www.ees.uni.opole.pl
ISSN paper version 1642-2597
ISSN electronic version 2081-8319
Economic and Environmental Studies
Vol. 14, No.1 (29/2014), 75-88, March 2014

Nature conservation in Polish agriculture under conditions of EU membership

Karol KOCISZEWSKI
Wrocław University of Economics, Poland

Abstract: The aim of the paper is to assess the effectiveness of the implementation of EU nature conservation measures in Polish agriculture. Environmental regulations influence main groups of Common Agricultural Policy instruments. In the Pillar I of the policy, this refers to cross-compliance, while in Pillar II this refers to agri-environmental programmes, the Natura 2000 payments and organic farming support. The implementation is ineffective and insufficiently directed to nature conservation. Domestic environmental and agricultural policy are not coordinated in all aspects. This is related to delay in construction of protection plans which are necessary for proper policy in the Natura 2000 network. Consequently, the specialized payments for farmers in the Natura 2000 network have not been implemented yet and agri-environmental measures have been implemented only partially. Moreover, the system of control and certification in organic farming does not involve requirements referring to biodiversity. There are some deficiencies in biodiversity protection standards within domestic regulations of cross-compliance. In this situation, Polish agriculture could contribute to degradation of biological diversity in rural areas.

Keywords: environmental protection in agriculture, biodiversity, sustainable agricultural development, agri-environmental programmes, rural development measures

1. Introduction

Nature conservation is an important element of the European Union's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). It is an example of integration of environmental policy into sectoral policies, and is one of the most important principles within the EU environmental policy. Its regulations influence certain instruments in CAP Pillar I[1] (cross–compliance,[2] so called *greening*[3]

[1] CAP consists of two pillars. Pillar I mainly involves direct payments for farmers. It contains the lion share of CAP expenditures amounting to 76.5% of the total budget in the period 2007-2013 (European Union, 2011). The rest of the sum was allocated to Pillar II.

Correspondence Address: Karol Kociszewski, Wrocław University of Economics, Institute of Economics, Ecological Economics Chair, ul. Komandorska 118/120, 53-345 Wrocław. E-mail: karol.kociszewski@ue.wroc.pl.

in the period 2014-2020) and especially in CAP II pillar (rural development measures, such as agri-environmental programmes, the Natura 2000 payments, organic farming support). Moreover, changes in biodiversity protection policy are planned for the years 2014-2020.

The goal of the article is to assess the effectiveness of the EU nature conservation measures implemented in Polish agriculture. The assessment is based on descriptive analysis of the way in which domestic policies were and still are being carried out. It is shown to what extent EU measures have been implemented, compared to the opportunities and obligations created by EU membership. Furthermore, comparative analysis in the context of the Natura 2000 sites in chosen Member States has been carried out. Sources of information used include EU and Polish official documents and regulations as well as data published by Eurostat and the Polish Central Statistical Office.

2. Biodiversity protection in European Union agriculture

2.1. Environmental policy implications

For the first time, environmental policy references directly formulated to agriculture were included in the Fifth Environmental Action Programme (*Towards Sustainability*) implemented in years 1993-2001.[4] Among other thing, references were made to the protection of biodiversity and natural habitats as well as the essential restriction of the use of pesticides and afforestation of agricultural land. One of four priorities in the next Sixth Environmental Action Programme (*Our future, our choice*) projected for the years 2002-2012 was nature and biodiversity (Commission of the European Communities, 2008). The focus of the programme was directed to the promotion and support of environmentally friendly agricultural practices, support of farms in areas of high

[2] According to cross-compliance rules, recipients of direct payments and recipients of environmental axis of RDP have to fulfil GAEC and SMR standards.

[3] According to CAP reforms plans for the years 2014-2020, greening measures will be compulsory for almost all farmers applying for direct payments. The greening measures go beyond cross-compliance obligations and raise the baseline, thereby increasing the environmental ambition for more targeted Rural Development measures. Greening requirements are: maintenance of permanent grassland, crop diversification and designation at least 7% agricultural area of each holding of every holding area (excluding existing grasslands) as Ecological Focus Areas (EFAs) (European Commission 2011b). All these duties are favorable for nature conservation.

