

To what extent is the EU's Common Agricultural Policy in line with the UN's Sustainable Development Goals?

Dissertation

Rominique van Kralingen, 15080633, ES3-3B

Supervisor: P. Pijlman

24-05-2018

The Hague University of Applied Sciences

Faculty of Management & Organization

European Studies

Executive Summary

This research aims to assess the level of alignment of the Common Agricultural Policy of the EU with the Sustainable Development Goals of the UN. It does so by examining how certain CAP measures affect the SDGs in the social and environmental dimension. The research also gives suggestions for future reforms to the policy to improve its alignment with the SDGs. The research was carried out by consulting academic sources such as journal articles and books, documents from institutions including the European Commission and the UN, and reports from several think tanks and NGOs. Moreover, information was gathered by conducting three interviews.

Upon analyzing the data, it becomes clear that the CAP is not well aligned with the SDGs. In the social dimension, the coupled and decoupled payments are causing a decrease in exports and income for developing countries (ODI, 2011, p. 2). However, these payments also facilitate a decrease in rural abandonment in the EU (Hogan, personal communication, March 23, 2018). Moreover, the policy does not strive for food security, but rather for food self-sufficiency (Gardner, 2009, p. 184). Furthermore, the CAP is contributing to food price volatility through export subsidies and import tariffs (ECDPM, 2011, p. 4).

In the environmental dimension, EU agriculture has an impact on climate change through high methane emissions (European Environment Agency, 2017, p. 24-26). Moreover, the greening measures that were introduced in the 2013 reform do not seem to help the policy to deliver on environmental ambitions. Furthermore, the practice of EU meat consumption and feed imports from developing countries to feed European livestock is connected to many problems such as deforestation and biodiversity loss (Friends of the Earth Europe, 2010, p. 12-13). However, the practice also creates jobs and income in the exporting countries (Hogan, personal communication, March 23, 2018).

In order to ensure that the CAP is more in line with the SDGs, it is recommended that clear targets and monitoring measures will be implemented to observe the progress towards the achievement of the SDGs. Moreover, an impact assessment should be made to measure the effects the policy has on all of the seventeen Sustainable Development Goals. Also, the system of direct payments should evolve towards new support mechanisms (CONCORD Europe, 2017A, p. 5). Furthermore, the practice that involves protein rich feed imports from developing countries for European livestock should be reformed and efforts should be made in order to combat deforestation and other issues connected to this practice.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	5
2. Literature review.....	7
2.1 The social dimension of the Sustainable Development Goals	7
2.2 The environmental dimension of the Sustainable Development Goals.....	8
2.3 Historical institutionalism	9
2.4 Sociological institutionalism	10
2.5 How the EU works	10
3. Methodology	12
3.1 Defining the research question.....	12
3.2 Desk research.....	12
3.3 Interviews.....	13
3.4 Further research methods	15
4. Defining the CAP	17
5. The evolution of the CAP and its structure nowadays	20
5.1 Mansholt Plan	20
5.2 Reforms in the 1980s.....	20
5.3 MacSharry Reform.....	21
5.4 Agenda 2000	22
5.5 Fischler Reform	23
5.6 Health Check	23
5.7 2013 Reform	24
6. Defining the Sustainable Development Goals.....	26
6.1 Stockholm Conference	26
6.2 Brundtland Report.....	26
6.3 The adoption of the SDGs	27
6.4 Outline of the SDGs.....	28
7. How the EU aims to achieve the SDGs	30
7.1 EU implementation of SDGs in general.....	30
7.2 EU implementation of some specific SDGs.....	31
8. The CAP and the social dimension of the SDGs	33
8.1 No poverty.....	33
8.2 Zero hunger	34
9. The CAP and the environmental dimension of the SDGs.....	36
9.1 Climate change	36
9.2 Life on land	37
10. Analysis	39
10.1 Historical and sociological institutionalism.....	39
10.2 Interviews.....	40
10.3 Other points of analysis	41
11. Conclusion.....	43

12. Recommendation	45
13. References	46
14. Appendices.....	53
14.1 Appendix I: Consent Form 1	53
14.2 Appendix II: Transcript Interview 1	54
14.3 Appendix III: Consent Form 2.....	57
14.4 Appendix IV: Transcript Interview 2.....	58
14.5 Appendix V: Consent Form 3.....	66
14.6 Appendix VI: Transcript Interview 3.....	67
14.7 Appendix VII: Student Ethics Form.....	71

1. Introduction

In 2015, the 15-year cycle of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) adopted by the United Nations came to an end (United Nations, 2015). A new set of goals that built on the MDGs was implemented and will stay in place until 2030. These Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are broad and ambitious in scope and they address the three dimensions of sustainable development: social, environmental, and economic. The goals are not binding, but it is expected that countries take action to achieve them (United Nations, n.d.C). The development and adoption of the SDGs has an impact on many different stakeholders including the European Union.

In order find out how the EU aims to assist in the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals, it is relevant to look at the different European policies and to assess the way in which these policies affect the SDGs. Agriculture is a crucial policy area, considering that it affects the amount of food available for consumption. Moreover, a large amount of the EU's budget is spent on agriculture. Therefore, it is relevant to analyze if this policy area is in line with the SDGs. The EU has created a common policy for the area of agriculture that is implemented in all of the Member States. It is called the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). According to the European Commission (2015, p. 9), the policy is well aligned with development objectives. This research aims to find out if this is truly the case and if the policy is in line with the SDGs. By looking at several sub-questions, the following research question will be answered:

To what extent is the EU's Common Agricultural Policy in line with the UN's Sustainable Development Goals?

The research will only measure the alignment of the agricultural policy with the SDGs in the social and environmental dimension. It will do so by looking at several specific Sustainable Development Goals that are concerned with social and environmental issues. These Goals focus on: no poverty, zero hunger, climate change, and life on land. Then, an assessment will be made on how certain measures of the Common Agricultural Policy affect these Goals both positively and negatively. Moreover, information on the creation and evolution of the CAP will ensure a better understanding of the policy and its structure nowadays. Furthermore, an outline of the SDGs and the way in which the EU implements them will provide the reader with essential data about the different Goals. The information is divided into six chapters and will give an answer to the following sub-questions:

- *What is the CAP?*
- *How did the CAP evolve and what does it look like nowadays?*
- *What are the Sustainable Development Goals?*
- *How does the EU try to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals?*
- *In what way is the social dimension of the SDGs incorporated into the CAP?*
- *In what way is the environmental dimension of the SDGs incorporated into the CAP?*

By answering these sub-questions through the six chapters, it will be possible to answer the research question. Moreover, several recommendations will be made on the basis of the gathered data. These recommendations are concerned with the future of the Common Agricultural Policy and its alignment with the SDGs.

2. Literature review

This research aims to identify the level of alignment of the Common Agricultural Policy of the EU with the Sustainable Development Goals of the UN. It does so by examining the social and environmental dimension of sustainability. This decision will be further explained in the methodology. Literature that discusses the alignment of the agricultural policy and the SDGs is quite limited. Instead, literature can be found on the effects the specific measures of the CAP have on developing countries, the market, food security and on environmental issues. Theories that can be linked to this study are historical and sociological institutionalism. This section outlines these theories to assess how appropriate they are for the research. It will also give some background information on how the European Union works and how the agricultural policy is implemented and adjusted through the EU. This will make the link between the research and historical and sociological institutionalism clearer. Furthermore, this section will discuss the best way to answer the research question.

2.1 The social dimension of the Sustainable Development Goals

Many people agree that the CAP has made significant progress since its creation in becoming less market distorting and more in line with development policy. For example, McCormick (2015, p. 362) mentions that the Community used to dump surplus products as food aid to poorer countries and in that way undercutting local farmers and distorting the international marketplace. Moreover, ECDPM (2011, p. v) finds that support for farmers has been largely decoupled and that market intervention mechanisms have been significantly reduced. However, today discussion remains about the effects that the CAP has on developing countries and the market. The European Commission (2015, p. 9) argues that the Common Agricultural Policy in its current form is closely aligned with development policy. It finds that the reforms the agricultural policy area has undergone, have led to a policy that is increasingly friendly for developing countries. It aims to ensure food security and seeks to actively benefit the global community. The European Commission (2015, p. 57) also argues that the support given to EU farmers is essentially non-market distorting and non-trade distorting. However, not everyone agrees with this positive view of the agricultural policy.

Oskam, Meester, and Silvis (2010, p. 118) argue that although the CAP has undergone many reforms that have diminished the negative effects the policy has on developing countries, the problems have not disappeared. This means that a significant part of

agricultural trade flows between the European Union and developing countries does not indicate differences in comparative advantages in production. More criticism is given by Brian Gardner. According to Gardner (2009, 179-184), the CAP is a failed attempt at self-sufficiency. He suggests that economic and political independence from other countries in securing an adequate food supply does not necessarily contribute to food security, because food security means securing food supply from multiple sources in the optimum way. Similarly, ECDPM (2011, p. vi) argues that the greater part of the CAP does not contribute to food security, because the direct payments that are offered to farmers do not play a role in satisfying demand. This is worrying, considering that the CAP is most clearly and directly connected to Sustainable Development Goal number two. This Goal aims to end hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture (UN General Assembly, 2015, p. 15). According to Anna Lartey (2014, p. 6-7), food systems around the world are becoming increasingly complex. Different trends have implications for the food that is being produced, the degree to which they are processed and the way in which people consume them. Concerns are rising over the impact and sustainability of consumption and production patterns.

2.2 The environmental dimension of the Sustainable Development Goals

When the CAP was first established, environmental concerns were not present yet. As these concerns were raised over the years, multiple reforms dealt with making the CAP more environmentally friendly. According to the European Commission (2017F, p. 4), farmers now have a double challenge, namely to produce food while also protecting nature and safeguarding biodiversity. However, opinions vary when looking at to what extent environmental measures have been implemented in the CAP and to what degree the policy aims to solve climate issues. These differences become clear when looking at the 2013 reform of the CAP.

According to the European Commission (2017A), the CAP's policies are compatible with environmental legislation and its measures promote the development of agricultural practices that preserve the environment and safeguard the countryside. Also, de Castro and di Mambo (Anania et al., 2015, p. 150-151) argue that the greening measures adopted during the 2013 reform can be seen as a reinforcement of environmental cross-compliance. They also find that this reform was necessary to strengthen the agricultural sector to the correct management of environmental resources at the EU level. In this way, the enhancement of environmental performance is not left to the Member States.

However, others find that the greening measures are not enough in order to tackle environmental problems. For example, Daugbjerg and Swinbank (2016, p. 275) argue that the greening measures were most likely put in place in order to harness more support for the agricultural policy instead of bringing about significant environmental improvements. Emil Erjavec, Marko Lovec and Karmen Erjavec (Anania et al., 2015, p. 238) agree with this view. They find that the environmental element of the reform was included in all discourses, but not proportionally implemented into measures, turning 'greening' into 'greenwash'. Moreover, Kaley Hart (Anania et al., 2015, p. 269) argues that the greening proposals and the environmental benefits were drastically weakened in the political negotiation.

2.3 Historical institutionalism

According to Fioretos, Falleti, and Sheingate (2016, p. 3), "historical institutionalism is a research tradition that examines how temporal processes and events influence the origin and transformation of institutions that govern political and economic relations." Both Bannerman and Haggart (2014, p. 5), and Steinmo, Thelen, and Longstreth (1992, p. 2) agree that these institutions include formal organizations, but also informal rules and procedures that structure conduct.

Moreover, Bannerman and Haggart (2014, p.5-6) list three key characteristics for historical institutionalism. First, the theory focuses on the historical development of institutions. It argues that developments are path-dependent, meaning that past decisions impact future institutional changes. Second, societal power relations are evident in institutions and in that way, procedures tend to favor certain actors and outcomes over others. Third, ideas can play a crucial role in shaping agents' preferences and outcomes. Similarly, Fioretos, Falleti, and Sheingate (2016, p.3-4) argue that the theory has some key characteristics that aim to improve our understanding of political phenomena. Empirically, historical institutionalism seeks to enhance people's understanding of the origins and evolution of institutions. Analytically, the theory underlines the role of temporal phenomena in the creation and reforms of institutions. Methodologically, the theory uses qualitative and comparative research methods in order to examine long-term processes impact distributions of power and policy outcomes.

2.4 Sociological institutionalism

Lisa Marriott (2010, p. 32) argues that sociological institutionalism has a focus on explaining certain types of behavior in a manner that is objective and quantified. Moreover, she argues that the theory adopts a broad definition of institutions and that these institutions can be seen as socially constructed. Similarly, Pelin Ayan Musil notes that sociological institutionalism defines institutions as socially constituted with culturally framed rules and norms (Musil, 2015, p. 80).

According to Marriott (2010, p. 32), sociological institutionalism finds that limits of knowledge restrict rational decision making. In this way, decisions are made through institutional rules, processes or operating procedures. Other authors point to cultural frames (Musil, 2015, p. 80) or institutionalized norms and cultural conventions (Hay, 2006, p. 61) to explain how political behavior is shaped and to explain what drives certain actors.

Another important element of sociological institutionalism has to do with the way in which change comes about. Pelin Ayan Musil (2015, p. 80) finds that the theory sees the process of learning as the main way to adapt and make changes. However, Hay (2006, p. 61) does not agree with this view. He finds that the theory can only account for path-dependent institutional change and that the theory is unlikely to offer insights on complex institutional changes.

2.5 How the EU works

The connection between the CAP and the theories of sociological and historical institutionalism can be illustrated by looking at how this policy is implemented and adjusted through the EU and how this process has changed over time. The European Union applies several policy modes: community method, regulatory mode, distribution mode, policy coordination, and intensive transgovernmentalism (Wallace, Pollack, & Young, 2015, p. 99-102). In the early days of the CAP, the policy fell under the community method. This mode is characterized by a high level of centralization, common resources, and a locking-in of stakeholders. The European Commission has a strong role in agenda-setting, implementation, and external representation. The European Council is rarely involved and the European Parliament's role is strictly consultative. The Council of the EU is involved in decision-making through qualified majority voting and the Court of Justice of the EU has an occasional but significant impact for example to reinforce the legal authority of the

Community regime. Member governments are in charge of the subordinated implementation of the common policy.

Nowadays, the CAP falls under the regulatory mode (Wallace, Pollack, & Young, 2015, p. 99-102). For this method, the degree of centralization varies, the resources do not include budgetary costs, and actors involve policy networks. The role of the European Council stays the same and the CJEU ensures that the rules are applied reasonably even. The Commission acts as the architect and defender of regulatory objectives and rules. The Council of the EU and the European Parliament are both co-legislator, meaning that the role of the EP has become more important for the CAP. Member governments are involved in the implementation as well as the enforcement of the policy.

By looking at how the EU works as an institution, it becomes clear that the theories of sociological and historical institutionalism are relevant to the research. The way in which the policy is implemented and reformed has changed over the years. Also, it shows that decision-making at EU level is guided by rules, processes, and procedures. In this way, each institution has its own role to play.

