

Published
Edit
⚙️

Discussion on lecture 5

[Marianne Erichsen](#)

11 Jun at 8:03

14

Please think of ways to raise their awareness of this topic. What kind of measures do you think governments (or universities or other stakeholders) can take to raise the farmers' awareness of this?

This topic was edited by [Eve Veromann](#)

Search entries or author

Unread

👁️

☰

☷

✔️ **Subscribed**

← [Write a reply...](#)

<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/158003>

[Eva Maria Hansel](#)

⚙️

<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/158003>

13 Jun 2017

I have got several ideas of what kind of measures the governments and the university could take to raise the awareness of the farmers.

The governments could inaugurate specific laws under the topic of "Ecosystem Services". For example every farmer has to introduce a "landscape management" which includes:

- > creating a balanced amount of non-crop/crop elements on their fields
- > building several nesting spots for insects to increase the amount of insect pollinators etc.

In addition i was thinking of public campaigns, to increase the public interest in these specific themes.

The universities could improve their themes/topics in the agricultural study paths (I actually do not have an overview what kind of themes agricultural students are learning/ maybe there are some in the group ;)). I could think of several modules like "Introduction in Ecosystems" or "Ecosystem services and agriculture", "Landscape Management" etc.

<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/155607>

[Eve Veromann](#)

⚙️

<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/155607>

16 Jun 2017

Great ideas! But how to motivate farmers? If they create non-crop areas nearby their fields, they lose cultivated land=amount of potential yield. What are possible methods/means/enforcements to encourage them to invest to the nature?

<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/157316>

[Diana Ismael](#)

⚙️

<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/157316>

17 Jun 2017

Thank you for this discussion.

The biological control is a very important topic that should be focused on more.

Most of the fields, I think, have some uncultivated areas around them. However, even though they don't have these areas, it may be right that they would lose cultivated land, but the compensation would probably come from the lower cost of the pesticides, or maybe higher price for their products for not using the pesticides.

Creating non-crop areas should be reasonable, not so huge so it affects the cultivated area or cause a huge lost for farmers, and not so small so it want lead to the wanted benefits.

Thank you

◀ Write a reply...

<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/157252>

Mariana Magante



<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/157252>

13 Jun 2017

Estonia has approved EU strategy "*Our life insurance, our natural capital: an EU biodiversity strategy to 2020*". We also have Nature Protection development plan until 2020. It takes into account global (Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020) and the EU's biodiversity strategy, the main objectives, and activities. I brought it out because our government values the ecosystem services, but this information does not reach to the ordinary people. It means that government has to do better awareness raising work. In addition to the brochures, they should make public campaigns and contact directly to the farmers. Also, universities have an important part in this. They should develop better collaboration with farmers.

Mariana

<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/155607>

Eva Veronero



<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/155607>

16 Jun 2017

It is so right! To rise the awareness of farmers as well as all citizens is very important and huge task but it takes time. For sure, all relevant instances must be involved in the problem solution process, including education and policy-making institutions. Do you have an idea whether and how is it possible to accelerate this process? How about the compensation systems for farmers?

<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/157246>

Gloria Pascualle



<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/157246>

22 Jun 2017

To respond to your comment, I think that this is what has been done so far with the implementation of the pillar II of the CAP. According to Article 28 of Council Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 every member state should set some extra environmental-climate-commitments (that goes beyond the "good farming practices requirements" of pillar I) to be introduced in their rural development Programme and then payments will be channeled to farmers that on a voluntary Basis decide to carry out farming operations in line with those commitments. However it has been criticised of these measures that :

- currently just 20% of the CAP funds is allocated to pillar II
- the costs that the farmer sustain for training, foregone income and further transactions are not of easy accountability and thus usually not covered in the payment
- the Meeting of those extra requirements usually mean a change in the farming model, Training, acquisition of Information and generally an higher commitment of farmers

Thus if this higher commitment it is not been well compensate for, then farmers tend to prefer payments in pillar I based on farmland area and cross-compliance, which ultimately do not foster the preservation of Ecosystem Services.

<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/157252>



<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/157252>

27 Jun 2017

I think that it is possible to accelerate this processes. Cooperation is the keyword. Different institutions should work together. But how to but them to work together more efficiently? At the moment I do not have an answer to this question. But money always makes the mare go.

◀ Write a reply...

<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/157254>



<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/157254>

19 Jun 2017

Hello,

I was also thinking about laws but also specific requirements by universities as said in the lectures.

If I am not mistaken, some subventions (like Common Agricultural Policy) may be determined by presence of areas dedicated to enhance environmental and ecosystemic services and to encourage good practices. (Taxes may also be applied to limit "bad" practices).

There are also environmental certifications and labelling (for example : high environmental value certification) to communicate environmental approach of the farm from which have been produced the food with the environmental added-value to the consumers. But to be beneficial to the farmer, consumer need to be aware as said Eva-Maria.

They are also networks, symposium and workshop organized by divers structures and government (AgroécoDom in France... and others which can be found in an annual report on agroecology (Rapport annuel sur l'agroécologie - Ministry of agriculture, food and forestry 2016) ([https://www.cbd.int/conferences/2016...\)](https://www.cbd.int/conferences/2016...)) creating new knowledge including farmers which may be very motivating and implementing new goals and guidelines...

