

Protecting our natural capital: an EU strategy to conserve biodiversity and ensure the provision of ecosystem services by 2020

Consultation is online at:

<http://ec.europa.eu/environment/consultations/biodecline.htm> until 22 October.

Answer on behalf of: IFOAM EU Group,

Identification number in the register of interest representatives: 67128251296-84

Profile of the respondent.

This section provides us with some basic information about the background of the respondent.

Status confirmation - I am responding on behalf of: (compulsory)

I am an interested citizen

I work in a private company or for a financial institution

I am a researcher

I work in a national administration

I work in a regional or local administration

I am a consultant

I work in a non governmental organisation

I work in an European Business/Industry Association

Country: (compulsory)

Austria

Belgium

Bulgaria

Cyprus

Czech Republic

Denmark

Estonia

Finland

France

Germany

Greece

Hungary

Ireland

Italy

Latvia

Lithuania

Luxembourg

Malta

Netherlands

Poland

Portugal

Romania

Slovakia

Slovenia

Spain

Sweden

United Kingdom

Outside the EU

Introduction to the main questionnaire

Many authoritative reports confirm that global biodiversity is under severe threat, with extinction rates occurring at 100 to 1000 times the normal rate. More than a third of species assessed face the risk of extinction and an estimated 60% of the Earth's ecosystems have been degraded in the last 50 years, with consequences for the ecosystems services that depend on them. Marine biodiversity is also under pressure, and approximately 90% of the planet's biomass lives in the ocean. Habitat destruction, fragmentation and degradation caused by land-use change, over-exploitation, unsustainable practices (e.g. overfishing), invasive species, ocean acidification, pollution and, increasingly, climate change are the strongest pressures on biodiversity.

In 2001, the EU set itself the target to halt biodiversity loss in the EU by 2010. Efforts to tackle biodiversity loss were subsequently stepped up, and an EU Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) was adopted by the Commission in 2006 to accelerate progress.¹ Despite the efforts to date, however, there are clear indications that the EU has not achieved its target.

In March 2010, The EU adopted a new biodiversity target that aims at *halting the loss of biodiversity and the degradation of ecosystem services in the EU by 2020, and restoring them in so far as feasible, while stepping up the EU contribution to averting global biodiversity loss.*

The European Commission is working on the development of a new EU biodiversity strategy to enable the 2020 target to be met. The objective of this consultation is to gather input from a wide range of

¹ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/biodiversity/comm2006/bap_2006.htm

stakeholders on possible policy options for this strategy. This public consultation takes into account the results of a first stakeholder consultation held in Brussels on 3 June, as well as the results of a recent Eurobarometer Survey of Attitudes of European towards the issue of Biodiversity.²

² http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_290_en.pdf

A) GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. The EU's 2010 biodiversity target was not reached because....

- a) measures taken were not sufficiently ambitious
 Agree Disagree No opinion
- b) measures taken did not address the main drivers of biodiversity loss
 Agree Disagree No opinion
- c) the relevant legislation (Birds and Habitats Directives, Water Framework Directive, Marine Strategy Framework Directive, etc) has not been sufficiently implemented
 Agree Disagree No opinion
- d) the level of funding directed towards this end was not adequate
 Agree Disagree No opinion
- e) the target itself was unrealistic
 Agree Disagree No opinion

2. The EU's approach to tackling the biodiversity challenge so far has not enabled the EU to reach its 2010 target because...

- a) it lacked a baseline and measurable targets against which progress could be measured
 Agree Disagree No opinion
- b) measures did not have the necessary buy-in from other sectoral actors
 Agree Disagree No opinion
- c) measures were largely voluntary/non-binding
 Agree Disagree No opinion
- d) measures were too diffuse and not sufficiently prioritised
 Agree Disagree No opinion

3. Biodiversity in the EU continues to be lost because...

- a) the policy framework to tackle the issue is inadequate
 Agree Disagree No opinion
- b) knowledge about the impacts of biodiversity loss is insufficient
 Agree Disagree No opinion
- c) the economic value of biodiversity for other sectors is underestimated
 Agree Disagree No opinion
- d) negative impacts from new and emerging threats (climate change, invasive species) have outweighed benefits from efforts to halt biodiversity loss
 Agree Disagree No opinion
- e) economic development objectives generally prioritised over biodiversity concerns
 Agree Disagree No opinion
- f) political will to tackle the issue has been insufficient
 Agree Disagree No opinion

