



Future of the CAP 2014 - 2020

For a new European food,
agricultural, environmental and
rural policy

Observations, propositions and levers

French CAP 2013 group

February 18th 2010

Contact : samuel@pouruneautrepac.eu –
www.pouruneautrepac.eu

Foreword

The Common agricultural Policy (CAP) is again experiencing changes. It is to be revised within the 2014-2020 period and its budget redefined accordingly.

The expected reform may well jeopardize the CAP. Negotiations will be closely linked to those relative to the revision of the EU financial perspectives. Voices already rise to question the legitimacy of the CAP and demand the allocation of all or part of its budget, representing an average 40% of the European budget, to other policies (climate, energy, research,...).

The French organisations signing this text are deeply convinced of the need to use the CAP as a tool to get involved in the answers to provide to the European and global issues of the early 21st century. These issues relate at the very same time to preserving food security, protecting natural resources, fighting climate change, supporting rural development and employment, and helping the developing countries. The CAP's future is every European's business.

Our organisations reckon that would the CAP not be brought to a new legitimacy and thus truly revised, it will be greatly weakened, or even questioned in the next few months. We bring thus our contribution with arguments speaking for a new ambitious, renovated and European policy.

This document is a contribution to the debate on the CAP for the 2014-2020 period, raising observations and levers lead frogging. Emerging from the current situation of the CAP in the EU, our propositions are fitted for this transition period that is needed to support the changes towards sustainable and socially conscious agricultures to the 2020 horizon.

Therefore, new objectives, a new legitimacy, a refoundation of the dispositives and an renewed framework beyond its existing « pillars » should result from this. Our organisations identified 6 priorities for a relevant agricultural policy that are detailed hereafter :

1. Agricultural markets should be better organised so as to regulate prices to an incentive, remunerative and steady level,
2. A truly consistent CAP that would not be damaging the food security of the South countries should be defined
3. Direct payments should be rebuilt on the basis of the remuneration of environmental services and balanced with the employment.
4. A sustainable agriculture that would efficiently contribute to the fight against climate change and address other environmental issues has be promoted
5. Job-generating sustainable agricultures need to be supported and territorial cohesion has to be guaranteed in order to support rural development
6. Consumption and food should be integrated into the heart of a renewed CAP.

These propositions aim at restoring the links between the different dimensions of agriculture that are too often considered as independent : agriculture, food , environment and rural development. Within this mindset our organisations bring their contribution to the debate on the CAP's future for the 2020 horizon.

This document deals with the future of the common agricultural policy in particular, not with agriculture in general. It does not claim to address every single issue and every single question.

1. Agricultural markets should be better organized so as to regulate prices to an incentive, remunerative and steady level

Observation

Experience of high rise in the agricultural prices in 2007, strong decline in 2008, then new rise during the second semester 2009 speak for a volatility that epitomizes the liberalisation of the agricultural markets. The dismantling of orientation and intervention tools leaves the European agriculture more exposed than yesterday to economic vagaries and to the market's risks. It should be feared that the agricultural policy might find entirely destitute in order to handle unfavourable and unpredictable situations on markets that are becoming ever more erratic.

In order to stabilize agricultural markets, governmental intervention and import protection have to be reconsidered with the objective of securing supplies, thus protecting the EU's food sovereignty. Such a perspective implies beforehand to change somewhat the goal of the CAP, and to focus it on matching the common market's needs. It then means controlling the amounts put to the market to ensure that supply will match demand, in order to support a greater steadiness of agricultural prices and incomes.

Within the dairy sector for instance the global market is too unpredictable and too narrow to represent the only perspective for European producers as international exchanges only stand for 6% of the global milk production, and prices are very volatile¹. Often criticized, quotas have played an effective role in the supply management of milk and dairy products, while contributing to a territorial distribution of production to the benefit of family structures². Moreover these quotas also helped controlling the CAP's expenditures. In spite of all this, the EU had planned on their removal in 2015³.

An effective protection of importations along with intervention measures should allow to regulate agricultural markets and stabilize production and consumption prices. The 2008-2009 milk crisis has showed the limits of the withdrawal of production control. It has also highlighted the damaging effects that a drop in milk prices could have on the production structures (income fall) but also on the CAP's expenditures (reintroduction of export subsidies at the expense of the developing countries).

