

# Permanent Grassland and tree density Working Group

**Outcomings of the Workshop**  
**2015, Varese**

# Definition

- To identify what PG is – farmers for greening needs to know how much PG and TG does he have?
- How to check the history - requirements?
  - 5 years ? – from 2010-14 becomes permanent in 2015?
  - Parcels had been split before eg. 2 crops in same parcel; field margins with grass and remainder under a crop?
  - How to handle if there is no history of a land – new area in the declaration? - greening issue
  - Farmers mix (ed)-up the grassland codes
- 3 types of PG:
  1. productive (100% grass)
  2. grass incl. trees and scrubs which are grazable
  3. PG-ELP
- No problem with Nr.1, with Nr.2+3 you need to be identified the grazable shrubs, and exclude non-eligible ones

# Grazable shrubs

1. Identify species
2. How to identify non-eligibles, non-grazable species?
3. Mixture of eligible and ineligible shrubs – how to deal with it?
4. If not grazed how is grazability established?
5. Heather: accessible + height ? + density + scatter
6. CwRS - Map on ortho the boundary of area with shrubs + RFV to see the % of eligibility
7. Controls: classical and RS+RFV – can RS identify height or accessibility? – JRC guidance ?
8. Activity

# PG - ELP

- PG – ELP – new eligible area is coming into the system
- predefined, delineated ? = mapped in LPIS (recommended in the technical doc)
- Delineation is compulsory to apply the reduction coefficient according to Arc 32. (5) of the DP reg. – can be over 50%
- If MS is using both the pro-rata and the reduction coefficient for ELP, you apply the pro-rata 1st!
- Key point is the definition of the traditional LP.

# What is the Minimum Activity (MA)?

- **Maintenance activity/status** if you do not have grazing (production) on the PP. OR **Minimum activity** for the „self maintained” areas? : activity or status of the land?
- Waste (abandoned) or non agricultural areas declared as fallow - RISK
- What if the MA definition is not sufficient?
- If at inspection the land is correct, does the MA matter at all?
- Prevent the development of scrub/ineligible areas.

# 100 trees/ha

- MS has to define what a tree is – can differ from the definition used for greening - when is it a shrub and when it becomes a tree?
- Does not apply for fruit tree – should it be harvested or not? ....maintenance...
- Applies to both arable and PG
- If for PG the pro-rata is used, no 100 tree rule should be used = 100 tree OR pro-rata
- Exclude all ineligible > 100 m<sup>2</sup> and count for the part left eligible

Is it hampering the agric activity or not?

- If the grass is used on an area over 100 trees, the pro-rata is a better solution – ex.: SP

# How to detect on image?

- Ineligible group of trees and trees having grass underneath cannot be separate on an image!
- Close to 100 trees = RFV
- Sampling procedure – W procedure? Scientifically supported procedure + consequent application is needed.
- The 100 tree is used on agricultural parcel level, but the rules should be used at RP update level to avoid the risk of non-correct elig. area delineation.
- Further RS possibilities: analysing shadow, stereo image, img outside the vegetation season.

# Pro-rata or the 100 tree rule?

- Applying the pro-rata system is regional, but the reduction rate is individual for each RP.
- Trees being LFs does not count into the 100!
- For environmental issues going under 50% is important, that is why pro-rata is used.



# Guidance – do we need it?

A guidance is useful, in some situations

BUT

Where a MS already has a good system so the guidance is not useful as auditors will expect the guidance to be followed.

WHERE IS THE BALANCE?

+ the risk of transposing the detailed technical rules into the regulations 😊