www.ees.uni.opole.pl
ISSN paper version 1642-2597
ISSN electronic version 2081-8319
Economic and Environmental Studies
Vol. 13, No.1 (25/2013), 73-86, March 2013

Nature conservation in Polish agriculture under conditions of EU membership

Karol KOCISZEWSKI
Wrocław University of Economics, Poland

Abstract: The paper's aim is to assess effectiveness of the implementation of nature conservation measures in Polish agriculture. Environmental regulations influence main groups of Common Agricultural Policy instruments. In the I pillar of the policy, it refers to cross–compliance, in the II pillar it refers to agri-environmental programmes, the Natura 2000 payments and organic farming support. In Poland they are ineffectively implemented and insufficiently directed to nature conservation. This refers both to domestic environmental and agricultural policy. In some aspects they are not coordinated. This is connected with 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 while the extent in which agri-environmental measures have been implemented is too small. 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*: environment protection in agriculture, biodiversity, sustainable development of agriculture, 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 with sectoral policies. It is one of the most important principles within the EU environmental policy. Its regulations influence certain instruments in CAP I pillar[1] (cross–compliance,[2] so called *greening*[3]

[1] CAP consists of two pillars. I pillar involve mainly direct payments for farmers. It is the bigger part of CAP expenditures. In years 2007–2013, it engaged 76.5% of the whole CAP budget (European Union, 2011). The rest of the sum was allocated in II pillar.

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 years 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 regarding determinants of biodiversity protection are planned in the reform of this policy for the years 2014-2020.

The goal of this article is to assess the effectiveness of the EU nature conservation measures implemented in Polish agriculture. This 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 were implemented in comparison to the possibilities and requirements connected with the EU membership. Furthermore, some elements of comparative analysis were involved – in the context of the Natura 2000 sites in chosen Member States. In the study, the author used EU and Polish official documents and regulations connected with environmental and agricultural policies, data published by Eurostat and the Polish Central Statistical Office.

2. Biodiversity protection in European Union's agriculture

2.1. Environmental policy implications

For the first time, environmental policy in the agriculture sector was developed in the Fifth Environmental Action Programme (*Towards Sustainability*) implemented in years 1993-2001.[4] Among other things, protection of biodiversity and natural habitats as well as essential restriction of the use of pesticides and with afforestation of agricultural land were introduced. One of four priorities in the next, Sixth Environmental Action Programme (*Our future, our choice*) projected for years 2002-2012, was nature and biodiversity (Commission of the European Communities, 2008). The implications of the programme directed to agriculture were: the promotion and support of environmentally-sound agricultural practices, support of farms in areas of high nature value, the improvement of agricultural infrastructures, as well as cultivation of

[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 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.

traditional breeds of cattle and agricultural plant species. The 6th 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 the 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). The *EU biodiversity strategy* involves plans related to agriculture: completion of works on 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 II pillar 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 the harmonized rules. The network includes two areas (European Commission, 2010a):

- 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.
- 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 in 10.6% of utilised agricultural areas (UAA) in the EU-27, 10% in the EU-15 and 12.2% in the EU-12[6] (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 no 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).

[6] The EU-15 group consists of countries which became member states before 2004. The EU-12 consists of countries which joined the EU in years 2004-2012.

strategy - the agri-environmental programmes (AEP) and other activities of the CAP II pillar 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 EU institutions (Kociszewski, 2013). As a result, assignment of HNV areas has not been completed yet.

2.2. Common Agricultural Policy instruments

A considerable part of EU territories which are important for nature conservation are located in rural areas (European Commission, 2011a), therefore specified regulations were introduced in both CAP pillars. So far, in the I pillar 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 (Regulation 73/2009/EEC):

- 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 others, 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

the II pillar. In most countries (e.g., Poland) such activities are based on the AEP - the most important environmental protection instrument in the CAP.[7] The allocation to the programme is equal to 23.1% of the whole II pillar expenditures in the years 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, but in practice, a very small share of the available funds were allocation to this action – only 0.1% of total II pillar expenditures (Directorate General for Agriculture and Rural Development, 2012).

An important direction of support within AEP is organic farming - its 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 a total of 3.15% of all EU-15's farms were organic (Willer and Kilcher, 2012), occupying 5.9% of UAA. At the EU-27 level, these indicators are 1.6% and 5.1% respectively (the percentage declined due to the EU-12 countries, where organic farming is at an early stage of development).

3. Implementation of the European Union's requirements in Poland

3.1. Administrative aspects

After EU accession, Poland had to adjust environmental and agricultural policies to EU requirements. One important task was the establishment of the Natura 2000 network accompanied by 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[8] and resistance of a part of local and regional authorities, in 2004, only 72 sites (3.7% of total area of the country) were classified as SPAs and 184 sites (7.8% of total area) were classified as SACs (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 total territory, the area of the network was relatively

[7] The AEP is based on subsidies granted to farms using extensive production methods and delivering additional environmental services. 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).