But also, at larger scales global conventions like COP13 about biodiversity maybe hopeful for farmers by deepening and widening awarness and interest.

Edited by [Clarisse Emeline Oceane Loaec](https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/157254) (<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/157254>) on 19 Jun at 22:30

<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/157248>



<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/157248>

20 Jun 2017

I agree with all the comments mentioning public campaigns as means to rise public awareness about these themes; with this respect specific information material should be created in order to inform people about the hidden impacts of their consumption habits on different ecosystem services (and thus on their future life quality). However, do you think that the specific theme of ecosystem services is easily understandable by non-academic people? Maybe campaigns to rise awareness about the importance of consuming organic products (which then support biodiversity and ES) would be more feasible?

Moreover I would like to draw attention on the economic evaluation of ES. Policy making often entails spending money and resources on initiatives which prove to be a priority of public interest; hence "raising awareness" among decision makers at institutional level means providing clear quantitative data about the importance of ES: several academic papers try to perform economic valuations of biodiversity and related ES, often taking as benchmark the potential costs that the society should bear if these ES wouldn't exist (or if we would destroy them). Valuating the monetary value of pollination ES in a specific region, for instance, involves careful interpretation of the current and prospect ecological-social-economic-institutional dynamics: it is not an easy task and a lot of research still needs to be carried out.

<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/157254>



<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/157254>

21 Jun 2017

Hi Leonardo !

I understand your questions and thought about it and I hope with adequate education program, people will be fully aware of ecosystem services (and broader sustainable issues) and will make their consumption choice accordingly .
By raising awareness to invite the consumer to purchase organic food, I think it must not lead to promote exclusively European organic food label (which is the distinctive sign dedicated to consumer) because new certifications are being created like for example Biodynamy (Demeter), Bio Cohérence (create after the harmonisation of the European and French Organic Product certification to remedy the "lack" induced by this uniformization, lowering French previous requirements), Bio Equitable (organic product according to European requirements merge with some of fair trade requirements)... which each are variant based on organic requirement. Then, promote Organic Product raise the question of certifying body : the cost, "industrial certifications" based on global and uniformized standards, binary certification without evolution perspectives (in France an association, Nature&Progrès promote organic production but its certification lean on Participatory Guarantee Systems (PGS) to avoid these drawbacks (<https://www.cairn.info/revue-pour-2011-5-page-57.htm>)).

I think that it is more complicated than only feasibility and promote only organic product is, in some kind of way, reducing possibilities to improve sustainability because people have to be aware of global challenges to distinguish differences between one certification and another to find the label which match the best with his "personal priority" and philosophy and which correspond best to a product or issue or so on -like farmer are choosing their certification-. And choosing to promote only organic product seems overlooking other valuable actions for example in agro-ecology (which can see at larger scale and may be a more appropriate approach than "only" organic practices in the field for systemic services).

Edited by [Clarisse Emeline Oceane Loaec](https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/157254) (<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/157254>) on 21 Jun at 2:24

<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/40094>



<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/40094>

21 Jun 2017

I agree with both of you. It's difficult to translate this information into something that "people on the street" easily can relate to, and get a hold of. I think you have many really good reflections Clarisse, but I agree with Leonardo that organic products could be a good place to start. Maybe from there, the campaigns can expand if we can manage to integrate an understanding of the organic products first?

If we are to raise the awareness of the farmers, maybe different stakeholders and universities can publish articles or information posts in the farmers trade-union or organizations magazines. It is my experience, that they usually send out a magazine once a month, a few times a year etc. Maybe the farmers read these magazines, which are directly targeted to their field. Personally, I can't imagine that the farmers will go to the university to learn about their "field of expertise", if they e.g. have been working as farmers for 20 years. Any thoughts about this, could magazines be a starting point?

 <https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/155607> 

<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/155607>

21 Jun 2017

You all have introduced great ideas! Starting with promotion of organic food would be a nice beginning but actually only 2.5% of Europe and 1% of the world's agricultural land is managed organically. So, if we would like to enlarge/enhance/restore/protect/conserv semi-natural habitats and non-cropped landscape elements in agricultural landscape to get benefits from ES-s and reduce the dependence of synthetic pesticides, the main attention must be paid to conventional farmers.

 <https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/40094> 

<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/40094>

22 Jun 2017

We were taking organic in relation to the consumers. In your opinion, isn't it still important to engage the consumers to buy organic products and thereby increase the demand of organic farming? But this is really interesting though; how do you (or anyone of you guys) think consumers can help enlarge/enhance/restore/protect/conserv semi-natural habitats and non-cropped landscape elements in agricultural landscape to get benefits from ES-s and reduce the dependence of synthetic pesticides? Do they have a voice?

My comment about rising awareness with the farmers were targeted all farmers, both conventional and organic.

Edited by [Marianne Erichsen \(https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/40094\)](https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/40094) on 22 Jun at 8:43

 [Write a reply...](#)

 <https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/79790> 

<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/21676/users/79790>

Yesterday

I don't think anyone mentioned this, but maybe if the government subsidized certain ecological services, such as non-crop land, or nesting spots like hedgerows, the same way they subsidize certain crops? Offering a monetary incentive is a good way to raise awareness, usually. Governments could also include ecological services in regulation.

Another possible method would be explicitly including ecological services in certification standards. I believe biodynamic certification already does this to some extent.

 [Write a reply...](#)