[4] Environmental Action Programmes are the base for EU environment protection policy implementation.

nature value, the improvement of infrastructures in the field of agriculture, as well as traditional breeds of cattle and agricultural plant species cultivation. The Sixth Action Programme is also linked to the *Thematic Strategy on the Sustainable Use of Pesticides* from 2006 (Commission of the European Communities, 2006). Key instrument of the strategy is Integrated Pest Management (IPM[5]) which, among other things, is aimed at reduction of negative impact of agriculture on biodiversity (harm to plants and animals, disruption to ecosystems). From 2014 on it will be obligatory as one of the cross-compliance requirements (Directive 2009/128/EC).

The latest EU strategic document of nature conservation is the *EU biodiversity strategy to 2020*, which was implemented in 2011 as an integral part of the *Europe 2020 strategy* (European Commission, 2011). *EU biodiversity strategy* includes plans related to agriculture: completion of the establishment of the Natura 2000 network, implementation of new direct payments for activities connected with the provision of environmental public goods (permanent pasture and meadow maintenance, crop rotation, the Natura 2000, ecological set-aside, water ecosystems improvement), designation of HNV (High Nature Value) areas, implementation of financial support for HNV farms within national Rural Development Plans (RDPs) which are the base of Pillar II measures in Member States. In practice, the most important instrument of the strategy is the Natura 2000 network, which should be designated by all Member States on the basis of harmonized rules. The network includes two kinds of areas:

- Special Protection Areas (SPAs), which are subjected to the provisions of so called "bird" directive (Directive 2009/147/EC). Until 2010, total SPA covered 12.1% of the EU-27 land territory (European Commission, 2010).
- Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), on which the "habitats" directive is implemented (Directive 92/43/EEC). Until 2010 total SAC covered (13.7% of the EU-27 land area).

The Natura 2000 area is established on 10.6% of UAA (Utilised Agricultural Area) in the EU-27, 10% in the EU-15 and 12.2% in the EU-12 (European Union, 2010). In accordance with the requirements of *cross-compliance* rules, agricultural activity cannot negatively affect habitats of plants and animals in the Natura 2000 sites. Furthermore, according to the *EU biodiversity*

[5] IPM is a system based on techniques with limited or lack of use of chemical agents, including biological plant protection (inter alia, through the use of species that are natural enemies of pests), special forms of crop rotation, use of adequate cultivation techniques (e.g., stale seedbed technique, sowing dates and densities, under-sowing, conservation tillage, pruning and direct sowing) (Directive 2009/128/EC).

strategy, the agri-environmental programmes (AEP) and other activities of the CAP Pillar II should be implemented there.

The second (next to the Natura 2000) category of nature conservation areas in agriculture is *HNV (High Nature Value) farming*. HNV areas may partly overlap with the Natura 2000 network, but are projected to cover a wider territory. Effective preservation of Europe's natural heritage requires much wider comprehended measures than these related only to the most valuable habitats (the Natura 2000 sites). *HNV* areas are defined as such, in which agriculture is the main way of land utilisation and, at the same time, three basic features should be met in three types of classified HNV areas: areas with specific rural landscape and with high proportion of semi-natural vegetation (meadows, pastures, woodlands, bushes, marginal farmlands, water bodies, hedges), areas with many farms conducting extensive agricultural production (including breeding), agricultural areas favourable for diversity of animal and plant habitats. *HNV Farmland* methodology is still in the development phase and is not yet fully unified by UE institutions (Kociszewski, 2013). As a result, assignment of HNV areas has not been completed.

2.2. Common Agricultural Policy instruments

A considerable part of EU territories which are important for nature conservation are located in rural areas, therefore specified regulations were introduced in both CAP pillars. So far, in Pillar I it is visible within the cross-compliance rules. Among these standards there are those that relate to biodiversity. They are included in two groups of requirements:

- Good Agricultural and Environmental Conditions (GAEC). They include permanent grassland protection, preservation of landscape, prevention against expansion of undesirable animal and plant species, the maintenance of olive orchards in good state.
- Statutory Management Requirements (SMR). The second group consist of, among other things, standards from "habitats" and "birds" directives, which are obligatory on the Natura 2000 agricultural areas.

