THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF THE COMMON AGRICULTURAL POLICY'S GREEN ARCHITECTURE

DOI: 10.26341/issn.2241-4010-2023-1b-6

Napoleon Maravegias
Professor Emeritus, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, School of Economics and Political Sciences, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens
nmarav@pspa.uoa.gr

Pavlos Petidis
Research Fellow, Research Center for Economic Policy, Governance and Development, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens
petides789@hotmail.com

Yannis El. Doukas
Professor (Asst), Department of Agricultural Development, Agrofood and Management of Natural Resources, School of Agricultural Development, Nutrition and Sustainability, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens
jodoukas@agro.uoa.gr

Abstract
The study looks at how environmental concerns were gradually elevated inside the CAP's policy-making framework and how they helped towards the "greening" transition of European agriculture. Within the context of multilevel governance, the analysis is based on theories of policy change, primarily neo-institutionalism and historical institutionalism. The analysis reveals that the historical trajectory of the previous era inside the EU and the global setting is being redefined by policy change.

Key words: *CAP, environment, policy-making, political economy,*

Introduction

There are several costs and benefits associated with the CAP, as well as divergent agendas and expectations among the EU Member States. It represents a significant difference in how benefits are divided among the multiple actors who participate formally or informally in its formation because it is a shared and essentially binding policy. Bureaucrats, sectoral interests, governmental agendas, and other pressure organizations interested in agriculture are among them.

The CAP also combines social, economic, and environmental aspects to develop a sustainable agriculture system in the EU. As a result, favourable environmental conditions promote agricultural activities, enabling farmers to benefit from natural resources, produce agro-food, and ensure financial stability. Therefore, agricultural income supports farm families and rural communities in addition to society's gains from agricultural production (EC, 2021). Furthermore, agriculture is particularly vulnerable to climate change since the weather directly impacts production. Agriculture, on the other hand, can assist in mitigating climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and storing carbon while preserving food production.

The article focuses on how environmental and climate change concerns were gradually raised during the CAP policy-making process in the EU in order to develop a green architecture for European agriculture. The study concentrated on policy change theories, specifically neo-institutionalism and historical institutionalism, within the framework of the EU's multilevel governance architecture.

The theoretical background

Academic researchers have specialised in the investigation of organisations and their interconnections for many years. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, social theorists began organising this literature collection. They focused on the institutionalisation brought on by the "iron cage" that organisational bureaucracies construct, as well as the organisational structure (i.e., bureaucracy) inside the society (Hall and Taylor, 1996). The study of political institutions predominated political science in the US and the UK until the 1950s. This method, sometimes known as "old institutionalism," concentrates on comparing and contrasting the formal institutions of government and the state (Andreou, 2018). It was complemented by a behavioural movement that popularised new theories on comprehending how policies are created and changed, including behaviourism, positivism, and rational choice theory. In favour of evaluating people rather than the institutions surrounding them, the limiting emphasis on institutions was dropped. Thanks to a significant work produced by John W. Meyer and Brian Rowan, institutionalism saw a significant rebirth in 1977. The way institutional research was conducted underwent a significant transformation due to the updated definition of institutionalism offered in this study (Andreou, 2018). The subject was the focus of a deluge of writing in the ensuing ten years from various fields, including those outside the social sciences.

In 1984, March and Olsen coined the phrase "neo-institutionalism." New institutionalism was distinguished by Kathleen Thelen and Sven Steinmo from old institutionalism, which was predominately based on detailed institutional histories with little emphasis on comparative investigations (Thelen and Steinmo, 1992). They noted in their investigation that institutions have an independent impact on political behaviour and thus have an impact on political process results. Neo-institutionalism was essentially an expression of opposition to the then-dominant behaviourist theoretical currents, particularly the idea that the fundamental premise of political analysis is observed behaviour. Behaviour can only be comprehended with consideration of the institutions through which it shows itself. In other words, because political institutions were perceived as neutral arenas in which political conduct is performed rather than as elements that influence political behaviour, behavioural perceptions overestimated the extent to which institutions influence politics (Andreou, 2018). One key idea that historical institutionalists have emphasised in their efforts to explain institutional continuity is that all political actions occur within a historical context. History is not seen as a collection of specific events but rather as something that influences decisions, actions, and occurrences in the future (Hall and Taylor, 1996). The terms "new institutionalism" and "historical institutionalism," which are characterised as progressive changes to existing institutions or new and inventive policies, and their relationship to policy change, will be highlighted in this article (Bennett and Howlett, 1992).

