ANNEX 3 - Examples of delivery of environmental services through the design and implementation of measures (or complementary approaches) supported by the EAFRD.

Key: AES = Agri-environmental Scheme LPIS = Land Parcel Information System For measure code translations see Annex 2

Notes: *Five additional examples were collected following the second meeting of the FG (the Netherlands, 23-24 June 2012); these are included in the Progress report but are not shown in the following table. A further 17 examples have been collected where too little information is provided to determine the source of the support for the environmental services delivered. These examples are not shown in the current table either.*

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
1	214	**MS:** Belgium **Region:** Province of Limburg (Regional Landscape of Haspengouw)	**Objective:** Biodiversity conservation **Topic:** To tackle the declining of farmland biodiversity in agriculture areas based on a short chain product approach (not subsidised). **Focus:** Implementation of single measure, Other: developing a concept of agri-environmental measure with economic return: moving towards self-sustained systems, independent of subsidies	Development of a new initiative in response to the continued decline of farmland species despite existing initiatives, such as agri-environment schemes. To incentivise farmers to provide winter feed for farmland birds and reduce carbon emissions based on added value of produce in short supply chains.	Adding value to bread by leaving 10% of cultivated wheat un-harvested. The harvested wheat is used to produce bread in a short supply chain at a slightly higher cost to the consumer to account for the provision of winter feed for farmland birds. Main actors include: regional consultants, the coordinators (Regionaal Landschap Haspengouw), farmers, miller, bakery school and bakers.	Field demonstrations (and online guidance documents for land management and environmental benefits). Website (communicates with consumer, producer and supplier). Collecting points for a soft toy bird	Improved farmland biodiversity, specific examples are the Skylark, Corn Bunting, insects, hares and deer. Benefits also for plant diversity allowing local species such as cornflower and poppies to flourish. Increased uptake and recognition of agri-environmental measures among stakeholders, with 24 bakeries selling the produce. Decreased dependency of subsidies. Reduced carbon footprint due to short supply chain. Improved landscape.	The process of growing wheat until the end product is complex: farmers need professional advice in wheat growing for baking purposes and mills are usually not allowed to pulverise wheat for consumption.	Added value produce could be used more effectively to deliver environmental services. Recommendations to integrate this initiative into the 214 measure: to provide multiple environmental services. • Ensure a minimum 10% coverage of the 214 measure, where implemented. • The 214 measure should orient itself more towards a self-sustained system by targeting subsidies at innovation, development and collaboration.
2	214 (pilot)	**MS:** Belgium **Region:** Flanders region (a collaboration between Flemish Land Agency and INAGRO vzw)	**Objectives:** Biodiversity conservation; Water quality; Preservation of landscapes; Other: Increase pollinators **Topic:** Natural pest control research and experiments to limit the use of pesticides. **Focus:** Implementation of single measure through a pilot project. Other: development of new measure focusing on natural pest control and functional agro biodiversity, generating win-win for farmers and nature	Current pesticide use is based on the number of aphids counted on/in wheat, but does not consider natural predators. Development of a new approach to reduce pesticide use in response to potential increases in EU pesticide controls and continuing decline in pollinators. To provide a sustainable/free option through the implementation of an integrated pest control system.	A pilot was carried out on several farms, supported by the Flemish Land Agency (farm advisors) and the Inagro Institute (scientists). The farmers experimented with the establishment of flower strips on their fields. Researchers monitored the presence, distribution and function of natural enemies in the flower strips and the adjacent crops.	Several demonstration days were organised for farmers, policy makers and local stakeholders. A regional plan will be developed to ensure a sustainable biological pest control system is in place.	This is a pilot project which is intended to be integrated into the agri-environment measure. The environmental services it is expected to deliver are: • Reduced use of pesticides through biological pest control; • Increased pollinators due to more pollen and nectar availability in agricultural landscapes; • Flower strips provide cover for wildlife and deliver a colourful and attractive landscape. This is expected to have positive outcomes for biodiversity, landscape values and water quality.	Monitoring pests will be time and cost consuming; Costs of ensuring farmers are well informed are high; Regional plan will require a minimum coverage of measures and cooperation among farmers to share knowledge and experience.. Pilot projects, funded under experimental European programmes only support short term experiments with little continuum for innovation, particularly in light of scarce resource and high competition.	• Training farmers should be prioritised, such as, training through agricultural schools/universities or training as a condition to enter agri-environmental schemes. A degree of training can also be delivered by improving farmer communication. • Increased collaboration and knowledge transfer is needed between member states on the development of efficient agri-environmental measures. • More funding should be devoted for research into agri-environmental measures.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
3	214	**MS:** Czech Republic **Region:** only protected areas (National Parks – NPs, Protected Landscape Areas – PLAs)	**Objective:** Biodiversity conservation **Topic:** To tailor 214 schemes to the real needs on plot level by using local knowledge of experts in nature protection. **Focus:** Implementation of a single measure	The design and implementation of 214 schemes was deemed too complex. The approach sought to tailor schemes to specific habitats according to their actual state and to improve coordination among national policies including the Programme for Landscape Management – PPK and measure 214.	With the help of the Ministry of Agriculture, farmers must use the LPIS to prepare their AES application. Paying agency then decide if the land management is appropriate and if it should receive funding under 214. Where payment is refused, farmers can apply for subsidies under the more flexible national scheme (run by the Ministry of Environment (PPK)). Applies to all farmers seeking AES payments. Actors: Farmers, Agriculture Ministry, the Nature Conservation Agency (AOPK), staff administering PLA/NP and advisors.	Communication was not always effective between paying agencies and farmers where there is low trust and poor administrative capacity. For example, farmers in some areas did not react to the paying agency staff request to come to their offices for negotiations on implementation of AEM on particular plots, which was necessary step before farmers filled in application forms.	Higher uptake of environmental management in all protected areas. In 2010 the uptake on valuable habitats was in total 84,4 % of eligible area of valuable habitats.	Additional investment required for LPIS use. Time consuming for all actors involved, particularly in the first two years of implementation. Different perspectives between farmer desire to maintain production levels and environmental management specified by LPIS created several difficulties in some protected areas and has led to a decline in trust between stakeholders.	Additional investments in LPIS should be lower in future years. The different perspectives can be better mediated with better training for paying agency staff. Identification of needs from PLA/NP in GIS available to all key stakeholders should be maintained into next programming period Advisors should help with decisions and be given more during initial stages. Improvements will focus on implementation and targeting. The communication between stakeholders at national and regional was a crucial point for the success of the policy.