The existing literature on the topic of the CAP's alignment with the SDGs and EU climate change policy shows the different views of authors and institutions on the effects that the agricultural policy has on social and environmental issues. The report will discuss the specific measures of the CAP that affect these issues. Moreover, it will connect these issues to the Sustainable Development Goals in order to assess the alignment of the policy with these Goals. The theory most suited to base the research on is the theory of historical institutionalism, because the agricultural policy of the EU was one of the first policies created by the EU. Therefore, the policy was influenced over time by temporal processes and events that led to several reforms. The path-dependent changes are crucial in order to understand the structure of the CAP today. However, elements of sociological institutionalism are also relevant to the research. The institutions of the EU were socially constructed and are guided by rules, processes, and procedures. Therefore, both of the theories will be addressed.

3. Methodology

In order to answer the research question and the sub-questions, several methods were selected. This section will justify and outline those methods, the reasons why these methods were chosen, and the advantages and disadvantages of the chosen approach. It will also discuss certain methods that were not included in the research and the reasons behind this decision.

3.1 Defining the research question

This research discusses the level of alignment of the Common Agricultural Policy with the Sustainable Development Goals by comparing these Goals to the agricultural policy. Sustainability has three pillars, namely an economic, social and environmental pillar (United Nations, n.d.B). However, this research only looks at the social and environmental pillars. This approach was chosen due to the relatively narrow focus that was needed for the research. Adding the economic pillar to the study would have broadened the focus significantly. This means that the quality of the research would have suffered from choosing to add the economic pillar.

3.2 Desk research

Desk research was used in order to answer the research question. This is the type of research that can be carried out mainly from behind a desk, in the library or in archives (Verschuren & Doorewaard, 2010, p. 159). Desk research has several characteristics. First, existing material is used, together with reflection on these sources (Verschuren & Doorewaard, 2010, p. 194). Second, there is no direct contact with the research objective. Third, the perspective of the material is different from what it is used for in the research. Desk research was used for this report, because a large amount of material is already available on the different topics that are incorporated into the research. This includes information on the Common Agricultural Policy of the EU, the Sustainable Development Goals of the UN, and sustainability in general. Moreover, a secondary research strategy was used. This strategy is characterized by rearranging existing data, and analyzing and interpreting this data from a different perspective (Verschuren & Doorewaard, 2010, p. 196-197). Another strategy that can be used for desk research is literature survey. In this case, the researcher is completely dependent on existing specialist literature. This strategy was not used for the research, because specific literature on the alignment of the CAP with the

SDGs is very limited. Therefore, information from multiple sources needed to be read, compared, analyzed and rearranged in order to be able to answer the research question.

The use of desk research and secondary research has several advantages. For example, the use of existing data is normally much cheaper and faster than creating new data (Swanborn, 2009, p. 65). In this way, it was relatively easy to find sources for the research. Moreover, planning the research is easier, because possible obstacles are known beforehand. For this study, one of the obstacles noted in advance included the lack of sources that compare the CAP to the SDGs. Another advantage is that a large amount of knowledge and information is available. Therefore, this research has a wide variety of sources. However, desk research also has its disadvantages. For instance, the researcher is completely dependent on what others have done and written. For example, literature on the alignment of the CAP with the SDGs is limited and was difficult to find. This means that the research objective and questions rely on the availability of the material that is needed (Verschuren & Doorewaard, 2010, p. 198).

As stated before, literature on the Common Agricultural Policy in combination with the Sustainable Development Goals and the alignment of this policy with the SDGs is scarce. Therefore, existing material was used and then rearranged from a different perspective in order to link the CAP with the SDGs. For example, in depth information about the CAP was used from EU sources in order to find out how the policy was developed, how it evolved, and what it looks like nowadays. Moreover, UN documents were used to gain information on the Sustainable Development Goals. Furthermore, academic journals and books were used from different libraries in order to gain information on the level of sustainability of the CAP and possible aspects of the policy that cannot be seen as sustainable. Other sources include critical assessments of the CAP when it comes to sustainability from think tanks such as ECDPM (2011) and ODI (2011), and from NGOs such as CONCORD Europe (2017A) and Friends of the Earth Europe (2010).

3.3 Interviews

Interviews were conducted in order to answer the research question. Interviews are an example of primary data (Swanborn, 2009, p. 64-65). This data is obtained by the researcher, because it is a result of the researcher's actions. It can also be called elicited data or new data. Advantages of this research approach include the ability of the researcher to create a situation that only contains the relevant variables, or the ability to ask the best possible questions (Swanborn, 2009, p. 65). In this way, it was possible to ask about the

relation between the agricultural policy and the SDGs. Also, people can provide a wide diversity of information that can be gathered in a relatively quick way (Verschuren & Doorewaard, p. 209). For this research, the different interviews took no more than one hour. A disadvantage of this method is that the measured behavior may be biased to a degree by the researcher's influence. For example, a commissioner of the EU for agriculture is likely to be rather optimistic about the alignment of the CAP with the SDGs.

This approach was chosen for the research, because literature on the CAP's alignment with the SDGs is hard to find. Therefore, more in depth information from experts and key persons was needed to answer the research question. Three interviews were conducted in total. The questions for the interviews differ, because the expertise of the interviewees varies. In that way, the questions were adjusted to their knowledge. The first interview was done with a policy advisor of a member of the European Parliament. The interview was conducted via a telephone call, because the distance in place between the researcher and the interviewee was large. The second interview was with Klaas Johan Osinga, a member of LTO team international. It was done in person, at the Malietoren in The Hague. The last interview was with Commissioner for agriculture and rural development Phil Hogan and was conducted via e-mail, because of the large distance in place and the limited time available from the interviewee.

Regarding research ethics, all of the interviewees were asked to sign an informed consent form. With this form, they agreed to be recorded for the interview. Moreover, they were asked if they wanted to stay anonymous or if their name could be used in the research. In this way, their confidentiality was guaranteed. Furthermore, it was made clear that participants could withdraw from the research at any time.

Other forms of primary data that were not used for this research include surveys, field or laboratory experiments, and group interviews such as focus groups (Swanborn, 2009, p. 65). A survey was not chosen as part of the approach, due to the level of complexity of the research. This means that it would be difficult to find a large enough group of people able to answer questions on the agricultural practice of the EU and its alignment with the SDGs. Moreover, it would be hard to create a survey with the same questions for every respondent. Just as with the interviews, the expertise of the respondents would vary, making it difficult to create one set of questions for all of them. Field and laboratory experiments were also not part of the chosen approach, because this would be time consuming and the information necessary to answer the research question could be found by using methods that can be carried out more quickly. In this way, the research could be finalized more efficiently by

using other methods. Group interviews such as focus groups were not part of the chosen research methods either. This is because the information needed could be obtained by interviewing one person at a time. Moreover, due to the varying expertise of people, it would be difficult to create one set of questions for all of them.

3.4 Further research methods

After doing desk research by reading the available material online and in books, and the interviews were conducted, this information needed to be rearranged and analyzed. The information was divided into the different sections of the sub-questions and sources were compared to each other. Different research methods were used for the varying sub-questions. These methods are outlined below for each of these sub-questions.

What is the CAP?

This question was answered by doing desk research only. The information came from several books and online sources. This part looks at the reasons behind the creation of the policy and the structure of the CAP in its early days. This information is needed to understand the significance of the policy.

How did the CAP evolve and what does it look like nowadays?

Desk research was used to answer this question. The information was obtained by reading available material online and in books. Moreover, documents from the European Commission were consulted. This section outlines the different reforms that were made to the CAP in order to get a clear view on how the policy developed and why it developed in this way. By doing so, the current structure of the policy becomes clear.

What are the Sustainable Development Goals?

Desk research was used in order to answer this question by reading available material online. Information from various United Nations documents were consulted. This section outlines why the SDGs were created and lists the different goals. This information is needed to gain insight on what the SDGs are and which of these goals can be linked to the Common Agricultural Policy.

How does the EU try to achieve these goals?

For this question, both desk research and the interviews were used. Many of the sources were documents from the European Commission. In this section, some general information on how the EU aims to achieve the SDGs is given. Moreover, the implementation of SDG number one and two is discussed more extensively. This gives a better understanding of the methods that the European Union uses in order to achieve the SDGs.

In what way is the social dimension of the SDGs incorporated into the CAP?

In order to answer this sub-question, information from both desk research and the interviews was gathered. The two SDGs most clearly connected to social issues and the CAP were discussed. Documents from various think tanks and NGOs such as CONCORD Europe (2017A) and ECDPM (2011) were used.

In what way is the environmental dimension of the SDGs incorporated into the CAP?

This section is structured in the same way as the previous section. Desk research and the interviews were used to gather information. Data from different think tanks and NGOs such as Friends of the Earth Europe (2010) and CONCORD Europe was consulted.

4. Defining the CAP

In order to fully understand the Common Agricultural Policy of the European Union and the way in which it is organized today, it is important to start by looking at why it was created in the first place and against what background this development took place. This section will give an outline of that background and will also discuss the way in which the CAP was structured in its early days. It will provide the reader with the goals and principles of that particular policy and the importance of establishing common rules in the area of agriculture in that period.

1957	1958	1960	1961	1962	1968
Goals of the CAP defined	Agreement three principles of the CAP	Legal proposals European Commission	Common policies on certain products	Green light from the Council of the EU	CAP came into effect

The CAP is one of the oldest and most controversial of EU policies (McCormick, 2015, p. 357-360). It was already mentioned as one of only a few policies in the Treaty of Rome in 1957 by the six founding countries of the EEC. There are multiple factors that contributed to the creation of the CAP and the prominent position of this policy area for the EEC, one of which has to do with the Second World War (Buonanno & Nugent, 2013, p. 171). During this period of time and also in the years after the Second World War, Europeans were suffering from food shortages. These memories were still fresh in the minds of citizens when the Treaty of Rome was drafted, causing Member States to support a policy that would aim to increase agricultural output and to become self-sufficient. Another reason for the establishment of the CAP is that agriculture had a crucial role to play in the economy of the Member States when looking at overall production, employment and trade (Zobbe, 2001, p. 3). For example, approximately 44% of the workforce in Italy and 31% of the workforce in France was employed in the agricultural sector in 1950 (McCormick, 2015, p. 358). Third, a national system was already in place to support farmers financially. Thus, a common policy would be needed in order for the agricultural market to operate fairly within the EEC (Buonanno & Nugent, 2013, p. 171).

An event that also had a crucial role to play in the creation of the CAP and in the importance that was given to this policy area was a deal between France and Germany. France wanted to put a protectionist CAP in place, because agriculture was a huge employer and producer of economic wealth there (McCormick, 2015, p.159-160). Germany, however, resisted this protectionism and was more interested in the customs union. In this deal, then, Germany

was given unlimited access to the French market in exchange for guaranteed financial protection for French farmers (Buonanno & Nugent, 2013, p. 171). In this way, the compromise between the two Member States enabled the CAP to have a prominent position within the EEC. Moreover, all these different factors combined form the background against which the CAP was established.

The goals of the CAP were already defined in 1957 in the Treaty of Rome and can be listed as followed:

- To increase agricultural productivity
- To increase farm income
- To stabilize agricultural markets
- To guarantee agricultural products provisions
- To ensure reasonable prices for consumers (Burny, 2010, p. 175-176)

Moreover, the EEC countries agreed to three principles in 1958 that would be crucial in managing the CAP:

- A single market in agricultural produce
- Community preference (the community's produce has priority over imported products)
- Joint financing of the CAP by all Member States (McCormick, 2015, p. 358)

A few years later, in 1960, the European Commission presented legal proposals on the way in which an agricultural policy at community level would be established (European Commission, 2017H). However, the evolution of the CAP was a difficult process (Wood & Yesilada, 2007, p. 151). The Council of Ministers held meetings every year to discuss package deals on EEC regulations for different products. In 1961, these meetings reached common policies on grains, eggs, poultry and pig products, fruit and vegetables, and wine. The Council of the European Union gave the green light to set up the common market for these products in 1962 and with this development, the CAP was created (European Commission, 2017H). Rules on competition were set up and the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF) was created. Meetings continued in the following years, setting up regulations on products such as milk and dairy products, and rice (Wood & Yesilada, 2007, p. 151). Finally, the CAP came into effect in 1968 after eleven years of working on the realization of such a policy.

The system that was put in place was built upon a dual system of internal price support for agricultural products within the community on one side, and protection from external

competition through the implementation of high tariff rates on the other side (Buonanno & Nugent, 2013, p. 171). Regarding internal price support, policies that were introduced included export subsidies, supplementary and fixed-rate aid, and structural aid to farmers (Wood & Yesilada, 2007, p. 152). Export subsidies accounted for a large share of the CAP budget. These subsidies made it possible for European farmers to compete in international markets. Second, supplementary and fixed-rate aid provided farmers of certain commodities such as olive oil and tobacco with direct payments in proportion to their output. Finally, structural aid to farmers was concerned with farm modernization and improved productivity. For example, the subsidies helped farmers to buy equipment, to do renovations and to obtain better seeds and fertilizer (European Commission, 2012, p. 6).

Protection from external competition was implemented by using a system called the variable levy (Wood & Nugent, 2013, p. 151). The Council of Ministers would decide on the desired internal price of each agricultural product. These are called target prices and they are more theoretical (Burny, 2010, p. 177). They were perceived as the ideal prices for the market to function in a way that seemed fair for farmers. After calculating the target prices, the EEC would impose a variable levy on farm products that were produced outside of the community (Wood & Nugent, 2013, p. 152). This levy would be equal to the difference between the lowest market price worldwide and the target price determined by the Council of Ministers. If these world market prices changed, the variable levy would also adjust. This levy was necessary to achieve the goals and principles of the CAP, because imports could increase dramatically if products from outside of the Union would be cheaper than the goods from within the Union. Therefore, the EEC market needed to be protected (Burny, 2010, p. 177). Minimum import or threshold prices were put in place, adding a variable levy on the import price. However, as a last resort, a guaranteed price would be paid to farmers within the community to take produce off the market in case it did not meet the target price (McCormick, 2015, p. 361).

This was the main structure of the CAP in its early days. The policy was a huge success, increasing the production of agricultural goods and in that way making the community self-sufficient (Burny, 2010, p. 177). However, the way in which the policy was organized soon caused major disadvantages and problems worldwide that needed to be addressed. These problems and the reforms that were necessary will be discussed in the next chapter.

5. The evolution of the CAP and its structure nowadays

As mentioned before, the initial structure of the CAP could not be sustained over time. The agricultural policy has undergone many reforms since it was first established and there will be more changes to follow in the future. This section will give an outline of the reforms that the CAP has undergone in a chronological order. It will show how the structure of the policy has changed over time. Furthermore, it will clarify the way in which the policy is organized today. Information about the different reforms will help to understand why the CAP is arranged in the way that it currently is. Moreover, knowledge about the features of the policy are needed in order to examine if they are in line with the Sustainable Development Goals.

5.1 Mansholt Plan

Already in 1968, when the CAP had just come into force, there were calls for restructuring of the policy (Wood & Yesilada, 2007, p. 152). Sicco Mansholt, the first European Commissioner for agriculture and crucial architect of the CAP, found that changes were necessary (European Commission, n.d.). His Mansholt Plan was faced with a fair amount of opposition from farmers as well as their political representatives. In principle, the plan called for the modernization of farms. The final decision on this matter came in 1972 when the European Commission revised the Mansholt Plan. This revision included a modest financing of loans to farmers, early-retirement incentives, and assistance for farmers regarding information and training to increase efficiency (Wood & Yesilada, 2007, p. 152). These were all minor changes compared to the initial Mansholt Plan.