Historical institutionalism quickly ran into the problem of institutional change despite its stress on institutional constancy. The literature on route dependency may be helpful when addressing the problem of policy change (or lack thereof) (Pierson, 2000). Path dependency refers to the fact that once formed, institutions have begun to follow historically set, specific courses where it would be costly to change course (Levi, 1997). Institutions "lock in" and then develop along the trajectories of their dependency as soon as they are created (Andreou, 2018).

Therefore, particular "trajectories" that may include both intended and unintended (and/or unanticipated) outcomes and inefficiencies serve as a guide for the formation of institutions and policies. Since of this lock, changing policies is frequently difficult because institutions are resilient, and actors defend the current model because it (even if it is suboptimal) reflects the requirements of its creators (Greener, 2002). Public policies and formal frameworks are often designed to be difficult to change since prior decisions encourage policy continuity, claims Pierson (2000). As rational actors gradually incorporate into the institutional environment, its effects grow, and as a result, systemic factors increasingly constrain and clearly define the strategic options available to them. As a result, institutional change may occur in a specific environment whose breadth and attributes were influenced by earlier political and institutional decisions.

Historical institutionalism analyses also examined institutional change through the concept of "punctuated equilibrium" (P.E.). The institutions have been in a condition of equilibrium throughout the majority of their history, continuing to operate following the decisions made at the time of their founding or the most recent punctuation point. The PE emphasises how crucial the institutional atmosphere is in influencing policy dynamics and the success of future reforms. Institutions are made to be rigorously traditional, so significant change can only result exogenously. This creates chances for those (people and interest groups) who want to innovate in the policy. Long stretches of institutional stability and reliance on the historical trajectory cross critical tipping points. Critical junctures are described as a brief period when uncertainty about an institution's future generates the grounds for the institution to be put on a new path of development by policymakers and where options for dramatic institutional transformation are both apparent and feasible (Hall and Taylor, 1996). A crucial turning point doesn't always happen at a moment when its effects may be seen in retrospect. Steinmo contends that the important juncture actually happens far earlier in the process, long before its impacts become apparent (Thelen and Steinmo, 1995). The phrase "short periods" refers to how briefly the institutions can change course before falling back into their old patterns of dependence. The actors can decide how an institution should change through time and what new policies to implement to address emerging problems.

Streeck and Thelen (2005) added several new ideas to the historical institution's conceptual toolkit as part of their methodical approach to dealing with institutional change. When "policies establish norms that assign normatively supported rights and obligations to actors and provide for their public, that is third party enforcement," theories of institutional change can also be theories of policy change (Streeck and Thelen, 2005). In the sense that they "constitute rules for actors other than policymakers themselves, rules that may and need to be applied, and rules that are legitimate in that they will, if required, be enforced by agents working on behalf of society," policies are institutions (Streeck and Thelen, 2005). They recognised five distinct categories of incremental change, either exogenous or endogenous, by distinguishing institutional change's process, which can be either incremental or abrupt, and its outcome, which can bring about either continuity or discontinuity. First off, displacement alludes to the progressive modification of the regulatory structures that make up the organisation. This is the most basic form of institutional change. Institutional arrangements are subject to change when preexisting arrangements are contested or ignored in favour of new institutions and related behavioural logic. Such changes are frequently triggered by rediscovery or activation and the creation of alternative institutional kinds (Streeck and Thelen, 2005). The second category, called layering, involves actively supporting changes made to an established group of institutions. Differential routes lead to change: introducing new components triggers dynamics that, over time, actively supplant or displace the old structure, whose domain contracts relative to previously (Streeck and Thelen, 2005). In this

scenario, new regulations and/or institutions are added alongside or overtop of older ones. In states with high levels of partisanship, this is a prevalent practice where the administration creates new frameworks and/or laws to "control" its party supporters without directly affecting state institutions (Andreou, 2018).

Institutions may deteriorate or atrophy in drift if they are kept the same to accommodate shifting political and economic conditions. Gaps in the regulations could trigger it. Political maturity will aid in implementing change (Streeck and Thelen, 2005). This neglect may or may not be intentional due to the institution's brief adaptation to the changes in the external environment. Institutions are diverted to new goals, functions, or purposes throughout the conversion process. This can occur due to fresh environmental issues, changes in the balance of power, or political struggles over the functions and goals that an established organisation might fulfil. Unexpected outcomes are to be expected, and as actors take advantage of ambiguities, change needs compromise. This kind of shift requires time (Streeck and Thelen, 2005).