As it was mentioned above - in the context of *EU biodiversity strategy*, farmers in the Natura 2000 sites can also participate in additional nature conservation measures financed from

Pillar II. In most countries (including Poland) such activities are based on the AEP - the most important environmental protection instrument in the CAP.[6] The allocation for the programme is equal to 23.1% of the total Pillar II expenditures for the period 2007-2013. AEP's physical area accounted for 14.8% of EU's UAA (17.4% in the EU-15 and 8.75% in the EU-12) (Directorate General for Agriculture and Rural Development, 2012). The number of participants was equal to 14.7% of total number of farms. Additionally, in the period 2007-2013 the *Natura 2000 payments and payments linked to Directive 2000/60/EC* were introduced. However, in practice allocation for this action is very low – only 0.1% of total Pillar II pillar expenditures (Directorate General for Agriculture and Rural Development, 2012).

An important direction of support within AEP is: organic farming. **I**ts methods in essence are to promote the protection of nature (Tyburski and Żakowska-Biemans, 2007). So far, this support was effectively applied in "old" Member States – until 2010 3.15% of all EU-15's farms were organic (Willer and Kilcher, 2012). They occupied 5.9% of UAA. At the EU-27 level, these indicators were 1.6% and 5.1% respectively (the percentage is lower due to the EU-12 countries, where organic farming is at an early stage of development).

3. Implementation of the European Union requirements in Poland

3.1 Administrative aspects

After accession, Poland had to adjust environmental and agricultural policies according to EU requirements. One of the most important tasks was the establishment of the Natura 2000 network as well as adequate legal and institutional solutions. Initially it was planned to designate all the areas within the network until 2007. As a result of organizational errors[7] and resistance of a part of local and regional authorities, in 2004 only 72 sites (3.7% of total area of the country) was classified as SPAs (Special Protection Areas) and 184 sites (7.8% of total area) were

[6] The AEP is based on subsidies granted for farms using extensive production methods and delivering additional environmental services provided by farmers. These services are favourable both for wildlife (e.g., the special Natura 2000 packages, changes in periods of grasslands swath in a way to be suitable for bird breeding seasons) and for maintenance of rare farm animals (e.g. local breeds).

[7] A lot of political failures were indicated by Supreme Audit Office in Poland (Najwyższa Izba Kontroli, 2008).

classified as SACs (Special Areas of Conservation) (Bołtromiuk, 2011: 88–101). Taking into account that according to the list proposed by the Polish Academy of Sciences, the network should cover 18% of national territory, the area of the network was relatively small. Until 2009 Poland belonged to the four countries with the lowest indexes of effectiveness of the Natura 2000 sites designation[8] in the EU (below 25%, similar as in Bulgaria, Romania and Cyprus (Eurostat, 2010: 234)). In the Benelux countries, Germany, Italy and Greece the index exceeded 95%. Next, as a result of protests of environmental NGOs as well as pressure of the European Commission, the number of districts and the area of the Natura 2000 were gradually increased:

- 144 sites (15.5% of total area of the country) were designed as SPAs in 2010. For comparison, the largest share of the SPAs in total area of a particular countries can be found in other new Member States: Cyprus (25.6%), Slovakia (25.1%), Slovenia (23.0%) and Bulgaria (20.4%). In the EU-15 the largest share can be found in Greece (20.9%) and Spain (20.6%).
- 823 sites (11% of total Polish territory) were designed as SACs. The largest share of SAC in total area of a particular country can be found in Slovenia (31.4%), Spain (24.5%), and Portugal (17.4%) (Eurostat, 2010).