5.2 Reforms in the 1980s

Additional changes were implemented in the 1980s (Daugbjerg & Swinbank, 2016, p. 265). In this period, the CAP had reached its zenith. Farms were producing more than the internal market needed, causing surpluses to be stored and turning into 'food mountains' (European Commission, 2012, p. 3). These surpluses would then be exported with the help of subsidies, or they would be stored or disposed within the community (European Commission, 2017H). These practices had distorting effects on world markets. Therefore, supply management was needed to counter those effects. Moreover, the amount of money that was needed to sustain this agricultural system absorbed much of the EC budget. During the 1980s, the costs for the CAP accounted for approximately 64 percent of this budget (Wood & Yesilada, 2007, p. 152). In this way, the structure of the agricultural policy resulted

into disputes with trading partners and also caused conflicts between the Member States (Daugbjerg & Swinbank, 2016, p. 265).

For these reasons, reforms were introduced in 1984 (Delayen, 2007, p. 2). A milk quota was presented to control dairy production and expenditures. This included a quota for each country within the community, quotas for the producers and purchasers, and also a milk tax in case producers exceeded their quota. The milk quota was successful in limiting the production. However, the determined limit was still higher than the level of consumption of goods within the community. Therefore, around 10 percent of the dairy products were exported with the help of export subsidies. Moreover, dairy farmers were having a hard time staying in business, because the prices for milk were extremely low. This shows that the problems that the CAP was facing in those days were not solved by the introduction of milk quotas and that further reforms would be needed in order to address these issues.

Some minor changes were implemented again in 1988. These alterations included a maximum ceiling for the budget of the agricultural policy and a limit on the quantities that were guaranteed to receive support payments (European Commission, 2017H). However, the first major reform came in 1992.

5.3 MacSharry Reform

The reforms from the 1980s failed to solve the problems that the CAP was facing (Stewart, 2000, p. 32-34). For example, budgetary costs continued to rise for this policy. Second, the agricultural sector failed to keep up with the income growth that was visible in other sectors. Instead, farm incomes remained static. Moreover, farmers were still producing more products than needed in the community, causing a surplus. Also, environmental concerns were raised over the years, suggesting that some aspects were fundamentally wrong with this policy. Another reason for reform was pressure from trading partners. They were concerned with the community's level of protectionism in the agricultural area and the way in which the highly subsidized export products would affect their markets. This was also a crucial point during the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), which began in 1986. Negotiations took seven years due to problems centering around the agricultural policy.

In this context, the first deep reform was initiated in 1992, called the MacSharry reform (Burny, 2010, p. 177). The changes that were implemented include the decrease of intervention prices and the start of direct payments to farmers. This reduction of price

support would help to increase the competitiveness of EU farm products on markets worldwide (European Commission, 2017B, p. 2). However, in order to keep supporting farmers, direct payments were introduced. The payments were linked to the level of production.

5.4 Agenda 2000

In the years after the MacSharry reform, it became clear that the outlook for European agricultural products was not very promising (European Commission, 1997, p. 28). The prospects were that the EU would have non-exportable surpluses and the possibility of losing a part of its share in expanding world markets after 2000. Moreover, upcoming WTO agreements put pressure on further reforms (Serger, 2001, p. 33). Also, the prospect of EU enlargement created challenges. Last, the legitimacy of the policy was questioned by criticism on the CAP from environmentalists and animal rights activists. In this context, further reforms were needed in order to enhance the competitiveness of the EU's agriculture domestically and externally (European Commission, 1997, p. 29).

The European Commission presented Agenda 2000 in 1997 (Serger, 2001, p. 31). One year later, the EC released the detailed proposals for the CAP reform. The key elements of the proposals include reductions in intervention prices with partial compensation through direct payments and the introduction of a new rural development policy as the second pillar of the CAP. Moreover, it included the introduction of horizontal agreements. These agreements would link direct payments to environmental considerations and put limits on direct payments to individual farms.

During the negotiations for Agenda 2000, there was a strong resistance from Member States regarding the horizontal agreements (Serger, 2001, p. 103). Therefore, the proposal to put limits on direct payments to individual farms was dropped. Also, the proposal to link the direct payments to environmental considerations was now optional for Member States. The final result of Agenda 2000, according to the European commission, was that it created economic, social, and environmental goals within the objectives of the policy (European Commission, 2017H).

5.5 Fischler Reform

Already in 1999, when Agenda 2000 was adopted, it was agreed that there would be a mid-term review of the effectiveness of the reforms (Centre for European Policy Studies, 2008, p. 86). At this point, it could not have been foreseen that the Fischler Reform would arguably become the most important step in the reform process of the CAP until now (Anania et al., 2015, p. 34). There were multiple key drivers that enabled the adoption of this important reform (Centre for European Policy Studies, 2008, p. 88). For example, there was pressure from budget constraints and from eastern enlargement. Also, pressure was rising from the WTO and the Doha Development Agreement. Moreover, criticism from consumers, environmentalists, and animalists was creating pressure to reform the CAP. Their concerns grew because of the food scares, such as diseases and the BSE crisis. This led to the demand for higher food safety and quality standards.

The main element of the 2003 Fischler Reform was the introduction of the Single Payment Scheme (Anania et al., 2015, p. 34). This meant the breaking of the link between direct payments to individual farms and the product type and amount that the farms produced (European Commission, 2017B, p. 2). These payments are called decoupled payments. This decoupling allowed farmers to produce according to market demand. The payments were also subject to cross compliance (Daugbjerg & Swinbank, 2016, p. 273). In this way, farmers had to follow certain environmental, animal health and welfare, and food safety regulations.

5.6 Health Check

With the adoption of the Fischler reform, it was already decided to review certain aspects of the CAP in 2007 or 2008 (Daugbjerg & Swinbank, 2011, p. 127-139). In the run up to the Health Check, the Commission stressed that this review would be technical in character. This was to assure farmers that the review would not turn into a major reform like the Fischler reform. A factor that contributed to the Health Check reform was likely the Commission's wish to have a stronger negotiating stance in the closing phases of the Doha Round. Moreover, the goal of the Health Check was to make European agriculture more competitive and more compatible with any likely Doha agreement, and to no longer limit the productive potential of EU agriculture.

The reform was agreed on in 2008 (Meyn, 2008, p. 1). The reform included the removal of many of the remaining coupled payments and the abolishment of set-aside requirements.

Moreover, milk quotas were increased and modulation was increased by reducing direct payments to farmers and transferring the money to the Rural Development Fund (European Commission, 2017E).

5.7 2013 Reform

For CAP traditionalists, the 2009 EU dairy crisis showed that it was necessary for the policy to remain strong (Daugbjerg & Swinbank, 2016, p. 274). Also, many papers and programs indicated that European society took agriculture seriously (Anania et al., 2015, p. 89-90). Moreover, many farmer organizations and Member States took a conservative stance on the CAP. On the other hand, there was also criticism on the policy from stakeholders such as think tanks, academics and green groups. In this context, the next reform took place.

In 2011, the Commission presented the proposals for the CAP reform together with an impact assessment of alternative scenarios for the evolution of the policy (European Commission, 2017D). According to the European Commission (2011, p. 3), the policy needed to be capable of addressing the main challenges of EU agriculture in the current decade. These challenges include economic, environmental and climate change pressures, and territorial aspects of the CAP.

The main changes that the 2013 reform brought about, have to do with a new system of direct payments that replaced the Single Payment Scheme (Anania et al., 2015, p. 52). This new system is called the Basic Payment Scheme and it is downscaled and more evenly distributed. Moreover, 30 percent of the budget for these direct payment is now linked to a greening component (Daugbjerg & Swinbank, 2016, p. 275). However, the implementation for the greening component can vary per Member state. In this way, states that are unwilling to implement this component have many options (Anania et al., 2015, p. 107). This suggests that harnessing support from stakeholders and environmental groups was the most likely purpose of the greening component, rather than bringing about environmental improvements (Daugbjerg & Swinbank, 2016, p. 275).

By looking at the CAP reforms in a chronological order, the evolution of the policy becomes clear. The agricultural policy has undergone many reforms since its creation, starting with the Mansholt Plan in 1972. However, the most important step in the reform process until now is the 2003 Fischler reform. Some of the major changes that were introduced over the years include the shift from price support to direct payments, the movement from coupled payments to decoupled payments for farmers, and the introduction of a greening

component to 30 percent of the direct payments. The 2013 reform is the most recent reform to the CAP until now. Therefore, it shows the current structure of the policy and the way in which European agriculture is organized today. This information is needed to assess the CAP's alignment with the SDGs. However, in order to do so, the Sustainable Development Goals have to be defined first. This will be discussed in the next chapter.

6. Defining the Sustainable Development Goals

This section will give a brief overview of the Sustainable Development Goals created by the UN. First, the Stockholm Conference will be addressed. Second, the Brundtland Report and the definition of sustainable development will be discussed. Third, there will be an outline of some of the major developments that led to the creation and the adoption of the SDGs. Last, the various Goals will be discussed. By doing so, the path that led the UN to adopt the SDGs will become apparent. Moreover, the links between the SDGs and the CAP will become clearer. This, in turn, will help to answer the main question.

6.1 Stockholm Conference

The United Nations Conference on the Human Environment took place in Stockholm in 1972 (United Nations, n.d.D). It was the first major conference of the UN on international environmental issues. The aim of the conference was to agree on a common outlook and principles to inspire and guide people with regards to the preservation and enhancement of the human environment (United Nations, 1973, p. 3).

6.2 Brundtland Report

In 1983, former Prime Minister of Norway Gro Harlem Brundtland was asked by the UN to become the President of an independent commission to research the major challenges that were facing society globally (Tosti, 2012, p. 101). The commission was given the task to present a document recommending strategies that would secure and enhance the environment of countries with various levels of social and economic development. The report was finished in 1987 and became known as the Brundtland Report. The study made the world aware of the urgency of making economic progress without depleting natural resources and without harming the environment (United Nations, 2007, p. 1). Moreover, it created a definition of sustainable development that remains the official definition of the concept today (Tosti, 2012, p. 101). The Brundtland Report defines sustainable development as development that “meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (The World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987, p. 6-7). The report also notes that sustainable development is a challenging process of change and that it must rest on political will. In continuation of the Brundtland Report, the UN held the first Earth Summit in Rio in 1992 (Tosti, 2012, p. 101). At this Summit, 178 countries signed Agenda 21. The Agenda laid

down a framework for a different perspective on economic growth that would enhance social equity and ensure environmental protection.

6.3 The adoption of the SDGs

Ever since environmental research could understand and quantify the accelerated risks that come with global warming, the UN has played a key role in making sustainable development a top priority (Strong, 2009, p. 26). For example, the Kyoto Protocol was agreed in 1997, which aimed at reducing emissions by setting targets for more developed countries. Also, the UN created several goals aimed at sustainable development. Prior to the creation of the Sustainable Development Goals, the Millennium Development Goals were in place. The MDGs were adopted during the 2000 Millennium Summit of the UN (United Nations, n.d.A). At this Summit, world leaders committed to a new global partnership to reduce extreme poverty. Eight time-bound targets were set with a deadline of 2015. These targets became known as the Millennium Development Goals.

Countries renewed their commitments to sustainable development in 2012 at the Rio+20 Conference (Orellana, 2016, p. 50). Three years later, in 2015, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development along with the Sustainable Development Goals. The seventeen different Goals will stay in place for fifteen years (United Nations, n.d.C). The SDGs build on the Millennium Development Goals and aim to complete what they did not achieve (UN General Assembly, preamble para. 3). Also, they encompass the environmental, social, and economic dimensions of sustainable development.

6.4 Outline of the SDGs



Figure 1. The Sustainable Development Goals: 17 Goals to Transform our World. Reprinted from United Nations website, by United Nations, 2015, retrieved from <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/blog/2015/12/sustainable-development-goals-kick-off-with-start-of-new-year/>

The Sustainable Development Goals are global in nature and are universally applicable (UN General Assembly, para. 55). Governments can set their own targets based on national circumstances, but taking into account the global level of ambition. Countries are expected to create frameworks and to take ownership of the different Goals. However, they are not legally binding (United Nations, n.d.C).

As stated earlier, there are seventeen Sustainable Development Goals. All of these Goals have their own targets, amounting to 169 targets in total (UN General Assembly, preamble para. 4). Figure 1 shows an outline of the different SDGs (United Nations, 2015). For example, Goal one is to end poverty in all its forms everywhere (UN General Assembly, p. 15). Several targets are linked to this specific Goal. One of these targets is to eradicate extreme poverty everywhere by 2030, measured as people having less than \$1.25 a day. Sustainable Development Goal two is to end hunger, achieve food security and improved

nutrition and to promote sustainable agriculture. One of the targets established together with this Goal is to correct and prevent trade restrictions and distortions in world agricultural markets in line with the mandate of the Doha Development Round. This includes the parallel elimination of all forms of agricultural export subsidies and all export measures with equivalent effect.

In short, this chapter presented some of the most important summits and events of the UN that are connected to sustainable development and the SDGs. Environmental issues were first discussed at the Stockholm Conference in 1972. Then, the Brundtland Report laid down the definition for sustainable development. Countries committed to sustainable development through the MDGs that were adopted at the 2000 Millennium Summit. Then, in 2015, the SDGs replaced the Millennium Development Goals and will stay in place until 2030. Moreover, this section gave an outline of the seventeen different SDGs. With this information, it becomes easier to determine the link between the CAP and some of the SDGs. This insight is needed to answer the main question and also some of the sub-questions. However, more information is needed to determine how the EU aims to achieve the SDGs. This will be further discussed in the next chapter.

7. How the EU aims to achieve the SDGs

This chapter outlines the way in which the EU aims to achieve the SDGs. First, general information will be given about the way in which the EU aims to implement the SDGs. For example, the European Consensus on Development will be discussed and attention will be paid to Policy Coherence for Development. Second, it will be outlined how the European Union aims to achieve some specific Sustainable Development Goals. This information will ensure a better understanding of how the EU can contribute to the achievement of the SDGs. It will also clarify the way in which certain EU policies are connected to these Goals. Therefore, it will be easier to answer the research question and the last two sub-questions.