Last but not least, exhaustion is a mechanism that causes failure, making it different from the other four shift cycles (Streeck and Thelen, 2005). On the other hand, rather than occurring suddenly, the breakdown occurs gradually. Exhaustion may happen when an institution's regular operations erode its surrounding conditions and available resources (Streeck and Thelen, 2005). In the event of fatigue, activities within the institution degrade its functioning, as opposed to drift, when the organisation retains its formal integrity despite becoming progressively dysfunctional.

The role of concepts and knowledge in systemic change has been thoroughly investigated in the context of public policy research. According to this perspective, much political discourse is a stage of social development expressed in public policy. More specifically, public policy (in time t1) develops as a learning function, with the prior public policy (in time t0) having the most significant cognitive influence. As a result, rather than directly addressing social and economic conditions, public policy reacts to the effects of earlier initiatives. "The purposeful endeavour to adjust the goals or tactics of public policy in order to conform with old knowledge and new facts," according to Hall, is how he defines social learning. The fact that such a mechanism causes policy to change suggests learning (Hall, 1993). The essential participants in this learning process are the experts in the specific field of public policy who either work for the state or advise it from privileged positions at the intersection of the bureaucracy and the intellectual subcultures of society. The three stages of social learning, as a change in public policy, are the overarching goals that direct public policy in a particular field, the public policy techniques or tools used to achieve the goals, and the actual costs of these tools. Each stage is divided into an equal number of variables. Historical neo-institutionalists, who acknowledge that institutions reflect, structure, and reproduce unequal power relations, hold that the development of institutions and policies is frequently the subject of conflict between groups with divergent spheres of influence and that this conflict often results in the institution or policy under consideration being changed (Andreou, 2018).

CAP and the environment- The historical Background

A favourable environment supports agricultural activities, enabling farmers to take advantage of natural resources, produce agro-food, and ensure their financial security. So, while agricultural production benefits society as a whole, agriculture's income sustains farm families and rural communities (EC, 2021). Furthermore, because climatic conditions directly impact farming activities, agriculture is particularly at risk from climate change. Agriculture also contributes to climate change by releasing greenhouse gases into the environment. Contrarily,

agriculture can lessen the effects of climate change by lowering greenhouse gas emissions and sequestering carbon while maintaining food production. As a result, the CAP incorporates social, economic, and environmental perspectives to get the EU closer to having a sustainable agricultural system.

The EU has agreed to additional international commitments for actions to address climate change and sustainable development challenges (see Vardopoulos and Karytsas, 2019), which will be based around a new and more ambitious green architecture, and the new CAP takes further steps in this direction (EC, 2021a). However, it was sometimes different from this. The CAP's original principles did not include environmental preservation and conservation because there were other priorities for policy. This perception gradually changed as environmental issues became more politicised in the early 1970s. It intensified in the 1980s with the publication of the so-called "Green Paper" on the prospects of the CAP, which emphasised the importance of environmental protection, the 1988 Communication on "Environment and Agriculture," and the guidebook "The Future of Rural Society," which emphasised the need to reduce desolation (Louloudis et al., 1999). Actually, "…the Green Paper, recognised the need to take and institutionalise measures to prevent and reduce environmental degradation from intensive agriculture." (Vardopoulos et al., 2018).

Additionally, the consumer and environmental movements for policy changes steadily grew and strengthened due to the food scandals that broke out in the late 1980s and early 1990s and the damaging environmental effects of the agricultural model supported by the CAP. Also, the EU accelerated its international efforts to tackle environmental issues with global repercussions, particularly following the United Nations Conference on the Environment and Developing in Rio in 1992 (Avrami, 2022). These endogenous and exogenous forces caused the CAP to undergo a considerable overhaul in 1992. As a result, starting in 1992, environmental concerns were increasingly crucial in the CAP revisions that followed. The 1992 agri-environmental measures were novel, although their budgetary implications were smaller than those of the conventional CAP policies. This is the first serious effort to support agriculture as a source of goods and services that improve the environment. This idea was expanded upon by Agenda 2000 and the notion of the "second pillar" for rural development (Doukas, 2011; Maraveyas, 1983). The Rural Development Pillar in the CAP was included as part of the Agenda 2000 reform package, stressing safe agri-food products and environmental outcomes. The relationship between the need for environmental preservation and direct incentives to help producers has been established. Through a series of acts addressing the many rural activities while acknowledging the crucial role of agricultural production, Member States were under pressure to take proper environmental safeguards.