SPAs and SACs partly overlap - the total area of the Natura 2000 is equal to 19.7% of Poland's land territory. The process of designation of the Natura 2000 has not been completed yet and it is estimated that the Natura 2000 areas should cover 21-22% of total territory of the country (Makomaska-Juchiewicz, 2009). Currently agricultural area of the Natura 2000 is 2.3 million ha, or 37% of total land territory of the network. They are equal to 14% of Polish UAA. There are 212 thousand farms on this area (including 65 thousand farms with entire area is located in the network). In order to effectively manage the network, special *Conservation Plans* (CP)[9] and

[8] This index is calculated as the ratio of the quantity of habitats and species protected under the Natura 2000 network to the number of species and habitats that have been designed to the respective protection in the European Union reference list.

[9] *Conservation plans* are established by the Ministry of Environment for 20 years and should contain characteristics of present and potential impacts on environment, formulation of conservation goals and conservation measures which should be applied, indicators of the favorable conservation status of habitats or species and animals and their habitats, the methods of monitoring the implementation of conservation tasks and their consequences, as well as recommendations for spatial planning.

Plans of Management Tasks (PMT)[10] should be implemented. They are the basis of the implementation of the instruments relating to nature protection in the framework of national RDPs. It is planned that by 2013 Polish authorities will adopt both kinds of plans for 406 sites within the network (they will cover 40% of areas designated as the Natura 2000 sites) (Bołtromiuk, 2011). The work started in 2009 and consequently by the end of 2011, only 1 PMT was adopted - in Haćki in the Podlaskie region. No CP was adopted. The data show that domestic nature conservation policy is ineffective. Moreover, without implementation of PMT and CP administrative rules in the Natura 2000 are similar to existing national forms of territorial protection and are not compatible with the "philosophy" of the network. They create too many barriers for socio-economic activities. According to this "philosophy" (which is close to the conception of sustainable development) these institutional solutions must go hand in hand with socio-economic development using the environmental values, but without their quantitative and qualitative degradation. They have to take into account the integrity of human activities with nature, among other things the impact of agriculture on formation (in the past) and maintenance (nowadays) of semi-natural landscape or fauna and flora habitats.

Another barrier of proper nature conservation policy in rural areas is connected with the fact that HNV areas have not been designated yet. This strongly impedes the support for farms functioning on territories which could potentially be classified in that category. In 2009 the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) started the development of a methodology for determining HNV. Consequently, it is difficult to foresee when these areas will be finally defined. A similar situation can be observed in most Member States.

For four years there was no new act on plant protection products which had to be implemented in accordance with directive on sustainable use of pesticides (Directive 2009/128/EC). Consequently, Polish law was not fully adjusted to the EU requirements in terms of entry into the market and the use of plant protection products. In march 2013 a new act on plant protection products (Dz.U. z 2013 poz. 455) was adopted, but it is mainly based on legal articles from previous acts on plant protection (Dz.U. z 2008 r. Nr 133, poz. 849). Regulations connected with duties of farmers aimed at limitation of risks for environment and for human

[10] *Plans of Management Tasks* are more flexible and less expensive than Conservation Plans. They are established on the regional level (by the Regional Director of Environmental Protection) for 10 years on the basis of the present knowledge about habitat types and species for which the area has been designated.

health were reduced to the minimum indicated in directive 2009/128/EC (MRiRW, 2013). According to the new act, the IPM system will be obligatory for farmers from 2014. Furthermore, the *Government's national action plan on reduction of risks connected with pesticides* use was published. The document indicates actions of administration in the field of training, awareness-raising, supervision over the IPM implementation. However, it does not contain any obligations for farmers or pesticides producers. Moreover, it is worth to underline that the new duties connected with farmers' attendance in trainings are less restrict than it was previously (MRiRW, 2013).

Together with the described deficiencies of legal regulations, some irregularities related to practical use of pesticides by farmers have been shown as a result of cross-compliance control (Brodzińska, 2011). They were connected with the lack of records on the use of plant protection products. Besides, it should be noted that, even if the records are carried out, they can be only formal. It is difficult to investigate whether they were reflected in practice. Serious problems were also associated with the remnants of plant protection products (incorrect methods of waste management after the use of pesticides) (Konecny, 2004: 23).

