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Agroforestry was the past,
Can it be the future?

Adolfo Rosati - Piero Paris
ITALY
Agriculture and Agroforestry mostly coincided. Only a small fraction of arable land had no trees.
Other examples
Steady decline in the last century

Nowadays, only 2-300,000 ha (2-3%) 

The majority is 

pure arable 

or 

specialized orchards
Forest grazing was banned or strongly restricted!
• CAP contributed to abandonment of traditional agroforestry systems (negative impact of trees on funding).
• Grants for afforestation exclude agricultural practice.
• These unfortunate conditions still persist.
Current limits to developing agroforestry in ITALY

• Farmers do not understand benefits of AF, do not trust the future tree value
• Farmers perceive trees as limits to crops yield
• Funding not available (222 activated in 4 Regions out of 20)
• Planting trees with 222 results in reduced SFP?
• Funding for 222 is too small, limited to the 1st year (not so 212, others)
• Too much paperwork, too many delays in paying
• Choice of trees too restricted, and subject to additional rules, limiting the farmer’s choices to plant trees that produce income (e.g.: no fruit trees allowed)
• Lack of locally selected planting material of noble hardwoods for timber production
• Most Italy: small, slopy, irregularly shaped fields make trees incompatible with mechanization of arable crops

Measure 222 does not fund agroforestry!
It funds ONLY silvoarable systems. AF is also Silvopasture, Alley cropping, Forest farming, ecc. Other measures fund other (but not all) AF options. No measures fund cultivating crops or introducing grazing animal under existing trees and orchards.
In summary

1. Unclear benefits (especially economic, for farmers!)
2. Unclear rules
3. Insufficient funding
4. Only silvoarable
Relevant solutions to encourage agroforestry in ITALY

• Resources for research and demonstration agroforestry projects (to develop the best systems, prove their economic value and their environmental and social benefits)
• Measure 222 should be encouraged in all administrative Regions
• It should be made clear and mandatory that trees planted with 222 (or other measures) must not reduce SFP or other funding
• Funding should be increased and extended well beyond the first year, considering agroforestry benefits to society as a whole (carbon fixation, biodiversity, etc.), and considering that while farmer’s direct benefits are limited. Just like measure 212
• Simplified bureaucracy and more predictable/reliable timing of funding
• Fewer restrictions on what to plant and where
• ALL AF PRACTICES SHOULD BE EQUALLY FUNDED
EURAF will make the difference!
Mediterranean Agroforestry

(my current project)
Superintensive olive agroforestry

From this to this

That’s it folks! Thank you