

Dana Salpina

How sectoral policy can benefit the protection of multi-functional cultural heritage? The case of agricultural landscape and the EU rural development policy

(doi: 10.7390/94139)

Aedon (ISSN 1127-1345)

Fascicolo 2, maggio-agosto 2019

Ente di afferenza:

()

Copyright © by Società editrice il Mulino, Bologna. Tutti i diritti sono riservati.
Per altre informazioni si veda <https://www.rivisteweb.it>

Licenza d'uso

L'articolo è messo a disposizione dell'utente in licenza per uso esclusivamente privato e personale, senza scopo di lucro e senza fini direttamente o indirettamente commerciali. Salvo quanto espressamente previsto dalla licenza d'uso Rivisteweb, è fatto divieto di riprodurre, trasmettere, distribuire o altrimenti utilizzare l'articolo, per qualsiasi scopo o fine. Tutti i diritti sono riservati.



Sulla nozione di patrimonio culturale

How sectoral policy can benefit the protection of multi-functional cultural heritage? The case of agricultural landscape and the EU rural development policy

di [Dana Salpina](#)

Sommario: [1. Introduction: Agricultural landscape as a multifunctional cultural heritage.](#) - [2. CAP: From food production to rural development and landscape preservation?](#) - [3. The EU Regulation 1305/2013 on support for rural development and its measures for the preservation of agricultural landscapes.](#) - [4. From theory to practice: The articulation of the EU policy measures in the RDP of Liguria and their use for the preservation of the agricultural landscape of Cinque Terre.](#) - [5. Concluding remarks.](#)

In order to shed light on the interactions between the sectoral policies and heritage protection objectives, this article focuses on the preservation of agricultural landscapes within the EU rural development policy, the second pillar of the CAP, which is often put forward as being powerful instrument in transforming the European agricultural landscapes. Based on the analysis of the EU 1305/2013 Regulation, rural development plan of Liguria and semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders, the article highlights the points of weakness and strength of the communitarian rural development policy in regards to the preservation of heritage agricultural landscape.

Keywords: Agricultural Landscape; EU Rural Development Policy; Landscape Preservation; Multifunctional Heritage; CAP.

1. Introduction: Agricultural landscape as a multifunctional cultural heritage

From the perspective of academic stream defending the functionalism of heritage, society and societal processes endow cultural heritage with values and functions [1]. However, only certain typologies of cultural heritage clearly manifest both cultural (e.g., associated with historic, identity or aesthetic values) and continuous 'use' functions. Think of fashion as heritage [2], industrial heritage [3] and cultural landscape. Indeed as stated in the preamble of the European Landscape Convention (2000) *'the landscape has an important public interest role in the cultural, ecological, environmental and social fields, and constitutes a resource favourable to economic activity'* [4]. It is particularly evident on the example of agricultural landscapes, which involves an intricate plot of interrelated interests such as environmental protection, food security, development of rural economies, preservation of cultural diversity and recreational space. Thus, if we look at agricultural landscapes with the eyes of ecologist or biologist, we might first see the environmental characteristics of an agricultural landscape, while from the perspective of economic sector the attention would shift towards its productive function. It means that in addition to ecosystem services agricultural landscapes provide a range of monetary and private goods [5].

However, there is also the cultural dimension of agricultural landscape that endows it with heritage function. As defined by the agrarian historian Emilio Sereni agricultural landscape is *"the form that man, in the course and for the ends of his agricultural productive activities, impresses on the natural landscape"* [6]. In other words, it is a product of a long historical trajectory, encompassing both tangible (e.g., dry-stone wall terraces, rural architecture, and irrigation systems) and intangible (e.g., traditional agricultural practices and *savoir-faire*) patterns created, used, transformed and developed by people. As such, the concept has a close relation with the idea of humanity and history. However, besides the historic value intrinsic to cultural heritage, there is the socio-symbolic aspects of agricultural landscapes that exist *'by virtue of being perceived, experienced, and contextualized by people'* [7]. This cognitive dimension has direct relevance for the development of emotional ties of individual and society to certain territory, also named as the sense of identity [8].

The global recognition of agricultural landscapes as heritage is the recent trend, which has initiated with the introduction of the category of 'cultural landscapes' within the framework of the World Heritage Convention (1972) of UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) in 1992, and the first inscription of agricultural landscape in the World Heritage List in 1995 [9]. Nowadays, the number of globally protected agricultural landscapes as well as the legal and institutional tools recognizing them is growing [10]. However, being at once productive land, natural milieu and cultural construct involving a series of interests (e.g., conservation vs. production, development vs. preservation) and sectoral policies makes the protection of agricultural landscapes a complex task (Figure, 1).




Figure 1. Agricultural landscape as a heritage with multiple functions. Author's elaboration.