3.2 Economic instruments

Particular systems of direct payments (main instrument of Pillar I) may have different impact on environment.[11] In the context of influence on nature conservation the Single Area Payments System (SAPS), which was implemented in Poland, is similar to the regional system. It is relatively more favourable for the environment than other systems.[12] For farmers, it is beneficial to declare "open landscape" area as a basis for direct payments' calculation. Consequently, the subsidies are suitable for extensive farms (including HNV), they contribute to

[11] From 2005, EU - 15 countries could choose one of three basic systems: historical, regional and hybrid. Besides, most of EU - 12 countries implemented the Single Area Payments System (SAPS).

[12] Both in the regional system and in SAPS payment value per farm depends on the number of hectares but not on production volume per hectare. In these systems direct payments are granted not only for areas directly used for agricultural production, but also for a part of farmland, which is not used for economic purposes but is important for nature (Alliance Environment, 2007). In the other direct payment systems, subsidy rates depend on past (historical) production volume of the farm (per hectare). They generate weaker incentives to maintain non-productive (but environmentally valuable) areas and the contribute to intensification of agriculture.

agricultural maintenance and, together with cross-compliance, help to preserve nature of rural areas. CAP economic instruments are strictly connected with administrative rules. From 2005 on recipients of direct payments and recipients of environmental axis of RDP have to fulfil GAEC and SMR standards. They include some rules referring to nature conservation:

- a lot of harmful activities are prohibited (burning grasslands, destroying protected plants, capturing and killing protected birds, destruction of their nests and habitats, destruction of trees which are nature monuments, destruction of ditches up to 2 meters in width),
- prevention from undesirable plants vegetation (obligatory mowing meadows and set aside, obligatory grazing on pastures or their mowing, prevention against weeds),
- restrictions in activities connected with changes in water relations,
- restrictions in reduction of permanent pastures and meadows area,
- keep water bodies with a total area up to 100 m^2,
- standards for the use of plant protection products (among other things they refer to: specification of equipment, rules of storage, obligatory records on the use of pesticides, limitation of use to the products permitted to be sold on the market),
- in the Natura 2000 areas the rules defined in PMT and CP should be obligatory. As it was mentioned above the plans do not function.

In the context of biodiversity protection it is worth to mention, that in the Polish version of cross-compliance standards there is no restrictive ban on diminishing permanent pastures area. Farmers can reduce the grassland area by 5% without additional requirements. If they want to reduce more (up to 8%), they need permission of the local officer from the rural development agency. Such rules contribute to reduction of effectiveness of environmental policy. For example, the Czech Republic introduced a complete ban on the conversion of permanent pasture into arable land. Member States have a range of freedom in setting mandatory requirements for farmers. Polish domestic policy is less effective due to missing regulations within cross-compliance standards:

- no requirement to preserve elements of landscape (for example woodlands, bushes). Among the new Member States only the Czech Republic has implemented such a requirement,
- no obligation to establish buffer strips around the Natura 2000 areas (with prohibited fertilizing, pesticide use or with obligatory cultivation of hedges),

- the lack of minimum requirement of the stocking density in permanent pastures.

Due to the delays in PMT and CP implementation mentioned above, the effectiveness of Pillar II measures was reduced. Within Polish RDP 2007-2013 it was planned to introduce the specified *Natura 2000 payments and payments linked to Directive 2000/60/EC*. For farmers it is easier to take part in these measures than in AEP. However, as a result of the lack of PMT/CP they have not been implemented. They will not function before the end of the current financial period. So far, subsidies for farmers in the Natura 2000 areas were only applied in the AEP which - due to substantive and administrative reasons - can cause some difficulties for the beneficiaries. Consequently, the implementation of agri-environmental packages related to the Natura 2000 sites is not eeffective enough. In the years 2004–2006 AEP packages which were favourable for biodiversity did not cover a large area of the Natura 2000. In spite of that the subsidies (per hectare UAA) in the network were 20% higher than in the rest of AEP packages, only 9 thousand farms took part in these measures (Bołtromiuk, 2011: 365). Their whole territory was 100 thousand hectares (4.3% of the Natura 2000 agricultural areas). Until 2008, the whole value of support for farmers in the Natura 2000 sites was 10 EUR million. In years 2007–2013 the subsidies were 16% higher than in other packages, meaning that financial incentives for biodiversity protection were weaker than in the previous period. This is an example of instable rules of support which are discouraging for farmers. The packages are not attractive to them, consequently their effectiveness is likely to be low. Until march 2012, only 3.6 thousand farms participated in the packages (1.3% of the estimated number of participants) with an area of 66.3 thousand ha (13.2% of the plan) (Szymborska, 2012). Only 16% of the available financial sources (for the years 2007-2012) were absorbed.