7.1 EU implementation of SDGs in general

According to CONCORD Europe (2017B), coordinated worldwide efforts are crucial in order to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the SDGs that accompany the Agenda. These efforts include the European Union and its Member States. The EU has been active in the adoption process and in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda within the community and in cooperation with partner countries (European Commission, 2017C). Moreover, sustainable development is one of the top priorities for the European Union (Latoszek & Klos, 2016, p. 67). The implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals in the EU is carried out in line with the principle of subsidiarity (European Commission, 2016A, p. 2). This means that outside of the area of exclusive competence, the EU can only act if the goals of the proposed action cannot be achieved by the Member States alone in a sufficient manner and can be better achieved at EU level. In this way, the Union's role is mainly to support, coordinate and complement national policies or to take a shared responsibility. Therefore, action taken by Member States is also pivotal in the achievement of the SDGs. In fact, it can be difficult to commit Member States to the SDGs via the European Union. A policy advisor of a member of the European Parliament (personal communication, January 18, 2018), notes that countries are careful when it comes to committing to the SDGs in legislative reports. This is because the countries have already committed to the different Goals in another setting and are generally not eager to do so again at EU level. However, the reports usually make a reference to the Sustainable Development Goals in a way that is non-binding. Similarly, K. J. Osinga (personal communication, January 25, 2018), an employee of team international of LTO Nederland (Dutch Federation of Agriculture and Horticulture), finds that it is difficult to bind Member States to the SDGs via the European Union.

One way in which the Union aims to integrate the SDGs is with the creation of the European Consensus on Development (European Commission, 2018). It is a blueprint which aligns the development policy of the EU with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. An important aspect of this document is the principle of policy coherence for development (PCD), which aims to align the objectives of development cooperation with all internal and external policies likely to affect developing countries (European Union, 2017, p. 6). One of the policy areas incorporated to PCD is agriculture (European Commission, 2015, p. 9). The Common Agricultural Policy in particular is considered by the EU to be well aligned with development objectives.

There are several difficulties with the implementation of the SDGs into EU policy. For example, the gap between commitments to the SDGs and the manner to putting them into action is widening (Jones, 2018). According to CONCORD Europe (2017B), necessary governance structures are lacking as well as strategies with clear implementation plans and monitoring mechanisms. Similarly, the European Commission (2016A, p. 2) notes that governance instruments such as better regulation tools are needed in order to further mainstream sustainable development into the EU's policy-making.

7.2 EU implementation of some specific SDGs

Sustainable Development Goal number one is to end poverty in all its forms everywhere (UN General Assembly, p. 15). The European Commission has several priorities that contribute to the achievement of this Goal. These priorities include jobs, migration, growth and investment, and a stronger global actor (European Commission, 2016A, p. 7-8). Moreover, one of the priorities of the EU's external action is to support the sustainable development of emerging countries, with the primary goal of eradicating poverty. The EU also has other ways to achieve the SDGs. For instance, the CAP and the Common Fisheries Policy ensure a certain standard of living for farmers and fisher communities. Other policies that contribute to the fulfillment of this SDG include the EU Cohesion Policy, the European Neighborhood Policy, climate policy, and trade and investment policy. Furthermore, the European Union provides humanitarian assistance and aims to reduce poverty and social exclusion through the Europe 2020 Strategy. However, the main role of the EU for the achievement of the first SDG is to support Member States in the fight against poverty (European Commission, 2016B, p. 4).

The second Sustainable Development Goal is to end hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture (UN General Assembly, p. 15). A

policy connected to this Goal is the Common Agricultural Policy. This policy aims for viable food production, the sustainable management of natural resources and climate action, and territorial development in a balanced manner (European Commission, 2016B, p. 4). The Common Fisheries Policy is also related to this Goal, because it aims to contribute to sustainable food supply. Other connected policies are the EU environmental and climate policy, innovation policy, and EU food policy (European Commission, 2016A, p. 10-11). Moreover, there are several funding instruments in place such as the European Agricultural Guarantee Fund.

The EU has several strategies in place to implement the Sustainable Development Goals. These strategies include the alignment of various policies with the SDGs and structural funds. However, it seems that further instruments are needed to achieve the different Goals. In particular, better implementation plans and regulation tools are needed. When looking at the implementation of the first two SDGs, it becomes clear that many European policies are connected to the Goals. However, in order to answer the research question, more in depth information is needed about the CAP. Therefore, the next two chapters will assess in what way the agricultural policy of the EU is aligned with the SDGs in the social and environmental dimension.

8. The CAP and the social dimension of the SDGs

This chapter will analyze how certain Sustainable Development Goals are linked to the CAP in the social dimension. In order to do so, the two SDGs most relevant to agriculture and social issues were selected. The first SDG which aims to end poverty in all its forms everywhere will be discussed, as the CAP has an impact on the livelihoods of farmers in developing countries (UN General Assembly, p. 15). The second SDG will also be outlined as it is most clearly connected to the agricultural policy. This goal strives to end hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture. By looking at these two goals and the way in which the Common Agricultural Policy contributes to the achievement of them or the way in which the policy hinders this achievement, the level of alignment of the policy with the SDGs becomes clearer. In this way, it will be easier to answer the main question.

8.1 No poverty

Sustainable Development Goal number one is to end poverty in all its forms everywhere (UN General Assembly, p. 15). A target that is connected to this goal is to eradicate extreme poverty for all people everywhere by 2030, measured as people living on less than \$1.25 a day. The CAP is linked to this SDG, mainly because the policy has implications for developing countries. Due to the complexity of the agricultural policy it is difficult to assess how its measures affect developing countries (ECDPM, 2011, p. v). However, the direct coupled and decoupled payments incorporated into the policy receive much criticism. These payments amount to 72 percent of the total EU CAP budget for the period between 2014 and 2020 (European Commission, 2017B, p. 2-9). Coupled payments are linked to the production of certain products. They may only be granted to certain sectors in order to create an incentive to maintain the level of production (Anania et al., 2015, p. 61-62). EU farmers receive these payments as an addition to the price of their products, thus encouraging production in the European Union (ODI, 2011, p. 2). Therefore, they lead to decreased exports and income in developing countries. On the other hand, Osinga (personal communication, January 25, 2018) notes that although the coupled support is considered to be market distorting, it is used for vulnerable regions in the EU and it is important for tourism, the economy and the quality of life in rural areas. Phil Hogan (personal communication, March 23, 2018), Commissioner for Agriculture and Rural Development, also finds that the payments help to avoid land abandonment and rural depopulation.

Decoupled payments are not linked to a type of product or the level of production (European Commission, 2017B, p. 2). They are described as a non-distorting measure (ODI, 2011, p. 2). However, they increase EU supply by helping to retain more land in use for farming and in that way decrease the supply from developing countries. Moreover, ECDPM (2011, p. 4) finds that the sheer scale of the payments tends to distort trade. Furthermore, CONCORD Europe (2017A, p. 1) states that the support given to EU farmers makes them more competitive on the global markets. However, Phil Hogan (personal communication, March 23, 2018) argues that this measure does not discriminate against developing countries and that the payments do not distort market prices as they are not related to price.

8.2 Zero hunger

The second Sustainable Development Goal aims to end hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture (UN General Assembly, p. 15). Some of the targets connected to the goal are concerned with ending hunger and ensuring access to food, ending malnutrition, and doubling agricultural productivity and incomes of small-scale food producers. The CAP can be clearly connected to this SDG, as the policy aims to increase agricultural productivity and to increase farm income (Burny, 2010, p. 175-176).

Another crucial point for the policy is food security. According to the European Commission (2017G, p. 3), European agriculture is one of the leading producers of food globally and ensures food security for more than 500 million European citizens. However, Gardner (2009, p. 184) finds that the CAP does not strive for food security, but rather for food self-sufficiency. In this way, he argues that the policy does not aim to meet the food needs of the population in the economically, socially, and environmentally optimum way. Instead, he finds that it introduced economic and political independence from other countries in order to secure an adequate food supply. Moreover, ECDPM (2011, p. vi) states that the largest part of the CAP does not contribute to world food security, because the decoupled direct payments focus on maintaining capacity and therefore do not play a role in satisfying demand.

Last, target 2.c aims to adopt measures in order to guarantee the proper functioning of food commodity markets and to help limit extreme food price volatility (UN General Assembly, p. 15). However, price volatility has increased over the last few years (EPP, 2017, p. 3). This fluctuation in price was caused by world price developments, market uncertainty, external policies, sanitary crises and more extreme weather event in the EU. The high price

volatility also has negative effects on the viability of farms in the European Union. ECDPM (2011, p. 4) also notes that the CAP contributes to market price volatility through variable border protection, meaning that export subsidies and import tariffs are implemented and eliminated as prices fluctuate. This strategy has a negative effect on all developing countries.

As demonstrated, the CAP affects the achievement of the SDGs in various ways. Regarding the first goal to end poverty, the agricultural policy has implications for developing countries. For example, the coupled and decoupled direct payments of the policy are possibly distorting markets and increasing EU supply of agricultural products. However, it is also suggested that the support received by European farmers has a positive effect on rural areas as it helps to avoid land abandonment and rural depopulation. The second SDG aims to achieve zero hunger and can be clearly connected to the CAP. Food security is a top priority for this policy. However, critics note that a significant part of the policy does not contribute to food security, since decoupled payments do not play a role in satisfying demand. Also, it is suggested that food security is in this case confused with food self-sufficiency. Another aspect that is linked to the goal of zero hunger is price volatility. The CAP appears to contribute to food price volatility and in that way it is negatively affecting the viability of EU farms. The next chapter will continue reviewing the linkages between the agricultural policy and the SDGs by looking into the environmental dimension.

9. The CAP and the environmental dimension of the SDGs

Similar to the previous chapter, this section will analyze how certain Sustainable Development Goals are linked to the CAP in the environmental dimension. In order to do so, the two SDGs that are most clearly connected to the policy in the environmental dimension will be discussed. SDG number thirteen will be reviewed, as it strives to take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts (UN General Assembly, p. 23-24). Goal fifteen will also be discussed, since it is concerned with terrestrial ecosystems, forests, desertification, land degradation, and biodiversity loss. By looking at how the CAP affects these goals environmentally, the level of alignment of the policy and the SDGs will become clearer. This information is valuable as it will help to answer the main question.

9.1 Climate change

As noted before, goal thirteen aims to take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts (UN General Assembly, p. 23). Targets linked to this SDG are concerned with for instance strengthening resilience to climate-related hazards and natural disasters, and integrating climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning. Agriculture and the CAP are connected to this SDG, as this policy area contributes to and is affected by climate change (European Environment Agency, 2017, p. 24-26). It can also be a considerable source of greenhouse gas emissions. Within the EU, agriculture is responsible for 10 percent of these emissions. Methane is one of the main greenhouse gases emitted from the agricultural sector. In 2015, approximately half of methane emissions in the EU came from this sector.

Moreover, the greening of the CAP was introduced in the last reform of the policy and can be seen as an example of a measure to combat climate change. In this way, 30 percent of the budget for direct payments is now linked to a greening component (Daugbjerg & Swinbank, 2016, p. 275). According to the European Commission (2017B, p. 8), these payments contribute to the promotion of environmentally and climate friendly practices. The support can be received by farmers who comply with the three greening obligations, namely: crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland, and ecological focus area. However, there is much criticism about the actual impact of the payments. Even before the adoption of the CAP reform, the PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (2012, p. 6) found that the greening of the policy would barely change the environmental impacts of the CAP in developing countries. Other authors note that the provisions of the reform were watered down during the negotiation process, meaning that

few farmers have to make costly changes in order to be eligible for the green payments (Anania et al., 2015, p. 128). Phil Hogan (personal communication, March 23, 2018), Commissioner for Agriculture and Rural Development, also notes about the green payments that progress has been made with the ecological focus areas, but that a "one-size-fits-all" approach is not appropriate in terms of delivering on the environmental objectives.

9.2 Life on land

SDG number fifteen is also relevant to agriculture as it aims to protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss (UN General Assembly, p. 24). Within the EU, approximately 40 percent of the land mass is still farmed (EPP, 2017, p. 4). In addition, around 30 percent is accounted to forest and woodland. Therefore, agriculture has a strong impact on land management and biodiversity.

Particularly important for the CAP is target 15.1, which aims to promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally (UN General Assembly, p. 24). This target can be linked to the meat production and feed imports in Europe. In order to feed European livestock, Member States strongly depend on plant protein imports for feedstuffs (CONCORD Europe, 2017A, p. 3). Around 70 percent of these proteins is imported (Fern, 2017, p. 25). These low cost imports include soy, sugar cane and palm oil from developing countries such as Brazil, Argentina, Bolivia, Paraguay and Uruguay (CONCORD Europe, 2017A, p. 3). The problem with this practice is that it results into negative environmental impacts within the exporting developing countries, as commercial and export-driven agriculture is the biggest driver of deforestation. Friends of the Earth Europe (2010, p. 12) also notes that the expansion of soy plantations causes massive deforestation in these countries.

EU meat production and feed imports can be linked to another target and even to other SDGs as well. Target 15.5 is concerned with reducing the degradation of natural habitats, halting the loss of biodiversity and preventing the extinction of threatened species (UN General Assembly, p. 25). According to Friends of the Earth Europe (2010, p. 12) and CONCORD Europe (2017A, p. 3), the production and import of soy is not only responsible for deforestation, but also for biodiversity loss. Other problems associated with the practice include loss of employment, increased food insecurity, and water pollution. Moreover,

deforestation causes an increase in CO₂ emissions. On the other hand, Phil Hogan (personal communication, March 23, 2018) finds that the practice also has some positive effects on developing countries. According to him, the exports create jobs and income for those in the source countries. The EU feed imports can be connected to several SDGs concerned with environmental and social issues. For example, there is a link with SDG number thirteen, which deals with climate change and with goal number one, which is concerned with no poverty.

When looking at the environmental dimension of the Sustainable Development Goals and the link with the CAP, SDG number thirteen about climate change and SDG number fifteen about life on land are crucial. Regarding climate change, the agricultural policy contributes to greenhouse gas emissions. In particular, EU agriculture is responsible for a significant share of methane emissions. Also, the greening measures introduced in the latest CAP reform do not seem to achieve the desired results in combating climate change. The second goal discussed in this chapter is concerned with life on land. The agricultural policy impacts this SDG through EU meat production and feed imports. Imports of soy, sugar cane and palm oil from developing countries used to feed European livestock cause environmental as well as social problems in the exporting countries. Deforestation, biodiversity loss, and loss of employment are some of the issues associated with this practice.

10. Analysis

10.1 Historical and sociological institutionalism

The main theories connected to this research are historical and sociological institutionalism. When looking at the results, several chapters can be linked to these theories. For example, chapter four, which aimed to define the Common Agricultural Policy, looked at the background against which the policy was created. From this section, it becomes clear that certain events led to the introduction of the agricultural policy. In particular the Second World War and food shortages contributed to its creation. Moreover, negotiations between France and Germany facilitated a deal on the policy. In this way, both of the theories can be linked to this chapter as it shows the influence of temporal processes and events (Fioretos, Falleti, & Sheingate, 2016, p. 3). Moreover, operating procedures and cultural conventions such as the negotiations between France and Germany are able to explain the driving forces behind the creation of the CAP.

The fifth chapter can mainly be related to historical institutionalism. This section showed the evolution of the policy through the reforms and gave an overview of its current structure at the same time. One of the key characteristics of historical institutionalism is that it focuses on the historical development of institutions and argues that these developments are path-dependent (Bannerman and Haggart, 2014, p.5-6). All of the CAP reforms built on past changes that were incorporated into the policy from its inception. In this way, all the reforms together show the development of the path-dependent changes to the policy. Also evident in the development of the CAP is the influence of several temporal processes and events, as highlighted in the theory of historical institutionalism (Fioretos, Falleti, and Sheingate, 2016, p. 3). Some of the processes and events that seem to have influenced the development of the CAP include budgetary constraints, criticism from environmentalists and animal health organizations, WTO agreements, GATT negotiations, the Doha Development agreement, the BSE crisis, the dairy crisis, and eastern enlargement. All of these processes and events had an impact on the CAP and its reforms.

