

## Report on the National Workshop in Portugal

Évora, 26 May 2017

Organised by University of Évora

This report presents the outcomes of the discussions at the PEGASUS WP5 national workshop in Portugal.

The list of attendees is presented in the Annex.

**The Portuguese national workshop's agenda was as follows:**

### **Event program**

#### **9.30h Reception**

PEGASUS objectives

*Workshop objectives.*

#### **9.45h Presentation of the results of the project.**

**Teresa Pinto-Correia | Rocío Juste Ballesteros**

Maps session: Cartography of the national study cases.

PEGASUS: Forms of governance and local collective actions and regional

National study cases: Intensive olive groves, Montado and Small farming

Questions

#### **11.00h *Coffee Break***

#### **11.15h Practical cases**

##### **11.15h – Good practices of Local Actions.**

**Jorge Filipe** - Cooperativa Integral MINGA

**Ana Lampreia** - Associação Campo Branco - Estrutura Local de Apoio

#### **12.00h - Debate**

Facilitator: **Rocío Juste Ballesteros**

Questions about governance, with particular attention to the needs of public intervention: construction and feasibility of best practices? | Is it required a change of politics? | Which will be the measures of politics to be created? | Which could be the contribution of the public politics for the success of the initiatives presented?

#### **13.00h Lunch (registration and confirmation)**



### **Session 1 – Lessons emerging from the project so far**

**Questions for the discussion:** *Is there any salient point that emerges as being particularly relevant/not relevant or not accurate to the situation in your country? Are there any other points specific in your country not included in the emerging findings so far?*

Particularly on the **maps**, please provide the key points from your discussion with stakeholders around the following questions:

- *Does the map show the agri and/or forestry systems in your country? If not, which ones you are missing? e.g. bergamot production in Calabria.*
- *If you look to the rules that we used, why do you think the system you're interested in does not appear? e.g. because the average bergamot farm is <3 ha and they are disaggregated in the landscape;*
- *Why are these systems relevant in your country? e.g. bergamot is important because of its economic output (€/kg), labour (#jobs in the sector), cultural heritage, etc.*
- *Do the links between the factors (type of management, type of crops, biophysical conditions) and the delivery of environmental public goods in your country/region resonate with stakeholders? If not, which links stakeholders think work differently than pictured in the maps and why?*

The main points of the discussion with stakeholders covered:

#### **Maps Session:**

Following the previous agenda, the workshop began with the presentation of the cartography provided by WP2 team. The maps arouse the curiosity of the stakeholders, being the main conclusion to agree about the utility of the maps as a tool for the comparative analysis within different regions in Europe. Mostly in Portugal, that is characterised for the heterogeneity of the landscape. Nevertheless, was discussed of the scale of 5 km that brought some doubts about the very different land uses that we can find in this regions and maybe be an obstacle for this comparative work. For instance, with this scale you can find a smallholding in Germany quite different than in Portugal.

It was agreed that the Portuguese case studies maps are representative of the national reality, intensive olive grove, small farming and Montado, this way was confirmed the importance of these systems related to the provision of ecosystem services and public goods. Nevertheless, the data represented on the maps allows to see the trend on the land uses, but they don't show the current situation. There is a huge difficulty in getting data from the last 5 years. In this way, the main concern was that if they are public why the institutions cannot access to them. As an example was spoken about the data of the IFAP (Portuguese Institute of Finance for Agriculture and Fisheries), the data is public but is not available, and could be very helpful.

During the presentation, the use of intensity and the impact on biodiversity as indicators were asked. Regarding to the intensity, some of the stakeholders point out that using this indicator some other important variables could be missing (i.e: invasive species), and is not enough in order to understand the viability of the practices. Related to the impact on biodiversity, was discussed that it only refers



to the habitats, what is not enough. In this case, there is a lot of satellite data that could be useful and could be interesting to see how to introduce it on the maps.

After this discussion, it was asked about including some other indicators to improve the utility of the maps as well as the quality of the comparative analysis. In this way, one of the proposals was to include social indicators in order to have a better understanding about the provision of ecosystem services. Another proposal was about how to introduce data about grants/subsidies and satellite data as a way of improving the maps and the comprehension of the situation.