Propositions

European agriculture has to be above all targeted at matching the needs of the European inner market, and at generating products with high added values that can be exported without governmental helps. It belongs to the public powers to keep on playing a role in the limitation of markets' risks, thus in the control of production volumes, with relevant tools that regulate prices and ensure fair agricultural incomes. Farmers need remunerative agricultural prices, covering the average production costs of the EU, in order to be able to generate the basic income.

If it is a matter of emergency that all direct and indirect subsidies should come to an end, including feedstuff subsidies, that lead to a European production of milk and meat that penalizes all the subsistence agricultures within the developing countries (as for powdered milk, milk and chicken), tariff protections and the use of strategic stock-building should on the other hand be reinforced among the range of intervention tools. If Europe wants its geopolitical weight to be as heavy as its

¹ European court of auditors, 2009

² 20% of agricultural jobs are in the milk sector

³ The dairy CMO was among the less expensive, its expenditures representing 6% of the total amounts of the CAP in 2008.

economic importance, it has to get involved in the global regulation of agricultural strategic stocks.

Nevertheless, insurances and mutualisation funds represent one of the leads that may be assessed with regards to their budgetary, economic and social efficiency. The option of crop insurance against climatic or natural hazards might convince farmers to loosen their prevention and use more phytosanitary products to the expense of agronomical practices that support the resiliency of agroecosystems (robustness of technical itineraries, rotations and variety choices,...). In times of a necessary adaptation of agroecosystems to climate changes, it seems urgent to assess the right environmental impact induced by crop insurances. At last, it may be highlighted that the best insurance against climatic and economic hazards remains an on-farm diversification of the activities.

Levers

- financing a stock-building system aiming at food security and market regulation, in order to anticipate speculation on raw material, and above all prevent the intervention of purely financial speculators that never take delivery of the goods on forward markets;
 - uphold a sufficiently strong border protection regarding agricultural products, in order to preserve the productive network on the European land and, on a long-term scale, avoid a too strong dependancy on food importations ;
 - within the milk sector by 2015, assess the social and environmental consequences of the geographical concentration of milk production due to the raise in milk quotas, adapt the decision of the raise in milk quotas (health check) according to the evolution of the demand in dairy products ;
 - redesign the milk policy towards meeting the needs of the common market and secure the control of milk production with a better supply management⁴, promoting the centralisation of the offer through collecting basins and a collective management of volumes by organisations of producers;
 - broaden the use of regulation tools such as production quotas to other branches prone to structural crisis : fruits and vegetables, pork,... ;
- in terms of risks management, assess the efficiency of crop insurance, given the possible environmental impact of insurance programmes.

2. A truly consistent CAP that would not damage the food security of Southern countries should be defined

Observation

The cohesion of European policies regarding development is a legal obligation stated once again in the new EU treaty. As a result, the objectives of the cooperation and development policy of the EU should not be compromised by other policies, such as the CAP. This is why a study on the impact of the post-2013 CAP project on development will be carried out before its adoption.⁵

Considering the lack of a global governance regarding agriculture, an unfair trade competition between the world's peasantries will not help the fight against disparities, the decline of poverty

⁴ European court of auditors, *Op. Cit*, 2009

⁵ http://www.concordeurope.org/Files/media/internetdocumentsENG/4_Publications/3_CONCORDs_positions_and_studies/Position_s2009/ACP112009/PCD_FR.doc

and the protection of natural resources. The “hunger riots” in the capital cities of many Southern countries in 2007/2008 have brought back on the agenda an old daunting issue : more than a billion people throughout the world are suffering from hunger, more than the double suffer from chronic malnutrition. These concerning events have generated debates up to the highest spheres about access to food, land and natural resources.

In order to put an end to uneven and unfair exchanges, the EU has to look for ways to allow developing countries to supply their national market with agricultural and commercial policies that guarantee food sovereignty. The future of the European agriculture on global markets lies in giving somehow the priority to quality products with a high added value (those which characteristics are linked to traditions, know-how, and lands). Products that can be only exported with subsidies, or even proven dumping should not be supported.