4. The EU biodiversity policy framework until now...

- a) has ensured the sufficient integration of biodiversity concerns into other policy areas

Agree **Disagree** No opinion

b) has ensured that biodiversity is sufficiently reflected in the financial perspectives and financing cycles of the EU

Agree **Disagree** No opinion

c) has ensured sufficient focus on ecosystem services

Agree **Disagree** No opinion

d) has ensured sufficient focus on the importance of ecosystem restoration

Agree **Disagree** No opinion

e) has raised awareness about biodiversity

Agree Disagree No opinion

f) has secured the commitment of actors in key sectors to biodiversity objectives

Agree **Disagree** No opinion

g) has suffered from policy gaps in certain areas

Agree Disagree No opinion

h) has made sufficient use of economic incentives and economic instruments

Agree **Disagree** No opinion

5. Future efforts to halt biodiversity loss in the EU should...

a) include measures and actions that go beyond nature conservation

Agree Disagree No opinion

b) focus on a limited number of direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss (those having the most significant impacts)

Agree Disagree No opinion

c) address the full range of drivers and pressures

Agree **Disagree** No opinion

6. To reach the EU's 2020 biodiversity target, existing EU environmental legislation (e.g. nature, air, water, chemicals, climate change, etc)...

a) is sufficient

b) would be sufficient if fully implemented

c) is not sufficient – additional measures focusing on other sectors are required

d) no opinion

7. Of the following sectors, which 3 in your view have the most significant negative impacts on biodiversity? Please rank them in order of importance (1 being the most important)

1. Agriculture

Energy

2. Fisheries

Forestry

Industrial production

Trade

3. Transport

Other [please specify]

8. Given that there are EU policies addressing several of the previous sectors, which 3 of the following policy areas have the most potential to bring benefits for biodiversity? Please rank them in order of importance (1 being the most important)

1. Agriculture and Rural Development

Climate Change
Energy
Health and Consumers
2. Maritime and Fisheries
3. Regional Policy
Research
Trade
Transport
Other [please specify]

B) THE PROPOSED APPROACH

To date, the EU's approach towards halting biodiversity loss has tended to be comprehensive, covering a broad range of sectors and actions with little prioritisation. The current biodiversity strategy, the 2006 Biodiversity Action Plan, includes some 160 actions. From the various assessments of the BAP undertaken to date³, it can be concluded that with this approach the EU has not met its objective of halting biodiversity loss in the EU by 2010. The Commission is therefore exploring the possibility to build the post-2010 strategy around a new, prioritised approach. The strategy would contain a limited number of measurable and strategic sub-targets (ST). The topics to be covered by those sub-targets currently under consideration are:

- ST1 – sustainable land management – agriculture and forestry
- ST2 – sustainable use of natural resources- fisheries
- ST3 – protecting habitats and species - nature conservation
- ST4 - working with nature and investing in natural capital – Green Infrastructure
- ST5 – preventing the introduction and spread of invasive species
- ST6 - the EU's contribution to global biodiversity

In this approach, it is assumed that the policy baseline, which includes EU nature legislation (Birds and Habitats Directives), water and marine legislation (in particular the Water Framework Directive and Marine Strategy Framework Directive), the Environmental Impact Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment Directives, the Climate and Energy Package; and pollution-related legislation (nitrates, pesticides, air, REACH, industrial emissions, waste...) will deliver substantial improvements for biodiversity. For this reason, the proposed sub-targets should focus on remaining gaps. For each sub-target, feasible and cost-effective measures and actions will need to be elaborated. The strategy should also seize upcoming opportunities to further integrate biodiversity into other policies arising from the forthcoming reform of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and Common Fishery Policy (CFP), and developments in Regional and Cohesion Policy.

ST1 – SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT - Agriculture and Forestry

Rural areas and agriculture account for 80% and over 40% respectively of the total EU land area. Unsustainable agriculture and forestry are one of the main pressures on biodiversity because of growing intensification on the one hand, and land abandonment on the other hand. Moreover, while traditional farming and forestry practices have often generated species rich habitats, these are declining across the EU. Given the agricultural sector's dependence on a range of ecosystem services such as pollination, biological control, soil formation, water availability, and genetic diversity, it has a direct stake in efforts to ensure biodiversity conservation.