Chapter six gave an outline of the Sustainable Development Goals and discussed crucial events that led to their adoption. The developments that led to the creation of the Sustainable Development Goals can be tied to the theory of historical institutionalism. For example, the Stockholm Conference was the first conference of the United Nations to discuss environmental issues. Moreover, the Brundtland Report stressed the importance of sustainable development. The urgency of the matter was then quickly picked up by the

Earth Summit in Rio in 1992. Soon, more summits on the environment followed. Moreover, the creation of the MDGs and their limited timespan asked for a another set of goals that could replace the MDGs in 2015. These path-dependent developments, together with many other events and processes, eventually led to the creation of the SDGs. The chapter can be linked to sociological institutionalism as well. The UN can be seen as a socially constructed institution and the SDGs were socially constructed as well. Within the UN, institutional rules, procedures, and process are in place to shape political behavior (Marriott, 2010, p. 32). For instance, one of these rules is that the SDGs are not legally binding to countries (United Nations, n.d.C).

Finally, the seventh chapter, which showed how the EU aims to achieve the SDGs, can also be linked to both of the theories. Looking at the theories of historical and sociological institutionalism, the institutions of the European Union can be seen as socially constituted institutions with culturally framed norms and rules (Musil, 2015, p. 80). The decision-making process is organized through institutional rules, processes and procedures (Marriott, 2010, p. 32). These rules allow Member States to decide if they want to commit to the SDGs on EU level or not.

10.2 Interviews

The three conducted interviews provided more in depth information about the CAP, its alignment with the SDGs and the way in which the SDGs are involved in the decision-making process of the EU. The first interview was conducted with a policy advisor of a member of the European Parliament and provided information on how the European Parliament integrates the SDGs in the decision-making process and in legislative reports. From this interview, it became apparent that it is difficult to bind Member States to the SDGs at EU level. However, they are often referenced in legislative reports. Moreover, it seemed that the policy advisor finds that the achievement of the SDGs is a task for Member States separately rather than for the EU.

The second interview was with Klaas Johan Osinga, a member of LTO and was concerned with specific measures of the CAP and the alignment of the policy with the SDGs. From this interview, it became clear that many measures of the CAP have positive as well as negative social and environmental effects on Member States and on developing countries. This makes it extremely difficult to assess if these measures are in line with the SDGs or if they are hindering the achievement of them. It seems that these difficulties derive from the complexity of the agricultural policy. Moreover, it became apparent that there are many

obstacles in the way when it comes to reforming the policy. Different interests are at stake from Member States, European Union institutions, farmers, think tanks and many more. This means that it takes time to accomplish change and that it is difficult to implement major reforms. Furthermore, it seems that the agricultural policy can be linked to almost all of the SDGs to some extent.

Information obtained from the third interview was also concerned with the specific measures of the CAP and the alignment of the policy with the SDGs. It was conducted with Phil Hogan, Commissioner for Agriculture and Rural Development. This interview also showed that CAP measures have positive and negative social and environmental impacts. Moreover, it became clear that Hogan did not think that the 2013 CAP reform and the accompanying greening measures are sufficient to achieve environment and climate related ambitions. Last, it can be concluded from the interview that clear targets for the SDGs are lacking in the policy and that monitoring measures need to be improved.

10.3 Other points of analysis

Chapter four and five indicated the creation and evolution of the Common Agricultural Policy. From these sections, it seems that one of the main reasons why the CAP was created in the first place and why it absorbs a significant share of the EU's budget is to achieve food security. This can be linked to SDG number two, which aims for zero hunger (UN General Assembly, p. 15). However, the results suggest that a large share of the policy does not contribute to food security. In this way, it could be concluded that the policy is not achieving its most important goal while at the same time hindering the achievement of SDG number two.

From chapter five it becomes apparent that the CAP has made tremendous progress regarding the negative social and environmental effects it used to have. For example, the price support farmers received which ultimately led to food mountains and dumping in developing countries has been replaced by a system of direct payments. Moreover, it seems that over the years, environmental and social issues have been increasingly taken into account. For instance, the last reform dealt with the greening of the policy.

The seventh chapter on how the EU aims to achieve the SDGs showed that one of the main roles of the European Union appears to be supporting the Member States in their individual efforts towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. Moreover, it became clear that it is difficult to bind Member States to the SDGs at EU level. Therefore, it seems that

the European Union as a whole does not have a strong position on the achievement of the SDGs. Rather, each Member State individually integrates these Goals into national policy in various ways. However, the EU has many common policies such as the CAP and aims to make these policies coherent with social and environmental goals. In order to do so, Member States can make changes to the implementation of the policy. This is also one of the reasons why the CAP is quite complicated and why it is difficult to measure its impact on the SDGs. Moreover, another reason why these impacts are hard to measure can be derived from the fourth chapter. It seems that clear targets and monitoring measures are lacking within EU policies to observe the progress towards the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals.

Looking at the results of the last two sub-questions in particular, it becomes clear that the Common Agricultural Policy affects the SDGs in a negative way as well as in a positive way. However, judging from the number of problems associated with the policy, it seems that the negative effects are more prominent than the positive effects. In this way, there are many aspects of the CAP that are hindering the achievement of the SDGs.

As indicated in the results, the CAP can be connected to many of the SDGs in the social and environmental dimension. Some measures of the policy can even be linked to multiple Goals at the same time. However, as the agricultural policy is quite complicated it is difficult to measure the exact impact it has on the Sustainable Development Goals. Moreover, data that measures this impact on the specific SDGs seems to be lacking. Furthermore, there are no clear goals set within the agricultural policy to ensure the progress towards achieving social and environmental ambitions.

11. Conclusion

When answering the research question “To what extent is the EU’s Common Agricultural Policy in line with the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals?” One can come to the conclusion that the agricultural policy is not well aligned with the SDGs. The steps taken to arrive to this conclusion include the assessment of the creation and evolution of the CAP, the overview of the Sustainable Development Goals and the way in which the EU implements these Goals, and a review on how the agricultural policy impacts the SDGs in the social and environmental dimension.

When looking at the social dimension, the Goals most clearly connected to the CAP are concerned with no poverty and zero hunger. Regarding no poverty, the decoupled and coupled direct payments have some positive social impacts such as quality of life and the avoidance of rural depopulation. However, the negative effects for developing countries cannot be ignored. For instance, the payments lead to a decrease of exports for developing countries (ODI, 2011, p. 2). Moreover, the policy is not contributing to food security, but rather to food self-sufficiency (Gardner, 2009, p. 184). In addition, the increase in food price volatility is negatively affecting the viability of European farms while at the same time impacting developing countries through import tariffs and export subsidies (ECDPM, 2011, p. 4).

In the environmental dimension, the SDGs concerned with climate change and life on land are crucial. When looking at climate change, agriculture in the EU is responsible for a large share of methane emissions (European Environment Agency, 2017, p. 24-26). Moreover, the latest reform of 2013 dealt with the greening of the policy. These changes have enabled some progress towards the achievement of this particular SDG. However, the impact is quite limited and more changes have to be made in order for the policy to be in line with environmental objectives. Regarding the Goal on life on land, the EU’s meat production and feed imports are worrying. Protein rich imports from developing countries for European livestock are causing deforestation in the exporting countries (Friends of the Earth Europe, 2010, p. 12-13). More environmental issues and even social concerns are connected to this practice, such as biodiversity loss, an increase in CO₂ emissions, and loss of employment. In this way, the alignment of the CAP with the SDGs in the environmental dimension is not well implemented.

However, by looking at the evolution of the policy it becomes clear that significant progress has been made already in order to diminish its negative social and environmental impacts.

From the introduction of the CAP in 1968 until now, much has changed about the policy. Over the years, problems were addressed in order to reduce market distorting effects and to limit negative environmental impacts. Price support shifted to direct payments and many of the direct payments were decoupled. This has led the policy to become more in line with social and environmental ambitions, but more reforms are needed.

Another point that needs to be taken into account is that the CAP can be connected to almost all of the SDGs to some extent. However, the policy is quite complicated and there are no clear targets or monitoring measures set within the policy to achieve to SDGs. Moreover, there is no impact assessment or specific data that measures the impacts of the policy on some of the Goals. This makes it difficult to assess the exact implications the agricultural policy has on for example developing countries and environmental issues.

12. Recommendation

In this research, the four SDGs most clearly connected to the Common Agricultural Policy were discussed. The level of alignment of the policy with these Goals is rather low. However, the policy can be linked to many more of the Goals. In order to find out more about the impact of the agricultural policy on social and environmental objectives, the alignment with the remaining thirteen Goals should be reviewed. However, this would be difficult to research. The policy is quite complex, making it hard to draw clear conclusions on its exact impact. Another obstacle would be the lack of data on how the CAP impacts the different SDGs. Moreover, there are no targets set within the policy to measure the progress towards the achievement of social and environmental ambitions.

Regarding the future of the Common Agricultural Policy, it is recommended that a major reform would be implemented in the course of the next few years in order to ensure that the policy is in line with social and environmental objectives. A critical analysis of the policy has to be made at EU level and certain measures have to be altered or replaced. For example, the system of direct payments should evolve towards new support mechanisms (CONCORD Europe, 2017A, p. 5) to enable the agricultural policy to become more in line with the SDGs and to help achieve these Goals.

The practice that involves protein rich food imports from developing countries for European livestock should also be reformed and efforts should be made in order to combat deforestation and other issues connected to this practice. It is recommended that reforms will be made to the practice that allow the policy to promote reduced and more sustainable meat consumption, lower levels of livestock production and the production of alternative feed crops in the EU (CONCORD Europe, 2017A, p. 3). Moreover, more effort should be made to ensure that the feed imports are produced in a sustainable way.

Another crucial aspect for a future CAP reform is the implementation of clear targets and monitoring measures in order to observe the progress towards the achievement of the SDGs. Accurate and exact data about the policy and its implementation of Member States is needed in order to monitor this progress. Moreover, an impact assessment should be made regularly that measures the effects the agricultural policy has on all of the seventeen Sustainable Development Goals. This would ensure the policy to become more in line with the SDGs.

13. References

- Anania, G., Balmann, A., Buckwell, A., Bureau, J.-C., De Castro, P., & Di Mambro, A., . . . Swinnen, J. (2015). *The Political Economy of the 2014-2020 Common Agricultural Policy An Imperfect Storm*. London: Rowman & Littlefield International.
- Bannerman, S., & Haggart, B. (2014). Historical Institutionalism in Communication Studies. *Communication Theory*, 1-22.
- Buonanno, L., & Nugent, N. (2013). *Policies and Policy Processes of the European Union*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Burny, P. (2010). Reforming the Common Agricultural Policy perspective of 2013 and beyond. *Advances in Agriculture & Botanics*, 175-186.
- Centre for European Policy Studies. (2008). *The Perfect storm; The Political Economy of the Fischler Reforms of the Common Agricultural Policy*. Retrieved January 6, 2018, from Centre for European Policy Studies: <https://www.ceps.eu/system/files/book/1718.pdf>
- CONCORD Europe. (2017A, April). *CONCORD reply to the European Commission's public consultation on the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP)*. Retrieved April 4, 2018, from CONCORD Europe: https://concordeurope.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/CONCORD_Consultation_reply_CAP_201704.pdf?1fdb40&1fdb40
- CONCORD Europe. (2017B, October). *Monitoring Agenda 2030 implementation across the EU*. Retrieved March 19, 2018, from CONCORD Europe: <https://concordeurope.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/CONCORD-monitoring-Agenda-2030-implementation-across-the-EU-October-2017.pdf?1fdb40&1fdb40>
- Daugbjerg, C., & Swinbank, A. (2016). Three Decades of Policy Layering and Politically Sustainable Reform in the European Union's Agricultural Policy. *Governance*, 265-280.
- Daugbjerg, C., & Swinbank, A. (2011). Explaining the 'Health Check' of the Common Agricultural Policy: budgetary politics, globalisation and paradigm change revisited. *Policy Studies*, 127-141.

- Delayen, C. (2007, September). *The Common Agricultural Policy: A Brief Introduction*. Retrieved December 21, 2017, from Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy: https://www.iatp.org/files/451_2_100145_0.pdf
- ECDPM. (2011, September). *Still a thorn in the side?* Retrieved January 4, 2018, from ECDPM: <http://ecdpm.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/DP-126-Reform-Common-Agricultural-Policy-Coherence-for-Development.pdf>
- EPP. (2017, September 4). *EPP views on the future of the common agricultural policy: for a strong, sustainable and innovative EU agriculture*. Retrieved May 8, 2018, from EPP: http://www.epp.eu/files/uploads/2017/09/CAP_FV3.pdf
- European Commission. (1997, July 15). *Agenda 2000*. Retrieved March 18, 2018, from European Commission: https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/cap-history/agenda-2000/com97-2000_en.pdf
- European Commission. (2011, October 20). *Commission Staff Working Paper; Executive Summary of the Impact Assessment; Common Agricultural Policy towards 2020*. Retrieved March 19, 2018, from European Commission: https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/policy-perspectives/impact-assessment/cap-towards-2020/report/summary_en.pdf
- European Commission. (2012). *The Common Agricultural policy; a story to be continued*. Retrieved January 20, 2018, from European Commission: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/50-years-of-cap/files/history/history_book_lr_en.pdf
- European Commission. (2015, August 3). *Policy Coherence for Development*. Retrieved March 21, 2018, from European Commission: https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/pcd-report-2015_en.pdf
- European Commission. (2016A, November 22). *Commission Staff Working Document; Key European action supporting the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals*. Retrieved April 8, 2018, from European Commission: https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/swd-key-european-actions-2030-agenda-sdgs-390-20161122_en.pdf
- European Commission. (2016B, November 22). *Next steps for a sustainable European future; European action for sustainability*. Retrieved March 18, 2018, from EUR-Lex: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52016DC0739&from=EN>

- European Commission. (2017A, February 22). *Agriculture and the environment: introduction*. Retrieved January 4, 2018, from European Commission: https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/envir_en
- European Commission. (2017B, May). *CAP explained; Direct Payments for Farmers 2015-2020*. Retrieved December 21, 2018, from European Commission: https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/direct-support/direct-payments/docs/direct-payments-schemes_en.pdf
- European Commission. (2017C, January 25). *EU's implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)*. Retrieved March 18, 2018, from European Commission: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/sustainable-development/SDGs/implementation/index_en.htm
- European Commission. (2017D, February 22). *Impact assessment for "CAP towards 2020"*. Retrieved March 15, 2018, from European Commission: https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/policy-perspectives/impact-assessment/cap-towards-2020_en
- European Commission. (2017E, February 22). *Impact assessment for the 2008 CAP "Health Check"*. Retrieved January 19, 2018 from European Commission: https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/policy-perspectives/impact-assessment/cap-health-check_en
- European Commission. (2017F). *The European Union explained: Agriculture*. Retrieved December 12, 2017, from European Commission: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/f08f5f20-ef62-11e6-8a35-01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF/source-search>
- European Commission. (2017G, November 29). *The Future of Food and Farming*. Retrieved May 9, 2018 from European Commission: https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/future-of-cap/future_of_food_and_farming_communication_en.pdf
- European Commission. (2017H, April 4). *The history of the common agricultural policy*. Retrieved January 27, 2018, from European Commission : https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-overview/history_nl