Propositions

In order to bridge the productivity gap between the various agricultures of the world, it is essential that the current negotiations within the WTO should take into account the idea of region-specific agricultural policies, as the EU did with the CAP. Farmers of developing countries would benefit of a protection from the agricultural exportations of foreign countries, and be granted with a fair remuneration for their products on national markets. The acknowledgement of the right to food sovereignty represents a major issue. It implies to forbid any measure that might be harmful to the agricultural development of south countries, essential to their food security.

On the other hand, livestock farming and the European diet remain very dependant on raw agricultural material imported from the southern hemisphere (oleaginous plants, soymeal and cakes...). The production of those goods have heavy ecological, social and climatic impacts and are to a great extend under the responsibility of the European Union and of European economic actors. It belongs thus to the European decision-makers to take ambitious initiatives within the frame of the CAP that will not put at stake the chances of further development for the family agricultures of the South and that will contribute to regaining the EU's protein self-sufficiency.⁶

The CAP has had negative impacts on farmers of developing countries that have been bankrupted due to dumpings on the global market. However, the principle of establishing an agricultural policy at the subregional level, as was done with the CAP in Europe, remains a relevant experience for other regions of the world.

Levers

- remove all forms of export subsidies that contribute to raising hunger and poverty in developing countries ;
- favour the self-sufficiency of the EU for vegetal proteins, in order not to boost great export monocultures, eviction and weakening factor of family and subsistence agricultures ;
- use development aid in order to diminish the dependence of farmers on inputs of fossile origin(fertilizers, pesticides,...) and support the most resilient agricultural systems regarding climatic hazards in order to build food stocks in developing countries ;
- support small farmers and acknowledge the key role of family agriculture in the implementation of production systems which provide food security, preserve natural resources, bring sources of revenues and fight climate change ;⁷

⁶ Incentives for legumes cultivation is necessary since the European Union covers only 30% of its vegetable proteins needs for animal feed

⁷ According to the IAASTD recommendations, 2008 www.agassessment.org

– implement a global food governance with the objective of eliminating hunger and poverty. This governance should acknowledge the right for people to feed themselves as a key principle, and allow States et groups of States to design their own agricultural and food policies ;

– team up all relevant stakeholders, including the civil society, in order to define reference terms, monitor ,and analyse the impact study on development that will be carried out in the course of the CAP post-2013 reform.

3. Direct payments should be rebuilt on the basis of the remuneration of environmental services balanced by the employment

Observation

An unfair and ill-targeted distribution of subsidies

In the course of the reforms, the direct support policy of direct agricultural revenues has replaced a market stabilization policy. Today in many production branches, direct supports represent the main part of the farm's revenue but are not sufficient enough to soften the chronic raises in the per-active revenue (-12,2% in 2009). In between 2005 and 2009, the true farm income per active of the EU-27 has fallen down by 1,7% while the farm workforce keeps on dissolving, by an average 11,5% in the 27EU since 2005. ⁸

What's more, the current income policy based on the single payment, is ineffective, unfair and ill-targeted for many reasons :

- it does not take into account the true income levels of farmers but still sometimes refers, in France for instance, to a historical production in order to justify an entitlement to a payment by the hectar
- this policy is ineffective when agricultural prices are too low and by far unjustified when prices are high ;
- it emboldens capitalisation effects regarding the land price, and thus feeds land annuities ;
- subsidies are focused on the largest farms or the most intensive agricultural types ;
- subsidies take poorly into account the favourable contribution or the negative impact for the society of the different farm types

For these reasons, direct payments are not socially legitimate anymore. The CAP does not always have the relevant tools to address the issue of an unfair distribution of subsidies.⁹

A poor integration of the environment

The interactions between agriculture and the environment can make externalities, whether positive (landscape maintenance, wild and domestic biodiversity protection, fire risks reduction,...) or negative (pollution of water resources, soil erosion, spoiling of natural habitats). As it is, agriculture can provide not only food and non-food agricultural goods, but also environmental services, or rural services such as land maintenance and support

Public policies should support the provision of positive externalities while holding back the production of negative externalities, a role they do not manage to play to this day., For one thing, a great part of CAP's subsidies support other types of agriculture which have a harmful impact on the environment. Further more, the tools aiming at integrating the environmental dimension are limited not to say ill-adapted.

