

Report on the National Workshop in France

Dijon, 13 October 2017

Organised by

**Marielle Berriet-Sollicec, Denis Lépicier, Virginie Piguet (CESAER, AgroSup Dijon, INRA)
Colas Chervier (IRSTEA), Christophe Déprés (VetAgroSup),
François-Gaël Lataste (BRL Ingénierie)**

This report presents the outcomes of the discussions at the PEGASUS WP5 national workshop in France. The other PEGASUS partners have already organized such National Workshops before summer. In France, the meeting was postponed because of the presidential election period and the lack of availability of our National partners. The list of attendees is presented in the Annex.

This workshop benefited from the seminar held in 2016 in CESAER (most contributors have already attended to the first seminar). The aim of this national workshop was to discuss with the 25 participants the results of the three French case studies. The workshop reported in this document (held on 13 October 2017) also focused on the analysis and discussion of the success factors that enhance ESBOs of agriculture and forestry. Furthermore, participants were asked to contribute to thinking about policy implications.

This workshop held in the CESAER in Dijon was organised in the following way:

The first step was to explain stakeholders the purpose, concept and the approach in the PEGASUS project and to present and discuss the 3 French case studies in Langres (FR 1), Volvic (FR 2) and Cévennes (FR 3).

The second step was based on a participatory approach. The most important factors were written on the flip board, their role in the case studies was discussed. Then, participants were asked to propose initiatives to encourage and/or improve the production of ESBOs. The stakeholders were also asked what would be the best way to share the knowledge gained from the case studies in general for facilitation of learning between practitioners.

Finally, a good atmosphere and a small group of motivated participants contributed to fruitful exchanges. Stakeholders expressed their interest in the PEGASUS programme.



Session 1 – Lessons emerging from the project so far

For the 3 French case studies, the main points can be summarized in the table below:

	Langres forest	Volvic water catchment	National Park Cévennes
ESBOs	Wood production Landscape Leisure services	Quantitative and qualitative management in drinking water Biodiversity Beef production Rural vitality	Agropastoral cultural landscapes (inheritance) Rural vitality Quantitative and qualitative management in drinking water
Valorization	Regular and irregular woodlots Nature reserve Discovery trails, game park ...	Danone Breeding Associative management (CEPIV) Steering committee	UNESCO Tourism Demography and new inhabitants
Factors ☺	Social demand Durability of practices Existence of ProSylva, an association which provide advices and knowledge Putting forestry professionals in question about their practices Public awareness Training and "forest school"	Concertation between actors Association of a scientific resource center (VetAgroSup) Danone's systemic posture Public supports to maintain activities	Role of incentive and coordination made by the Parc In the 2 nd pillar, specific action "Pélardon" for areas of oak and chestnut groves Market orientation towards local productions
Factors ☹	Changes in mentalities and practices hard to develop Persistence of subsidies for regular woodlots	Long food chain organization without local anchorage Competition for the use of water Relationship of mistrust Relative absence of agricultural representatives and Volcano Park Not enough attractive support for organic farming	CAP and proratisation of surfaces Low perception of climate change Intensification of agricultural practices Market orientation towards intensive productions



Session 2 – Messages for practice

The main points of the discussion with stakeholders covered:

- **role of economic factors (prices, ..):** the economic factor is preponderant but only in a short-term logic. We have interest to develop a market economy and heritage approach by integrating the issue of time steps. Long-term blocking factors are therefore not only economic but psychological and social (reluctance to change vs collective and/or individual capacities to innovation), environmental (valorization of biodiversity, climate change ...).
- **scales of practices:** solutions are to be designed simultaneously at different scales (global, national, local) by thinking about the interrelations between them. The global scale imposes a local market, the national imposes rules on the local and the global imposes norms on the national. The local has nowadays less strength but it can bring to the national level innovative ideas. The local level is able to find solutions by making niches, creating parallel markets.
- **importance of local actors to adapt intervention plans and/or projects:** in any case, necessary support on local relays to translate and adapt these plans and/or projects.
- **role of social capital** and differentiated perceptions of the local population and external users (e.g. tourists) concerning social, environmental and economic benefits of agriculture and forestry.
- **important indirect role of public and private actors** who rely on dialogue and consultation to influence practices but also anticipate tensions/conflicts between stakeholders. That's why it



appears important to analyze tensions as revealing blocking factors. The strength of territories is the ability to collectively manage tensions.

