (2022)
Pattern 2: Eroding goals

Problem: Delay of solution, higher costs of adjustment in the future

Source: Mathijs et al. (2022)
Pattern 3: Self-limiting solutions (limits to growth)

Problem: Suitable solutions are delayed or diminished due to design implications

Source: Mathijs et al. (2022)
Pattern 4: Success to the successful

Problem:
Allocation of resources to a small number of well-known solutions

Source: Mathijs et al. (2022)
Guiding principles for resilience-enabling environment

1. If a FS cannot cope with a shock, the EE should provide temporary resources to ensure robustness.

2. Before shocks occur, the EE should help to build anticipatory and responsive capacity.

3. The EE should assist the FS to detect, assess and address long-term challenges.

4. The EE should foster the potential diversity of responses rather than focusing on a limited number of actions.

5. FS and EE should together develop ambidexterity, i.e. a balance in allocating resources to meet immediate vs. future challenges.

Source: Mathijs et al. (2022)
Good public policies are essential for resilience

1. Public policies can moderate or reinforce pressure to change
   • e.g. lax or tight regulations
   • closing down or opening up policy networks,
   • influencing public and professional debates.

2. Public policies can enhance or constrain the capability of farming systems to deal with challenges
   • Robustness
   • Adaptability
   • Transformability
SURE-Farm Policy work package

**Question:** To what extent do current policies at the EU and member state level enable or constrain the resilience of (European farming) systems along the dimensions of robustness, adaptability and transformability?

**Assessment tool and bottom-up case studies:** To assess policies (goals and instruments) in terms of strengths and weaknesses, and to provide entry points for policy improvements.

**The aim is not:** To assess the resilience of the policies themselves, but the extent to which these policies influence the resilience of (European farming) systems.
Resilience Assessment Tool

Resilience Enabling Policies

- Transformability
  - Niche innovations
  - In-depth learning
- Robustness
  - Short-term focus
  - Protecting status quo
- Adaptability
  - Dismantling status quo
  - Long-term focus
- Variety
- Flexibility
- Middle-term focus
- Buffer resources
- Risk management

This project is funded by the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 727520.
Method

- Starting point: Specific farming system and its challenges
- Identification of relevant policies: national implementation of CAP and other relevant agricultural policies (issued by a Ministry of Agriculture)
- Document analysis: Identify policy goals and instruments
- Scoring the resilience characteristics based on identified text elements, supported by argument
- Overall analysis of resilience strengths and weaknesses – colouring the wheel
- Stakeholder check (a set of interviews or focus group)
- Second phase: 5 bottom-up in-depth case studies
Demographic challenges: depopulation/outmigration, ageing farm population, lack of skilled labour, changing consumer preferences, gender balance

Economic: Market access, price volatility, value chains, insufficient insurance arrangements, financial and management skills, land prices, capital scarcity, food safety, public health, animal welfare

Environmental: Climate change, soil fertility, nitrate, environmental regulation, pollinator loss, lack of environmental skills, diseases, wildlife

Institutional and political: fragmented governance structures, land ownership, geo-political instability, trade conflicts, acceptance of conventional farming, future of pesticides, regulatory costs, political distortions on land markets

CAP policy instrument and their resilience orientation

Many measures constrain Transformability: Implied in goals but not specific. Support for organic and new rural value chains EIP-Agri

Direct payments
Greening payments
Market safety net
Crisis reserve
Insurance schemes
Coordination of production
GI

AECM
Investment support
Leader and Leader Plus
Flexibility: modulation, etc.
Regional measures

Resilience Enabling Policies

This project has received funds from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 727520
CAP 2014-2020: too focussed on robustness with uneven success, and constraining transformability

- Most financial resources go into payments that provide buffer resources
  - little access for small-scale farms and less land-intensive systems
- Government-supported risk management schemes struggle with effectiveness and acceptance by the target groups.
- Undesirable effects of robustness-enabling policies:
  - disincentives to adapt or transform,
  - in the long run, even the unlearning of adaptability of transformability,
  - wrong illusion of stability.
- Much fewer resources are devoted to programs that enhance adaptability.
- Support for transformability is generally underdeveloped.
Arable crop system in the Netherlands (Veenkolonie)