- European Commission. (2018, April 13). *European Consensus on Development*. Retrieved April 10, 2018, from European Commission: https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/policies/european-development-policy/european-consensus-development_en
- European Commission. (n.d.). *Sicco Mansholt: farmer, resistance fighter and a true European*. Retrieved December 6, 2017 from European Union: https://europa.eu/european-union/sites/europaeu/files/docs/body/sicco_mansholt_en.pdf
- European Environment Agency. (2017). *Air Quality in Europe - 2017 Report*. Retrieved April 29, 2018, from European Environment Agency: <https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/air-quality-in-europe-2017>
- European Union. (2017, June 17). *The New European Consensus on Development*. Retrieved April 10, 2018, from European Commission: https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/european-consensus-on-development-final-20170626_en.pdf
- Fern. (2017, May). *Agriculture and deforestation; The EU Common Agricultural Policy, soy, and forest destruction*. Retrieved May 8, 2018, from Fern: <http://fern.org/sites/default/files/news-pdf/Fern%20CAP%20FULL%20REPORT%20FINAL.pdf>
- Fioretos, O., Falleti, T. G., & Sheingate, A. (2016). *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Institutionalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Friends of the Earth Europe. (2010, October). *A New Food and Agriculture Policy for the European Union*. Retrieved April 29, 2018, from Friends of the Earth Europe: https://www.foeeurope.org/sites/default/files/cap_pp_full_final1.pdf
- Gardner, B. (2009). *Global Food Futures; feeding the world in 2050*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Hay, C. (2006). Constructivist Institutionalism. In R. E. Goodin, *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions* (pp. 56-74). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, A. (2018, February 19). *The Sustainable Development Goals, the EU and member states: Getting their act together and acting together*. Retrieved January 15, 2018, from ECDPM: <http://ecdpm.org/talking-points/sustainable-development-goals-eu-member-states-getting-act-together-acting-together/>

- Lartey, A. (2014). Goal 2 End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture. *UN Chronicle*, 6-8.
- Latoszek, E., & Klos, A. (2016). The European Union's Action for Sustainable Development. *Eurolimes*, 60-71.
- Marriott, L. (2010). *The Politics of Retirement Savings Taxation: A Trans-Tasman Comparison*. Sydney: CCH Australia Limited.
- McCormick, J. (2015). *European Union Politics*. London: Palgrave.
- Meyn, M. (2008, December). *Update on the CAP Health Check*. Retrieved February 3, 2018 from ODI:
<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.510.8836&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Musil, P. A. (2015). Czech Public Opinion on Turkey's Accession to the EU: An Analysis through the Lenses of Sociological and Discursive Institutionalism. *New Perspectives: Interdisciplinary Journal of Central & East European Politics & International Relations*, 71-95.
- ODI. (2011, September). *Making the EU's Common Agricultural Policy coherent with development goals*. Retrieved April 28, 2018, from ODI:
<https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/7279.pdf>
- Orellana, M. (2016). Governance and the Sustainable Development Goals: The Increasing Relevance of Access Rights in Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration. *Review of European Comparative & International Environmental Law*, 50-58.
- Oskam, A., Meester, G., & Silvis, H. (2010). *EU policy for agriculture, food and rural areas*. Wageningen: Wageningen Academic Publishers.
- PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency. (2012). *Reform of the EU Common Agricultural Policy: Environmental Impacts in Developing Countries*. Retrieved May 11, 2018, from PBL:
http://www.pbl.nl/sites/default/files/cms/publicaties/pbl_2012_reform_of_the_EU_CAP_583_500136006.pdf

- Serger, S. S. (2001). *Negotiating CAP reform in the European Union - Agenda 2000*. Retrieved March 18, 2018 from Agrifood: http://www.agrifood.se/files/sli_rapport_20014.pdf
- Steinmo, S., Thelen, K., & Longstreth, F. (1992). *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stewart, R. S. (2000, September). *The Impact of the 1992 MacSharry CAP Reforms on Agriculture in Grampian Region*. Retrieved December 19, 2017, from OpenAIR@RGU: <https://openair.rgu.ac.uk/handle/10059/550>
- Strong, M. (2009). Facing Down Armageddon: Our Environment at a Crossroads. *World Policy Journal*, 25-32.
- Swanborn, P. G. (2009). *Research Methods: The Basics*. The Hague: Boom Onderwijs.
- The World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our Common Future*. Retrieved January 21, 2018, from un-documents: <http://www.un-documents.net/our-common-future.pdf>
- Tosti, E. (2012). From the Brundtland Report to the Global Organic Textile Standard. *Nordic Textile Journal*, 100-106.
- UN General Assembly. (2015, October 21). *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. A/RES/70/1. Retrieved February 20, 2018, from www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A_RES_70_1_E.pdf
- United Nations. (1973). *Report of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment*. Retrieved March 7, 2018, from United Nations: http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/CONF.48/14/REV.1
- United Nations. (2007, April). *Framing Sustainable Development; The Brundtland Report – 20 Years On*. Retrieved March 10, 2018, from United Nations: http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd/csd15/media/backgrounder_brundtland.pdf
- United Nations. (2015). *The Sustainable Development Goals: 17 Goals to Transform our World [Figure]*. Retrieved March 16, 2018 from <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/blog/2015/12/sustainable-development-goals-kick-off-with-start-of-new-year/>

United Nations. (n.d.A). *Millennium Summit (6-8 September 2000)*. Retrieved March 16, 2018, from United Nations:

http://www.un.org/en/events/pastevents/millennium_summit.shtml

United Nations. (n.d.B). *Sustainable Development*. Retrieved March 21, 2018, from

United Nations: <https://www.un.org/ecosoc/en/sustainable-development>

United Nations. (n.d.C). *The Sustainable Development Agenda*. Retrieved March 21, 2018, from United Nations:

<http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/development-agenda/>

United Nations. (n.d.D). *United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (Stockholm Conference)*. Retrieved March 16, 2018, from Sustainable

Development United Nations:

<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/milestones/humanenvironment>

Verschuren, P., & Doorewaard, H. (2010). *Designing a Research Project*. The Hague: Eleven International Publishing.

Wallace, H., Pollack, M. A., & Young, A. R. (2015). *Policy-Making in the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wood, D. M., & Yesilada, B. A. (2007). *The emerging European Union*. New York: Pearson Education.

Zobbe, H. (2001, September). The Economic and Historical Foundation of the Common Agricultural Policy in Europe. *Fourth European Historical Economics Society Conference*. Oxford : Merton College.

14. Appendices

14.1 Appendix I: Consent Form 1

Informed Consent Form

Informed Consent Form

- 1) Research Project Title: To what extent is the EU's Common Agricultural Policy in line with the UN's Sustainable Development Goals?
- 2) Project Description: The central issue in the report will be the development of the Sustainable Development Goals and the alignment or incorporation of those goals into EU policy, specifically the Common Agricultural Policy. Alignment of the SDGs into EU policy would help to achieve those goals.

If you agree to take part in this study please read the following statement and sign this form.

I am 16 years of age or older.

I can confirm that I have read and understood the description and aims of this research. The researcher has answered all the questions that I had to my satisfaction.

I agree to the audio recording of my interview with the researcher.

I understand that the researcher offers me the following guarantees:

All information will be treated in the strictest confidence. My name will not be used in the study unless I give permission for it.

Recordings will be accessible only by the researcher. Unless otherwise agreed, anonymity will be ensured at all times. Pseudonyms will be used in the transcriptions.

I can ask for the recording to be stopped at any time and anything to be deleted from it.

I consent to take part in the research on the basis of the guarantees outlined above.

Signed: _____

Date: _____

14.2 Appendix II: Transcript Interview 1

Interviewer: Als eerste, zou u wat meer over uzelf kunnen vertellen? Wat u doet?

Beleidsmedewerker: Ja, dus ik werk als beleidsmedewerker voor een lid van het Europees Parlement. Wij als zijn medewerkers bereiden zijn dossiers voor. Zowel de wetgevende dossiers op het gebied van regionaal beleid en interne markt en consumentenbescherming en ook allerlei andere dingen tuurlijk die hij op zijn agenda heeft staan, zoals afspraken om met mensen te spreken, om speeches te houden. We bereiden zijn persuitingen voor, dus persberichten. Eigenlijk als medewerker is het zo dat je wat een lid doet, dat moet voorbereid worden en daar hebben ze zelf vaak maar beperkt de tijd voor. Vaak hebben ze wel in hun hoofd wat ze graag willen, maar niet de tijd om het uit te werken en daar zijn wij als medewerkers voor om ze daarmee te helpen.

Interviewer: Oké en dan wat meer over waar mijn scriptie over gaat. De Sustainable Development Goals worden die vanuit het Europees Parlement ook behandeld?

Beleidsmedewerker: Daar wordt zeker ook over gepraat. In veel dossiers die besproken worden in het Parlement zie je vaak referentie aan de Sustainable Development Goals, dus het leeft zeker wel. Het is natuurlijk zo dat het alleen een wetgevende of juridische bindende werking geeft als het wordt genoemd in wetgevende rapporten. In juridische rapporten van leden kunnen ze in principe over van alles schrijven. Dat is eigenlijk meer bedoeld om de discussie te starten en om de Europese Commissie een beetje op te porren, zodat het een thema is waar ze wat mee moeten. Wat dat betreft, dus juridisch heeft het verder geen wetgevende werking, dus het gaat er echt om in welke dossiers worden die Sustainable Development Goals genoemd.

Interviewer: En bij het maken of aanpassen van wetten, hoe worden die dan besproken? Is dan echt alleen wanneer het genoemd wordt?

Beleidsmedewerker: Dus je vraagt eigenlijk hoe het wetgevende proces in elkaar zit?

Interviewer: Ja, hoe die Sustainable Development Goals daarbij worden betrokken.

Beleidsmedewerker: Als ze genoemd worden in een wetgevend rapport, dus als er bijvoorbeeld staat: we moeten ons wat betreft de doelstellingen van deze wet richten op de Sustainable Development Goals, dan is het heel duidelijk dat er op die manier aan

gerefereerd wordt. Dan kan een lidstaat theoretisch verplicht worden om daarnaartoe te werken. Dus als het in een wetgevend rapport staat. Dan staat er bijvoorbeeld vaak in de eerste lijntjes van het rapport: gegeven dat of gezien dat de Sustainable Development Goals zijn besloten alle EU lidstaten, gegeven dat iedereen zijn commitment nog een keer herbevestigd heeft, gezien dit, gezien dat. Daarna komt dan de echte wet. Dan wordt er op die manier aan verwezen, dan wordt van tevoren een beetje het kader aangegeven van de wet. Onder die omstandigheden stellen we dit en dat voor bijvoorbeeld. Maar je kan het ook in de hoofdtekst doen natuurlijk. Het is natuurlijk wel zo dat de lidstaten, waar het gaat om dit soort commitments, dat ze vaak wel voorzichtig zijn. Ze hebben zich natuurlijk al in een ander verband ook aan die doelstellingen gecommitteerd en vaak zitten ze er niet op te wachten om nog eens een keer via Europa daartoe gedwongen te worden. Het valt nog vaak niet zo mee om dat juridisch bindend vast te houden, maar er wordt wel heel vaak een referentie van gemaakt.

Interviewer: En dan bijvoorbeeld bij beleidsterreinen zoals agricultuur, weet u of het daar ook wordt behandeld?

Beleidsmedewerker: Ja wat dat betreft ben ik geen expert op het gebied van agricultuur. Dus daarvoor zou je echt iemand anders voor moeten bellen. Daar kan ik dus geen zinnige uitspraak over doen. Ik weet wel dat het een populair thema is, heel breed ook dus ik kan het me heel goed voorstellen, maar aangezien ik niet op de dossiers werk, heb ik het niet zelf gezien.

Interviewer: Nee oké, duidelijk. Als het dan gaat over die Sustainable Development Goals, gaat het dan vooral om de economische, sociale of milieu dimensie? Of misschien allemaal?

Beleidsmedewerker: Dat hangt van het rapport af waar het in aangehaald wordt. Ik denk eigenlijk allemaal, maar dat er wel vaak ook de nadruk ligt op de economische en sociale dimensie voor mijn gevoel.

Interviewer: En denkt u dat er genoeg aandacht besteed wordt aan deze Sustainable Development Goals in het Parlement?

Beleidsmedewerker: Dat vind ik moeilijk om te zeggen. Wij zijn natuurlijk ondersteunend personeel voor politici, dus ik kan er wel wat van vinden, maar dat is eigenlijk meer aan de baas om daar wat van te vinden. Persoonlijk, dus even niet als medewerker van mijn baas,

vind ik het zeker wel belangrijke doelstellingen, dus ik denk dat het goed is als er naar gekeken wordt om mensen ook op de radar te houden. Ik moet zeggen dat ik niet gespecialiseerd ben op dit soort dingen, dus ik zie het vaak ook wel een beetje voorbijkomen. Ik zie het ook best vaak voorbijkomen, dus zelfs voor mij, voor iemand die daar niet heel erg mee bezig is met de Sustainable Development Goals, vind ik wel dat er veel aandacht voor is. Ik denk dat het wel in ieder geval voor iemand zoals ik, die dus op het wetgevend proces zit in het algemeen, dat het mij wel bereikt en dat het speelt. Ik zie het wel steeds terugkomen en dat ze best vaak ook aangehaald worden.

Interviewer: En dan als laatste vraag, denkt u dat er vanuit het Parlement nog iets verbeterd kan worden om de Sustainable Development Goals te bereiken?

Beleidsmedewerker: Nou ja, ik denk dat het vooral toch een zaak is van de lidstaten, van de landen zelf om daar stappen te maken. Anders dan een herinnerende functie, van let erop, jullie hebben je hier aan gecommitteerd dus dat is belangrijk, denk ik niet dat wij zoveel instrumenten hebben om ze te dwingen. Zoals je weet, bij het wetgevend proces zal de Raad ook toe moeten stemmen en daar zijn het de lidstaten weer, dus ze laten alleen toe waar ze zich echt aan willen committeren. Wij zijn misschien meer het vingertje van let erop let erop, maar niet een politieagent die ze kan dwingen om het te doen. Ze moeten het zelf willen en als zij dan iets willen dan kunnen wij daar ook wat aan doen. Het is zo dat de Commissie die stelt wetten voor en het Parlement en de Raad samen besluiten ze en de Raad dat zijn de landen. Als ze niet willen, dan committeren ze zich ook niet, dan kunnen wij hoog of laag springen.