9. In your view, how necessary is it to have a sub-target on agriculture and forestry?

³ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/biodiversity/comm2006/index_en.htm

Necessary

Somewhat necessary

Not necessary

No opinion

10. Please rank the following options according to their importance in ensuring conservation of biodiversity in the agriculture and forestry sectors (1 being most important):

Preserving and/or expanding extensive agriculture and High Nature Value areas **2**

Reducing the negative impacts of intensive farming **4**

Increasing the total land area devoted to organic farming in the EU **1**

Increasing the share of funding for biodiversity-related agri-environment measures **3**

Other [please specify] **Implementing stricter indicators for the environmental benefits agro-environmental measures must have**

11. In order to contribute to a better conservation of biodiversity, the reformed Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) should...

a) include more explicit biodiversity conservation objectives

Agree Disagree No opinion

b) integrate the Biodiversity Strategy's agriculture & forests sub-target into its own objectives

Agree Disagree No opinion

c) include obligatory biodiversity monitoring and reporting requirements

Agree Disagree No opinion

d) include voluntary biodiversity monitoring and reporting requirements

Agree **Disagree** No opinion

ST2 – SUSTAINABLE USE OF NATURAL RESOURCES – Fisheries

As the IFOAM EU Group does not work on fishery policies these fields are left blank

88% of EU fish stocks are overfished, making fisheries the most representative example of overexploitation of natural resources in Europe. Pressure from unsustainable fishing is also a major cause of degradation of marine ecosystems and the other services they provide. Yet, as with the agricultural sector, the long-term viability of the fisheries sector depends on healthy ecosystems. The April 2009 Green Paper on the reform of the Common Fisheries Policy⁴ highlights the main challenges facing the sector, including those relating to marine biodiversity.

12. In your view, how necessary is it to have a sub-target on fisheries?

Necessary

Somewhat necessary

Not necessary

No opinion

13. Please rank the following options according to their importance in ensuring conservation of biodiversity in the fisheries sector (1 being most important):

Changes to the Common Fisheries Policy governance system

Changes to the EU fishing fleet structure

Changes to the monitoring and control system

Measures aimed at minimising and/or eliminating the negative impacts of fishing (including discard and by-catch)

Expanding marine protected areas

Other [please specify]

14. In order to contribute to a better conservation of biodiversity, the reformed Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) should...

- a) include more explicit biodiversity conservation objectives
Agree Disagree No opinion
- b) integrate the Biodiversity Strategy's fisheries sub-target into its own objectives
Agree Disagree No opinion
- c) include obligatory biodiversity monitoring and reporting requirements
Agree Disagree No opinion
- d) include voluntary biodiversity monitoring and reporting requirements
Agree Disagree No opinion

ST3 –PROTECTING HABITATS AND SPECIES - NATURE CONSERVATION

The Birds and Habitats Directives are key legal instruments dedicated to habitat and species conservation at EU level. Together with other environment legislation such as the Water and Marine Strategy Framework Directives, the Birds and Habitats Directives form the backbone of the EU biodiversity policy. The Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC was adopted in 1992. The overall aim of this Directive is to promote the maintenance of biodiversity, taking account of economic, social, cultural and regional requirements. The main objective of the Directive is to achieve a favourable conservation status of over 1.000 animals and plant species and over 200 so called "habitat types" (e.g. special types of forests, meadows, wetlands, etc.), which are of particular European importance. The Habitats Directive also establishes the EU wide Natura 2000 ecological network of protected areas. For these areas it provides a high level of safeguards against potentially damaging developments. The Birds Directive 2009/147/EC was originally adopted in 1979. This Directive ensures far-reaching protection for all of Europe's wild birds, identifying 194 species and sub-species among them as particularly threatened and in need of special conservation measures. Member States are required to designate Special Protection Areas (SPAs) under the Birds Directive and Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) under the Habitats Directive, which are critical for the survival of the targeted species and habitats. They together form the EU Natura 2000 network.

At present, approximately 18% of EU territory is designated as protected areas under the Natura 2000 network. However, recent assessments show that only 17% of known protected habitats and species are in favourable conservation status.