4	214 and 216	**MS:** Czech Republic **Region:** National	**Objective:** Biodiversity conservation **Topic:** To promote schemes for wildlife support (fodder strips on arable land), which are too demanding and with high opportunity costs to be attractive for arable farmers. The need was met by members of the hunters' society who were able to persuade farmers on local level to join the scheme. **Focus:** Involvement of local communities and possibly implementation of a single measure	The low uptake of the AES 'growing of grassland strips on arable land' in the previous programming period has been attributed to low environmental awareness among arable farmers. Now the government wants to encourage farmers to participate on the scheme 'sowing of fodder strips for wildlife'. The scheme is demanding and not attractive for farmers (e.g. high opportunity costs, affecting organisation of farmland operations) and there is a general lack of advisors.	Farmers apply for the scheme in most cases via the internet usually as a part of an integrated application form. In every village there is a local association of hunters' society and hunters were able to meet farmers and persuade them to join the scheme. Therefore personal contacts in local networks were able to overcome the low attractiveness of the scheme for arable farmers and they started to join the scheme. Actors: farmers, hunting society, regional offices of Ministry of Agriculture (MoA)	The communication was the key factor of success of the scheme (i.e. hunter society and farmers on the local level). There is no government assistance for the administration. Farmers get the information about the scheme from large events (seminars) and via the internet (also booklets are available from regional branches of the Ministry of Agriculture).	As a result of the effort of the small group of hunters the enthusiasm for the scheme spread across the country. The voluntary involvement of the hunter society led to growing uptake of farmers of this agri-environment scheme. In 2011 a total 1100 ha of fodder strips were planted, which represents 1100 km of strips 10 meters wide. In contrast, in the last programming period grassland strips to prevent soil erosion had no such support or communication and resulted in less than ten applications.	Because the involvement of hunters' society was not arranged by state administration and was voluntary there were no new costs to farmers or administrations. Costs were born on hunters' society site, because they invested time to persuade farmers to join the scheme.	The case shows that, when the scheme is demanding and high opportunity costs are associated, a suitable agent dealing with potential beneficiaries is essential. This lesson led to attempt to create new delivery system relying on such agents. The intention is to pay such agents in case of schemes on valuable grasslands for the next programming period with a hope to increase the effectiveness and sustainability of demanding agri-environmental schemes. It is envisaged the agents should serve to increase the trust in policies, improve environmental planning on farm level and improve tailoring of the schemes.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
5	214 and 111	**MS:** Estonia **Region:** National	**Objective:** Biodiversity conservation; Preservation of the landscape **Topic:** Advisory and training for farmers under agri-environment **Focus:** Implementation and combination of several measures; Other: disseminating the information about the environmental values and services (best practices) the farmers good provide	In Estonia there is low interest amongst farmers in environmental issues that have no obvious economic benefits. In response training was provided to improve knowledge of the values of environmental services and to show how farm management can have a direct impact on the environment. The EC specify that farmers cannot be compensated training under measure 214. The solution was to connect measure 214 with training under measure 111 as a baseline requirement.	Training for the agri-environment measure is free of charge, financed through measure 111 and RDP technical assistance. Under the two agri-environmental measures implemented nationally (support for the environmentally-friendly farming and for organic farming) farmers are required to pass the basic 1-day agri-environmental training (for organic farming 2 days) by the end of 1st contracting year and the additional 1-day (for the organic farming 2 days) training by the end of the contracting period.	The training sessions provide direct two-way communication between farmers and managing bodies. The training sessions also support communication between farmers which is important for sharing of best practices.	Training improves farmer knowledge of environmental land management through agri-environment schemes. This background information is expected to form a good foundation for the farmers to go beyond their contractual commitments when choosing management practices. Includes farmers with the on-going evaluation process, giving them direct feedback of the impact of their management. This better farmer knowledge may also help to support collective approaches in the future.	Two to four days per 5-year commitment period doesn't seem enough to provide the level of advice necessary. Due to the number of farmers involved there are limits to the amount of advice which can be support (lack of organisers, budget) The time spent for the farmers not working (2-4 days) as well as transportation costs are not covered.	Important to support communication between farmers. Trainings could be innovative if possible. We have been including video clips and movies to the programme (for example a film Poppies Promises produced by Nautilusfilm) and it has been very successful (affected emotionally). It is also good to organise smaller discussion groups in trainings etc. Trainings should be diverse enough in subjects to attract farmers (taking into account also their diverse management practices). Particularly an issue for farmers who have already passed some training and would like to learn something new.