14.3 Appendix III: Consent Form 2

Informed Consent Form

Informed Consent Form

- 1) Research Project Title: To what extent is the EU's Common Agricultural Policy in line with the UN's Sustainable Development Goals?
- 2) Project Description: The central issue in the report will be the development of the Sustainable Development Goals and the alignment or incorporation of those goals into EU policy, specifically the Common Agricultural Policy. Alignment of the SDGs into EU policy would help to achieve those goals.

If you agree to take part in this study please read the following statement and sign this form.

I am 16 years of age or older.

I can confirm that I have read and understood the description and aims of this research. The researcher has answered all the questions that I had to my satisfaction.

I agree to the audio recording of my interview with the researcher.

I understand that the researcher offers me the following guarantees:

All information will be treated in the strictest confidence. My name will not be used in the study unless I give permission for it.

Recordings will be accessible only by the researcher. Unless otherwise agreed, anonymity will be ensured at all times. Pseudonyms will be used in the transcriptions.

I can ask for the recording to be stopped at any time and anything to be deleted from it.

I consent to take part in the research on the basis of the guarantees outlined above.

Signed: _____



Date: _____

25-1-2018

14.4 Appendix IV: Transcript Interview 2

Interviewer: Als eerste vraag, kunt u wat meer over uzelf vertellen? Uw opleiding, werk.

Osinga: Ja, dus ik werk voor de land- en tuinbouw organisatie. Mijn naam is Klaas Johan Osinga. Ik werk voor het team internationaal van LTO. LTO is een belangenorganisatie voor boeren en tuinders, dus wij komen op voor de economische collectieve belangen van boeren en tuinders, van onze leden. Dat doe ik met name op internationaal niveau, vaak in Brussel.

Interviewer: Dus dat heeft veel te maken met de EU?

Osinga: Ja heel veel te maken met de Europese Unie, het gemeenschappelijk landbouwbeleid noem maar op.

Interviewer: En dat landbouwbeleid, in welke mate beschouwt u dat als duurzaam?

Osinga: Dat hangt af van de rekbaarheid van het begrip duurzaamheid. Ik denk dat het gemeenschappelijk landbouwbeleid ervoor heeft gezorgd dat de landbouw in Europa nog relatief kleinschalig is gebleven en op basis van gezinsbedrijven. Als je kijkt naar Nederlandse boeren en tuinders dat zijn bijna allemaal nog steeds gezinsbedrijven. Het zijn geen Bv's of multinationals en daar heeft het gemeenschappelijk landbouwbeleid ten dele voor gezorgd. Als je dat ook rekent bij duurzaamheid denk ik dat het GLB daar heel veel aan bij heeft gedragen. Er zullen ook critici zijn die zeggen dat het GLB heeft bijgedragen aan perverse effecten. Dat je grond hebt braak gelegd alleen maar om subsidie binnen te harken. Dat soort voorbeelden zijn er ook, maar ik denk toch grosso modo het feit dat je landbouwbeleid voert zorgt ervoor dat de structuur van jouw land- en tuinbouw relatief kleinschalig blijft en ook dat het gezinsbedrijven blijven. Haal je dat weg, dan wat je gaat zien is een versnelde schaalvergroting, wat veel Nederlanders niet leuk vinden. Ze willen geen mega stallen. Het korte antwoord is dus ja, maar we kunnen er heel veel over zeggen. We kunnen er de hele avond over praten. Het Gemeenschappelijk Landbouwbeleid is duizend pagina's wettekst en dan nog duizenden andere pagina's uitvoeringswetgeving.

Interviewer: En wat zijn dan de sterke punten van het beleid op gebied van milieu en sociaal?

Osinga: Het belangrijkste is dat het boeren en tuinders en hun gezinnen jaren lang een soort stootkussen gaf in slechte jaren, dus als er een jaar lang niks verdiend wordt dan had je nog een stukje subsidie vanuit Brussel. 10.000 euro, 20.000 euro waar je dan je boodschappen van kon doen, ook al had je het hele jaar niks verdiend en dat komt soms voor. Dan heb je het hele jaar verdiend en dan aan het einde van het jaar blijkt dat je achteruit gegaan bent omdat de oogst mislukt is, omdat de prijzen niks waren, omdat er een ziekte was uitgebroken. Een hagelbui, één hagelbui kan een oogst vernietigen.

Interviewer: En zijn er dan ook minder sterke punten van het Gemeenschappelijk Landbouwbeleid?

Osinga: Nou de bureaucratie, het onbegrip toch wel. Ik denk dat de meeste Europeanen nog steeds wel positief staan tegenover het Europese Landbouwbeleid. Ik denk dat de grote meerderheid niet weet wat het precies inhoudt. Dat zou ik ook zien als een zwakte, maar dat komt ook omdat de afstand tussen landbouw en de burger groter geworden is.

Interviewer: Zou dat dan zijn omdat het beleid ingewikkeld is of omdat mensen zich er niet in verdiepen?

Osinga: Beide. Ik denk niet dat je mensen kunt verwijten dat ze die duizenden pagina's tekst niet lezen, dus het is ook wel lastig hoor. We hebben het net over de SDG's gehad en dit is een inner circle, maar als ik naar buiten ga en ik vraag mensen op straat wat zijn de SDG's dan weet niemand dat.

Interviewer: Nee dat denk ik ook. Het GLB heeft ook directe ontkoppelde betalingen. Denkt u dat deze betalingen zorgen voor oneerlijke competitie voor boeren in ontwikkelingslanden?

Osinga: Dat is een goede, dat is een onderwerp van discussie. Je kunt beargumenteren, even een concreet voorbeeld. Nederland is de grootste exporteur van uien in de wereld. Die uien worden hier geteeld op vruchtbare gronden en op die gronden ligt dan ook nog 400 euro per hectare subsidie vanuit het GLB. Wij exporteren naar landen als Senegal en Niger op grote schaal. Daar kunnen ze ook uien telen, alleen kleinschaliger. Het is daar natuurlijk ook droger. Je kan zeggen, die 400 euro draagt bij tot het ongelijke speelveld voor de Afrikaanse producenten. Aan de andere kant kun je zeggen van ja, maar daar is het niet om begonnen. Het is begonnen om ons systeem van landbouw in stand te houden

van relatief kleine boeren en relatief klein landschap. Als ik het over kleinschalig heb, ik weet niet waar je vandaan komt. Ben je hier geboren?

Interviewer: Nee, in Katwijk.

Osinga: Katwijk. Ga maar eens naar Australië, een jaartje rondreizen in Australië. Hoe groot is het gemiddelde landbouwbedrijf in Australië?

Interviewer: Geen idee.

Osinga: 3000 Hectare. Gemiddelde landbouwbedrijf in Brazilië, nou 300 – 400 hectare. Gemiddelde landbouwbedrijf in Nederland 30 hectare. Dat komt ook omdat de tuinbouw relatief natuurlijk intensief is, maar kleiner. Dus de subsidies die dragen eraan bij dat die structuur in stand gehouden kan worden. Zonder dat zou de schaalvergroting, die vindt nu ook plaats, maar die zou nog veel sneller gaan. Is het dan onze schuld dat wij het de boeren in Senegal lastig maken? Of zou je niet moeten zeggen van kijk eens Senegal, waarom voeren jullie geen landbouwbeleid en brengen jullie je eigen landbouw tot ontwikkeling om zo te kunnen concurreren met ons? Ghana om een voorbeeld te noemen, exporteert ananas naar Nederland, naar de Albert Heijn. Vorige week expres nog even gekeken, want ik zag dit aankomen. Boontjes uit Senegal, peultjes uit Ethiopië die liggen hier in de winkel. Daar verdienen de boeren daar weer geld aan. Bij ons is het koud nu, dus wij telen die producten niet, dus nu kunnen Afrikanen naar ons exporteren. Straks is het seizoen weer anders, is het daar heet en droog, ze kunnen niet telen. Dan exporteren wij misschien weer die kant op. Is dat ongelijk speelveld? Daar kunnen we het over hebben. Ik draai het liever om. In plaats van te zeggen van Europa moet stoppen met die subsidies, zeg ik waarom doen Senegal en Ethiopië niet meer aan eigen landbouwbeleid? Bijna ieder land in de wereld doet aan landbouwbeleid. Natuurlijk is het tegenargument van ja maar jullie zijn rijk en wij zijn arm. Wij doen natuurlijk heel veel op dat terrein en Europa geeft die landen ook vrije toegang tot onze markt. Al worden er natuurlijk wel private eisen gesteld van de retail. Voordat die ananas uit Ghana hier mag binnenkomen, stelt Albert Heijn wel allemaal eisen, maar dat zijn private eisen en daar moeten onze boeren ook aan voldoen als ze willen leveren aan de Albert Heijn. Dat komt bovenop het wettelijke, dus dat staat los van het Gemeenschappelijk Landbouwbeleid, dat wordt wel eens verward. Maar ik heb er sympathie voor, voor het argument van het is slecht voor de boeren in de derde wereld, maar ik zeg van ja maar landbouw is natuurlijk speciaal. Je werkt met biologische, met levende wezens, biologische processen in de open lucht. Het is een eerste levensbehoefte,

dus daar mag je ook wel beleid voor voeren. We hebben ook beleid voor gezondheidszorg, dat laten we ook niet over aan de markt.

Interviewer: Dus als ik het goed begrijp zegt u dat het ook een andere kant heeft?

Osinga: Hier kun je de hele avond over discussiëren. Je kunt er een heel debat over houden.

Interviewer: Dat geloof ik ja. Er zijn ook nog steeds gekoppelde betalingen van het Gemeenschappelijk Landbouwbeleid. Dit zijn er niet veel, maar bijvoorbeeld zoals voor katoen. Vindt u dit dan oneerlijk of zegt u ook van hier zit een andere kant aan?

Osinga: Nou dat is politiek he, dat klopt. Je kunt nog steeds betalingen koppelen aan de productie. De Europese Commissie vindt dat niet leuk, die wilt er eigenlijk vanaf, maar een land als Frankrijk gebruikt nog steeds tien procent van hun GLB budget voor gekoppelde betalingen. Dat wordt gezien als marktverstoring in de WTO, dus dat ligt gevoelig. Aan de andere kant zegt Frankrijk van wij besteden dat geld voor bepaalde kwetsbare regio's. Het wordt gebruikt dus als structuurbeleid. Bijvoorbeeld voor melkveehouders in berggebieden in het oosten van Frankrijk, is er een subsidie van twee cent per liter melk. Dat zijn gekoppelde betalingen. Hoe meer liters melk, hoe meer subsidie. Dit gaat dus om boeren die daar ergens in de bergen zitten in het oosten van Grenoble ofzo die daardoor kunnen blijven boeren in dat berggebied. Dit is belangrijk voor de leefbaarheid van het platteland, toerisme, de economie. Dit heeft niks met de markt te maken. In die zin, opnieuw een genuanceerd antwoord. Aan de ene kant dus een gevoelig onderwerp, aan de andere kant weer begrijpelijk.

Interviewer: En denkt u dan dat het in de toekomst gaat verdwijnen?

Osinga: Ik denk dat de Europese Commissie wil proberen om daar toch zoveel mogelijk van af te raken en dat de lidstaten één voor één, nou ja Nederland niet, maar ik denk bijvoorbeeld Frankrijk, Polen, Italië en Oostenrijk gaan proberen om het er in te houden. Wij niet, want wij zijn nogal liberaal als Nederlanders. Ook hebben wij geen bergen. We hebben wel veel weide gebieden.

Interviewer: Volgende vraag dan. Om de hoge productie van vee te onderhouden in de EU worden proteïnerijke voedingscomponenten geïmporteerd uit ontwikkelingslanden. Dit zorgt in die landen voor problemen in de natuur, zoals ontbossing en voedselonzeekerheid.

Bent u het hier mee eens en wat zijn volgens u de effecten die dit heeft op ontwikkelingslanden?

Osinga: Ja, dus dit is een stelling. Nou wij importeren inderdaad veel soja via Rotterdam en dat is ooit zo afgesproken. Google maar eens op Blair House Agreement. Dat is een akkoord tussen de EU en de VS, lang geleden. Wij gingen dus onze grenzen openstellen voor dit soort producten, dus daarom importeren wij enorm veel soja uit Brazilië. Wij hebben ook een vrij grote veehouderij in Nederland, dus dat heeft daar alles mee te maken. Het heeft ook te maken met ondernemerschap en onze ligging. Onze ligging is cruciaal en ook de aanwezigheid van grote havens in Rotterdam. Nou is dat schadelijk voor, ik kijk vooral even naar Brazilië. Dan hebben we het nu over soja, maar we kunnen ook kijken naar palmolie en dan kijken we naar Indonesië en Maleisië. Palmolie wordt voor allerlei producten gebruikt, soja ook trouwens. Het heeft wel gezorgd voor ontbossing, maar sinds een paar jaar hebben we bijvoorbeeld de sustainable soy initiative op Europees niveau, wat in feite vraagt van leveranciers om zich te certificeren en een eis aan die certificering is dat je dus geen bos meer kapt. Of dat allemaal goed gecontroleerd wordt, dat mag ik aannemen. Maar kijk, dit jaar komen er weer verkiezingen aan in Brazilië. Brazilië is een grote soja exporteur. Volg maar eens hoe die verkiezingen gaan. Dan zie je dat het anders is dan in Nederland. We hebben hier democratie, vrije pers. In die landen gaat dat anders, dus ik heb de neiging om te zeggen van ja dat staat wel op het certificaat, maar kunnen we hier wel zeker over zijn? Er is heel veel discussie op dit moment over bijvoorbeeld vlees. Brazilianen en Argentijnen, Uruguayanen die exporteren heel veel vlees, rundvlees naar Europa. Voldoet het vlees wel aan de Europese voedselveiligheidsnorm? Daar is wel discussie over. Er zijn onderzoeken geweest door de Europese Unie en er bleken allerlei misstanden in Braziliaanse slachthuizen. Dat is natuurlijk hoog politiek, want er loopt handelsoverleg tussen Zuid-Amerika en Europa. Het kan zijn dat er op 19 of 20 februari op hoog niveau een deal bereikt wordt. Dat gaat over rundvlees bijvoorbeeld. Het gaat ook over soja, over ethanol, over suiker. Is het allemaal geproduceerd volgens Europese normen en waarden? Wij eisen dat, dus ze mogen binnenkomen als ze aan onze normen, waarden en eisen voldoen. Wordt dat allemaal goed gecontroleerd? Klopt het allemaal? Nou, daar zijn twijfels over. Lang antwoord op één vraag.

Interviewer: In 2013 waren er veranderingen aan het Gemeenschappelijk Landbouwbeleid. Dit ging vooral over het groener maken van het beleid en nu is dan 30 procent van de directe betalingen gelinkt aan een 'greening' component. Denkt u dat dit voldoende heeft geholpen om het beleid wat duurzamer te maken?

Osinga: Nou, beperkt.

Interviewer: Denkt u dan dat er nog meer veranderingen nodig zijn?

Osinga: Het percentage gaat omhoog denk ik. Dat is mijn voorspelling. Dat gaat echter op een andere manier. Lidstaten krijgen meer ruimte om het zelf in te vullen. Dan hebben we het wel over 2021 of 2022. Lees dan de krant. Er wordt nu wel al aan geschreven in Brussel. Ze zijn nu aan het schrijven, maar de boeren die voelen dat pas in 2022 of 2023 denk ik. Zo lang duurt dat.