15. In your view, how necessary is it to have a sub-target on nature conservation?

- Necessary**
- Somewhat necessary
- Not necessary
- No opinion

16. In your view, should this sub-target focus on an improved conservation status of species and habitats of community interests?

- yes**
- no

If no what should in your view be the focus of the sub-target?

17. What are in your view the 3 most important measures to improve the implementation of the Birds and Habitats Directive and the favourable conservation status of habitats and species?

- a) Improved knowledge of the conservation status of species and habitats
- b) Adequate funding for the management of the Natura 2000 networks 3**

- c) Appropriate management of Natura 2000 sites
- d) Better integration of - and respect for - the EU Birds and Habitats Directives in other EU policy areas (e.g. Agriculture, Regional Development & Cohesion, Transport, Energy, Maritime & Fisheries,...) **2**
- e) Better Communication and Public Awareness about the EU Birds and Habitats Directives and Natura 2000
- f) Additional designations of Natura 2000 sites
- g) Better valuation of the ecosystem services and benefits produced by Natura 2000 sites
- h) Better legal enforcement of the legislation at EU and national level **1**
- i) Other [please specify]

ST4 – WORKING WITH NATURE AND INVESTING IN NATURAL CAPITAL - Green Infrastructure⁵

Ensuring adequate protection of biodiversity both within and outside of protected areas and investing in natural capital are vital to sustain the long-term functioning of ecosystems. Europe has undergone more habitat and ecosystem fragmentation than any other continent to date. European ecosystems are literally cut to pieces by urban sprawl and a rapidly expanding transport network. Fragmentation reduces the opportunities for organisms to disperse and affects their ecological needs (e.g. access to specific habitats, sufficient area for food and breeding). It also affects the ability of ecosystems to provide the services we need. Overcoming these challenges requires putting in place so-called 'Green Infrastructure' to re-establish connections between areas with high biodiversity or importance for ecosystem functionality, and to improve the permeability of landscapes (e.g. buffer zones and corridors, green urban areas and eco-bridges to reconnect natural areas divided by transport infrastructure), as well as to ensure the continued provision or re-establishment of ecosystem services (e.g. natural coastal protection through marshes/flood plains; natural water cycling; urban cooling solutions such as tree planting, etc). These measures, which depend on integrated land management, can also make a valuable contribution to climate change mitigation and adaptation.

18. In your view, how necessary is it to have a sub-target on Green Infrastructure?

- Necessary
- Somewhat necessary
- Not necessary
- No opinion

19. A sub-target on Green Infrastructure should primarily seek to...

- a) ensure connectivity between protected areas, e.g. Natura 2000 sites, and between ecosystems within and outside protected areas
 Agree Disagree No opinion
- b) maintain and increase the resilience of ecosystems and their continued service delivery
 Agree Disagree No opinion
- c) restore ecosystems that contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation and disaster risk reduction
 Agree Disagree No opinion
- d) ensure systematic compensation of biodiversity loss ("no net loss")
 Agree Disagree No opinion

⁵ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/ecosystems/index_en.htm

20. Measures under this sub-target should focus on...

- a) increasing biodiversity in urban areas
Agree **Disagree** No opinion
- b) mitigating the adverse effects of transport and energy infrastructure
Agree Disagree No opinion
- c) promoting integrated spatial planning that fully takes into account ecosystems and ecosystem services (eg through ecosystem service mapping)
Agree Disagree No opinion
- d) ensuring compensation of biodiversity loss ("no net loss")
Agree Disagree No opinion
- e) introducing market mechanisms to regulate the use of ecosystem goods and services (payments for ecosystem services, pricing mechanisms, taxes, etc.)
Agree Disagree No opinion
- f) introducing specific biodiversity provisions in relevant impact assessment tools (e.g. Environmental Impact Assessment Directive⁶, Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive) as a condition for the provision of EU funding
Agree Disagree No opinion
- g) Increasing the rate of public and private investments in natural capital maintenance/restoration
Agree Disagree No opinion
- h) developing stronger linkages between biodiversity and territorial cohesion objectives/landscape policy and their financing
Agree Disagree No opinion

21. Do you believe that working with nature (i.e. nature-based solutions) can be more cost-effective than man-made or technological solutions?

