



3rd EU level workshop in the context of the HERCULES project

The potential of labelling in landscape management

Tuesday, May 31, 2016

Bip building, room Zinneke
Place Royale n°11, 1000 Brussels

Minutes of the meeting

14:00 - 14:10	Welcome and introduction by Tobias Plieninger , HERCULES Project Coordinator, Department of Geosciences and Natural Resource Management, University of Copenhagen
14:10 - 14:30	Keynote: The potential of labelling in landscape management Carsten Mann , Head of Governance and Innovation Research Unit, Center for Technology and Society, Technische Universität Berlin
14:30 – 15:30	Examples of labels with potential in landscape management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peggy Dieryckxvisschers, Quality Policy Officer, European Commission, DG Agriculture and Rural Development, Unit B.3 Quality Policy • Heli Siitari, Wildlife Estates Label Finland • Carol Ritchie, Executive Director, EUROPARC Federation • David Shiel, AONB Senior Countryside Officer, Clwydian Range and Dee Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty <p>Moderator: Patrick Worms, Senior Science Policy Advisor, World Agroforestry Centre</p>
15:30 – 16:00	Discussion
16:00 – 16:15	Conclusion by Tobias Plieninger , HERCULES Project Coordinator, Department of Geosciences and Natural Resource Management, University of Copenhagen

Welcome and Introduction by Tobias Plieninger

Tobias Plieninger introduced the participants to the HERCULES project and its broad vision which seeks to provide research on the protection of cultural landscapes in order to empower public and private actors to sustainably manage them, on a local to a Pan-European level. He listed HERCULES values which range from nature conservation, tourism and even the improvement of social-well-being and the heritage of the local identity. In addition, he provided a clear definition of landscape labelling and its benefits. Landscape labelling can foster the provision of bundles of ecosystem services from landscapes by delivering benefits of payments, reducing transaction costs and by obtaining real market recognition thanks to an inter-sectoral cooperation. He illustrated his

presentation with examples of labels (Biosphere Reserves, Geographic Indications, Forest Stewardship Council and Organic certifications) and relevant policy arenas, which include: UNESCO Man and Biosphere, Sustainable Development Goals, European Landscape Convention and Reserves.

Finally, before giving the floor to the next speaker, the aims of the workshop were given by underlining the potentials of labelling approaches for sustainable development from various perspectives (such as fostering the provision of bundles of ecosystem services from landscapes, delivering benefits of payment for ecosystem services to all stakeholders through social and infrastructural investments and providing an easy accessible format at the national and international level).

1/ Carsten Mann: Priority questions for the science, policy and practice of Cultural Landscapes in Europe

Carsten Mann opened the floor by giving background information concerning the rural landscape and underlined the fact that directed transformation of rural areas was one of the main policy objectives. This transformation is accompanied by a search for new governance approaches such as financing instruments, business models, network, Public Private Partnership (PPP), or integrated management that seek to better deal with a range of challenges rural areas are facing.

He highlighted the fact that landscape labelling as a hybrid governance approach connects ideas of integrated landscape management which concepts of Geographic Indication/regional brands and Payment schemes for Ecosystem Services (PES). This is to create a certification scheme for particular socio-ecological systems as a product and the range of ecosystem goods and services provided at landscape level. As such, labelling fosters the maintenance of cultural landscapes (heritage), and improves market and political recognition for landscapes and their managers. However, labelling has to face barriers such as the increase of heterogeneity of goals, visions, and interests at regional scale which can lead to conflicts. Besides, it is important to note the lack of social awareness and acceptance of the labelling concept.

After, to illustrate his presentation, Carsten Mann listed an analysis of typical labelling examples in the EU. These examples were classified by case type, selection criteria and region of application.

The first example concerns Biosphere Reserves (BR) in North-East Germany which are established as model regions for sustainable development, often including regional brands. Branding initiatives were successful when they were integrated in national protected area networks and rural development initiatives that allowed for initial funding. In addition, regional brands need to be integrated into regional market structures (local and regional market portfolios) and to facilitate multi-actor exchange. Ideally, initiatives are coordinated on national level for example by partnering programs that allow for communication and learning. However, long term coordination of regional brands demands for political support, resources, and committed actors.

The second example concerns Geographic Indication (GI) which is indirectly linked to landscape management. GI of Iberian ham for example represents positive aspects such as being a niche product in a clear arranged field with a small production chain and a strong consumer demand. But it depends on Dehesa landscape management system, which is neither defined as agricultural land nor as forest, creating a lack of policy support and funding possibilities. A large diversity of ham certificates and a lack of regional and national association or lobbying power are identified as hindering governance factors.

The third example concerns Landscape Park and Heritage Sites such as the Landscape Park of Thames Chase Community Forest in Southern England. Considered as an important landscape heritage site, the project benefited from being integrated in the national Forest Initiative and in planning policy and was a high priority politically speaking. However, unfortunately with time, there was a shift of public political support and resources, so the project subsequently depended on alternative funding models and community support securing the survival of the park.