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

small. Until 2009, Poland belonged to the four countries with the lowest indexes of effectiveness of the Natura 2000 sites designation[9] in the EU – it was below 25% - similarly to Bulgaria, Romania and Cyprus (Eurostat, 2010: 234). In the Benelux countries, Germany, Italy and Greece the index accounted for over 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 gradually increased:

- 144 sites (15.5% of the total area of the country) were designed as SPAs in 2010. For comparison, the largest share of the SPAs in the total area of a country occurs 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 the 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. As a consequence, 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. It is estimated that the Natura 2000 areas should cover 21-22% of total territory of the country (Makomaska-Juchiewicz, 2009). Currently, the agricultural area of the Natura 2000 amounts to 2.3 million ha, or 37% of total land territory of the network. This is equal to 14% of Polish UAA. About 212 thousand farms exist on this territory (including 65 thousand farms with its entire area located in the network). In order to effectively manage the network, special *Conservation Plans* (CP)[10] and *Plans of Management Tasks* (PMT)[11] should be implemented. They are the basis of the implementation of the instruments related to nature protection in the framework of national Rural Development Plans (RDPs). It is planned that by

[9] 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 (Bołtromiuk 2011).

[10] *Conservation plans* are established by the Ministry of Environment for 20 years and should contain characteristics of present and potential impacts on the 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 (Bołtromiuk 2011).

[11] *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 (Bołtromiuk 2011).

2013 Polish authorities will adopt both kinds of plans for 406 sites within the network (they will cover 40% of areas designated the Natura 2000 sites) (Bołtromiuk, 2011). The work started in 2009. By the end of 2011, only 1 PMT was adopted - in Haćki in the Podlaskie region. No CP was implemented. These data indicate that the 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, without their quantitative and qualitative degradation. They have to take into account the integrity of human activities with nature - among others the impact of agriculture on formation (in the past) and maintenance (nowadays) of semi-natural landscape or fauna and flora habitats.

Another barrier for proper nature conservation policy in rural areas is connected with the fact that HNV areas have not been designated yet (MRiRW 2013). This strongly impedes the support for farms functioning on territories which could potentially be classified in the HNV category. In 2009, the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) started to develop a methodology for determining HNV.It is difficult to foresee when these areas will be finally defined. A similar situation is observed in most Member States (European Commission 2010b).

During four years no new act on plant protection products was created, which had to be implemented in accordance with the directive on sustainable use of pesticides (Directive 2009/128/EC). Consequently, Polish law was not fully adjusted to the EU requirements regarding the market for and the sustainable use of plant protection products. In March 2013 a new act on plant protection products (Dz.U. z 2013 poz. 455) was adopted. However, this act 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 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 on. Furthermore, the Government's national action plan on reduction of risks connected with pesticides use was published. The document indicates administrative actions in the field of

training, awareness-raising and supervision of 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, it may be that practice is different from what is recorded. Serious problems are 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 the I pillar) could have different impacts on the environment.[12] 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.[13] For farmers, it is beneficial to declare an "open landscape" area as a basis for direct payments' calculation (Alliance Environment, 2007). Consequently, the subsidies are suitable for extensive farms (including HNV), they contribute to agricultural maintenance and – together with cross-compliance – help to preserve nature of rural areas. CAP economic instruments are strictly connected with administrative rules. Since 2005 recipients of direct payments and participants of

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

[13] Both values accounted according to the regional system and SAPS payment - per farm - depend on the number of hectares but not on the production volume per hectare (Alliance Environment, 2007). 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 reasons but is important for nature (Alliance Environment, 2007). In the remaining 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 contribute to intensification of agriculture.

measures within the environmental axis of RDP (since 2007)[14] have to fulfil GAEC and SMR standards. They include some rules referring to nature conservation (Regulation 73/2009/EEC):

- a lot of harmful activities are prohibited (firing 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,
- requirement to keep water bodies with a total area up to 100 m^2
- standards for the use of plant protection products (among others 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.

However, as it was mentioned above the plans do not function.

In the context of biodiversity protection it is worth to mention that within the Polish version of cross-compliance standards there is no restrictive ban on diminishing permanent pastures area (ARiMR 2011). 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 the reduction of effectiveness of environmental policy. To compare, the Czech Republic introduced a complete ban on the conversion of permanent pasture in arable land (Europejski Trybunał Obrachunkowy, 2008). Member States have a range of freedom in setting of mandatory requirements for farmers. Consequently, Polish domestic policy is less effective due to missing regulations within cross-compliance standards (ARiMR 2011):

- 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.

[14] In years 2007-2013 national RDPs consisted of three axis: economic, environmental and social. Each of them involved different rural development measures.