6	214	**MS:** Estonia **Region:** National	**Objective:** Biodiversity conservation; Preservation of the landscape **Topic:** n/a **Focus:** Support schemes for the maintenance of semi-natural habitats	There is a problem of semi natural habitats (SNH areas), particularly those which are covered by more trees or bushes than are allowed under the SAPS eligibility rules, becoming abandoned and overgrown. Such areas are recognised as being very rich in species and often found in land not eligible for SAPS and agri-environment payments.	The know-how and daily execution of the 214 measure is carried out by the Ministry of Environment, while the paying agency and the regulation relating to the conditions of payment are from the Ministry of Agriculture. This scheme differs from the other AE schemes in that unlike other AE sub-measures this scheme goes beyond the SAPS eligible area to account for the 10 important habitats such as wooded meadows, wooded pastures and alvars. Farmers have the choice to either to take all the possible CAP payments or the semi natural habitat (SNH) payment.	The Environmental Board has been very active in communication with the farmers, organising the information days and the compulsory trainings, also helping them in daily management questions. As they act on a local scale they are trying to motivate also farmers to take up the commitment.	The scheme has been particularly successful in the protection of wooded meadow habitats. It is a good example of support combined with available measures. The requirements and administration needed is simple. The scheme is also a very good example of how the different administrations can work well together. There is also very good cooperation between farmers and board of experts. An improvement could be training requirements as pre-condition.	While at the beginning of implementing the measure in 2007 the payment rate for SNH areas was competitive with the other CAP payments, the situation has now changed. As the SAPS payment is increasing in time, the payments farmers are getting through the other CAP payments is now higher and thus making the SNH scheme less attractive. Payment rates will be revised in the next programming period to account for this.	The current design of the scheme has a trade-off between simplicity and effectiveness. Although the scheme is relatively easy for the farmers and the administration, on-going evaluation shows that this compromise is not always the best for the areas and species. This will be addressed during the next period.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
7	111	**MS:** Finland **Region:** Mainland	**Objective:** Multiple **Topic:** Training and information in support to environmental measures **Focus:** Actions in support of potential beneficiaries	Need for targeted environmental land management and greater uptake of existing measures. Training and information actions were used to promote the participation of farmers in all different kinds of environmental measures according to which is best suited to a holding/area.	Measure 111 support training actions with particular focus on promoting access to scientific knowledge and innovation. Training was designed for different farm types with possibilities to include generic training for groups of students (such as for business and production management skills, converting to organic production or animal welfare), on-site training (energy efficiency on holdings, dissemination of scientific knowledge and forest improvement and environmental awareness) and information campaigns. Certain topics are not covered by the training such as those that lead to a profession or qualification and those that continue further training of employees in the food sector.	Training may consist of: - on-the-spot training events, including lectures by experts and excursions to functioning sites, action and recreational days and packages and demonstrations produced by the students themselves on the training content, as well as inspirational activities; - homework and online discussions; - creating an online forum and returning homework through it; - discussing homework either in teams or with individual persons and enterprises. Training is available in different languages.	There is a higher relevance of environmental issues and RDP environmental measures in the regions where training actions are implemented. These projects also promote environmental issues by having a high profile in local, regional and even national media. It also creates networks on local level facilitating communication beyond the training sessions.	Administrative burdens for beneficiaries. Concern that the legislative proposal offers possibilities for actions like the measure 111. However the similar measure 331: Training and information which is as important as 111 will not be possible as wide as today because rural residents and rural communities are removed from the target group.	Environmental measures in RDP need training and information actions for a successful implementation. Examples of successful project are usually at farm level for example: YmpäristöAgro focus on environmental aspects of agriculture, with a goal to provide information on new and existing rural environmental management methods of financing targeting largely farmers but also other actors in the food chain. (http://www.proagriaoulu.fi/fi/ymparistoagro/). RaHa (water conservation) provides seminars and video on project results showing experiences of farmers (http://www.ymparisto.fi/default.asp?contentid=370861&lan=fi&clan=fi)
8	Design of Axis 2 measures	**MS:** Finland **Region:** Mainland	**Objective:** Multiple **Topic:** Consultation and design of AEM sub measures **Focus:** Design of environmental measures and practices for agri-environment schemes / Axis 2 measures	This approach of large-scale stakeholders involvement in the early design of Axis 2 measures from the beginning of the planning process increases awareness from an early stage and helps the Ministry to form functioning and relevant environmental measures.	This approach involves representatives from the ministry, paying agency, regional administration, farmer's organisations, environmental NGOs, researchers and advisory services. They are invited to consider Axis 2 issues under eleven thematic subgroups. Discussion within the subgroups is then fed into the design of Axis 2 measures, ensuring the environmental issues raised are covered.	The main communication aspect is the provision of a forum to ensure the planning of the environmental measures is an open process where information, expertise and practical experience is shared in a productive way. The members of the groups spread information further effectively.	Early and constant contact with the stakeholders helps them to understand how and why the measures of the new RDP are developed. Stakeholders with different views get together and through discussions learn better to understand each other and find solutions to problems together. This approach activates researchers to think of solutions to their findings and not only basic research Provides the ministry with feedback on a large scale and in a continuous way during the preparation of the measures.	It leads to a lot of coordination effort and administrative work for the Ministry.	It is important to have a bottom up approach to the planning process in order for the Ministry design measures which are scientific, administrative and practical. Sufficient time is needed for this approach to be effective. For example, the stakeholder groups are now concentrating on specifying the needs for agri-environmental actions in Finland and solutions to them for the next programming period, ahead of the implementation phase. This approach is similar to an on-going evaluation process and should be used to feed into the Finnish RDP design once the EU regulations are ready.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