## **Session 2 – Messages for practice**

### Questions for the discussion:

- *Do the emerging findings of the project and discussions in previous sessions imply that policy change is needed? If yes, what change (e.g. policy design, implementation/delivery, scale of action, etc.)? What types of policy measures do you feel are currently missing (please use examples if possible)?*
- *Are there serious constraints preventing the achievement of the environmental and social goals? In what areas?*
- *How has policy (in combination with other factors) contributed to success?*
- *What opportunities are there for developing public-private interactions?*

The main points of the discussion with stakeholders covered:

During both the presentation and the debate were identified some specific key questions, that can lead us to make some conclusions. Most of the debate was focused on the ESBO “sustainable food production”. The first point was to talk about the role of the different actors involved in the provision of this ESBO, mostly the question was how to increase the demand of this type of ESBO in order to increase its provision. In this sense was discussed:

The need of responsible consumption programs for the general public and in particular at schools. At this point we were talking about a need of policy change at this level, educational and at awareness level.

The role of small farmers in order to influence the consumers. This point was a very interesting discussion, involving different opinions about the responsibility that have the small farmers. In this way was pointed out the multifunctionality of these actors, who have to produce, to sell, to lobby and now also to educate about the consumption of their products. At the end this point went through if the small farmers truly have the whole responsibility or not in influencing the consumers or that fact has to rely on the public administration or local authorities.

Market drivers:

Rules for importation/exportation market, in order to protect and assess national products.



Regulate prices and work schedules in order to assure the access for the small farmers to the market and to be competitive with the supermarket chains.

Related to the perception of the landscape and their role as an ecosystem services and public good provider, the discussion went through about some local problems that face in particular the Alentejo. In this way it was debate about the problem for people in general to enjoy the landscape. As a specific example, the properties are fenced, making very difficult the recreational use of the land.

At the end of this part, one of the main conclusion was the fact of the need of understanding the different motivations that led the actors involved in the provision of public goods and ecosystem services. This way, it has be to found the way to sum efforts and co-responsibilities within the different governmental levels in order to stablish a national strategy that involves all of these actors and that allows the provision of the ESBOs.

### **Session 3 – Messages for policy**

#### Questions for the discussion:

- *How can local or thematic initiatives such as those examined in the case studies, expand their reach/impact, be replicated/transferred, and/or become more effective?*
- *What key qualities or actions/stepwise processes do participants need to adopt, to develop and achieve success? Please assess how participants' needs might differ between different groups of stakeholders, and different environmental or social goals targeted, in different contexts, etc.*
- *Who are the key people to involve, to enable long-lasting change? Why?*
- *What are participants' needs in terms of the types of maps or other basic information which would be useful in this context?*
- *What format should PEGASUS' tools and guidance take, to spread success across rural areas?*

The Portuguese workshop included the presentation of two local initiatives, one of them, the cooperative MINGA analysed in the Portuguese case study “Small Farming in Montemor-o-Novo”, and the other one as an example of a successful local action, the “supporting local structure” lead by the Campo Branco Association. Both of them related to support the small farmers.

In both cases, the replicability of their actions was based on the social support as well in some cases of the public administration support. As was described on the case study, the case of MINGA is not truly supported by the administration but also they do not wanted this support. The case of Campo Branco, they had this support, as a partner for some projects and proposal, but the collaboration ended due to the complex bureaucracy and the ineffectiveness. At this last point, the main problem was that the administration did not understand the real problems of the rural world, not knowing this way how to work and communicate with them.



<b>Attendees to the PEGASUS WP5 national workshop in Portugal</b>		
<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Signature</b>
Ana Lampreia	Associação Campo Branco	
Maria Helena Guimarães	Universidade Evora	
Jorge Gonçalves	Cooperativa MINGA	
Marta Salomé Vieira de Almeida	Associação Trilho	
Ana Cristina Agulheiro Santos	Universidade de Evora	
Jose Francisco da Veiga	Direção Regional de Agricultura e Pescas do Alentejo	
Sara Cruz	Direção Regional de Agricultura e Pescas do Alentejo	
Anabela Pinelo Mariz	Direção Regional de Agricultura e Pescas do Alentejo	
Mario Figueira	Direção Regional de Agricultura e Pescas do Alentejo	
Victor Lamberto		
Joaquim Francisco Riso Pifano		
Jose Manuel Herrera	Universidade Evora	
Jose Munoz Rojas	Universidade Evora	
Florence Melen	Associação Trilho	
Marta Cortegano		