The strong dependence of multifunctional heritage from sectoral policies is particularly evident in the relation between the EU agricultural policy

and agricultural landscape. The latter has seen dramatic changes during the post-war agricultural intensification [11], and currently continues to change but this time in the direction of sustainable production and rural development. While the main objective of agricultural policy will always remain the food production and safety [12], in the context of rural development, which directly relies on the well-being of rural population, the preservation of agricultural landscape becomes a pivotal instrument in achieving the current policy objectives [13].

In this view, there has been an increasing scientific interest in the degree of protection and support provided by modern EU agricultural policy for the ecosystem services [14] and territorial development [15]. However, its role in the preservation of heritage agricultural landscapes is poorly explored topic. The paper therefore examines the second pillar of the CAP on rural development and questions *whether and how the current policy measures benefit the preservation of heritage agricultural landscapes?* In order to answer this question the first section briefly introduces to the European agricultural policy and its evolution in relation to environmental and heritage protection objectives. The second section focuses on the rural development and its measures related to the preservation of agricultural landscapes. More precisely, it examines the EU Regulation 1305/2013 on support for rural development and evaluates its possible impact on agricultural landscapes. The third section discusses the application of these measures at the local level through analysis of the rural development plan (RDP) of Liguria. It evaluates the benefits and limits of the sectoral plan *vis-à-vis* the preservation of the agricultural landscape of Cinque Terre recognized as World Heritage site [16].

Finally, the paper highlights the main points of strength and limits of the communitarian rural development policy in relation to the preservation of heritage agricultural landscapes. Thus, the former rely in the direct forms of support for the maintenance and restoration of cultural and natural heritage elements present in rural landscapes. While the latter concern the operational limits including the weakness of the information channel between the responsible authorities and farmers, the lack of attention to the traditional agricultural knowledge and practices, as well as the inflexibility to the morphological and socio-economic specificities of heritage agricultural landscapes. This is because the agricultural landscapes within the EU agricultural policy are seen merely through the prism of the environmental services. The concluding remarks highlight the necessity in more inclusive policy measures for the next programming period (2020-2027), which lives a room for the local policy makers to adopt the EU support to the needs of specific sites.

2. CAP: From food production to rural development and landscape preservation?

In the first decades after the World War II, the main objectives of the EU agricultural policy (known as CAP) were the maximization of the agricultural productivity and stabilization of agricultural market. The intensification of agriculture has led to the negative transformations in terms of simplification of landscape mosaic [17], soil and water erosion, air pollution and impoverishment of agrobiodiversity [18]. Since then, the agricultural policy has evolved considerably and through the major reforms the environmental protection has become one of the major concerns of the current CAP. First, under the *agri-environmental regulation* [19], farmers started to receive a financial support for reduction agro-chemical inputs and extensive forms of agriculture, which permitted to mitigate the impact of farming activities and consequently to protect the rural landscape [20].

Further, in the beginning of 2000s, the rural development policy has become the second pillar of the CAP, which was the reflection of the development issues in the rural environment [21]. During the previous programming period (2007-2013), the community strategic guidelines have outlined the multifunctional role played by agriculture in sustaining the richness and diversity of landscape, food security and cultural/natural heritage of Europe [22]. Although the CAP is not responsible for landscape protection in direct manner, today it is often put forward as being powerful instrument in transformations occurred in the European agricultural landscapes [23]. That is because the agricultural policy has a great power over decisions of farmers - the main custodians of agricultural landscapes. The opportunities and limits designed in the CAP can result in the transformation, degradation or preservation of agricultural landscapes.

The modern CAP is based on the joint provision of public and private goods, which means that farmers are remunerated not only on the basis of their marketed production, but also for delivering of the wider public good services [24], which have no direct market value (e.g., cultural landscape or agro-biodiversity) [25]. It recognizes traditional agricultural landscapes as a part of the cultural and natural heritage, while the ecological integrity and the scenic value of landscapes are seen as the important elements in attractiveness of rural areas for business, tourism, and life in general [26]. Thus, only *traditional* agricultural landscapes and those having *scenic value* and transmitting *ecological integrity* are recognized as a public good worth of being preserved. This 'landscape-oriented' approach is interpreted in two pillars: 1) direct payments for the provision of agri-environmental 'benefits', constituting the major part of the CAP expenditure (around 70%); 2) rural development policy that takes a small portion of CAP expenditure, however, considered to have closer focus on the landscape preservation objectives [27].

3. The EU Regulation 1305/2013 on support for rural development and its measures for the preservation of agricultural landscapes

The EU rural development policy was initially introduced simply as an income support for farmers operating in poor quality lands. Currently the policy is governed by the Regulation 1305/2013, herein referred to as the Regulation, which stipulates that '*restoring, preserving and enhancing ecosystems [...] including high nature farming as well as the state of European landscape*' is one of the six priority areas of the policy for 2014-2020 [28]. This demonstrate an increasing awareness on the environmental and landscape values present in agricultural lands and on important role played by the policy measures in their preservation.