9	214	**MS:** Finland **Region:** Mainland	**Objective:** Water quality and availability **Topic:** Rationalisation of environmental land management and fertilisation through 214 measures: A) planning and monitoring, B) fertilisation of arable crops **Focus:** Water quality and availability	Finland is a country of many thousand lakes and the rivers run out to the Baltic. Almost every parcel of farm land has a dike around it and underground drainage is common and necessary. Furthermore acid soils mean that nutrients are lost to water courses more easily than in soils with a more neutral pH. As such water protection practices are highly prioritised under measures 214. Consequently, the requirements for planning and fertiliser use are mandatory for any agri-environment beneficiary.	To be eligible for any agri-environment payments, a beneficiary must comply with the following requirements: A) The cultivation plan includes: a soil fertility analysis (repeated after 5 years); annual recording of data together with specific farming practices carried out (including sowing). B) Fertilisation is based on the result of the soil fertility analysis, carried out sufficiently frequently in accordance with the "Environmental planning and monitoring of farm practices", as well as the annual cultivation plan.	During the two first programing periods training was compulsory. However the current period has seen only minor changes to the scheme and most farms have the skills and knowledge to implement the approach without further training.	LPIS has allowed a systematic approach to planning and monitoring on all farms. It allows farmers to take into account the farm- and parcel-specific needs for environmental management in the planning and implementation of their farm practices both annually and across several years. The use of nutrients has declined in Finland which can be seen even in sale statistics of fertilisers and the measure helps targeting fertilisation according to the crop and soil. It also reduces the run off of nutrients which is one of the most important factors in reducing eutrophication of surface water.	The controllability of the particulars of the fertilisation measure has sometimes been questioned. The highest burden of these measures is the time consuming control and administrative burden. It could partly be overcome by means of submitting of information electronically. It can also be quite laborious for farmers as they need to be well informed and many may need to learn to use data programs.	The agri-environment measure is in 93 % of the agricultural land in Finland - all of which have these basic requirements in place. Requirements on fertiliser use together with the planning and monitoring measure have played a central and successful role in the reduction and better targeting the use of fertilisers. The policy framework seems to offer possibilities for a similar approach in the future.
10	214	**MS:** Finland **Region:** Mainland	**Objective:** Biodiversity, Water management **Topic:** Nature management fields **Focus:** Implementation of single measure	There is a need to improve soil conditions, combating soil erosion and preserving biodiversity loss.	Nature management fields are perennial grass areas and biodiversity fields which may be established on managed uncultivated areas under the single payment scheme. Biodiversity fields may be sown with meadow plant seed mixtures, landscape plant seed mixtures or game plant seed mixtures. The size of the area of nature management fields can vary from year to year within certain limits on a farm which helps the planning of farming practices. The management can be done by common ordinary agricultural practices and machinery. The area can be declared in a yearly application after the farmer has made an environmental commitment.		This measure has kept the amount of fallow-like area high in Finland even though there is no longer a compulsory fallow requirement in the CAP. Biodiversity researchers consider this measure to be one of the most effective biodiversity measures in the Finnish RDP since it has been very widely applied. It increases the agricultural area suitable for especially insects and birds and diversifies the landscape. It has no real impact on endangered species, but forms a suitable habitat for common species in the effectively cultivated agricultural areas.	The measure has no additional administrative burden and is controlled through common on the spot checks. The future of this measure depends on the definition and management requirements of the greening (the ecological area) of the direct payments and the relationship between greening and the agri-environment-climate measure.	Yearly application makes the environmental action more like ordinary farming and it is not 'mystified' by some special arrangements.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
11	214	**MS: Finland** **Region:** Mainland	**Objective:** Biodiversity **Topic:** Management of traditional biotopes under 214 - Note though that the initial restoration of traditional biotopes may be carried out with non-productive investment support. **Focus:** Implementation of single measure (but if used with non-productive investment for start-up then can be multiple measures)	Need to maintain diverse flora and fauna of traditional biotopes and preserve landscape values related to long-term land use. The measure is designed to keep the features included in the contract managed and to include in the management scheme a maximum portion of the traditional biotopes that are classified as nationally or regionally valuable. It also promotes the preservation of the endangered species of traditional biotopes and prevents the species found in traditional biotopes from becoming endangered and the impoverishment of nature.	This approach is implemented through land management practices in accordance with specific rules so that traditional biotopes are managed and restored in accordance with a specific plan. Non-productive investments can be used to support the initial restoration. After restoration, a contract for on-going management for 5 years, after which it is possible to specify the measures and apply for a new contract. Special payments can also be granted to beneficiaries other than farmers in accordance with the Leader approach. The Leader approach provides registered association with the opportunity to manage valuable areas that farmers are not able to manage.	Where the Leader approach has been used, communication is based on providing people at the local level participation in planning and implementing the development of their region. Applications for special measures are delivered to the local action groups for processing and the issuing of a statement. The contract can be concluded when the measures included in the contract support the objectives of the local rural development plan of the contract area and the conclusion of the contract is appropriate for the plan in question. The conclusion of the contract is not subject to the existence of a commitment on agri-environment payments.	This measure is considered to be one of the most important biodiversity measures in the Finnish RDP. According to an assessment of endangered biotopes all traditional rural biotopes are endangered in Finland. This measure is central for the managing of such areas in Finland. The measure has been good in many ways but it should cover a greater area of land and some administrative simplification should be done.	The administrative burden of both the farmers and the administration has been criticised and simplification should be done especially considering the calculation of eligible costs. The implementation of the Leader approach has had some administrative problems. The definition and management requirements of the greening (the ecological area) of the direct payments and the relationship between greening and the agri-environment-climate measure may affect this measure.	This measure seems suitable even in the future.