Generally, implementation of AEP is ineffective. This is visible from the data referring to its implementation in Poland in comparison to other Member States. In the years 2004-2006 AEP's share in the total value of RDP was 5.75% (MRiRW, 2005). The programme turned out to be the sixth RDP instrument in terms of the value. At the same time it was the most important rural development measure at the level of the EU as a whole – its share in the value of Pillar II financed from the Guarantee section of European Agriculture Guidance and Guarantee Fund was 41.7% (European Commission, 2005: 3). In the new Member States the share was 18%

(Konecny, 2004: 70). In the period 2007-2013 the AEP share in what is officially classified as Pillar II increased to 14% (MRiRW, 2011). However, this is still lower than in all groups of Member States: EU 27 (23.1%), EU 15 (27.8%), EU 12 (16%) (Directorate General for Agriculture and Rural Development, 2012). In the Community as a whole AEP is still the most important measure in terms of financial value (ranked third in Poland).

Relatively small value of expenditures on AEP, especially in the first period of membership, meant reduction in financial support for organic farming. In spite of this, the subsidies were attractive for farmers and contributed to dynamic increase in the number of organic farms. The share of organic farming in Polish UAA increased from 0.38% at the beginning of 2004 (IJHARS, 2005) to 3.7% at the end of 2011 (IJHARS, 2012). The share of organic farms in the total number of farms increased from 0.13% to 1.4% during the same period. Nevertheless, the rules and procedures regarding the conduction of organic farming are insufficiently restrictive and inaccurate in the context of nature conservation. A controlled beneficiary does not have to show that he adequately takes care of crops (in practice he does not even have to show that he cultivates them) (Stalenga, Tyburski, 2012). In addition, supervision over certification bodies is not sufficient. They do not always reliably verify and inspect the farms applying for organic farming certificates.

4. Conclusions

Nature conservation measures play an increasingly important role in the CAP. As a result of accession to the EU, requirements connected with biodiversity protection covered a much bigger UAA and were implemented in a larger number of farms in Poland compared to the period of membership. The system of direct payments used in Poland (SAPS) is relatively favourable for the environment. However, environmental requirements associated with the system are ineffectively implemented and insufficiently directed to nature conservation. This is a result of failures in domestic environmental and agricultural policies. In some aspects they are not coordinated, which is connected with barriers for designation of the Natura 2000 network and the delay in the construction of protection plans which are necessary for proper policy in the Natura

2000 network. The lack of the plans was a reason of limited implementation of AEP and a factor making implementation of the specialized payments for farmers in the Natura 2000 impossible. It is an example of the impact of national environmental policy errors (in this case, of nature conservation policy) on reduction of agricultural policy effectiveness (as well as on its efficiency - due to reduction of expenditures on payments to farmers). The MARD and the Ministry of environment should cooperate to a larger extent. Furthermore, so far functioning organisational solutions related to the operation of the Natura 2000 network insufficiently integrate nature conservation with socio-economic development. Protection plans should be implemented faster, more effectively and should be constructed in a way enabling benefits to farmers in the Natura 2000 network. Taking into account that there are some deficiencies in biodiversity protection standards within domestic regulations of cross-compliance, it can be stated that the MARD should be more resistant to pressures from agricultural lobbies, and should implement environmental protection requirements to a greater extent. The Ministry should also improve effectiveness of EAP implementation, in order to prevent Polish agriculture from contributing to degradation of biological diversity in rural areas.