While designing their RDPs the EU Member States and regions have to address at least four priority areas set by the Regulation [29]. However, the selection of the focus areas, measures, and sub-measures is under the jurisdiction state/regions, and therefore can be shaped according to regional characteristics and needs [30]. The analysis of the Regulation has shown a number of measures that theoretically can be used in the preservation of tangible and intangible elements of the agricultural landscapes (Table, 1).

Table 1. Measures of Rural Development Policies (2014-2020) that might be relevant for the preservation of heritage agricultural landscapes [31]

Measure	What it supports?	How it can influence the preservation of agricultural landscapes?	Positive (+)/ Negative (-) Impact
(1) Knowledge transfer and information actions	(Art. 14) Vocational training and skills acquisition actions, demonstration activities and information actions.	The support provided within this measure can be used in organization of training courses aimed to preserve traditional knowledge and agricultural practices, and therefore help to maintain the heritage agricultural landscapes and enhance the local production.	+
(4) Investments in physical assets	(Art. 17) Improvement of the overall performance and sustainability of the farm through modernization (water and energy saving), as well as other improvements linked to agri-environment-climate objectives.	This effect of this measure is twofold. On the one hand, it may benefit the environmental dimension of agricultural landscapes. On the other hand, the effect of such modernizations can affect the aesthetic, cultural or historic values of heritage agricultural landscapes.	++
(5) Restoring	(Art. 18) Risk management and mitigation; the	This measure is particularly relevant for the fragile agricultural	++

agricultural production potential damaged by natural disasters and catastrophic events and introduction of appropriate prevention actions	restoration of agricultural land and production potential after nature caused disasters.	landscapes	
(6) Farm and business development	(Art. 19) Business start-ups of young farmers; development of small farms; development of non-agricultural activities.	This measure can help to balance the age of the farmers and therefore abandonment of historic agricultural landscapes. In the case of development of small farms, the effect can be twofold, because it may result in the enlargement of land parcels, and therefore bring to the simplification of land mosaic. What concerns the development of non-agricultural activities, its benefit will depend on the type of future activities. Thus, not balanced development of agritourism may bring to partial abandonment of agricultural activities in favor of hospitality services.	+-
(7) Basic services and village renewal in rural areas	(Art. 20) Drawing up and updating of management and protection plans for Natura 2000 sites and other areas of high nature value; improvement of rural infrastructure; studies and investments associated with the maintenance, restoration and upgrading of the cultural and natural heritage of villages, rural landscapes and high nature value sites, including related socio-economic aspects, as well as environmental awareness actions.	The measure can benefit the tangible dimension of agricultural landscapes (e.g., restoration of rural architecture), and improve the management of the sites.	++
(10) Agri-environment-climate payments	(Art. 28) Preservation and promotion of the necessary changes to agricultural practices that make a <i>positive contribution to the environment and climate</i> .	The measure covers only those commitments going beyond the baseline standards of EU (e.g., 'greening'), State and Region concerned. However, considering that traditional agricultural practices are usually sustainable in terms of environmental protection, their protection and improvement might be supported by this measure.	+
(13) Payments to areas facing natural or other specific constraints	(Art. 31) Support for the farmers in mountain areas other areas facing natural or other specific constraints	It can prevent abandonment of agricultural, pastoral activities in 'difficult' territories (high altitude, steep slopes, climate)	+

The table shows that there is a wide range of rural development measures that can have positive outcomes on landscape protection through the incentives for the environmentally sustainable land use and production systems. However, it is important to note that the Regulation does not mention UNESCO sites or cultural landscapes in specific manner. The reference is made only to the Natura 2000 sites [32] and natural protected areas. In this view, the communitarian rural development policy leaves a room for adapting a broader policy framework on domestic level. Therefore, the local (regional) rural development plans can serve not only as the operative instruments, but also develop a system going beyond merely environmental and production objectives. In order to understand how the rural development policy measures are articulated at the local level, the next section will focus on the RDP of the Liguria Region and its application on the agricultural landscape of Cinque Terre.

4. From theory to practice: The articulation of the EU policy measures in the RDP of Liguria and their use for the preservation of the agricultural landscape of Cinque Terre

The terraced agricultural landscape of Cinque Terre including five historic villages Monterosso, Vernazza, Corniglia, Manarola and Riomaggiore are spread in the coastal zone of the Region of Liguria (northwestern Italy). Due to the complex morphology (steep slopes) and lack of flat areas suitable for agriculture, the landscape, both along the coastal zone and inland, is characterized by distinctive land-use practices, which have created agricultural terraces dating back to 1100AD [33].