⁸ Eurostat, 2009

⁹ *The Health Check of the CAP reform : impact assessment of alternative policy options*, DG Agri, 2008

• Cross compliance aims above all at restricting « negative externalities », but not at valuing the production of « positive externalities ». If bufferstrips along rivers represent the major success of cross compliance, this type of « good agricultural practice” remains a soft requirement that does not question neither the amounts of inputs nor the farming model.¹⁰

• The incitative logic of agro-environmental measures (AEM) consists in compensating a gap compared with the yield references of conventional agriculture. Because of this, AEM do not acknowledge an environmental service. No to mention that the AEM’s impact is limited due to the weakness of the budget that have been provided.¹¹ At last, the 5 years contractual length of the AEM will not support the sustainability of agro-environmental commitments confronted with non-contractual “entitlements” with more convincing amounts.

The CAP is experiencing a lack of legitimacy, whether social or environmental.

Propositions

A better acceptance of the CAP by the public opinion lies in a new legitimization of direct payments on the basis of the services provided by the farmer to the society.¹² These payments would become fairer : by rewarding a service, they would support a sustainable agriculture often more workforce-intensive. The preservation of agro ecosystems profitable to the environment would be favoured thanks to the sustainability of the rural vitality. They would represent a true acknowledgement of the services that farmers bring to the whole society.

This new settlement would allow to switch from a historical entitlement logic to a contractual payment of environmental services, associating to it employment-based criterias (balanced according to the number of employees and the size of the farms).

We suggest to make the payments of environmental services the basis for the attribution of direct payments, thus a founding principle of the next CAP. In practical terms, these payment would adress :

- the maintenance of the regulation functions of the ecosystems such as the management of the water resources, carbon storage ;
- the preservation of biodiversity, the protection of natural habitats, the maintenance of rural landscapes ;
- the resistance to natural hazards, the resilience of ecosystems to climate change, the conservation of the genetic ressources, and the durability of a rural vitality necessary to supply all these services.

Production systems supplying environmental services already exist and have been implemented in tens of thousands of farms in France and in Europe : for instance organic farming, low-external input sustainable agriculture, integrated protection or extensive systems in high natural value areas.¹³ The CAP should only support by strong incentives these types of agriculture that it has too often neglected.

Targeting better the direct payment in order to take into account the natural ressources protection, the sustainability of the rural economy and the employment is thus a priority for the future CAP. It would be vain to think that an unfair and ineffective help system could last without this objective after 2013.

¹⁰ European court of auditors, *Is cross compliance an efficient policy ?* Special report No 8, 2008.

¹¹ *The Health Check of the CAP reform : impact assessment of alternative policy options*, DG Agri, 2008

¹² IEEP report, *Provision of Public Goods through Agriculture in the European Union*, 2009

¹³ Main characteristics of HNV farming are : low intensity of land use, high proportion of semi-natural vegetation, presence of a landscape mosaic [European forum on nature conservation and pastoralism]

Levers

– implement the « polluter pays » principle in all farms, whether beneficiaries of public subsidies or not, and remove any public help likely to have a negative impact on the environment. Respecting the law should be a prerequisite in order to benefit from the CAP's direct payments, but the mere respect of the law cannot possibly lead to any subsidy ;

– good agricultural and environmental conditions (GAEC) have to be reconsidered at the EU level on agronomical basis more adapted to fieldwork, the facultative norms regarding soil protection (erosion, structure, fertility, minimal maintenance) have to be made mandatory .

– support the farming systems that are important to the supply of environmental services and address the current issues (climate, energy, water, biodiversity) and which, with a voluntary approach go beyond the law, in particular the environmental laws, as low-external input sustainable agriculture, organic farming and high natural value farming systems (HNV)

– legitimate these new direct payments also with employment, by establishing a maximum limit per agricultural worker (ceiling/AWU) and by farm ;¹⁴

– consider contract-signing periods for environmental services payments, that would go beyond five years, in order to guarantee a long-lasting supply on a long-term scale (up to 7 years, the period of the long term financial frame of the EU) ;

These new settlements for the direct payments system would allow to support a more ecological agriculture, in order to tackle climate change and to protect natural resources.

