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Distribution of direct subsidies (1st pillar)

- in France, still in favor of farms with less positive environmental effects (Kirsch, Kroll, Trouvé, 2017)
- Linked to the reform of the CAP in 1992 then in 2003
- With a compensation by the 2nd pillar subsidies (especially for the less advantaged areas)... which is not sufficient
- Contrary to Germany, which chose the complete harmonization of amounts of direct subsidies
Distribution of direct subsidies according to « environmental » classes of farms (French FADN). Case of milk farms (Kirsch, Kroll, Trouvé, 2017)
Distribution of direct subsidies according to « environmental » classes of farms (German FADN). Case of milk farms (Kirsch, Kroll, Trouvé, 2017)
Some remarks on the French 2\textsuperscript{nd} pillar and more generally the « greening » of CAP

- 2\textsuperscript{nd} pillar subsidies
  - Focus on regions and farms already « environmental-friendly » (see below)
    - with insufficient amounts for encouraging whole changes of practices (see national assessments)
  - Subsidies per ha, which are clearly insufficient in some little farms (e.g. organic farming in market gardening)
  - Some subsidies clearly not for environmental-friendly farms

- New CAP in France : some positive and negative points
  - « Green payments » : some big arrangements (e.g. for mais producers in favor of monoculture, for soya production with fertilizers in ecologic areas...)
Proportion de bénéficiaires Programme de développement rural hexagonal (PDRH) / nombre de cotisants MSA 2007-2010 par canton (%)
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Regulation of agricultural markets and environnement (1)

- Case of the compromise with USA in the 60’ and 90’ → abolition of tariffs on oleaginous crops
  - sizeable imports of oleaginous crops from South America, with GMO’s
  - intensive livestock production in Europe, based on maize and soya, to the detriment of grassland
- Case of the transatlantic free trade agreements (Gerstetter et al., 2013 ; Bureau et al., 2014 ; Trouvé et al., 2017)
  - risks on weakening the EU’s environmental and food safety policies and the EU’s right to regulate
  - higher risks for some productions which present environmental services (case of cattle production and grassland)
Regulation of agricultural markets and environnement (2)

- The case of European dairy production (Trouvé et al., 2016)
  - rapid and recent deregulation of dairy markets, with removal of milk quotas
    - geographic concentration of milk production in EU (see below)
      - with problems of effluents pression
      - Weakening the complementarity between crops and breeding
    - Encouraging the rise of production in some regions → increasing number of animals/ha, less pasture... (+ overproduction)

- More generally, big difficulties to demand to farmers strong changes...
  - ... when prices and revenues are so variable and in many cases very low
    - difficulties for long term investments
Some proposals for another CAP (Bazin, 2015)

• Tools for regulating markets
  • storage and prices management, at least direct subsidies according to the farm revenues
  • Regulating production volumes

• Keeping strong border measures

• Strong environmental conditions for receiving subsidies →
  • Subsidies allocated par worker (and not per hectare)

• Strong subsidies for changing farm practices, organic farming, direct short supply chains... especially for the school meals