Additionally, Member States were granted latitude in how they supported farmers in conjunction with environmental measures and the threat of fines, such as the reduction or elimination of support funding, if they disobeyed. The support amounts that eventually were not paid to farmers were transferred to the Member State's rural development program (Doukas, 2018; Louloudis and Maraveyas, 1997). Moreover, from a list of potential measures, among which environmental preservation and climate action were necessary, Member States should develop complete national or regional programs. These steps enhanced efforts to train farmers in ecologically friendly practices to assist forests with very high ecological value and underserved areas. Also, the Member States were given incentives to spend a portion of these funds to support the development of more ecologically friendly production techniques in the beef and milk industries.

In the CAP's Mid-Term Review (MTR) in 2003, cross-compliance was made a prerequisite for all direct payments. Cross-compliance sets down environmental and other criteria that farmers must satisfy to be eligible for subsidies. Regulations for statutory management under Union law and standards for excellent agricultural and environmental

conditions of the land establishment were incorporated in the cross-compliance norms (EC, 2021c). Additionally, on June 26, 2003, EU farm ministers approved the "Mid Term Review," a major CAP reform. The reform drastically altered how the EU's farmers were supported and instituted a "one farm payment" unrelated to output. The CAP reform's guiding principles state that "this new system will be connected to the respect of environmental, food safety, and animal welfare criteria, as well as the duty to keep all farms in excellent agricultural and environmental condition (cross-compliance)". Also, by lowering direct payments for larger farms, more money was made available to farmers for programs promoting the environment, quality, or animal welfare (Maravegias and Doukas, 2011; Maravegias and Martinos, 1997)

Based on the unique soil-climatic characteristics of each region, more efforts have been made over the past two decades through the CAP to encourage farmers to adopt more environmentally friendly practices in plant and animal production and to achieve the most effective exploitation of natural resources by incorporating new technologies throughout the framework of the production process (Doukas, 2018). The green direct payment, which accounts for 30% of the direct payment budget under the new CAP system, is given to farmers that satisfy three environmental requirements (soil and biodiversity in particular). Farmers must diversify their crops, safeguard permanent grassland, maintain biodiversity, and give 5% of their arable land to ecologically beneficial regions (Ecological Focus Areas) (Doukas, 2014). Depending on the circumstances, there are exceptions to the norms. For example, farmers with a significant amount of grassland benefit the environment. The proportion of permanent grassland to agricultural land is determined at the national or regional level in EU countries (with a 5 per cent margin of flexibility).

Furthermore, sections of permanent grassland are designated as environmentally sensitive in EU countries. Farmers are unable to cultivate or transform permanent grassland in these places. In addition, farmers who chose the small farmer's program are exempt from the greening regulations for administrative and proportionality considerations (EC, 2021d).

Furthermore, organic farmers immediately qualify for a greening reward for their property due to how they generate their goods. Depending on a farmer's particular circumstances, further exemptions can be applied. Farmers who disregard the greening regulations would receive lower direct payments. Such decreases indicate the number of hectares identified as non-compliant, given the extent of the greening criteria (Doukas, 2014). Given that green direct payment is required, it can help a significant portion of the cultivated land adopt good techniques for the environment and the fight against climate change. The goal is to establish precise and quantifiable standards since, as experience has demonstrated, the Cross-Compliance regime offers a framework of regulations that is relatively lax and easy to ignore while also having substantial flaws in control mechanisms.

Global population increase, urbanisation trends, the depletion of natural resources, and risks to agricultural production due to climate change are all increasing pressure on the global agricultural industry (Doukas, 2019). Furthermore, the effects of climate change are being felt throughout the EU, particularly in European agriculture. These effects include changing rainfall patterns, rising temperatures, seasonal unpredictability, and extreme weather events, including heatwaves, droughts, storms, and floods. Human systems and European environments are at risk due to severe climate change impacts, such as river flooding, droughts, and coastal flooding. Even though some climatic changes will be advantageous to some parts of northern Europe, the vast majority will be harmful, impacting regions already going through environmental or other changes. The combination of several of these consequences may increase vulnerability in various areas. In the southern and southeast regions of the EU, agriculture will be most negatively impacted.