Adjustments of Polish law to EU regulations on plant protection products are delayed. Polish Parliament introduced a new act on plant protection products. The Government has implemented the national action plan in order to reduce hazards, risks connected with the use of pesticides. These documents enable the implementation of the basic provisions of Directive 2009/128/EC. However, in practice the duties for farmer and pesticides producers are insufficient to limit negative impacts on biodiversity. Besides, the effectiveness of controls on pesticides use is low. It is not sure that farmers comply to provisions on the application of pesticides. Another problem is connected with the risks associated with storing the remnants of plant protection products.

The system of farm control and certification in organic farming does not involve requirements referring to biodiversity. The system of control should be improved, not only regarding the certification of organic farms but also the execution of cross-compliance standards.

In years 2014-2020 nature conservation within the CAP is expected to increase in importance (especially within Pillar I). Implementation of the greening component of direct

payments should lead to improvement of the effectiveness of actions implemented in Poland. Otherwise, Polish farmers will have problems with EU subsidies absorption.

Literature

Alliance Environment (2007). *Evaluation of environmental impact of the CMO and direct support measures of the CAP for arable crops*. Brussels: Alliance Environment, Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development.

Bołtromiuk A. (2011). *Koncepcja sytemu publicznego wsparcia rolnictwa na obszarach europejskiej sieci ekologicznej*. In: Bołtromiuk, A.; Kłodziński, M. (eds.), *Natura 2000 jako czynnik zrównoważonego rozwoju obszarów wiejskich regionu Zielonych Płuc Polski*. Warszawa: IRWiR PAN.

Brodzińska, K. (2011). *Problemy środowiskowej oceny zrównoważonego rozwoju rolnictwa ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem instrumentów WPR*. In: A. Graczyk (ed.), *Kryzys a rozwój zrównoważony rolnictwa i energetyki*. Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu no 231.

Commission of the European Communities (2006). *Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, A Thematic Strategy on the Sustainable Use of Pesticides.* Brussels. COM(2006) 372 final.

Commission of the European Communities (2008). *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament, Environment Policy Review.* Brussels. 2.7.2008. COM(2008) 409 final.

Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (O. J. L 206, 22/07/1992 P. 0007 – 0050).

Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds (O. J. L 20/7 26.1.2010).

Directive 2009/128/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 establishing a framework for Community action to achieve the sustainable use of pesticides (O. J. L 309, 24.11.2009).

Directorate General for Agriculture and Rural Development (2012). *Rural Development in the European Union, Statistical and Economic Information. Report 2012.* Brussels: European Union.

European Commission (2011a). *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, Our life insurance, our natural capital: an EU biodiversity strategy to 2020*. Brussels. COM(2011) 244 final.

European Commission (2010). Natura 2000 barometer. Natura 2000. *Nature and Biodiversity Newsletter* 29.

European Commission (2011b). *Proposal for regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing rules for direct payments to farmers under support schemes within the framework of the common agricultural policy.* Brussels 19.10.2011. COM(2011) 625 final/2.

European Commission (2005). *Agri-environment Measures, Overview on General Principles, Types of Measures, and Application. Unit G-4 - Evaluation of Measures applied to Agriculture, Studies.* Brussels.

Eurostat (2010). *Environmental Statistics and Accounts in Europe*, Eurostat statistical books. 2010 edition. Luxembourg: Publication Office of European Union.

IJHARS (2005). *Rolnictwo ekologiczne w Polsce w 2004 roku.* Warszawa: IJHARS.

IJHARS (2012). *Rolnictwo ekologiczne w Polsce w 2011 roku*. Warszawa: IJHARS.

Kociszewski, K. (2013). *Ekologizacja polskiego rolnictwa a jego zrównoważony rozwój w warunkach członkostwa w Unii Europejskiej*. Wrocław: Wyd. Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu.