Finally, the last example concerns Payment Schemes for ES (PES) about organic agricultural certification of an exemplary value-chain in France. Fortunately, there is a high level of policy support, established market structures, a growing consumer demand and an inter-regional and national guidance by syndicates. Negative aspects include having to face lobbying power of conventional agriculture, persistent mindsets, a diversity of certificates and finally, standardized procedures which may prevent local adaptation.

Mr. Mann concluded his presentation by explaining the lessons learned from existing approaches. He concluded that labelling to work sustainably, it has to be an integral part of the policy agenda (institutional interplay, funding structures and linkage to administration), it has to link to existing markets and consumer demands, it needs an active leadership (PPP, coordinated exchange) and finally it must build on shared interests and values among actors having a common interest in sustainable landscape management and preservation.

2/ Peggy Dieryckxvisschers: Labelling of European Geographical Indications

Peggy Dieryckxvisschers explained how the European Geographical Indications is classified to start her presentation. First, she described that labelling is composed of registering “names” concerning wines, spirits and aromatized wines and foodstuffs. Then European Union quality designations are classified into three terms: Protected Designation of Origin (PDO), Protected Geographical Indication (PGI) and Traditional Specialty Guaranteed (TSG). In addition, she underlined that it was important to note that only PDOs and PGIs are Geographical Indications (GIs). She added that a GI is an Indication Property Right (IPR) which indefinitely protects the product and which defines a good on its geographical origin, its characteristics, reputation and its causal link (the area from where the product is coming linked to its specification). Then, she explained that it is also protected against wrongful uses such as direct or indirect use of a registered name on non-originating product, misuse, imitation or evocation, even if the name is translated, and any other false or misleading indication or other practice liable to mislead the consumer. In addition, she specified that GIs are not necessarily the name of the place (e.g. Feta), “traditional”, healthy, organic, GMO-Free, or “home-made”.

Moreover, Mrs. Dieryckxvisschers explained that PGIs and PDOs have similarities and differences. Both PGIs and PDOs have to be registered with geographical names and have the same registration procedures, both products have to fully originate in the region of which they bear the name, and both benefit from the same level of protection and controls. However, the number of production steps to be realized in the region differs between PGI and PDOs, the link to the geographical environment is stronger for PDOs, whilst reputation of the product only concerns PGIs. Finally, only PDOs require all of the raw materials which are involved in the production to have originated from the region.

Besides, concerning traditional and specialties guarantees, she explained that it was important to distinguish between “traditional” and “specialty”. In other words, traditional means: proven usage of the name for at least 30 years with the product being produced in a traditional manner using

traditional raw materials. Concerning specialty, it means that a product has a characteristic that distinguishes it clearly from other similar products of the same category.

Furthermore, she added that GIs represent benefits for consumers, producers and also for society. For consumers, they guarantee the origin, the quality and the authenticity of the product through controls. GIs also have the benefit of preventing standardisation of products. For producers, they guarantee EU wide-protection, a ticket for EU support, a position in the food chain and a better price. Social benefits of GIs include the encouragement of rural development which boosts the local economy. In addition, they promote social cohesion (diversity and heritage, attraction for tourism and gastronomy, local expertise and tradition).

Finally, GIs are inevitably linked to a territory with natural factors and resources. On one hand, there is a direct link with the use made of specific resources such as local breed. On the other hand, there is also indirect links such as production and management practices which take into account landscape and ecosystems considerations (Comté cheese for instance: management of herds, extensive livestock and low external inputs).

To conclude her presentation, she underlined that in October 2015, there were 3342 protected GIs in EU, such as GIs Aromatized wines (5), GIs Spirits (336), Food (1249) and Wine (1752).

3/ Heli Siitari : Wildlife Estate Label in nature and landscape conservation

Heli Siitari started her presentation by giving an example of a label, the Wildlife Estates Label, where landscapes have to meet certain management criteria. She explained that this label aims to improve the recognition of best practices in land management. Heli Siitari added that it represents a tool for sustainable land use and wildlife management operating according to agreed principles for environmentally appropriate, socially beneficial and economically viable land management. For example, the criteria which have to be taken into account are: creating and improving habitats in favor of biodiversity, restoring natural conditions where game and flora species can thrive, ensuring that land is maintained in a good condition, the promotion of the rural economy and population (against desertification) and the creation of added-value for natural and cultural heritage. Moreover, the aims of the Wildlife Estates Label include engaging private and public sectors in mutual cooperation to halt the loss of biodiversity, rewarding best examples of land biodiversity management, creating a database of useful information to communicate to policy makers and establishing synergies, sharing experiences and business opportunities, showing that land managers can be solution providers, improving the image of landowners and hunters and finally encouraging social and economic development of rural communities. Heli Siitari explained that all estates can apply to get the label (no restriction in terms of area covered, location or activity but the only expectation for applicants is to have a coherent and multifunctional management on their territory). Furthermore, she added that estates with this label can benefit from payment schemes depending on the country in which they are situated. In addition, she used Wildlife Estates in Finland as an example; there are currently 8 estates, which represent 29 135 responsibly managed hectares. Finally, she concluded her presentation by underlining the strengths of labelling for landowners which include providing a platform for EU-wide networking, sharing best practices, new ideas and a way of thinking.