Yes, often

Rarely

No

No opinion

22. In the context of competing demands for land, how important is it to ensure the provision of ecosystem services (water purification, carbon sequestration, pollination...) as compared to other economic and social considerations?

More important

Equally important

Less important

No opinion

ST5 – INVASIVE SPECIES

Invasive Species are recognised as a major and growing driver of biodiversity loss in the EU, and the costs arising from economic and social impacts are estimated at least 12 billion Euros per year in Europe. In 2008 the Commission adopted a Communication entitled "Towards an EU Strategy on Invasive Species"[COM(2008)789]. A public consultation on Invasive Alien Species was organised in 2008. Results can be consulted via the following link:
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/invasivealien/docs/results_consult.pdf

6 Please note that a separate public consultation on the review of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive is being carried out from 28 June to 24 September 2010.

23. In your view, how necessary is it to have a sub-target on invasive species?

Necessary

Somewhat necessary

Not necessary

No opinion

24. A sub-target on invasive species should primarily seek to...

a) Prevent the introduction of new invasive species

Agree Disagree No opinion

b) Establish an early warning and rapid response system

Agree Disagree No opinion

c) Control and/or eradicate invasive species that are already settled in the EU

Agree Disagree No opinion

d) All of the above

Agree Disagree No opinion

ST6 – EU CONTRIBUTION TO GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY

The EU's 2020 biodiversity target explicitly includes a global dimension, calling for the EU to step up its contribution to averting global biodiversity loss. We depend on biodiversity elsewhere for many of our needs and have a degree of responsibility for the global loss of biodiversity on account of our consumption and production patterns. Biodiversity and ecosystems play a crucial role in mitigating climate change (e.g. by absorbing carbon emissions) and enabling species – including humans – to adapt to its impacts. Given that the livelihoods of a large part of the population in many developing countries is directly dependent on biodiversity and healthy and functioning ecosystems, the protection of biodiversity is also very closely linked to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.

25. In your view, how necessary is it to have a sub-target on the EU contribution to global biodiversity?

Necessary

Somewhat necessary

Not necessary

No opinion

26. A sub-target on the EU contribution to global biodiversity should primarily seek to...

a) increase EU development aid spending on biodiversity related projects and programmes

Agree Disagree No opinion

b) reduce the negative impacts of the EU's production and consumption patterns on global biodiversity?

Agree Disagree No opinion

c) prevent negative impacts of EU trade and fishing agreements on biodiversity

Agree Disagree No opinion

d) ensure that biodiversity concerns are systematically reflected in the EU's dialogue with third countries

Agree Disagree No opinion

e) for all projects and programmes funded through EU development cooperation assistance, introduce mandatory ex-ante environmental impact assessments that include biodiversity related criteria

Agree Disagree No opinion

f) incentivise and/or reward efforts by third countries to conserve biodiversity and ecosystem services, e.g. through international payments for ecosystem services, biodiversity offset payment schemes, etc

Agree Disagree No opinion

g) seek further convergence between international biodiversity and climate change objectives to seize the full potential of 'co-benefits'

Agree Disagree No opinion

27. Of the following list of measures, which three do you believe would be the most effective in reducing the impact of the EU's Ecological Footprint⁷ on global biodiversity? Please rank them in order of effectiveness (1 being most effective)

awareness-raising campaigns

certification systems

import restrictions or levies

increase resource efficiency **1**

labelling of products and services

public procurement criteria **3**

sustainability criteria in trade agreements **2**

taxation

Other [please specify]

28. Do you believe that the EU's development policy currently contributes sufficiently to the protection of global biodiversity?

Yes

Somewhat

No, not sufficiently

No opinion

29. Do you agree with the proposed approach as broadly outlined above?

Yes

Somewhat

No

No opinion

if you answered 'No' or 'Somewhat', please explain what you think is lacking in this approach?