Source: Buitenhuis, Dutch case study
Hazelnut production in Lazio, Italy

Source: Sorrentino, Severini & Sidorini, Italian case study
Egg and broiler production in Sweden

Source: Manevska-Tasevska, Swedish case study
Comparing CAP 2014-2022 vs. CAP 2023-2027

Increased flexibility to better take into account local conditions

Current architecture

- Climate/Env. measures in Pillar II (AECM, Forestry measures, investment measures...)
- Greening (3 detailed obligations on crop diversification, permanent grassland and EFA)
- Cross-compliance (on Climate/Env. 7 GAEC standards (water, soil, carbon stock, landscape) and requirements from Nitrates Directive and Natura 2000 Directives)

Level of requirement

New architecture

- Climate/Env. Measures in Pillar II
- Eco-scheme in Pillar I
- Climate/Env. Measures in Pillar II
- New, enhanced conditionality (on Climate/Env., 15 practices built upon EU minima (climate change, water, soil, biodiversity and landscape) and requirements from Nitrates Directive and Natura 2000 Directives)

Source: European Commission (2018)
### CAP 2023-2027 vs. guiding principles for resilience-enabling environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>CAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide temporary resources to ensure robustness after shock.</td>
<td>+ Crisis reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Direct payments ‘permanent’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before shocks, build anticipatory and responsive capacity</td>
<td>~ Foresight exercise, market outlooks etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assist the FS to detect, assess and address long-term challenges</td>
<td>+ European Green Deal, FtF Strategy, Biodiversity Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Not sufficiently translated in CAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster the potential diversity of responses rather than focusing on a</td>
<td>- Strong path dependency of policy instruments and policy mix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limited number of actions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS and EE should together develop ambidexterity, i.e. a balance in</td>
<td>- Unbalance allocation of resources towards immediate income support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allocating resources to meet immediate vs. future challenges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Resilience frames in the CAP debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income resilience</th>
<th>Farmers’ supply chain position resilience</th>
<th>Climate change impact resilience</th>
<th>Disease resilience</th>
<th>Ecological resilience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resilience of what?</strong></td>
<td>Farmers &amp; farms</td>
<td>Farmers &amp; farms, agricultural sector</td>
<td>Farmers &amp; farms, farming sub-sectors, agricultural sector, agri-food chains, food systems</td>
<td>Agro-ecosystems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resilience to what?</strong></td>
<td>Low &amp; volatile income due unstable prices &amp; market or weather shocks</td>
<td>Low market power &amp; rewards of primary producers in supply chain</td>
<td>Environmental &amp; weather shocks linked to climate change</td>
<td>Pest &amp; diseases affecting plants &amp; animals, disrupted agri-food chains &amp; food systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resilience for what purpose?</strong></td>
<td>Providing income with aim to ensure food security</td>
<td>Increasing income with aim to ensure food security</td>
<td>Climate change resilient food production &amp; availability</td>
<td>Food security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How to enhance resilience</strong></td>
<td>Income support measures (Direct payment schemes)</td>
<td>Support for producer groups, cooperatives, inter-branch organisations</td>
<td>Risk management tools &amp; weather risk management</td>
<td>Risk management tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resilience for what reason(s)?</strong></td>
<td>Equity in distribution of income support</td>
<td>Competitiveness of farmers, equity in rewards</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resilience according to whom?</strong></td>
<td>European Commission MEPs of EPP, S&amp;D Flanders, Ireland, The Netherlands Traditional &amp; young farmers’ organisations, Agricultural research, advisory &amp; training services agency</td>
<td>European Commission MEPs of GUE/NGL, S&amp;D, Greens-EFA, EPP Traditional &amp; young farmers’ organisations</td>
<td>European Commission MEPs of ECR, EPP, ID, Renew, S&amp;D Flanders, France, Ireland, The Netherlands University Traditional farmer’s organisation, few sustainable farming organisation, Agri-technological organisation</td>
<td>European Commission MEPs of Greens- EFA, GUE/NGL, S&amp;D, EPP Flanders, Ireland, advisory council Flanders Sustainable farming organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Buitenhuis et al. (2022); Sociologica Ruralis, based on analysis of 127 policy documents
## CAP 2023-2027 vs. resilience frames in the CAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resilience frame</th>
<th>CAP elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income resilience</td>
<td>+ Direct payments + Income component of eco-schemes and RDP measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers supply chain position resilience</td>
<td>~ support in RDP for producer organizations ~ outside CAP: unfair competition legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change impact resilience</td>
<td>- Not sufficiently addressed through eco-schemes and AECM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease resilience</td>
<td>~ mostly coping strategies through crisis reserve and RDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological resilience</td>
<td>- Probably not sufficiently addressed through eco-schemes and AECM - Lack of programs at farm system scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How the CAP post 2020 could enable resilience better