Given the strain on natural resources, agriculture must improve its environmental performance by employing more sustainable production techniques. Farmers must employ

mitigation and adaptation measures to address the dangers of climate change. Promoting climate change and sustainable natural resource management is one of the CAP's three primary objectives (EC, 2021b). Of course, the principal managers of the natural environment are European farmers, who work, produce, and invest in the larger European rural region (Maravegias and Doukas, 2012; Maraveyas and Duquenne, 1994). Thus, the CAP 2021–2027 aims to encourage the development of a competitive and sustainable agricultural sector that can support farmers' livelihoods while also supplying society with nutritious food and vibrant rural communities. The European Green Deal is focused on agriculture and rural areas, and the new CAP aims to be a crucial tool in achieving the Farm to Fork and biodiversity objectives (Doukas, Maravegias and Chrysomallidis, 2022).

As a result, the new CAP operating framework (2021–2027) stipulates that measurable environmental and climatic requirements must be met for direct payments to be eligible. Direct payments will therefore depend on meeting environmental and climatic requirements, such as crop rotation in place of crop diversification, the preservation of carbon-rich soils through the protection of wetlands, and the sustainable management and enhancement of water resources. Each member state must create programs to assist farmers or offer incentives for sound agricultural practices to achieve this. Financially, the increased transfer of resources from pillar 1 to pillar 2 for environmental and climatic policies reflects the financial upgradation of environmental issues by 15% (EC, 2018a).

Policy making and the "greening" of the CAP

In order to show how actions made by Member States' governments have constrained their future behaviour and bolstered the independence and positions of supranational institutions, historical institutionalism has been utilised. Leading European Union lecturers on historical institutionalism include Paul Pierson (1996) and Simon Bulmer (2009). They defended the usefulness of this research method and, in Bulmer's words, the "description" of political and policy-related activities within the context of multilevel government. Bulmer supported and utilised the "governance regime" concept, in particular, to examine the EU at the level of various subsystem policies.

The rational choice institutionalism theory has been primarily utilised to describe the goals of Member State governments in the integration process and show how various EU decision-making norms affect actors' behaviour and influence. Governments actively participate in and delegate authority to the EU because they gain several benefits from doing so, the most significant of which are: reduced transaction costs through improved policy development, policy effectiveness, and policy compliance, which are characteristics of the behaviour of governments according to the rational choice analysis. Its foundation is the theory of rational behaviour in economics. The players' perspectives on keeping or modifying the CAP are correctly interpreted (Doukas 2011).

The implementation of the CAP has different costs and advantages for each Member State, leading to competing goals and expectations. It causes a significant distinction in the distribution of the benefits among the numerous actors who engage formally or informally in its formation because it is a shared and fundamentally binding policy. They include national priorities, committee bureaucrats, sectoral interests, and other pressure organisations interested in agriculture (Doukas and Maravegias, 2021; Maravegias, 1991). The Commission and the Council of Agriculture and Rural Development Ministers, which speak for farmers in their nations and the interests of the major trading partners, have historically used CAP reform choices as a negotiating tool (e.g., UN and the members of the World Trade Organization). Large interest groups have rarely been represented in the CAP's history, especially when it

comes to consumer groups. This is especially true of the CAP's current policy. However, a few things happened in the late 1990s that significantly altered the data.

As it turned out, following the significant issues that arose and the widespread panic in cases like the bovine spongiform encephalopathy crisis, the discovery of dioxins in food in Belgium, and the "foot and mouth disease," consumers' demands for higher safety standards and food quality have significantly increased, as have concerns about the impact of the CAP on the environment, animal health, and the adoption of practices for their proponents. As was to be predicted, these demands became increasingly pressing as income levels in EU Member States rose. However, even before the reform process, these worries had risen and deepened out of anxiety about the aforementioned situations and continued to be a top priority for EU residents. Whatever the CAP's position on these issues, one of its political responses has been to put them at the top of its agenda. As a response, the Green Party leaders attempted to attend meetings of the appropriate ministers in nations like Germany and Italy, helping to advance efforts to review and redefine the CAP (Swinnen, 2001).