Since 1997 the territory of *Portovenere, Cinque Terre, and the Islands (Palmaria, Tino and Tinetto)* is the UNESCO World Heritage site. The inscription of the site under the category 'continuing cultural landscapes' was motivated both by uniqueness and by fragility of this agricultural landscape. Due to the complex geomorphological context, unfavorable tectonic and structural setting the area is highly prone to land sliding and the adverse effects of seasonal floods [34]. Besides the natural risk factors, the steep slopes of Cinque Terre hinders the mechanization of agriculture, which augments the average cost of the productive activity [35] and reduces the aspiration of young generation to develop their family vineyards. In addition, constantly growing tourism industry 'stoiles' the human resources from the agricultural sector. According to the last available data, in 2010 there were only 244 ha of cultivates land [36], which strongly contrast with over 2000 ha of terraces cultivated in the area just several decades ago. The terraces are managed by around 200 smallholder farmers [37], which supply the major part of their harvest to the Social Winery (*Cantina Cinque Terre*). Besides this agricultural cooperative, the territory counts around 20 private wineries producing their own certified agricultural products. However, the preservation of agricultural landscape mainly relies on the smallholder farmers, whose average age is relatively high (over 65).

Regardless the efforts of the local actors to preserve the agricultural landscape [38], it still risks to remain an emblematic element recalling whilom flourishing agriculture. In this context, the support provided within the EU agricultural policy have an increasing importance for the preservation of the local agriculture. Indeed, during the previous planning period (2007-2013), the territory has benefited the reconstruction of aqueduct and the introduction of the network of monorail trains called '*trenini*' [39]. It is considered the major contribution of the RDP for the local agriculture, although the network serve only a small portion of the territory. Currently, the RDP of Liguria is focusing on the diversification of agricultural activities, which is reasonable in view of rapidly growing vine and gastronomic tourism considered the major opportunity for the preservation of agricultural landscapes [40]. However, would this diversification make sense in the case of Cinque Terre, where tourism has already overshadowed the local agriculture?

Within the ongoing programming period (2014-2020) the RDP of Liguria disposes around 300 million euro [41], distributed within 15 measures and 43 sub-measures. The analysis of the RDP regulations has shown only few measures that were articulated in direct reference to the preservation of agricultural landscapes. This concern the measure for the improvement of the performance and sustainability of farms provided under the Article 17 of the EU Regulation. Under the RDP of Liguria the measure was articulated to support the non-productive activities such as the restauration of traditional drystone walls, the planting of hedges and rows, the creation and reconstruction of water troughs (ponds, puddles) and wildlife observation points [42]. While in the Cinque Terre, the major part of the requests funded under this measure regarded the reconstruction of drystone walls. The latter is crucial not only for the aesthetic value, but also to the bio-diversity and for historic value of the agricultural landscape.

Thus, regardless the fact that the main objective of the support refers to agro-environment objectives, the actions funded under this measure benefited the tangible dimension of the agricultural landscapes.

Further, the investment for basic services and village renewal provided under the Article 20, within the RDP of Liguria was made available for the projects related to the maintenance, restoration and redevelopment of the cultural and natural heritage of villages, rural landscapes and sites of high natural value [43]. In Cinque Terre, this fund was requested mainly by the local authorities for the recovery of small roads between the farm properties, in order to improve the accessibility of the farms and prevent the abandonment of the agricultural lands.

However, the analysis has also shown certain mismatches between the evaluations of the policy measures presented in the previous section and their *de-facto* use. This concern the investment for the vocational trainings and skills acquisition provided under the Article 14 of the Regulation, which within the RDP Liguria was limited to the trainings included in the Regional Registry (*Catalogo Regionale delle Conoscenze e delle Innovazione*). Those are mainly technical trainings (e.g., use of plant protection products and agricultural machineries) [44], which have little reference to the preservation of agricultural landscapes and practices. Further, a number of operational and normative issues limiting the access to the funds by the local farmers have emerged.

First limit is the threshold set by the RDP, which is not adapted to the characteristic of heritage agricultural landscapes. In agricultural landscapes such as Cinque Terre, the generations of farmers were able to preserve a number of physical and socio-economic characteristics (e.g., small plots of properties) that makes them heritage. However, this very characteristic hinders the preservation of the agricultural landscape. The complexity of land structure in Cinque Terre implies the high cost of all types of interventions in the landscape. The transportation of materials for restoration of dry-stone walls requires excessive expenditure in terms of financial resources (e.g., rent of helicopter) and time spend by the farmers [45]. That is because the state and the dimension of the roads between the agricultural plots do not allow the use of usual transportation means.