- 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 II pillar measures was reduced. Within the Polish RDP 2007-2013 it was planned to introduce 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 the AEP, but as a result of the lack of PMT/CP they were not implemented. They will not function before the end of the current financial period. So far, subsidies for farmers in the Natura 2000 areas were carried out only within the AEP which - due to substantive and administrative reasons - can bring some difficulties to the beneficiaries. Consequently, the implementation of agri-environmental packages related to the Natura 2000 sites is not sufficiently effective. 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 the fact that the subsidies (per hectare UAA) in the network were 20% higher compared to other AEP packages, only 9 thousand farms took part in these measures (Bołtromiuk, 2011: 365). Their whole territory embraced 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 the years 2007–2013 the subsidies were 16% higher than in other packages. This may imply that financial incentives for biodiversity protection has weakened compared to the previous period. Furthermore, this seems to be an example of instable rules of support which are discouraging for farmers. The packages are not attractive to them. Consequently, their effectiveness is low. Until March 2012, only 3.6 thousand farms (1.3% of planned the planned number of participants) with area of 66.3 thousand ha (13.2% of the planned area) participated (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 in the data referring to its implementation in Poland in comparison to main groups of Member States. In the years 2004-2006 the 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 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 the II pillar financed from the Guarantee section of European Agriculture Guidance and Guarantee Fund was 41.7% (European Commission, 2005: 3). In new Member States the share

was 18% (Konecny, 2004: 70). In the period 2007-2013 the AEP share in the total value of II pillar increased to 14% (MRiRW, 2011). However, it 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. In Poland it is on the third place.

The relatively small value of expenditures on AEP - especially in the first period of EU membership – meant a 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 restrictive and inaccurate in the context of nature conservation. The beneficiary, when controlled, 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 at all) (Stalenga and 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. Concluding remarks

Nature conservation measures play an increasingly important role in the CAP. As a result of Poland's accession to the EU, requirements connected with biodiversity protection covered a larger UAA and have been implemented in a larger number of farms in compared to the pre-membership period. 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. A reason is failures in domestic environmental and agricultural policies which in some aspects are not coordinated. This is connected with barriers for designation of the Natura 2000 network and with delay in construction of protection plans which are necessary for proper policy in the Natura 2000

network. The lack of the plans was a reason for the limited implementation of AEP, while making the implementation of specialized payments for farmers in the Natura 2000 impossible.

Thus, national environmental policy errors (in this case, nature conservation policy) reduced the effectiveness of agricultural policy. Also its efficiency was reduced due to a reduction of expenditures on payments to farmers. The MARD and the Ministry of environment should cooperate to a larger extent. Furthermore, organisational solutions related to the operation of the Natura 2000 network functioning until now 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 for 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 could be stated that the MARD should be more resistant to pressures from the agricultural lobby, and should implement environmental protection requirements to a larger extent. The Ministry should also support the improvement of the effectiveness of EAP implementation. Otherwise Polish agriculture could contribute 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 into the legal system. The Government has implemented the national plan of action 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 pesticides use controls is low. It is not sure whether farmers comply with 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 include requirements referring to biodiversity. The system of control should be improved, not only regarding certification of organic farms but also to the execution of cross-compliance standards.

In the years 2014-2020 nature conservation within the CAP should grow in importance (especially within I pillar). Implementation of the greening component of direct payments should lead to improvement of the effectiveness of actions implemented in Poland, as otherwise Polish farmers will have problems with absorption of EU subsidies.

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.

ARiMR (2011). *Broszura wzajemna zgodność (cross compliance). Minimalne normy, Obszar A i Obszar B obowiązujący od 2011 r*. Warszawa.

Bołtromiuk, A. (2011). *Koncepcja sytemu publicznego wsparcia rolnictwa na obszarach europejskiej sieci ekologicznej*, in: A. Bołtromiuk, M. Kłodziński (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: Graczyk, A. (ed.). Kryzys a rozwój zrównoważony rolnictwa i energetyki: 84-98. *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu* 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.* 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).

Council Regulation (EEC) No 73/2009 establishing the common rules for direct support schemes for farmers under common agricultural policy and establishing certain schemes for farmers (O. J. L 30, 31.01.2009).

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*. COM(2011) 244 final.

European Commission (2010a). *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.* COM(2011) 625 final/2, SEC(2011) 1153, SEC(2011) 1154.

European Commission (2010b). *Situation and Prospects of Agriculture and rural areas*. Brussels.

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.

Europejski Trybunał Obrachunkowy (2008). *Czy zasada współzależności jest skuteczna?* Sprawozdanie specjalne 2008, nr 8. Luksemburg.

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(1):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.

MRiRW (2013). *Wyznaczanie obszarów cennych przyrodniczo*. Available at: http://www.minrol.gov.pl/pol/Ministerstwo/Biuro-Prasowe/Informacje-Prasowe/Wyznaczanie-obszarow-cennych-przyrodniczo. Accessed 04 February 2014.

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