12	214	**MS:** Finland **Region:** Mainland	**Objective:** Water management, air quality, climate stability **Topic:** Incorporation of liquid manure in the soil **Focus:** Implementation of single measure	This scheme targets the need to reduce the risk of nutrient loading to surface water courses and ground water, ammonia emissions and preserving air quality.	Payments are granted on a parcel basis for incorporating manure or urine in the soil over certain thresholds and under the conditions of a valid agri-environmental commitment. Liquid manure or urine can only be spread using incorporation or earthing up equipment. The accepted types of equipment are defined separately. During the year in question, the spreading of additional phosphorus fertilisers on the parcel by means of surface application is not allowed, if liquid cattle or pig manure has been spread. The term of the contract is five years.	An unintended consequence is greater communication between farmers due to sharing of equipment.	Ensures more efficient use of livestock manure. Encourages use of manure outside of livestock farms; for example, where crop cultivation often has too little organic matter added. It also indirectly promotes co-operation between farms activities because the equipment needed is often shared by several farmers.		This measured seems possible in the future. There are possibilities to widen it to cover also some actions concerning more effective use of non-liquid manure.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
13	214 and 216	**MS:** Finland **Region:** National	**Objective:** Biodiversity **Topic:** Innovative policy approaches **Focus:** Implementation of a single measure; delivery of environmental measures through the Leader approach	Need to involve local concerns and local stakeholders when creating and managing multifunctional wetlands. Need better coordination and integration of the two measures (214 and 216) to ensure the correct delivery process and to ensure the measure was in line with the local development strategy.	The AES application should include map with location of the project and wetland to be managed as well as a construction and management plan and budget. The proposal should present an estimate of predicted impact area and foreseen benefits on water quality, biodiversity, and landscape. LEADER groups are asked to approve the projects whether they fit in the broader rural development benefits (based on their LEADER development strategy). Actors involved: registered Associations and farmers, regional authorities (agricultural and environmental), Paying Agency, National authorities (Ministry of Agriculture), LEADER Action Groups (LAGs), NGOs and different projects (assistance in wetlands creation and planning).	Communication between beneficiaries and advisors is needed and different planning supporting guidelines are required. The combination of two different measures requires extensive communication with administration which frequently did not have experience with the measures (e.g. with LEADER approach, with agri-environmental measure or non-productive investment). LEADER action groups were expected to communicate with local stakeholders on the creation of the wetlands but their involvement was not so high.	The results of research show that created wetlands have high potential to provide ecological services (e.g. water cleaning, biodiversity increase). It is expected about 10 % of target will be reached by the end of the programming period. A lot of institutional learning was enabled. Further increase of new wetlands is expected, which is in line with priorities of the new RDP (e.g. biodiversity, management of natural resources and climate change). Another positive outcome (beside created wetlands) is experience and institutional learning which are ready to be transferred to the next programming period for improved performance of the policy. Also more different stakeholders were involved which also gives opportunity to learn from and prepare their participation better for the next programming period.	The delivery process became quite complicated because several procedures, which were in past managed separately or which had different rules, were merged together (such as, multiple measures, multiple actors, new approach, and new concepts for investments). As a result the approval process was quite slow resulting in frustration amongst applicants. During the policy innovation process there was clear lack of communication between national and regional level concerning rules of implementation. And the administrative capacity varied greatly by region. Similarly, the advisory service was generally not considered effective although in some regions local advisors emerged and supported the process successfully. The interest of LAGs in the implementation of measures was not sufficient.	When there is an attempt to innovate policy there should be given sufficient effort in the design and especially the implementation process in order to avoid significant difficulties in policy management. The need for careful design of policy implementation is even higher when different features of the policy should be integrated (e.g. different measures, 'traditional' and LEADER approach). The delivery process itself can make the policy non-efficient (i.e. low output with a lot of effort). But when the deficiencies in the implementation process and the key rules are improved the policy innovation is expected to be successful. There is an intention to design the wetland supporting measures again in the future Rural Development Plan and already there are several options how to improve the delivery process in order to increase the success of the policy.