It is important to note that the RDP Liguria does provide the measures specifically designed for the areas with natural constrains. Indeed, the sub-measure n. 13.1 (*Indennità compensativa per le zone montane*) aims to establish the balance between the income difference of the 'difficult' areas and the areas with favorable conditions for agriculture (e.g., flatlands). All three municipalities of the Cinque Terre (*Riomaggiore, Vernazza, Monterosso al Mare*) [46] are classified eligible for such compensation. However, the interviews has demonstrated that the local farmers have issues with receiving such help due to the small dimension and fraction of their land parcels. Indeed, the technical disposition of the measure states that the agricultural systems of arboriculture (e.g., vineyards) in the mountain areas have right for 500€ per hectare. It further specifies that the contribution less than 300€ cannot be payed due to the administrative costs [47]. In this context, the farmers of Cinque Terre whose land properties often do not exceed 0.5 hectare become ineligible for such help [48].

Second limit is that RDP Liguria is designed mainly for the farms with certain economic capacity. It means that besides the technical requirements, the farmer need to provide the financial guarantee, which in the case of small farms represents the main obstacle in receiving the funds for development of the their businesses and introduction of new infrastructure [49]. The agricultural landscape of Cinque Terre has become the World Heritage helps to its distinctive geo-morphological and socio-economic structures. However, these very characteristics hinder the use of the RDP resources conceived for the preservation of the heritage landscape. In this context, the accession to the RDP funds for the large-scale projects mainly rely on the National Park and the Social Winery. The interviews has shown the great expectations of the local farmers in relation to the post-2020 RDP, and introduction of the specific regulations for the UNESCO sites. However, according to the Agricultural Councilor of the Region this measure may not bring substantial results, as there is a need in more profound changes of price policies in favor of the areas with difficult accessibility like Cinque Terre (e.g., the differentiation of the regional prices for the construction of dry-stone walls and local products).

Third limit refers to the weakness of information channel between the responsible authorities and farmers. In order to take advantage of these funds the farmer first needs to be informed on the available opportunities. However, the semi-structured interviews with farmers have demonstrated that they either not properly informed on opportunities available for their profiles, or they fears the paper requirement, calling the system too complex (it. '*contorto*'). This issue is particularly relevant in the case of small hold farms managed by aged population. Although there is already an informational desk of RDP ('*sportello agricoltura*'), its function is limited to the general information on the ongoing calls [50]. It means that there is a necessity to develop an effective one-to-one farm advisory service that can properly reach and assist the farms.

5. Concluding remarks

A series of conflicting views and interests associated with the multi-functionality make the protection of heritage a challenging task. However, as it was demonstrated on the example of agricultural landscapes, the multi-functionality may bring additional sectoral funds for the preservation of heritage values. Thus, the communitarian rural development policy recognizes landscape as an important driver of rural economy, and therefore provides the direct forms of support for non-productive services of agriculture, including bio-diversity and landscape.

However, the research has shown that the objectives behind the preservation of agricultural landscapes rather reverberate the congruence between the CAP and the EU environmental policy tools (Habitat Directive, Environmental Assessment Directives), with little or no reference to 'culture-driven' measures such as the preservation of traditional knowledge and agricultural practices. This sheds light on broader relations between heritage protection objectives and sectoral policies adapting to the global trends in terms of climate change, decrease of bio-diversity and other environmental problems.

Although the rural heritage and cultural values of agricultural landscapes are cited in several documents and web pages dedicated to the CAP, such considerations remain superficial since there is no specific policy focusing on the procedural methods for identification and protection of the cultural value elements present in the agricultural landscapes. The way the policy measures articulated *in situ* reveals the inflexibility of the regional plans to the morphological and socio-economic specificities of heritage sites. This further demonstrates that the public good provision of agricultural landscapes is still regarded as a by-product of land use activities [51].

In addition, there is also the weakness of the information channel between the responsible authorities and farmers, impeding the accession to the funds by smallholder farmers. Therefore, one-to-one support for the stallholder farmers is needed, particularly for those operating in the heritage agricultural landscapes with high risk of abandonment. Such initiatives shall follow the effective advertisement campaigns targeted to inform the aged farmers on available forms of support.

The preservation of landscape and biodiversity was set forth as one of the nine objectives of the future CAP (2020-2027). Taking into account that the natural and cultural dimensions of agricultural landscapes are strictly interrelated, the next rural development policy shall increase the sensibility to the cultural dimension of agricultural landscapes. In other words, there is a need in more inclusive policy measures for heritage agricultural landscapes in terms of both supported subjects and types of projects. The former can be implemented through the minimization of the requirement for the heritage agricultural landscapes in relation to their morphologic (e.g., small land properties) and socio-economic specificities (e.g., low economic income, aged farmers). While types of projects shall not limit to the diversification of farm activities by means of tourism or provision of the environmental services.