Starting points

- **Meet the need for more tailored policy mixes** that address the specific resilience needs of Europe’s farming systems

- Develop a **long-term vision for the CAP**
Policies to enable robustness

- enhance the ability and willingness to **anticipate** stresses and shocks, to cope with them and to respond
- **foresight** exercises linked into **strategy** development and **outreach** and **engagement** schemes
Policies to enhance adaptability

• Coherent and sufficient **remuneration of public goods**;

• Increase flexibility and variability through **reducing red tape** along tree dimensions:
  – requirements for access to supportive policy schemes, in particular RDP
  – more flexible or better aligned regulations and inspections;
  – integrated approach to the multitude of monitoring and control systems.

• Close the gap between **reflection/innovation and practice** – more support for
  – project-type funding rather than predefined measures;
  – AKIS and advisory services to integrate advice for production and provision of public goods;
  – collaboration for opening up and reconnecting agriculture with society;
  – fostering farmers’ adaptive capacity, e.g. by paying them for time spent in research projects
Policies to enhance transformability

- Formulate a coordinated **long-term vision**
- Support **deep learning**
- Adopt **reflexive modes of governing** that influence people’s assumptions about the future, their self-perceptions and identities – dialogue, co-design, communication of role models and positive examples
- Develop **EIP-Agri and LEADER** into **cross-sectoral support for rural cooperation**

**Programs for rural cooperation should:**
- adopt integrated approaches across sectors,
- change the rules of state aid to allow more flexibility and innovation;
- provide funding for the creation, facilitation and integration of multi-actor networks;
- develop training schemes for facilitators of integrative rural development;
- encourage links to other policy areas to enhance connections.
Key points for the future CAP (1)

• Reduce **direct payments** with a view to phasing out by 2028 …
• … and divert the budget into those CAP measures that specifically address resilience needs
• Use **eco-schemes** to foster public services (e.g. biodiversity, attractive landscapes) and adaptation to environmental and climate change
  – points-based system to enable regional differentiation, flexibility and diversity;
  – enable equivalence of established certification schemes;
  – define three or four tiers of payment levels aligned with public or private certification schemes of corresponding levels of ambition.
• Ensure that member states’ **national strategic plans support adaptability** to meet the ambitions of the Green Deal, the Farm-to-Fork Strategy and the Biodiversity Strategy.
Key points for the future CAP (2)

• Ensure that MS provide ample **support for cooperation and cross-sectoral networking** in rural development programmes.
• Enable **producer organisations** to coordinate adaptation to shifting markets and changing environments.
• Strengthen AKIS through more **project-type funding**, more funding for **advisory services** to integrate advice for production and provision of public goods.
• Enable transformative innovation, reflexivity, deep learning through more support for **LEADER** and **EIP-Agri**, with **European networks** around key challenges.
• Replace young farmers’ premium with **support for start-ups** in rural areas.
• Provide support for **fast internet** in rural areas as a precondition for connectivity.
Thank you very much for your attention!