14	214	**MS: France** **Region: Aquitaine**	**Objective:** Multiple **Topic:** Environmental certification as a prior condition to sign an agri-environmental contract - Only came into being for AEM in 2011 http://agri-agro.aquitaine.fr/toutes-les-actualites/candidature-mae-area-2011/ **Focus:** n/a		Relates to 7 areas of agricultural practices: fertiliser application, PPP inputs, biosecurity, plant effluents, biodiversity, energy and water. To be certified AREA, farms must comply with the measures that affect repository AREA. They have a period of one year from the date of certification to follow the advice agronomic, and the Certiphyto to make a diagnosis of irrigation equipment, as appropriate.				Viewed as a successful factor from a mid-term evaluation of a French RD programme

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
15	214	**MS: France** **Region:** Parc National des Cévennes (PNC) Languedoc-Roussillion (Lozere)	**Objective:** Biodiversity, water management, water quality and availability, soil functionality **Topic:** Territorial agri environment measure **Focus:** Implementation of a single measure	There is a political aim of combining development with environmental protection in the Parc National des Cévennes (PNC) Biosphere Reserve Since 2007, the 'Territorial agri-environmental measures – Park Core area' (MAEt) has been implemented in the core area, managed jointly by the DDAF, the PNC and the Chamber of Agriculture. The approach addresses the need of intense targeting to environmental issues, the need to take into account farmers needs and socio-economic conditions and the consequent need for collaboration between several institutions	The Park territory has been split into four geographical areas which are coherent in terms of habitats and for which a prior assessment of environmental sites has been conducted, based on EU legislation, including the habitats and birds directives, Natura 2000 prescriptions, strategic documents and other local priorities. Prior to establishing the MAEt contract for a farm, the Park conducts a (free) environmental diagnosis and the chamber of agriculture conducts a technical / economic diagnosis of the farm and results are combined to establish the exact actions that should be contracted and remunerated for the following 5 years.	To ensure success, this approach requires considerable local consultation and negotiations, building confidence, mutual knowledge, and increasing awareness of different actors' concerns and of the long-term impacts of the different strategies. The Park considers that since 2000 its strategy of establishing contracts with farmers is shifting relationships with the agricultural profession towards better understanding and trust.	Besides the quite important heaviness of the process, the Park considers this type of project as a good way to enhance collaboration between DDAF (administration), the chamber of agriculture and the PNC and to achieve coherent approach to support provided to farmers in relation with environmental services. Farmers are the biggest economic beneficiaries of the measures implemented, together with actors involved in the tourism activity who indirectly benefit from the maintenance of agricultural activity and landscape management. As a result, at least in the core area of the park, agriculture has declined less than elsewhere and more new farmers are now being established in the core area than elsewhere. But we cannot discriminate the impact of MAET from those of the general policy implemented, whole CAP and initiatives related to marketing of products included.	The implementation of the measure requires a lot of coordination and intermediation. A considerable amount of time has been necessary for all actors to agree on a common framework, and the resulting framework is quite complex.	Multiple, poorly coordinated, Payments for Environmental Services lead to confusion and inconsistency. There is still room for improving coordination of National, regional and local agencies in these type of areas. The presence of institutions, such as the Park or Chambers of agriculture, plays a critical role to foster the formulation of a comprehensive strategy for the area, with clear objectives and cross-cutting approach. Farmers favour simple clear environmental criteria. This type of measure is relevant to achieve highly targeted environmental results in some specific contexts. However, their elaboration must be supported through sufficient funding to allow the right level of uptake. The 5-year length of the contract has been criticized as it is a too short time to witness really environmental results.