In the heritage sites like Cinque Terre, the preservation of the agricultural landscape directly depends on the attractiveness of the local agriculture and farmers' income. The latter instead cannot rely only on the direct agri-environmental incentives. There is an increasing necessity in structural measures adapted to the needs of the specific sites, as well as the creation of favorable conditions for the development and active enhancement of the local production (e.g., establishment of the *Consorzio tutela* for Cinque Terre wines), including the preservation of traditional agricultural knowledge and practices. This would require the reservation of a part of the RDP funds for the heritage agricultural landscapes at the risk of abandonment.

Note

- [1] For the detailed discussion on the functionalism of cultural heritage see Muller M. (1998) Cultural Heritage Protection: Legitimacy, Property, and Functionalism. *Inter-national Journal of Cultural Property* 7, no. 2 (1998): 395-409; Loulanski T. (2006) Revising the Concept for Cultural Heritage: The Argument for a Functional Approach. *International Journal of Cultural Property* (2006) 13:207-233.
- [2] See F. Caponigri, *Problematizing fashion's legal categorization as cultural property*, in *Aedon*, 2017, 2.
- [3] See L. Loures, T. Panagopoulos (2007) From Derelict Industrial Areas towards Multifunctional Landscapes and Urban Renaissance. *WSEAS Transactions on Environment and Development*, issue 10, Volume 3, Oct. 2007.
- [4] Preamble to the European Landscape Convention, Florence, 20 October 2000.
- [5] See G.V. Huylenbroec, V. Vandermeulen, E. Mettepenningen A. Verspecht A. (2007), Multifunctionality of Agriculture: A Review of Definitions, Evidence and Instruments, *Living Rev. Landscape Res.*, 1, 3, pag. 5. [Online Article]: cited [8 Nov 2018], <http://www.livingreviews.org/lrlr-2007-3> [last accessed 8 Nov 2018]; L. Schaller, et al. (2018) Agricultural landscapes, ecosystem services and regional competitiveness -Assessing drivers and mechanisms in nine European case study acres. *Land Use Policy*, 76 (2018), pagg. 735-745.
- [6] "Paesaggio agrario - la forma che l'uomo, nel corso ed ai fini delle sue attività produttive agricole, coscientemente e istematicamente imprime al paesaggio naturale", in E. Sereni, *Storia del paesaggio agrario italiano*, Laterza (first published in 1996)
- [7] Ashmore, W., and B. Knapp, eds. 1999. *The Archaeologies of Landscape*. London: Blackwell.
- [8] For the discussion of the identity value of landscapes and *genius loci* see M. Antrop (2000) *Geography and landscape science*. Belgeo, 1-2-3-4 | 2000, 9-36; E. Relph (1976), *Place and Placelessness*, London: Pion, pag. 61.
- [9] The first agricultural landscape inscribed in the World Heritage is Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras. For more details about the site see: <https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/722> Last accessed 10 June 2019.
- [10] Currently, the main instruments recognizing the heritage value of agricultural landscapes at the global scale are the UNESCO Conventions (World Heritage Convention, and the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage) and the Programme on Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS) of UN FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization). In addition, there are also the category of 'protected areas' of IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature), the list of Biosphere Reserves promoted by Man and Biosphere Programme of UNESCO, the list of Geoparks of UNESCO, and other international programmes developed within the framework of the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (1992). The typologies of agricultural landscapes protected within these global instruments varies from almost untouched forest pastures to landscapes of staple crops.
- [11] For more discussion on the topic see the next section
- [12] Indeed, the first objectives of the CAP as defined in the Art. 39 of Treaty on the functioning of the European Union (OJ of the EU 26.10.2012, C 326/4) is "to increase to increase agricultural productivity by promoting technical progress and by ensuring the rational development of agricultural production the optimum utilisation of the factors of production, in particular labour".
- [13] For the programming period 2014-2020, the objective of the rural development policy are: (a) fostering the competitiveness of agriculture; (b) ensuring the sustainable management of natural resources, and climate action; (c) achieving a balanced territorial development of rural economies and communities including the creation and maintenance of employment. Art. 4. Regulation 1305/2013.