Interviewer: Dan over de SDGs. SDG nummer twee is: end hunger, achieve food security, and improve nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture. Vindt u dat dit voldoende overeenkomt met het Gemeenschappelijk Landbouwbeleid?

Osinga: Ja, nou ja ze liggen wel in elkaars verlengde. Doelstelling van het GLB is altijd voedselzekerheid geweest. Nu zijn wij dus een exporterend land, dus de discussie ontstaat dan van moeten wij de wereld voeden? Je kan ook de discussie omdraaien van kunnen sommige landen zichzelf wel voeden? Er zijn misschien landen beter in andere zaken, kunnen zij andere producten produceren waar wij slecht in zijn? Hier is het klimaat geschikt voor voedselproductie. Wij hebben een redelijk gematigd klimaat met genoeg regen. Het ligt dus een beetje in elkaars verlengde. Ik geef wel toe dat er ook discussie over is. Degenen die daar tegenin gaan zeggen dat we terug moeten naar een zelfvoorzienende landbouw in Europa. Dat betekent eigenlijk dat je de grenzen dicht moet doen. Dat is protectionisme. Dat kan, maar in Europa of Nederland, de enige politieke partij die dat vindt is de SP.

Interviewer: En zijn er dan nog andere Sustainable Development Goals die gelinkt kunnen worden aan het GLB?

Osinga: Ja nogal wat. Natuurlijk water en klimaat, bodemvruchtbaarheid, nummer twaalf bodem, gezondheid, gezonde voeding, positie van de vrouw. Dit omdat vrouwen een belangrijke rol spelen in land- en tuinbouw, al is die rol vaak onzichtbaar zeker in ontwikkelingslanden. Verder ook partnerships, nummer zeventien. Dit is dus publiek-private samenwerking. Ik heb er nu dus zo al zeven of 8 genoemd. Uiteindelijk is ook de ontwikkeling van het platteland van uitermate groot belang voor de ontwikkeling van een land, dus ook “ending global poverty”, nummer één. Vaak begint ontwikkeling bij de landbouw. Dit zorgt voor productiviteit en het verdienen van geld. Dan kunnen kinderen

naar school en kunnen zij misschien ook doorleren. Ze verlaten dan de landbouw, maar is dat erg? Nee, dat is juist de bedoeling denk ik.

Interviewer: Denkt u dat het belangrijk is om te onderzoeken in welke mate het Europees beleid overeenkomt met die Sustainable Development Goals?

Osinga: Ja, alleen als je nou even op Google zoekt naar de teksten van de Europese commissaris van landbouw, Phil Hogan, wat hij allemaal zegt over het toekomstige GLB, dan noemt hij de SDG's regelmatig. Of het concreet wordt betwijfel ik op dit moment. De SDG's zijn er wel heel mooi, maar mijn ervaring in Brussel is dat de mensen die nu teksten aan het schrijven zijn, zeggen dat het wel erg abstract en ver weg is.

Interviewer: En denkt u dan dat het lastig is om landen vanuit de EU te binden aan de SDG's?

Osinga: Ja dat is wel lastig. Toch vind ik dat, nou Nederland heeft getekend voor de SDG's, maar de Europese Unie heeft ook getekend voor de SDG's. Of het legally binding is, is wel inderdaad de cruciale kwestie en daarom vraag ik ook aan jou of we het nou over een concreet doel hebben of over een beetje een wazige en vage richting? Ik ben bang dat de meeste mensen het zien als het tweede. We gaan een beetje in de richting waar we heen moeten, maar concreet, dat zien we later wel. Het leeft onvoldoende, dat vind ik hier ook. We praten hier over de SDG's, maar we gaan naar buiten en vragen iemand wat de SDG's zijn en dan krijg je een glazige blik.

Interviewer: En zijn er dan manieren waarop de link tussen het GLB en de SDG's beter gemonitord zou kunnen worden? Heeft u daar ideeën over?

Osinga: Ja dat is zeker de vraag, want Hogan heeft het dus op dit moment over "deliverables". Het nieuwe GLB moet "deliverables" hebben. Denk dus aan biodiversiteit, klimaat, dierenwelzijn, schoon water en hoe maken we dat concreet? Daar breken ze nou op dit moment hun hoofd over bij het directoraat-generaal landbouw- en plattelandsontwikkeling van de Europese Commissie. Ik ben er gisteren geweest en het gaat ook over kun je ook als sectororganisatie initiatieven nemen op gebied van duurzaamheid en kun je die ook dan verbindend verklaren voor iedereen? Het is allemaal we heel nieuw hoor op dit moment. Ik ben daar nu over in het denkproces.

Interviewer: Dus dat moet allemaal nog concreet gemaakt worden?

Osinga: Ja, dat is het korte antwoord. Ik denk daar wel over na, dus als jij daar nog ideeën over hebt laat het dan weten.

Interviewer: Ja ik ben het zelf ook aan het onderzoeken hoe dat gemonitord zou kunnen worden. Dit waren mijn vragen eigenlijk. Heef u zelf nog ideeën of opmerkingen?

Osinga: Nou als je de scriptie af hebt, krijg ik het graag. Misschien dat er leuke dingen in staan.

Interviewer: Ja natuurlijk, ik zal het opsturen.

14.5 Appendix V: Consent Form 3

Informed Consent Form

Informed Consent Form

- 1) Research Project Title: To what extent is the EU's Common Agricultural Policy in line with the UN's Sustainable Development Goals?
- 2) Project Description: The central issue in the report will be the development of the Sustainable Development Goals and the alignment or incorporation of those goals into EU policy, specifically the Common Agricultural Policy. Alignment of the SDGs into EU policy would help to achieve those goals.

If you agree to take part in this study please read the following statement and sign this form.

I am 16 years of age or older.

I can confirm that I have read and understood the description and aims of this research. The researcher has answered all the questions that I had to my satisfaction.

I agree to the audio recording of my interview with the researcher.

I understand that the researcher offers me the following guarantees:

All information will be treated in the strictest confidence. My name will not be used in the study unless I give permission for it.

Recordings will be accessible only by the researcher. Unless otherwise agreed, anonymity will be ensured at all times. Pseudonyms will be used in the transcriptions.

I can ask for the recording to be stopped at any time and anything to be deleted from it.

I consent to take part in the research on the basis of the guarantees outlined above.

Signed: _____ *Kevin Keary* _____ **Date:** __03/04/2018

14.6 Appendix VI: Transcript Interview 3

Interviewer: Could you tell me a bit more about yourself? Your work, education etc.

Hogan: I grew up on a farm in Kilkenny in the south-east of Ireland. I graduated with a degree in Economics and Geography from University College Cork. After that I returned to Kilkenny to manage my family's farm.

I got in to politics early and became a local councilor at 22 and later became a Member of Parliament and then a Minister in the Irish Parliament. I have been Commissioner for Agriculture and Rural Development since 2014.

Interviewer: Does the European Commission pay attention to the Sustainable Development Goals? If yes, in what way?

Hogan: The European Commission is fully committed to the Sustainable Development Goals and aims to lead the way in implementing the UN's 2030 Agenda. The SDGs feature in all of the Juncker Commission's 10 priorities which are:

- A New Boost for Jobs, Growth and Investment
- A Connected Digital Single Market
- A Resilient Energy Union with a Forward-Looking Climate Change Policy
- A Deeper and Fairer Internal Market with a Strengthened Industrial Base
- A Deeper and Fairer Economic and Monetary Union
- A balanced and progressive trade policy to harness globalisation
- An Area of Justice and Fundamental Rights Based on Mutual Trust
- A New Policy on Migration
- A Stronger Global Actor
- A Union of Democratic Change

Interviewer: Does the European Commission pay attention to the Sustainable Development Goals when it comes to the agricultural policy? If yes, in what way?

Hogan: Yes, the SDGs are an important part of the Common Agricultural Policy. The CAP and farmers and agri-food businesses have a key role to play in how the EU achieves these goals.

The Communication on the Future of Food and Farming which I announced at the end of last year commits the CAP and, by extension, farmers to "a higher level of environmental and climate ambition, and address citizens' concerns regarding sustainable agricultural production." The Communication is a reform of the current CAP and adapts it to help with our current needs and challenges. The Commission will set out broad policy objectives (in line with SDGs) and each Member State will have to draw up an action plan on how to achieve these objectives. There are consequences if a Member State does not achieve what it agreed to do.

Interviewer: Are the economic, social and environmental pillar of sustainability all discussed in the European Commission for the decision-making process or are some pillars discussed more extensively? In what way?

Hogan: These pillars individually are equally important but to achieve sustainable development, policies in these three areas have to work together and support each other. Effective monitoring is being done by the Commission to ensure policies take into account the three sustainable development pillars and to provide evidence for a post-2020 review of EU progress in achieving the SDGs.

Interviewer: In your opinion, does the European Commission pay enough attention to the SDGs in order to achieve those goals? In what way? Are there any possible improvements that could be implemented?

Hogan: Yes the SDGs are a top priority for the European Commission in all policy areas. Significant progress has been overall but progress for some goals, such as affordable and clean energy has been faster than for others like zero hunger. Better data and technology would help us to monitor our progress better and bring us closer to achieving these goals.

Interviewer: To what extent do you consider the Common Agricultural Policy to be sustainable? Could you explain some of the strengths and weaknesses of the policy when it comes to sustainability?

Hogan: I believe it is but I am striving to make it better. Sustainability is something that can always be improved upon.

Interviewer: In your opinion, do direct decoupled payments of the CAP affect developing countries and competition for farmers? In what way?

Hogan: One of the more persistent myths about the Common Agricultural Policy is that it discriminates against farmers in the developing world by supporting 'uncompetitive' European agriculture. Decoupled payments do not distort prices in the markets as they are not related to price.

Interviewer: Do you think that coupled payments of the CAP create unfair competition for farmers? In what way?

Hogan: Coupled payments can help maintain agricultural activity in regions that may otherwise suffer from issues such as land abandonment rural depopulation. For that reason, they are retained as an option for Member States to use if they so wish, subject to conditions.

Interviewer: In your opinion, does the import from developing countries of protein rich food components for livestock in the EU affect developing countries? In what way?

Hogan: It affects developing countries both positively and negatively. On the one hand, exporting protein rich products creates jobs and income for those in the source countries. On the other hand, the production of protein rich food such as soy beans, can cause serious environmental damage in those countries.

Interviewer: The reforms of the CAP in 2013 had to do with the “greening” of the policy. In this way, 30 percent of direct payments now has a “greening” component. Do you think this helped the policy to become more sustainable? Are any further changes needed for the policy to become more sustainable? If yes, what changes?

Hogan: The current CAP has a green architecture, with a number of elements. However, it is very compliance-driven, based on the application of EU-wide detailed rules and the extensive use of controls. In the Communication on the Future of Food and Farming I propose moving to a performance-based approach, where the focus will be on delivering results, which is essential for the achievement of our environment and climate-action ambitions.

As you pointed out, the principal element of the existing greening architecture is the greening measures themselves, to which 30 per cent of the direct payment is linked. Our own evaluation indicates that there have been some benefits associated with greening,

particularly with regard to EFAs. However, we have concluded that, as with many other aspects of the CAP, a "one-size-fits-all" approach is not appropriate in terms of delivering on our environmental objectives. The European Court of Auditors' Special Report from 2017 justifies this new approach as the report found that greening, as currently implemented, is unlikely to significantly enhance the CAP's environmental and climate performance.

Interviewer: Do you think it is important to research to what extent EU policy is in line with the Sustainable Development Goals? Why (not)?

Hogan: Yes, evaluation policy performance is very important. We need to know if we are on track with fulfilling our objectives and if we are using taxpayers' money in the most effective way. The European Commission has committed to providing regular reporting of the EU's progress as of 2017.

Interviewer: In what way could the link between the CAP and the SDG's be monitored better?

Hogan: As technology progresses and data become more accessible and accurate, the SDGs will be monitored better.

14.7 Appendix VII: Student Ethics Form

Student Ethics Form

European Studies
Student Ethics Form

Your name: Rominique van Kralingen

Supervisor: Pieter Pijlman

Instructions/checklist

Before completing this form you should read the APA Ethics Code (<http://www.apa.org/ethics/code/index.aspx>). If you are planning research with human subjects you should also look at the sample consent form available in the Final Project and Dissertation Guide.

- a. ☒ Read section 3 that your supervisor will have to sign. Make sure that you cover all these issues in section 1.
- b. ☒ Complete sections 1 and, if you are using human subjects, section 2, of this form, and sign it.
- c. ☒ Ask your project supervisor to read these sections (and the draft consent form if you have one) and sign the form.
- d. ☒ Append this signed form as an appendix to your dissertation.

Section 1. Project Outline (to be completed by student)**(i) Title of Project:**

The Common Agricultural Policy and its alignment with the Sustainable Development Goals

(ii) Aims of project:

To determine the level of alignment of the Common Agricultural Policy of the EU with the Sustainable Development Goals of the UN.

- (iii) Will you involve other people in your project – e.g. via formal or informal interviews, group discussions, questionnaires, internet surveys etc. (Note: if you are using data that has already been collected by another researcher – e.g. recordings or transcripts of conversations given to you by your supervisor, you should answer ‘NO’ to this question.)**

YES

If no: you should now sign the statement below and return the form to your supervisor. You have completed this form.

This project is not designed to include research with human subjects. I understand that I do not have ethical clearance to interview people (formally or informally) about the topic of my research, to carry out internet research (e.g. on chat rooms or discussion boards) or in any other way to use people as subjects in my research.

Student's signature _____ - date _____

If yes: you should complete the rest of this form.

Section 2 Complete this section only if you answered YES to question (iii) above.

(i) What will the participants have to do? (v. brief outline of procedure):

The participants will answer several questions about European policy, the CAP, sustainability, and the SDGs.

(ii) What sort of people will the participants be and how will they be recruited?

The participants will have knowledge on the working of European institutions, the Common Agricultural Policy, and/or the Sustainable Development Goals. Several people with knowledge on these topics will be approached via e-mail.

(iii) What sort stimuli or materials will your participants be exposed to, tick the appropriate boxes and then state what they are in the space below?

Questionnaires[X]; Pictures[]; Sounds []; Words[]; Other[].


A questionnaire will be made for the participants. These questions will be asked in person, via telephone, or via e-mail.

(iv) Consent: Informed consent must be obtained for all participants before they take part in your project. Either verbally or by means of an informed consent form you should state what participants will be doing, drawing attention to anything they could conceivably object to subsequently. You should also state how they can withdraw from the study at any time and the measures you are taking to ensure the confidentiality of data. A standard informed consent form is available in the Dissertation Manual.

(vi) What procedures will you follow in order to guarantee the confidentiality of participants' data? Personal data (name, addresses etc.) should not be stored in such a way that they can be associated with the participant's data.

In order to guarantee the confidentiality of participants' data, they will be asked beforehand if personal data such as their name can be communicated in the report.

Student's signature:  date: 17-05-2018

Supervisor's signature (if satisfied with the proposed procedures):  date: 23-5-2018