4/ Carole Ritchie: EUROPARC Federation

Europe's Parks and Protected Areas has been a successful label for over 170 years and is a potential for further environmental, social and economic benefits. This is why Carole Ritchie introduced EUROPARC Federation by focusing on a variety of landscapes in different countries such as, Snowdonia in Wales, Skaftafell in Iceland, Jostedalbreen in Norway, Fertő Hanság in Hungary, Kemeris in Latvia, Cevennes in France, La Albufera in Spain, Triglav in Slovenia, Piatra Ciului in Romania or Goreme in Turkey. All these areas are protected and part of the Federation.

The mission of EUROPARC is to work for natural and cultural heritage in order to improve and champion policy and practice of Protected Area management to deliver sustainable and valued nature. Furthermore, Carole Ritchie insisted on the fact that a variety of landscapes is part of national identity *"often sculpted by nature and shaped by people. [It] influenced course of history, inspired artists and thinkers and enriched lives"*.

She then followed her presentation by introducing the National Parks Label by talking about Wales' National Parks and by giving key valuation. Briefly, Wales' National Park covers 20% of Wales and accounts for over half a billion pounds of Wales' Gross Values Added representing 1.2% of the Welsh economy. Nearly 30 000 people are employed within the Parks and 38% of jobs provided are linked to the environment. The Parks receive 12 million visitors each year spending about £1 billion on goods and services.

The National Parks Authorities receive funding of about £15m per annum, representing less than £5 per person in Wales.

In addition, Wales National Parks are composed of a residential population of over 80 000 people and recruit and coordinate over 15 000 hours of volunteering activity each year.

Concerning environment and ecosystem services, the National Parks compose of around 20% of the land area of Wales. They also contain a number of important reservoirs supplying water (£6.7 m per year). The National Parks are developing land management practices within the river catchment areas in order to reduce flood damage and its costs.

Moreover, her presentation brought different examples of landscape labelling which can work on a bigger scale such as the "Parque Natural de Andalucia". Indeed, about a fifth of Andalucia is protected. 24 parks use the "Parque" brand, including 178 business and 1400 produces and services. Finally, Mrs. Ritchie introduced the European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in protected areas (ECST), which in 2015 represented 143 charter areas in 17 countries. Their principles include giving priority to protection, contributing to sustainable development, engaging all stakeholders, planning sustainable tourism and pursuing continuous improvement. Well-managed sustainable tourism that the ECST encourages brings measurable economic, social and environmental benefits. It also serves to strengthen relations with local tourism stakeholders and the wider tourism industry. The ECST also provides access and membership to an extensive and dynamic European network.

The ECST can encourage customers to respect the environment, to engage in energy and water saving activities and to use environmentally friendly products as well as reducing, recycling and managing waste.

(EUROPARC Conference 2016, in Parc Jura vaudois, Switzerland, 18-22 October 2016)

5/ David Shiel : Clwydian Range and Dee Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

David Shiel described the situation before the Clwydian Range Project was introduced. There had been a lack of management of the upland area due to current generations of farmers lacking skills and confidence with upland management. As a result, there had been a destocking of the area. A move away from more traditional breeds of sheep further exacerbated the problem. As the area already receives 39.5 billion pounds annually in tourism expenditure, the Clwydian Range Food trail was introduced as part of the project which aimed to better place food as part of the tourism experience in the area. The project also aims to provide sustainable incentives for traditional upland management and to raise awareness between the link between land management, conservation and food. In order for the product to be branded 'Clwydian Range Lamb', a number of grazing and land management criteria have to be fulfilled. For example, sheep must have been grazed on the qualifying sites for at least half of their lifetime and land must be managed as part of an agri-environmental scheme or by other methods approved by and agreed with the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

The brand 'Clwydian Range Lamb' aims to have a strong association with the quality of landscape and conservation of the Clwydian Range. David stressed that in order for the brand to be valued by consumers, the product must be associated with freshness. The routes to market of the product are local butchers, the hospitality sector and box schemes.

Limitations of the project included the small scale of the project, establishing and maintaining direct routes to market, pricing fluctuations and a lack of brand recognition outside of the region.

6/ Open Discussion: chaired by Patrick Worms, Senior Science Policy Advisor, World Agroforestry Centre

To conclude the workshop, an open discussion took place with Patrick Worms, the moderator of this workshop. There was a dynamic exchange between the different questions and answers of the participants and all of them agreed on several points:

Participants agreed that landscape labelling does not just have to be about the quality of the product but can be used to directly and indirectly promote management tools, procedures and actors which are involved in its production. In addition, there was a general understanding on the need for additional research on how to develop procedures which can upscale existing labels and on how to create new labels which promote landscapes comprehensively. Finally, there was a general agreement that labelling schemes often face the problem of a lack of consumer recognition.