¹⁴ *Op. Cit.* DG Agri has estimated that budgetary savings of a € 100 000 payment threshold could reach 3 billions €, or 8% of the total amount of decoupled payments. Such a limitation would affect 25 000 EU holdings (1% of the total).

4. A sustainable agriculture that would efficiently contribute to the fight against climate change and address other environmental issues has been promoted

Observation

Greenhouse gases emissions coming from the European agriculture outpace the absorption capacity of plants and soils.¹⁵ Further than carbon dioxide, this result is also explained by the impact of two other powerful greenhouse gases: nitrous oxide coming from the degradation of chemical fertilizers on agricultural soil and methane from the digestion of ruminants and the handling of manure. The livestock sector is responsible for half of the greenhouse gases emissions of the agricultural sector, reflecting on the breeding and feeding methods is an emergency.

The current feeding method for animals is not sustainable for many reasons:

- even though it occupies almost two thirds of the agricultural land in the EU, it also uses agricultural land in foreign countries, with great environmental impacts (deforestation of forests and savannah) to supply vegetal proteins;
- it oversimplifies cultural systems (« *cerealisation* ») and has a responsibility in the decline of grasslands in Europe, that led to a biodiversity loss;
- it supports the decline in legume cultures in Europe, leading to excessive mineral nitrogen supplies with negative impacts on climate and water pollution;
- it favours the broad introduction of GMOs in cattle feeding, in spite of the opposition of the European consumers;
- at last, it maintains the European union in a situation of dependence regarding imports of vegetal proteins (the EU barely produces 30% of its needs).

Analysis highlights the need to reconsider the farming systems as a reply to the climate challenge.¹⁶ Which the CAP only started to take into account very recently. The Health Check, resumed in the end of November 2008, includes climate change in the new challenges that farmers have to face nowadays. Put into practice, those new challenges are added to the pillar 2 of the CAP, described as the rural development pillar. Those measures are partly financed by an additional modulation of the direct payments of the pillar 1 and are co-financed up to 75% by the EU

Propositions

It is essential to broaden the CAP's integration of energetic and climatic challenges. Not only in terms of the emissions of the farming systems but also in terms of flexibility, without leaving this issue in the pillar 2 of the CAP with so little budget. Doubt also has to be cast on non-sustainable production modes that arrogate nowadays direct subsidies.

It is essential to suggest leads toward the exit of a farming that depends too much on fossil energies. The CAP has thus to support the farming systems that favour the cut in greenhouse gases emissions, energetic self-sufficiency of farms, and thus a diminished vulnerability regarding

¹⁵ The land use for agriculture and livestock production generates 34 million tons of equivalent carbon per year [INRA / CarboEurope 2009]

¹⁶ *Ibid*

the rise in oil prices, as well as carbon storage agro-ecosystems that help creating the humus of the soils.

This agro-ecological conversion has to be supported by the CAP, not by isolating « new environmental challenges » one from the other, but rather by supporting production systems which address them simultaneously with a better water management, a cut in chemical fertilizers, and the maintenance of biodiversity (systemical approach).

There's a pressing need for the CAP to reverse the trends, most of all in the animal feeding by reestablishing the essential links between the crops and livestock, that would allow a strong reduction of the ecological footprint of agriculture. The EU will also have to prove itself outstandingly exemplary in order to aim at a better efficiency regarding the vegetal calories produced and transformed into animal calories.

The European agriculture can address this challenge thanks to innovating agricultural techniques, low-demanding regarding fossil energy, remunerative for its farmers, supportive in the fight against climate change, respectful of other agricultures and of ecological and land balances. There will not be any long-term global food security without an environmental security.

Levers

Regarding production systems :

- support the production systems which have a low dependence on inputs from fossil origin, and that value biodiversity as a production factor, and ensure a sustainable management of water and soils in animal and vegetal branches, promote short-distance channels that demand transformation, waste recycling and local marketing ; promote agronomical techniques that improve the soils in humus ;
- support legumes cultures so as to reduce the protein deficit in the animal diet and fight against greenhouse gases emissions (rotation diversification and cut in the use of fertilizers) ;
- support grass-based systems in order to acknowledge the multiple functions of grasslands in carbon storage, protection of biodiversity, soils and water resources ;
- prevent some climatic risks by giving the priority to the most resistant and resilient production systems regarding natural and climatic: diversification of species and varieties, suitable crop management to evolutive pedo-climatic contexts.