Furthermore, during the nearly three decades following the creation of the CAP (1962–1992), pressure groups representing farmers' professional associations did not pose a challenge from other strong organisations pushing contrary viewpoints and assertions. The European agricultural model, which has detrimental environmental repercussions, has weakened the consumer and environmental movements over time, as a result of food scandals and escalating bad environmental effects. They consequently rapidly grew in power within the EU institutions (Doukas, 2018).

Cross-compliance also has an unclear economic philosophy, although appearing to be politically justified. The issue was whether adding new conditions to existing income support was a valuable tool for policy. Let us think about the success of cross-compliance even though this issue is outside the purview of this analysis. For instance, as we have demonstrated, numerous researchers draw attention to the fact that direct payments were allocated by agricultural policy objectives rather than environmental objectives, linking two contradictory findings and the absence of clear environmental policy objectives. Indeed, farmers wholly reliant on direct payments ought not to "coincide" with those who seriously harm the environment.

It is crucial to consider how decisions were made regarding the distribution of direct payment savings, specifically from farmers' non-compliance. The Member States could only withhold 25% of the funds obtained through the implementation of cross-compliance; therefore there was not much motivation for the states to put in place a reliable control system. Political rhetoric did not match political reality. Thus the pressures and worries that the new "players" have brought to light may have been more important for the reform process. Nevertheless, they were the Commission's most important ally in attaining its objective reform objectives for the environment and food safety. On the other hand, the comparable deterioration of producer pressure organisations over the previous two decades also had a significant impact. The gradual decline in the rural population brought about this change, both in terms of absolute numbers and as a share of the overall workforce in the EU (Doukas, 2011).

The establishment of the Green Payment Scheme was another significant turning point in the path-dependence of the CAP's design and execution. The producers' environmental compliance is now quantifiable for the first time, and the requirements for awarding them the total amount of the direct payments are clearly defined. Last but not least, an even more precise allocation of measurements within the new framework of the CAP for the years 2021–2027 was required due to the EU's commitments to climate action and the devastating effects of climate change along the entire agro–food chain.

As seen from the examples above, the goal of developing green architecture is evident, reflecting a solid yet adaptable framework intended to "green" the CAP. For many years, CAP received harsh criticism for its ideology and method of operation's detrimental effects on the environment, which included the intensification of agricultural production and the loss of natural resources. The new CAP increases rational choice within a rigid framework of shared commitments and objectives, with conditionality—linking money to results—playing a significant role under the pressure of a smaller budget. The CAP is simultaneously working to raise awareness of and improve environmental and climate change-related concerns through particular funding mechanisms. Planning to accomplish these objectives incorporates both CAP pillars, encourages collaboration with other similar policies, and increases flexibility based on national priorities (Doukas and Maravegias, 2021).

Conclusions

Even while concerns about how economic activity and agricultural output affect the environment and climate change have been in the public conversation for more than 40 years, in the last 20 years there has been a greater focus on policy change and adaptation to address these issues. Farmers' power is notably diminished. The consumer and environmental movements are also becoming more vital globally and within the EU's multilevel governance framework.

Additionally, it is now well acknowledged that agriculture is particularly vulnerable to climate change because weather directly affects farming activities. Agriculture also contributes to climate change by simultaneously releasing greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. In addition, the EU has committed to taking new initiatives to address climate change and sustainable development challenges.

As a result, the new CAP for the programming period 2021–2027 promotes a new green architecture. By involving measurable environmental and climatic criteria, such as preserving carbon-rich soils through the protection of wetlands, the sustainable management and enhancement of water resources, and crop rotation rather than crop diversification, the Policy adapts to the new climate challenges. Moreover, environmental and climate action plans to provide at least 30% of the funding for the second pillar, or roughly 23 billion euros, to environmental and climate change activities, demonstrating the Commission's determination to strengthen these goals.

References

- Andreou, G. (2018) *Η νεοθεσμική προσέγγιση της πολιτικής*. Kritiki.ISBN 9789605862565.
- Avrami, L. (2022) Η ανάπτυξη της ελληνικής περιβαλλοντικής πολιτικής υπό το πρίσμα των ευρωπαϊκών εξελίξεων (1981-2021): Μια χαμένη ευκαιρία; In Y. El. Doukas, N. Maravegias, & G. Andreou (Eds.), *Η χωρική διάσταση της ευρωπαϊκής ολοκλήρωσης: σύγκλιση ή απόκλιση;* Dionicos. ISBN 9786185665036.
- Bennett, C. J., & Howlett, M. (1992) The Lessons of Learning: Reconciling Theories of Policy Learning and Policy Change. *Policy Sciences*, *25*(3), 275–294. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4532260.
- Bulmer, S. (2009) Politics in Time meets the politics of time: historical institutionalism and the EU timescape. *Journal of European Public Policy*, *16*(2), 307–324. https://doi.org/10.1080/13501760802589347.