C) THE ECONOMICS OF BIODIVERSITY

The loss of biodiversity and degradation of ecosystems has already had serious economic consequences. The annual loss of ecosystem services under a business-as-usual scenario is estimated to be equivalent to around €50 billion, while by 2050 the accumulated welfare losses could be equivalent to 7% of annual consumption, according to an international study on 'The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity' (TEEB), which is analyzing the global economic benefit of biological diversity, the costs of the loss of biodiversity and the failure to take protective measures versus the costs of effective conservation.⁸

30. How important do you think it is to assign an economic value to biodiversity and ecosystem services?

Important

Somewhat important

Irrelevant, biodiversity has intrinsic value

Not important

⁷ The ecological footprint compares human demand with planet Earth's ecological capacity to regenerate. Key features of the footprint include the overexploitation of marine resources (unsustainable catches), forestry (unsustainable management) and species (unsustainable hunting). The EU's ecological footprint is 4.7 global hectares per person, whereas its available bio capacity is only 2.2 global hectares per person. The EU's footprint has increased by approximately 16% in the last decade.

⁸ <http://www.teebweb.org>

No opinion

31. Do you believe that the value of natural assets should be accounted for in national budgeting systems, e.g. National Accounting Standards?

Yes

Yes, but it is not possible

No

No opinion

32. Which three out of the following market based instruments would you consider most effective to enhance biodiversity and halt biodiversity loss? Please rank them in order of effectiveness (1 being most effective)

2 Payment for ecosystem services

Taxation

Systems of off-sets, credits and compensation for damage and restoration of biodiversity

1 Reform or elimination of harmful subsidies

3 Pricing of natural resources or products on the basis of their impacts on biodiversity

Certification and labelling schemes

Other [please specify]

D) GOVERNANCE

As Parties to the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity, the 27 EU Member States are obliged to adopt National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans. The EU, as a Party, must also develop such a plan. Many of the issues that need to be covered in these Plans often fall within the competences of local and regional authorities.

33. In your opinion, how can the participation and commitment of local authorities in the implementation of these strategies best be enhanced?

- Regional and local governments should implement measures; monitor and report their progress
- targeted training programmes for local authorities

34. In your opinion, the implementation of the strategy should be based mainly on?

Voluntary commitments

Mandatory measures

Market-based instruments

A mixture of the above

No opinion

35. How do you think the private sector could increase its contribution to the protection of biodiversity?

- By informing the public and their shareholders about how they use biodiversity

- By increasing the resource efficiency of their activities through the development of dedicated strategies (business/biodiversity interdependency indicators; ecosystem services reviews, etc)

- By engaging in partnerships with environmental NGOs

- By increasing their use of raw materials from sustainably managed sources

- Through the provision of funds for the protection and conservation of biodiversity

- By compensating for residual/unavoidable harm to biodiversity caused by their activities, e.g. through biodiversity offset schemes and other compensation mechanisms.

Other [please specify]

No opinion

E) MONITORING OF BIODIVERSITY

It is very important to increase the knowledge base on biodiversity for the formulation of science based policies, as well as to be able to measure progress. Over the past years a lot of progress has been made in gathering data and information on biodiversity, but more needs to be done to fill in remaining knowledge gaps.

36. From the following list, which 3 options would be the most effective for increasing the knowledge base? Please rank them in order of effectiveness (1 being most effective)

Through EU legislation on monitoring biodiversity and reporting

3 By including biodiversity considerations in existing monitoring and reporting systems

1 Through dedicated EU funding for national monitoring

Through the adoption of guidelines on monitoring

2 By encouraging voluntary monitoring by the private sector, stakeholders and citizens

Other [please specify]

F) ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

If you have additional comments, please provide them here (optional) [max. 500 characters]

- In the EU's global biodiversity footprint, feed imports play a crucial role. Especially the cultivation of GMO soya has devastating effects in Latin American countries. This issue should be addressed in both the CAP and trade policies.
- Industrial farm practices and monocultures, especially in relation with genetically modified plants, have devastating effects on soil biodiversity and partly on insect diversity, this problem should be addressed in the strategy.
- Not only the diversity of wild species should be considered in this action plan, but also agrobiodiversity, the diversity of plant varieties and animal breeds in agricultural use must be addressed. The maintenance and further development "on farm" of these genetic resources can be of crucial importance for future food security. Obstacles for the maintenance of these genetic resources lie partly in restrictive legislation (marketing of seed) and in insufficient funding.

Thank you for answering this questionnaire.

How did you perceive the questionnaire? (compulsory)

Expectations met

Expectations not met

If expectations not met :

Why? (max. 1 reply)