Regarding agricultural extension, research and development :

- use knowledge, know-how and technologies in order to enhance multi-criteria research on climate change and biodiversity, and broadcast the production methods that address the contemporary ecological issues (agroecology, organic agriculture, low-external input systems, ...) ;¹⁷
- reinforce training for farmers, method transfer as well as the exchanges on experiences of adaptation of the production systems to ecological issues.

¹⁷ *Op. Cit.*, IAASTD, 2008

5. Job-generating sustainable agricultures need to be supported and territorial cohesion has to be guaranteed in order to support rural development

Observation

Since 1999, the reinforcement of Pillar 2 for Rural Development (measures that are cofinanced up to 50% by member States) has been operated through a shift on the direct payments of Pillar 1.¹⁸ However, Rural Development has not managed to grow on embodying a new perspective for the agricultural policy promoting employment, land cohesion and environment.

Pillar 2 owns currently three times less budget than Pillar 1, and its management remains evermore complex. Shifting money from pillar 1 to pillar 2 (modulation) does not shine accurate to us. It forces them into a financing competition (one of them is cofinanced, the other not) instead of reinforcing their complementarity.

The dominating agricultural model, mainly productivist, and financed to a great extent by the farm subsidies, has heavy impacts, not only on natural resources but also on the employment. As it is, the agricultural workforce keeps losing weight in the EU, with a further 11,5% loss between 2005 and 2009. The challenge today is not anymore to improve productivity per work hour, but rather to assess productivity through its consumption of natural resources, by developing an ecologically productive agriculture that would need more workforce. In a few regions of the South and East of the EU, where agriculture still accounts for a quarter of the rural economy, small and « semi-subsistence farms »¹⁹ are crucial on the economic, social but also environmental scales (maintaining high natural value systems).

Valuing employment calls for a strong political ambition in favour of an innovating, job-creating agriculture with outputs of high added value, which implies a greater generational renewal in the years to come. Less than 8% of the farmers of the EU are less than 35 years old, and more than 25% are more than 65 years old.²⁰ This is how big the generational challenge is for the future of the European agriculture.

Propositions

According to a sustainable agriculture outlook, the objectives of the Rural Development policy need to be focused on maintaining and creating employment as well as on supporting land cohesion. Nevertheless, such commitments call before all things for going beyond the two (unbalanced) pillars of the CAP in order to go towards a strategic long-term planning with secured fundings for the CAP. The « U-bend » effect that would favour one objective at the expense of the other (pillar 1 vs pillar 2) needs to be avoided.

Land cohesion is the other priority for Rural Development. As the less favored areas (mountain, intermediary and with specific handicap) are covering the UAA of the EU on 57%, the CAP's has to secure the sustainable agricultural systems with high natural value by supporting the income of the farmers in these areas. Compensatory payments for natural handicap are thus necessary to prevent land abandonment, the withdrawal of the agricultural activity from areas that are over-ex-

¹⁸Optional since its introduction in 1999, the modulation of direct payments became mandatory after the 2003 reform, with a 5% rate to reach 10% in 2012 according to the CAP health check agreement in 2008.

¹⁹ According to the EC terminology

²⁰ Rural development in the EU, statistic and economic information, 2009 report, DG Agri.

posed to the marginalisation risk, but also to avoid the migration of certain productions to plain areas.

Levers

- secure the support to sustainable farming and to farms with high added value in regions with natural handicap in order to avoid dropping-outs from the farming activity, agricultural land loss, and the desertification of the rural areas ;
- support more actively the settlement of young and new farmers in order to renew generations for inheritable and environmental-friendly agricultural types, suggest to common institutions to consider the land issue (access, settlement, ...) on a european scale ;
- back-up small farmers and acknowledge the key role of « semi-subsistence agriculture » in the creation of production systems that simultaneoulsy guarantee food security, preserve natural ressources, contribute to the rural development and fight climate change ;
- support training, education, project engineering, method transfer, as well as the exchange of experiences.