- Climate Focus. (2016) COP21 Paris 2015 - Climate Focus Overall Summary and Client Briefs. Climate Focus. https://www.climatefocus.com/publica-tions/cop21-paris-2015-climate-focus-overall-summary-and-client-briefs.
- Doukas, Y. El, Maravegias, N., & Chrysomallidis, C. (2022) Digitalization in the EU agricultural sector: Seeking a European policy response. In K. Mattas, G. Baourakis, C. Zopounidis, & C. Staboulis (Eds.), *Food Policy Modelling. Cooperative Management* (pp. 83–98). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-08317-4_6.
- Doukas, Y. El. (2011) *The political economy of the Common Agricultural Policy reform*. [National and Kapodistrian University of Athens].
- Doukas, Y. El. (2014) The agricultural sector in the period 2014-2020. In A. Mitsos (Director), *The policies financed by the budget of the European Union and the Greek economy - Final Report [Study for the Bank of Greece]*. ELIAMEP.
- Doukas, Y. El. (2018) Η Κοινή Αγροτική Πολιτική και ο Ελληνικός Αγροτικός Τομέας. In N. Maravegias & T. Sakellaropoulos (Eds.), *Ελλάδα και Ευρωπαϊκή Ενοποίηση: Η Ιστορία μιας πολυκύμαντης σχέσης 1962-2018*. Dionicos.
- Doukas, Y. El. (2019) The Common Agricultural Policy under the pressure of the new Financial Framework (2021-2027): Nationalization and adaptation. *Region & Periphery*, *8*, 133–142. https://doi.org/10.12681/rp.21159.
- Doukas, Y. El., & Maravegias, N. (2021) *Ευρωπαϊκή Αγροτική Οικονομία και Πολιτική: Μετασχηματισμοί και Προκλήσεις Προσαρμογής*.Kritiki. ISBN 9789605863753.
- European Commission (2018a) Proposal for Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council. COM (2018) 392 final.
- European Commission (2018b) A Modern Budget for a Union that Protects, Empowers and Defends: The Multiannual Financial Framework for 2021-2027. COM (2018) 321 final.
- European Commission (2021a) Sustainable agriculture in the CAP, https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-fi sheries/sustainability/sustainable-cap_en.
- European Commission (2021b), The CAP and climate change, https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-fi sheries/sustainability/environmental-sustainability/climate-change_en.
- European Commission (2021c) Cross-compliance, https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-fi sheries/key-policies/common-agricultural-policy/income-support/cross-compliance_en.
- European Commission (2021d) Environmental sustainability in EU agriculture, https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-fi sheries/sustainability/environ-mental-sustainability/.
- European Parliament (2018) 2021-2027 multiannual financial framework and new own resources : Analysis of the Commission's proposal. PE 625.148 – July 2018.FA0 (2019), FAO's work on climate change: United Nation's climate change conference, http://www.fao.org/3/ca7126en/ca7126en.pdf.
- Eurostat (2020) SDG 13 - Climate action - Statistics Explained. European Commission. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/SDG_13_-_Climate_action#Climate_action_in_the_EU:_overview_and_key_trends.
- Greener, I. (2002) Understanding NHS Reform: The Policy-Transfer, Social Learning, and Path-Dependency Perspectives. *Governance*, *15*(2), 161–183. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0491.00184.
- Hall, P. A. (1993) Policy paradigms, social learning, and the state: The case of economic policymaking in Britain. *Comparative Politics*, *25*(3), 275. https://doi.org/10.2307/422246.

