

AGROFORESTRY IN THE EU AND ROMANIAN PUBLIC POLICIES. A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS BETWEEN SELECTED MEMBER STATES

Șandor MIGNON^{1*}, Diana E. DUMITRAȘ² and Ionel-Mugurel JITEA^{2*}

¹*Department of Environment Sciences. University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Cluj-Napoca, Romania.*

²*Department of Economic Sciences. University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Cluj-Napoca, Romania.*

*Corresponding author, e-mail: sandor.mignon@usamvcluj.ro; mjitea@usamvcluj.ro.

Introduction: Although there is not a general accepted definition for ecosystem services (ESS) (Spangenberg *et al.*, 2014) most of the researches acknowledge that it represents the “benefits that humans recognise as obtained from ecosystems that support their survival and quality of life” (Harrington *et al.*, 2010). In this context, it is proved that agroforestry delivers important ESS (Fagerholm *et al.*, 2016). To enhance the possibilities of agroforestry development, rules at different levels need to comply and to be consistent (Jakobsson and Lindborg, 2015).

Aims: 1) to understand how agroforestry is regulated at the EU level and what type of incentives are promoted by the policy-makers in order to deliver ESS through agroforestry development; 2) to understand how the EU regulations are applied by the national authorities (drivers; barriers); 3) to compare different examples of national and regional regulations across EU for good practices examples that can be further promoted in the debate for future policy reforms;

Materials and Methods: An analysis of the legal repository of the European Commission (<http://eur-lex.europa.eu>) from the year of 2000 to our own day is realised. The legal documents related to agroforestry issued by the national authorities were also analysed.

Results: Results reveal that agroforestry is recognised only marginally by the public policies as being eligible for the first CAP pillar payments. Also, there is a Rural Development measure that support investments in agroforestry, the system management falls under the forestry regulations. This acts as a barrier for the system development, especially in the New Member States.

Conclusion: There is the need to relax the management burdens in the harvesting process.

Acknowledgments: This project is funded in the frame of the ERA-NET FACCE SURPLUS, EU Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme. Grant agreement No 652615.

Keywords: public policies, ecosystem services, Romania.

References

1. Spangenberg J, von Haaren C and Settele J (2014). The ecosystem service cascade: Further developing the metaphor. Integrating societal processes to accommodate social processes and planning, and the case of bioenergy. *Ecol Econ* 104: 22–32.
2. Harrington R, Anton C, Dawson T, de Bello F, Feld C, Haslett J, Kluvánková-Oravská T, Kontogianni A, Lavorel S, Luck G, Rounsevell M, Samways M, Settele J, Skourtos M, Spangenberg J, Vandewalle M, Zobel M and Harrison P (2010). Ecosystem services and biodiversity conservation: concepts and a glossary. *Biodivers. Conserv.* 19: 2773–2790.
3. Fagerholm N, Torralba M, Burgess P and Plieninger T (2016). A systematic map of ecosystem services assessments around European agroforestry. *Ecol Indic.* 62: 47-65.
4. Jakobsson S and Lindborg R (2015). Governing nature by numbers - EU subsidy regulations do not capture the unique values of woody pastures. *Biol Conser.* 191:1–9.