- **links between sectors and territories:** it should be crucial to develop forms of articulation between sectors and territories for forestry and agricultural activities i.e. working on how each sector defines, mobilizes and fits in its territory. To do this, Madelrieux proposes 3 criteria (Madelrieux et al., 2017)¹ (i) anchoring (use and valorisation of local resources), (ii) dependence (control of the source of used inputs, location of decision centers sectors, coordination of the actors of the sector), (iii) footprint (environmental impact, services rendered and wealth created). Importance of interprofessions in this change of perspectives.

Session 3 – Messages for policy

The main points of the discussion with stakeholders covered:

- **“classical” public support policies, even if they are important to maintain activities in difficult rural areas (2nd pillar supports), seem to have little effects on the change of practices:** difficulties of adaptation to territorial specificities, perverse effects and opportunity for the capture of aid, sometimes based on unsuitable modalities (e.g. State aid to the productive forest, aids for organic farming, process of proratisation of aid of the first pillar, ...)
- **integrate risk taking as a public policy tool** in order to secure innovation, support training, recognize the right to experiment, to error (do not have any guarantee at all costs). Assert this right to experimentation that officially exists in France since 2003.
- **evolve towards new forms of "territorial design"** that are necessarily closely linked to specific local contexts: an engineering service can only be locally thought. Associate design offices, associations, training and research centers, ...
- **importance of the territorial facilitator** to translate the initial problem and convey new knowledge/references to solve it. Territorial engineering needs to be built locally but conveying resources, knowledge, external experiences. Regional park have historically played this role of mediation in rural areas.
- in this context, **what is the role of local public authorities**, which should not only be perceived as financial partners for the payment of aids but have to be associated for co-designing policies. In France, acculturation on the decentralization and the complex relations between State and local public authorities is required.
- what about the **creation of an engineering agency for local authorities?** Rather than an agency, presence of a mediator at a local level aims to ensure that territorial engineering is not only dedicated to the implementation of public mechanisms but is also vigilant in the identification of needs. In this context, the role of the State can be seen as an "orchestrator" which is vigilant in an equitable territorial logic.

¹ Madelrieux, S., Buclet, N., Lescoat, P., Moraine, M. (2017). Ecologie et économie des interactions entre filières agricoles et territoire : quels concepts et cadre d'analyse ?, Cahiers Agricultures, 26(2), 24001.

- think of **realistic private and political initiatives based on scientific evidence based** (evidence based practices) with particular attention given to the concrete problem initially posed and the search for operational solutions targeted to the problem in its own context.



Attendees to the PEGASUS WP5 national workshop in France

Nom	Prénom	Organisme	Signature
Andriot	Patricia	Ministère de l'Agriculture, Réseau rural	
Aury	Nicolas	DRAAF Bourgogne - Pôle Forêt - Bois - Biomasse	
Berriet-Sollicic	Marielle	Cesaer UMR Inra - AgroSup Dijon	
Blancard	Stéphane	Cesaer UMR Inra - AgroSup Dijon	
Boutteaux	Jean-Jacques	ONF	
Chervier	Colas	IRSTEA	
Chevignard	Nicole	DSHS – Agrosup Dijon	
Colson	François	Fédération des PNR	
Déprés	Christophe	VétagroSup	
Gallouet	Emilie	Ministre de l'Écologie, du Développement durable et de l'Énergie	
Giraud	Georges	Cesaer UMR Inra - AgroSup Dijon	
Lataste	François Gaël	BRL ingénierie	
Lépicier	Denis	Cesaer UMR Inra - AgroSup Dijon	
Mairet	Nathalie	GAEC Mairet	
Marechal	Anne	IIEP Pegasus Project Manager	Excusée
Michelin	David	CDC Biodiversité	Excuse
Michelin	Yves	VetagroSup	
Perrier-Comet	Philippe	inra Montpellier	Excuse
Perrot	Elodie	VetagroSup	
Pignet	Virginie	Cesaer UMR Inra - AgroSup Dijon	
Pressurot	Anne	Agence de L'eau RMC	Par visio
Sicard	Louis	Assemblée Permanente des Chambres d'agriculture	

DETRAILLE ERIC

FUA / DGPE