- Hall, P. A., & Taylor, R. C. R. (1996) Political science and the three new institutionalisms. *Political Studies*, *44*(5), 936–957. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.1996.tb00343.x.
- Levi, M. (1997) A model, a method, and a map: Rational choice in comparative and historical analysis. In M. Lichbach & A. Zuckerman (Eds.), *Comparative politics: Rationality, culture and structure* (pp. 19–41). Cambridge University Press.
- Louloudis, L., & Maravegias, N. (1997) Farmers and agricultural policy in Greece since the accession to the European Union. *Sociologia Ruralis*, *37*(2), 270–286. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9523.1997.tb00050.x.
- Louloudis, L., Beopoulos, N., & Vlachos, G. (1999) Πολιτική για την προστασία του αγροτικού περιβάλλοντος στην Ελλάδα με ορίζοντα το 2010. In N. Maravegias (Ed.), *Η ελληνική γεωργία προς το 2010*. Papazisis.
- Maravegias, N. (1983) Croissance economique et espace rural. Agriculture et agro-industrie dans le development regional de la Grece [Universite des Sciences Sociales de Grenoble, Faculte des Sciences Economiques]. https://doi.org/10.12681/eadd/3813.
- Maravegias, N. (1991) Agriculture méditerranéenne et politique agricole commune: l'expérience de la Grèce. In S. Bedrani & P. Campagne (Eds.), *Choix technologiques, risques et sécurité dans les agricultures méditerranéennes*. Montpellier (pp. 159–165). International Centre for Advanced Mediterranean Agronomic Studies (CIHEAM).
- Maravegias, N., & Doukas, Y. E. (2012) A stategy for rural development in Greece: The case of Island Areas. *Region & Periphery*, *1*, 37–56. https://doi.org/10.12681/rp.16481.
- Maravegias, N., & Doukas, Y. El. (2011) Traceability and the new CAP. In G. Baourakis, K. Mattas, C. Zopounidis, & G. van Dijk (Eds.), *A resilient european food industry in a challenging world*. Nova Science Publishers.
- Maravegias, N., & Duquenne, M.-N. (1994) L'agriculture grecque dans le processus d'intégration européenne. *Économie Rurale*, *224*, 58–60.
- Maravegias, N., & Martinos, N. (1997) L'agriculture grecque face à l'union économique et monétaire de la Communauté Européenne. In A. Abaab, P. Campagne, M. Elloumi, A. Fragata, & L. Zagdouni (Eds.), *Agricultures familiales et politiques agricoles en Méditerranée : enjeux et perspectives* (pp. 277–284). International Centre for Advanced Mediterranean Agronomic Studies (CIHEAM).
- March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1983) The new institutionalism: Organizational factors in political life. *American Political Science Review*, *78*(3), 734–749. https://doi.org/10.2307/1961840.
- OECD (2021) OECD at the UN Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen (COP15). www.oecd.org/env/cc/oecd-cop15-copenhagen.htm.
- Pierson, P. (1996) The path to European integration. *Comparative Political Studies*, *29*(2), 123–163. https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414096029002001.
- Pierson, P. (2000) Increasing returns, path dependence, and the study of politics. *American Political Science Review*, *94*(2), 251–267. https://doi.org/10.2307/2586011.
- Streeck, W., & Thelen, K. (2005) Introduction: institutional change in advanced political economies. In W. Streeck & K. Thelen (Eds.), *Beyond continuity: institutional change in advanced political economies* (pp. 1–39). Oxford University Press.
- Swinnen, J. F. M. (2001) A Fischler reform of the Common Agricultural Policy? *Centre for European Policy Studies*, *Working Document No.3*. https://www.ceps.eu/ceps-publications/fischler-reform-common-agricultural-policy/.
- Thelen, K., & Steinmo, S. (1992) Historical institutionalism in contemporary politics. In S. Steinmo, K. Thelen, & F. Longstreth (Eds.), *Structuring politics: Historical institutionalism in comparative analysis* (pp. 1–32). Cambridge University Press.

- U.N. (2021) Goal 13, Department of Economic and Social Affairs. United Nations. https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal13.
- Vardopoulos, I., & Karytsas, S. (2019) An exploratory path analysis of climate change effects on tourism. *Sustainable Development, Culture, Traditions Journal, Special Volume in Honor of Professor George I. Theodoropoulos,* 132–152. https://doi.org/10.26341/issn.2241-4002-2019-sv-13.
- Vardopoulos, I., Falireas, S., Konstantopoulos, I., Kaliora, E., & Theodoropoulou, E. (2018) Sustainability assessment of the agri-environmental practices in Greece. Indicators' comparative study. *International Journal of Agricultural Resources, Governance and Ecology*, *14*(4), 368. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJARGE.2018.098024.