6. Integrate consumption and food into the heart of a renewed food policy : quality, access for all, seasonality, and closeness

Observation

The ties between food and health are now clearly established regarding cardio-vascular diseases, some cancers, type II diabet, obesity,...²¹These illnesses have important social and economic costs.²² Food, sugar- and fat-rich drinks, unbalanced nutritional supplies as well as chemical contaminations of our food (including by numerous pesticides) are incriminated. A rise in the consumption of fruits, vegetables and whole cereals is necessary with the objective of a balanced and diversified diet,.

Mobilizing the next CAP in order to influence on the diets is essential to match the society's expectations better in terms of quality and access to food, of nutrition and public health. Fighting against the illnesses of food abundance is a way to tackle a public health issue as much as a way to tackle problems of over-exploitation of the resources and resulting environmental issues. We need a policy clearly focused on food that would target first of all consumers' needs, matched with the ability of our environment to provide for it, with transparent and affordable prices, taking into account the production and induced environmental costs, while guaranteeing a remunerative income to the producers.

A true food policy is necessary : it has to support more actively the products coming from the organic agriculture and the protected designation of origin, that bring landmarks in the identification of the geographic origin and the production methods. These agricultures contribute to the vitality and the employment in rural areas and have social and environmental assets that benefit the whole society. Thus in their food purchase European consumers should be able to choose the type of agriculture they hold as being the most beneficial to the society, and that does not maintain artificially low prices thanks to an underpaid agricultural workforce, and damages the environment and the health of producers in foreign countries or on our territory. A quality, close-at-hand, seasonal and affordable food remains thus the main legitimacy for the CAP.

Propositions

The CAP has to broaden its intervention tools to food information and education in order to promote the evolution of consumption ways : more of diversified local plants, less sugar, less animal and vegetal fat coming from intensive and non-sustainable exploitation methods. It also has to act for reducing food waste : each European generates 160 kg of wrapping waste each year, among which two thirds are from food origin. Food itself is thrown to the bin : 26% in France, 50% in the USA. Not throwing it anymore would reduce our ecological footprint by 8%. A true food policy cannot ignore the waste of food products on ethical, social as well as environmental grounds.

The CAP has moreover to support local and seasonal food systems, as well as short channels in order to reestablish confidence links between producers and consumers and act for the reduction of greenhouse gases. In particular CAP must back-up the integration of quality (including organic agriculture) and locally grown food in the catering (canteens, university, administrative restaurants...)

The EU also has to consider which support it can bring to the most deprived people, with the CAP itself, or within the frame of a social policy to reinforce in this field. The Most deprived people scheme (MDP) allows to support the distribution of food products thanks to charities NGO's. The

²¹ Source European agriculture and health consortium [EAHC]

²² Cost estimated at € 192 billion by the EU, almost four times the cost of the CAP [EAHC]

MDP being restricted to a few basic products (products made from cereals, sugar, rice and above all milk for two thirds), broadening the program to fruits and vegetables and to quality proteins seems to us necessary so as to diversify nutritional supplies.

Levers

- amplify information to consumers on environmental-friendly production modes that supply healthy products to consumers, such as organic agriculture : inform and sensitize on the reduction of the waste in food products among the general public but also among professionals, whether public or private ;
- broadly develop nutritional education programs, above all in favour of fruit, vegetable, cereals and legume consumption, integrate there in the sensibilization to a diet poorer in animal proteins, in the respect of nutritional needs ; promote a seasonal food consumption through information and sensibilization programs ;
- support development and durability of the short channels (urban and peri-urban channels for instance) that contribute to link producers and consumers around quality, season and locally produced products, support above all projects that involve local authorities and farmers in the offer of quality and local products in the public catering (canteens, university and administration restaurants) ;
- focuse support to production modes in accordance with public health issues, by supporting the production systems that use none or very little pesticides, exclude GMOs and preserve domestic biodiversity ;
- reinforce the MDP scheme and diversify nutritional contribution of food products, for instance with the introduction of quality fruits, vegetables and leguminous in this framework.

Lexicon

AEM: Agro-environmental measures

EAHC : European agriculture and health consortium

EU : European Union

GAEC : Good agricultural and environmental conditions

GMO : Genetically modified organisms

HNV : High natural value

IAASTD : International assessment of agricultural knowledge, science and technology for development.

MDP : Most Deprived People scheme

UAA : Utilised agricultural areas

WTO : World trade organisation