16	n/a	**MS: France** **Region:** Pays Houdanais	**Objective:** Water quality and availability, water management, resilience to flooding **Topic:** Basin contracts for a global and coordinated management of water resources **Focus:** Contrats de bassin Versant - watershed contracts	Need to address water pollution caused by domestic and agricultural activities; restore aquatic and wetland, develop heritage related to water, manage runoff to control floods, monitor water quality. Need of coordinated actions at territorial level by establishing watershed contracts (to cover water catchment area).	Two global basin contracts stipulated by the Community of Communes (local administrative body), several Regions and the State water agency concerning two main rivers. Five-year action plan including actions for the management of the river sides. Required a technician, a work programme (developed in partnership with farmers associations and environmental organisations). Network for measuring water quality and aquatic life in place along the river including using GIS as a cross check.		Transfer of skills between actors. Collective approach ensured sufficient financial and technical support After 2 years, ~27kms of riparian forest had been established; flood risk had been reduced; over 75% of sewerage facilities were under rehabilitation		Territorial approach involving multiple stakeholders is important, particularly at the local level.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
17	n/a	**MS:** France **Region:** Parc National des Cévennes (PNC) Languedoc-Roussillion (Lozere)	**Objective:** Biodiversity; water management; water quality and availability; soil functionality; resilience to flooding and fire; preservation of landscapes **Topic:** n/a **Focus:** Small and/or semi-subsistence farms; Implementation of collective contracts/approaches; Promotion of linkages with the agri-food market	For economic reasons indoor livestock rearing has developed widely in the last two decades leading to increased cultivation of most productive land and abandonment of less productive meadows and moorlands. Aim: improving income from quality products whose production delivers environmental services.	The Parc National des Cévennes (PNC) has developed a Park label "Les authentiques du Parc" that would allow farmers who produce quality products with high environmental credentials to benefit from the Park's image. The idea has so far been applied to two products: Easter beef (1995) and Free-range lamb (1997). An association has been founded to manage the initiative. It groups 10 farmers together with 4 butchers and 5 restaurants, and the Park participates as an observer. Product specifications have been developed and include 90 days on outdoor pasture as a key element.	Communication to consumers include the need to raise consumer awareness on seasonality and characteristics of products which are produced according to environmentally friendly ways, their higher costs and the necessity to contribute to remuneration of these higher costs. In the case of free range lamb, the National Park administration played a key role at the start of the process in terms of communication: initiating discussions with farmers about funding and establishing contacts with butchers and restaurants. When the initiative was well developed the Park administration took a step back.	Even with this minimal scheme, the number of producers and production volumes are too small to allow profitability. Personal commitment is therefore the main reason that producers continue to participate. In conclusion, the initiative is limited by two constraints. First, the small number of producers does not allow economies of scale. Second, the combination of production, protection of the environment and local marketing may be too difficult to achieve. Some breeders have already started to develop their own marketing initiatives in the nearby Montpellier or even Paris markets. Although promising this endangers the collective initiatives and may undermine local marketing. The Park is now willing to look more closely at certification of farms according to environmental criteria or to extend the use of the Brand "agneaux de parcours" outside of the core area of the Park to increase quantities.	Labelling and certification require significant administrative capacity. Promotional signs are hard to put in place and are required in significant volume. The small labelling scheme implemented here is also too costly to be efficient. These obstacles can be overcome, for products which have a potential to reach market profitability by financial help in the initial phases of the projects, to build up image and connection to markets. Unfortunately, as the local demand and the production calendar do not overlap well enough, and as the number of producers meeting the criteria remains small, sales of Agneaux de Parcours are quite restricted (only 800 sold every year, plus 70 young lambs and 30 ewes). The Park would tend to conclude that the major problem is also that the consumer is not yet willing to pay a sufficient price premium for these products.	Setting-up a brand within a limited geographical area where production quantities are limited, leads to supply chains with insufficient critical mass to cover structural costs. One way to keep these initiatives running is to fund control and structural costs, meaning producers can never be independent. On the other hand, looser geographical criteria and flexible production criteria applied for example to supply chains like the Pelardon PDO provide nation-wide recognition and viable quantities, but a weaker link to the territory, unclear environmental benefit, and confused marketing of the product. Different solutions may be available: increase the efficiency of this production and marketing schemes through extension of the area eligible for the label, and/or better organization, in order to reduce structural costs; increase consumer awareness and try to develop their willingness to pay for these services.
18	214	**MS:** Germany **Region:** National	**Objective:** Biodiversity, Landscape **Topic:** CNC Contractual Nature Conservation **Focus:** Implementation of a combination of measures. Instrumental perspective	Nature conservation administrations (from local to Länder) need a flexible toolbox to stipulate adapted land use practices for site specific conservation efforts (nature conservation laws, Natura 2000, biodiversity strategies) with farmers. Need to implement demanding, site specific AES.	Each of the 14 German RDP has implemented a CNC subprogram under AEM to meet conservation needs. Environmental agencies/ administrations develop contracts with targeted and specific practices within specified regions or settings. CNCs fund 170 million euros of contracts annually (400 million euros for AEM) and includes more than 100 practices and variations of practices	The measures are implemented in the RDP at Länder level. The administrative implementation is done by the agricultural administration normally in the course of applying for direct payments and AES, etc.	A very flexible approach that can be adapted to many specific situations of conservation needs and farming situations. There is very good evidence for the higher nature conservation value of the specialized Nature conservation contracting programs. The federal states of Thuringia and Rhineland-Palatinate have very good monitoring data, documenting that the more ambitious and nature conservation oriented programs have much higher nature conservation effectiveness.	The administration efforts for CNC are higher than for classical AES; Requires identifying and acquiring land parcels with a checked potential to contribute to conservation targets; Requires more complex and demanding regulations to be agreed; and The control system is more demanding than paying direct payments.	Complex targets like the protection of species and habitats need a complex and flexible toolbox and results in higher administrative burdens. Possible suggestions to overcome burdens: using local mediating agencies/ land care organisations/ cooperatives of farmers to reduce administrative efforts. Implementing a new control system organised in a similar way to the private organic farming inspection bodies.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
19	323	**MS:** Germany **Region:** National	**Objective:** Biodiversity, Landscape, Water management, Water quality **Topic:** Rural heritage projects in support to Natura 2000 **Focus:** Combination of measures; Instrumental perspective	Project development in support to the implementation of nature conservation and Natura 2000 water protection actions.	Development of local projects from stakeholders together with the nature conservation agency. Mostly funded through 323 measures in each of the 14 German RDPs under a rural heritage program. Annually about 90 million euros are spend for measures in the field of nature conservation /Natura 2000 and Water protection/ WFD. Together with AES natural heritage projects provide 80% of the public funding for implementing Natura 2000 in Germany.		Highly flexible tool and provided tailored and accepted solution for addressing specific needs.	The administration efforts for developing, approving and controlling are high foradministrations. The organisational skills and pre-financing capacities of the executing organisations are demanding.	Stakeholders involved in the development of locally tailored projects are very valuable partners. The projects often show environmental results are often combined with dissemination and PR.The developing, approving, implementation and controlling must be simplified both for applying stakeholder and for administration.The high flexibility allows efficient solutions to be implemented and secures a best fitting and regionally accepted solution.
