WILDFIRES IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

The cohesion of the European Green Deal policies to prevent them

INTRODUCTION

Environmental context:

Demographical movement, specifically rural exodus.

Forest management has lead to an increase of forests.

Climate change effects increased high-to-extreme fire danger.

Management context:

EU focuses on mitigation plans.

€1 in prevention can save up to €4-€7 in mitigation/recovery.



Research Question:

Are the strategies of the EGD coherent to prevent the complex problem of wildfire prevention?



Objectives:

- •Examine the level of coherence.
- Observe if the policies can comprehensively solve the complex problem.
- •Identify synergies and gaps between policies.

ANALITICAL FRAMEWORK

Coherence:

Process where policymakers design a set of policies in a that, if properly way implemented, they can possibly achieve a larger goal and solve a complex problem wildfire this in case prevention.

Cejudo & Michel (2017) Model

European Green Deal:

Holistic initiative towards a sustainable, low-carbon economy.

Target areas:

Combat climate change

European Commission (2021)

- Biodiversity loss
- Environmental degradation | and social equity

While fostering economic growth

Scientifical evidences:

- Landscape planning wildfires
- •Planning risk assessment in rural-urban areas.
- •Resilient forest management → election of species, discontinuity of inflammable fuels.
- Increase of research and public awareness.

EU Scientifical Booklet (2021). Land-based wildfire prevention measures.

METHODOLOGY

Analysis of the coherence elements, Cejudo & Michael model (2017).



Policy Objectives



Policy Instruments



Policy Target

| Anal | ysis of | 4 strategies of | | |
|------|---------|-----------------|---------|--|
| the | EGD, | that | mention | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Forest Strategy 2030

Biodiversity Strategy 2030

Adaptation to Climate Change Strategy

Farm to Fork Strategy

| | No overlapping | Simultaneous operate | Contribute to the complex problem |
|---------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Level 1 | | | |
| Level 2 | | | |
| Level 3 | | | |

RESULTS

| Policy Objectives | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------|---------|------|-----|--|
| | FS 2030 | BS 2030 | ACCS | FFS | |
| FS 2030 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | |
| BS 2030 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | |
| ACCS | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| FFS | 1 | 2 | 1 | I | |
| Total | 5 | 6 | 5 | 4 | |

| Policy Instruments | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------|---------|------|-----|--|--|
| | FS 2030 | BS 2030 | ACCS | FFS | | |
| FS 2030 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | |
| BS 2030 | 2 | - | 2 | 1 | | |
| ACCS | 1 | 2 | _ | 2 | | |
| FFS | 1 | 1 | 2 | - | | |
| Total | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | | |

Policy Target: The primary focus does not lie on the delineation of policy targets themselves. The principal targets in all the strategies are the Member States and policy areas are Agriculture and Rural Development and Environment.

CONCLUSIONS

- •High levels of coherence, especially in Adaptation Climate Change Strategy and Biodiversity Strategy.
- •Better results have been shown in pairs of policies, where the general objectives create synergies with the wildfire-specific ones.
- Presence of overlapping objectives, in the case of the Biodiversity Strategy 2030 and the Forest Strategy 2030.
- None of these policies fully deal with the complex and wildfires achieve problem totally comprehensive management in the prevention phase.

LIMITATIONS

- methodology employed •The recognizes the effects of subjective biases to influence conclusions.
- •Further expert assessment is to determine if these needed collectively suffice policies to address the complex issue of wildfires in scientific terms.
- Other factors that might influence the outcome \rightarrow funding and Member State's implementation.

REFERENCES