- [14] See B. Jack (2015) *Ecosystem Services: European Agricultural Law and Rural Development*. Monteduro M. et al (eds.) *Law and Agroecology: A Transdisciplinary Dialogue*. Springer, 2015, pagg. 127-150; See M. Lefebvre, M. Espinosa, S. Gomez y Paloma (2012) *The influence of the Common Agricultural Policy on agricultural landscapes*. Reference Report by the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission, 2012.
- [15] N.P. Seidl, M. Golobič (2018) The effects of EU policies on preserving cultural landscape in the Alps, *Landscape Research*, 43:8, pagg. 1085-1096.
- [16] It is important to note that the reference to the World Heritage in the paper is used only as an evidence to the internationally recognized heritage status of the selected case study. Thus, the analysis of the World Heritage Convention in relation to the EU Regulation is out of the scope of this paper.
- [17] In Italy, the simplification of agricultural landscape mosaic during early CAP was the result of the growth of average farm dimension from 5-6 ha to 20 ha and more. For a discussion of the transformations occurred in the agricultural territories of Italy see *Programmazione Sviluppo Rurale 2007-2013*, in Documento per il Piano Strategico Nazionale. Gruppo di Lavoro 'Paesaggio', April 2006, pagg. 10-16.
- [18] For a general discussion of the post war CAP impacts, see C. Stoate (2001) *Ecological impacts of arable intensification in Europe*. *J Environ Manag*, pagg. 337-365; J.A. Klijn (2004) *Driving forces behind landscape transformation in Europe, from a conceptual approach to policy options*. The new dimensions of the European landscape. pagg. 201-218.
- [19] *Council Regulation (EEC) No 2078/92* of 30 June 1992 on agricultural production methods compatible with environmental protection and preservation of the countryside.
- [20] However, the expenditure for market management was much higher (90% of total) than the expenditure for support of farmers and environmental consideration. While now the product based support represents just 5% of the total CAP expenditure. This topic is discussed in EC (2013) *Overview of CAP Reform 2014-2020*, *Agricultural Policy Perspectives Brief N°5*, December 2013, pag. 4.
- [21] For a general overview of the evolution of CAP before and during the Fischler reform (2003) see S. Gay, B. Osterburg, D. Baldock, A. Zdanowicz (2005) *Recent evolution of the EU Common Agricultural Policy (CAP): state of play and environmental potential*. MEACAP - WP6 D4b *Common Agricultural Policy - March 2005*. A. Tosto (2010) *Evoluzione della Politica Agricola Comune ed Affermazione della Multifunzionalità in agricoltura: L'Agricoltura Sociale in Sicilia*. Tesi di Dottorato Università degli Studi di Catania (2009-2010), pagg. 10-44.
- [22] See the Axis 2 of the Rural Development Policy (2007-2013) in the *Council Decision 2006/144/EC* Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32006D0144&from=en> [last access 20 Nov 2018].
- [23] See M. Scornaienghi (2014) *Il riconoscimento del valore del paesaggio agrario nella Politica Agricola Comune*. INEA Working paper, Roma, 2014, pag. 14; G. Ferrari (2017) *Paesaggio agrario e consumo del territorio*, in *Atti del Convegno 'Tutela Paesaggistica e Paesaggio Agrario'*, Portovenere 3-4 giugno 2016, (a cura di) D. Granara, Giappichelli Editore, pagg. 75-80.
- [24] According to the formulation of European Commission, a public good is a good that, even if it is consumed by one person, is still available for consumption by others. EC, Key terms as regards the CAP and environment. Available at: <https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/envir/cap> [last access 28.03.2018].
- [25] For a review of CAP ecosystem services, see B. Zanten, P. Verburg, M. Espinosa et al. (2014), *European agricultural landscapes, common agricultural policy and ecosystem services: a review*. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, Springer Verlag/EDP Sciences/INRA, 2014, 34 (2), pagg. 309-325.
- [26] EC, *Agriculture and Landscape*. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/envir/landscape_en [last access 28.03.2017].
- [27] See M. Lefebvre, M. Espinosa, S. Gomez y Paloma (2012) *The influence of the Common Agricultural Policy on agricultural landscapes*. Reference Report by the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission 2012, pag. 73.
- [28] Art. 5, Regulation 1305/2013.
- [29] Besides the above mentioned priority area, there other five articulated as: knowledge transfer and innovation; farm viability and competitiveness; food chain organisation and risk management; resource-efficient, climate-resilient economy; social inclusion and economic development.
- [30] Art. 6, Regulation 1305/2013.
- [31] Elaboration of the author based on *the Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 of the European Parliament and the Council of 17 December 2013 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for rural Development (EAFRD) and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005*. It is important to