- peter.feindt@hu-berlin.de

- For more information and to follow the project, please check: www.surefarmproject.eu
Reserve slides
RESILIENCE IS MORE THAN ROBUSTNESS

WHY THE CAP SHOULD WIDEN ITS APPROACH TO RESILIENCE
TOWARDS A RESILIENT CAP FOR RESILIENT FARMING SYSTEMS

www.surefarmproject.eu / #FutureofCAP
Sources cited


Cluster 1: Robustness-oriented policy, often impeding adaptability and transformability
Dairy farming system in Flanders, Belgium

Source: Lievens & Mathijs, Belgian case study
Example: Crop farming system in Bulgaria

Challenges: depopulation of rural areas, changing consumer preferences, lack of organized markets and market infrastructure, lack of financial and management skills among farmers, extreme weather conditions and climate change, the implementation of nitrate regulations, fragmented national and regional governance structures, ongoing problems with the post-socialist land ownership regime, the Russian embargo.

- Robustness: supporting the status quo through area-based direct payments and providing additional buffer resources in case of natural disasters.
- Adaptability: agri-environmental measures, producer groups and socio-economic development. However, some of these elements are not readily available to crop farmers and social learning is not a goal.
- Transformability: no ambition to dismantle incentives that maintain the status quo, no consideration of in-depth learning and little support for niche innovations.
Crop farming system in Bulgaria
(focus on large family and corporate producers)

Source: Valchovska & Peneva, Bulgarian case study
Cattle breeding system in Bocage Bourbonnais in the Massif Central in France

Source: Léger, French case study
Arable farming system in Saxony-Anhalt, Germany

Source: Daskiewicz & Balman, German case study
Private fruit and vegetable farms in Poland

Source: Ciechomska Polish case study
Arable crop system in the Netherlands (Veenkolonie)

Source: Buitenhuis, Dutch case study
Cluster 2: Adaptability-enhancing policy
Hazelnut production in Lazio, Italy

Source: Sorrentino, Severini & Sidorini, Italian case study
Egg and broiler production in Sweden

Source: Manevska-Tasevska, Swedish case study
Cluster 3: Resilience-constraining policy
Extensive sheep grazing system in the Huesca region in Northeast Spain

Source: Bardaji, Soriano & Bertolozzi, Spanish case study
Transformability-oriented policy
Arable farming system in East Anglia, UK

Challenges: In preparation for the British farm policy after Brexit, the UK government has announced a policy that promises to provide the same level of resources to the farm sector but with different patterns of incentives.

- Robustness: -
- Adaptability and transformability: The new policy framework is geared towards the provision of public goods and the enhancement of competitiveness through agro-environmental schemes, capital grants, skills and training programs, and emphasis on participatory and peer-to-peer learning. Long-term policy goals are clearly articulated and transformative ambitions are supported by planned measures to support in-depth learning, science-technology adoption processes, farmer access to innovations, in particular innovations to support the provision of public goods.
Arable crop system in East Anglia, UK
Post-Brexit policy outline

Source: Midmore, British case study
• Average score: policy goals 3.17, policy instruments 2.95

• Possible explanations
  • Financial constraints
  • Administrative constraints
  • Symbolic dimension of policy-making
  • Time gap between goal development and implementation

Source: Authors’ analysis, based on case study findings
Significant differences in the resilience-enabling capabilities between the case studies

Total average ResAT score per case study

Source: Authors’ analysis, based on case study findings
Mixed ability to enhance resilience: some resilience dimensions are more supported than others

Source: Authors’ analysis, based on case study findings

Average ResAT scores per resilience category – goals
Mixed ability to enhance resilience (2)

Average scores per resilience category – instruments

Source: Authors’ analysis, based on case study findings
Instrumentation and implementation bias towards robustness and against adaptability

Source: Authors’ analysis, based on case study findings

Difference of the average ResAT scores for instruments vs. goals per case
ResAT conclusions

• CAP enhances resilience of most farming systems, but bias towards a robustness-cum-adaptability orientation.

• Support for transformability generally underdeveloped.

• National or regional policy design choices can have large resilience effects.

• Eastern European cases score much higher on robustness and much lower on transformability – reflection of recent major transformations and interplay with national policy context?