Makomaska-Juchiewicz, M. (2009). Stan wdrożenia sieci Natura 2000 w Polsce. *Chrońmy przyrodę ojczystą* 65: 11–28.

Konecny, M. (2004). *EU Enlargement and Agriculture: Risks and Opportunities.* Brussels: Friends of Earth Europe.

MRiRW (2013). *Biuletyn informacyjny 4-5/2013*. Warszawa: Ministerstwo Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi.

MRiRW (2005). *Plan rozwoju obszarów wiejskich na lata 2004–2006.* Warszawa: Ministerstwo Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi.

MRiRW (2011). *Plan rozwoju obszarów wiejskich na lata 2007–2013*. Warszawa: Ministerstwo Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi.

Najwyższa Izba Kontroli (2008). *Informacja o wynikach kontroli wdrażania ochrony na obszarach Natura 2000*. Warszawa: NIK.

Stalenga, J.;Tyburski, J. (2012). *Rolnictwo ekologiczne i wsparcie PROW w Polsce w okresie programowania 2007–13*. In: *Proceedings from the Conference „Programy rolnośrodowiskowe – z korzyścią dla człowieka i środowiska”*, organised by Polish Ecological Club and MARD. Kluczbork, Poland 11–12.04.2012.

Szymborska, E. (2012). *Programy rolnośrodowiskowe chroniące wody i bioróżnorodność w okresie programowania 2007–2013 – stan wdrożenia 2012*. In: *Proceedings from the Conference „Programy rolnośrodowiskowe – z korzyścią dla człowieka i środowiska”*, organised by Polish Ecological Club and MARD. Kluczbork, Poland 11–12.04.2012.

Ustawa z 18 grudnia 2003 r. o ochronie roślin (Dz.U. z 2008 r. Nr 133, poz. 849).

Ustawa z 8 marca 2013 r. o środkach ochrony roślin (Dz.U. z 2013 poz. 455).

Willer, H.; Kilcher, L. (eds.) (2012). *The world of organic agriculture: Statistics and emerging trends 2012*. Bonn–Frick: FIBL and IFOAM.

Tyburski, J.; Żakowska-Biemans, S. (2007). *Wprowadzenie do rolnictwa ekologicznego*. Warszawa: SGGW.

Ochrona przyrody w polskim rolnictwie w warunkach członkostwa w Unii Europejskiej

Streszczenie

Celem artykułu jest ocena skuteczności wdrażania działań ochrony przyrody w polskim rolnictwie. Regulacje środowiskowe wpływają na zmiany niektórych instrumentów Wspólnej Polityki Rolnej UE (WPR). W pierwszym filarze tej polityki dotyczy to zasady zgodności środowiskowej (cross–compliance), w drugim filarze programów rolnośrodowiskowych, płatności w sieci Natura 2000 i wsparcia rolnictwa ekologicznego. W Polsce działania te są wdrażane nieskutecznie oraz są niewystarczająco ukierunkowane na ochronę różnorodności biologicznej. Odnosi się to zarówno do krajowej polityki rolnej i środowiskowej. W pewnych aspektach nie są one skoordynowane. Przejawia się to w opóźnieniach opracowywania i wdrażania planów ochrony i planów zadań ochronnych, które są niezbędne do prawidłowej polityki w sieci Natura 2000. W rezultacie nie wdrożono wyspecjalizowanych płatności dla rolników w sieci Natura 2000, a program rolnośrodowiskowy został zrealizowany w ograniczonym zakresie. Ponadto, system kontroli i certyfikacji w rolnictwie ekologicznym nie zawiera wymogów ochrony różnorodności biologicznej. W tej dziedzinie występuje też wiele niedoskonałości w zestawie standardów cross-compliance. W takiej sytuacji Polskie rolnictwo może wpływać na degradację różnorodności biologicznej na obszarach wiejskich.

Słowa kluczowe: ochrona środowiska w rolnictwie, bioróżnorodność, zrównoważony rozwój rolnictwa, program rolnośrodowiskowy, instrumenty rozwoju obszarów wiejskich.