note that section 'What it supports' does not necessary include all support aspects, but only those selected by the author according to the objective of the research. The estimation of influence indicated by the symbols positive (+) and negative (-) are qualitative and subjective, based on preventive estimations of the author.

[32] Natura 2000 sites are natural areas protected under the Habitats Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC).

[33] See Terranova R., (1984). *Aspetti geomorfologici e geologico-ambientali delle Cinque Terre: rapporti con opere umane (Liguria Orientale)*. Studi e Ricerche di Geografia 7:39-90.

[34] For more detailed discussion on natural risk factors present in Cinque Terre see M. Agnoletti et al. (2019) *Terraced Landscapes and Hydrogeological Risk. Effects of Land Abandonment in Cinque Terre (Italy) during Severe Rainfall Events*. Sustainability 2019, 11, pag. 235; pagg. 1-12; A. Françoise (1999) *L'environnement et le paysage au secours de deux viticultures héroïques: l'évolution récente des vignobles en terrasses de Banyuls et des Cinque Terre*. In: Sud-Ouest européen, tome 5, 1999. Sud-Ouest européen. Identités en mutation. pagg. 83-92.

[35] In view of incredible efforts invested by the farmers to the land, the agriculture in Cinque Terre recognized as heroic agriculture. The Art 7 of the Italian 'Wine Law' (*Legge n. 238/2016:Disciplina organica della coltivazione della vite e della produzione e del commercio del vino*) specifically dedicated the heroic and historic vineyards.

[36] According to (ISTAT, 2010) the distribution of the cultivated lands is following: Monterosso -46 ha (out of 247 ha available agricultural land), Riomaggiore - 85 ha (out of 252 ha), Vernazza - 113 ha (out of 394 ha). The terraces are mainly used for cultivation of vine, but also olive and citrus trees.

[37] The agricultural land properties of the farmers ranges between 0,1-0,5 ha

[38] Since the disastrous flood in 2011, the efforts of the local actors are directed to the preservation of the remaining and the recuperation of the abandoned agricultural terraces. Thus, the National Park annually provides the local farmers with the material necessary for the reconstruction and maintenance of dry-stone walls (vine roots, wooden poles, and stones). Besides the National Park, in the territory of Cinque Terre there is a number of 'private' initiatives carried out by Voluntary Associations such as *la Fondazione Manarola, Associazione Uniti per Corniglia, Save Vernazza*, etc. In terms of income support, the Cantina Cinque Terre helps to maintain the market margin proposing relatively high price per grapes (3, 5/4 euro per 1 kg of grapes). Thus, it insures that the remaining small-hold farmers have some economic profit out of their lands.

[39] The monorails were constructed helps to the funds of the measure 1.2.5 - 'infrastructures related to the development and adaptation of agriculture and forestry', which were accessed by Social Winery. According to the Director of the Winery, currently they are about to access to another 800 thousands of euro within of the measure 4.3 for the construction of monorail trains in the areas missing such infrastructure.

[40] P. Borghi (2017) *Turismo nelle Aree Rurali: Gli Agriturismi*, in *Atti del Convegno 'Tutela Paesaggistica e Paesaggio Agrario'*, cit, pagg. 157-172.

[41] EC (2016) Factsheet on 2014-2020 Rural Development Programme for Liguria.

[42] It is important to note that the RDP of Liguria sets specific requirements for the construction of drystone walls including the use of materials and forms corresponding the traditional construction models and methods (without use of cement). See *Allegato A., Delibera di Giunta regionale n. 666 del 15/07/2016*.

[43] See the measure 7.6. in *Delibera di Giunta regionale n. 249 del 25/03/2016*. Available at: http://www.agriligurianet.it/media/com_publiccompetitions/docs_repository/MISURA7_6_1132.pdf [last accessed 28.01.2019]

[44] Allegato n. 1, Decreto di Giunta regionale n. 742 del 12/09/2018.

[45] The amount of support for the construction of drystone walls provided within the measure 4.4 is 105€ for m², which cannot exceed 200m² per request.

[46] See the section '*Indennità compensativa per le zone montane*' in *Allegato Elenco Comuni Svantaggiati*, PSR Liguria (2014 - 2020), ultima modifica 05/08/2015. Available at: http://www.agriligurianet.it/media/com_publiccompetitions/docs_repository/Elenco_comuni_svantaggiati_%202015_08_860.pdf [last access 12.02.2019].

[47] See *Disposizioni tecniche e procedurali per la presentazione di domande di Misura 13 "Indennità a favore delle zone soggette a vincoli naturali o ad altri vincoli specifici"*, Regione Liguria. Available at: http://www.agriligurianet.it/media/com_publiccompetitions/docs_repository/DGR_153_995.pdf [last accessed 13.02.2019]

[48] It is important to note that CAP does provide the 'direct payments' under the pillar 1 specifically designed for the smallholder farmers. However, the beneficiaries of the 'small farmer scheme' are not likely to receive additional support. The amount of such support (€500-1250 per year) often does not correspond with the needs of farms.

[49] From the interview with a local actor: '*Piccolo agricoltore cosa ci mette in garanzia? Un trenino costa mediamente in opera di media lunghezza costerà sui 100 mila euro. Un contadino che se vuole fare un trentino, come fa trovare 100 mila euro?*

[50] According to the Agrarian Councilor of the Region, the technical assistance (business plans, documentations) is the function of agrarian associations (e.g., CIA, Confagricoltura) and private consultants.

[51] Similar evaluation for the previous programming period was given in M. Lefebvre et al. (2013), *Agricultural landscapes as multi-scale public good and the role of the Common Agricultural Policy*, the 2nd AIEAA Conference, Parma, 2013.