20	323	**MS:** Germany **Region:** National	**Objective:** Biodiversity, Landscape, Water management, Water quality **Topic:** Land care organisations, local biological stations, regional partnership**s** **Focus:** Combination of measures, coordination with other EU funds, Involvement of local communities Organisational perspective	There is a need for coordination and management between relevant stakeholders where the environmental targets need action that do not relate to farming practices.	Local organisations act as intermediaries for actors between local level and at national level to support planning and implementation of local projects with environmental focus. For example: Land care organisations (incl. farmers associations, conservationists and cultural landscape organisations); Biological stations (NGO driven); Regional partnerships (similar to land care organisations); Plenum Baden-Wurttenberg (5 pilot regions 'nature protection through use' - applies to all land users in pilot regions).	Varies by organisation. For example: Land care organisation: Voluntary participation, relies on regional networking, local council funding and fee membership. Projects developed and implemented at local level. Biological stations: State funded and locally run. Regional partnerships: Financed via Article 57 EAFRD (responsible for N2K and WFD) Plenum Baden-Wuttermberg: Voluntary participation, regional networking, regional added value. Provides initial funding only.	A tool for networking among local actors; promoting coordination among national, regional ,local funds making administrative tasks for farmers easier and improving effectiveness at the landscape level.	A burden is the non-permanent structural/ institutional funding and the complex regulations of using EAFRD-Funding for such projects. These core actors for delivering environmental services are not funded structurally by EU funds but by federal states and county money. But they highly depend on additional funding by projects e.g. by article 57 Natural Heritage projects.	Environmental services must be delivered locally in many situations. Land care organisations are central institutions of local development of strategies to deal with change in agricultural landscape in a parity dialogue. Building trust for fair and open communication and common project development needs time. Developing a common view of the local landscape and agreed development and conservation targets is a long but fragile process.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
21	214, 216, 323	**MS:** Germany **Region:** Eifel Region (mountainous region bordering LU and BE)	**Objective:** Biodiversity, Landscape **Topic:** Regional pilot project for cooperative conservation actions ("conservation by use") **Focus:** Combination of measures, coordination with other EU funds, Involvement of local communities. Regional perspective	Biodiversity loss due to intensive farming and over-exploitation of rich grasslands. Intensive farming has to lead to changes in farm structure & intensification of grassland which in turn endangers the existence and biodiversity of meadows, mountain pastures, heath land, neglected grassland, etc. Within the region Eifel, grassland is used mainly by intensive dairy farmers (8000-11000 kg milk/ year).	A scheme was developed using 214, 216 and 323 funding to help promote the co-participation of successful dairy farming (both conventional and organic) in grassland conservation programme together with University of Bonn. The scheme also includes public land. The conservation programme consisted of implementing farming practices that allow biodiversity to thrive. For example, integrating hay into the cows diets (also positive outcome as increase milk yields). The scheme also implemented monitoring system and research on the nature conservation, farming, and regional development.	In the region Eifel for more than 30 years communication networks were developed and maintained on a personal not formal basis via the personal commitment of Prof. Schumacher (University of Bonn) and his ability to communicate adequately to farmers, conservationists and administrations (local and federal state).	More than 4000ha of selected grasslands is under the contractual nature conservation with up to 20% of the intensive dairy farms now deemed nature conservation grassland. Loss of (phyto) biodiversity stopped. Many endangered/ red-list species now have stable and growing populations. Farmers implement “conservation by use” successfully; even the most productive farms participate. On farm experiments of farmers with the fodder from the nature conservation grassland reveal new perspectives for further rising milk yields.	The growing number of contracts means more administration and control and as a consequence increased administrative burdens.	Measures must be implemented and promoted by committed enthused and convincing local advocates. The integration of many thriving farms is needed to achieve viewable results and regional acceptance. EAFRD-Funding/ nature conservation contracting/ agri-environmental schemes must be accompanied by very flexible instruments like investment support by foundations, provision of public land to farmers, flexible scientific support, ...
22	n/a	**MS:** Germany **Region:** Rhön Region	**Objective:** **Topic:** Rhön biosphere reserve **Focus:**	Revitalise a neglected rural areas, address abandonment and agricultural decline with farmers at the centre of this process.	Creation of the Biosphere reserve concept (UNESCO) and implementation of a series of activities through concentration of public sector, NGOs, and privates. Main action: reintroduction of local sheep bred (meat and organic milk). AE payments ensured for grazing land and meadows. Additional EAFRD support coming from organic farming measure, LFA payments and Leader. Other EU national and private funds involved too.	• The Biosphere Reserve has always aimed to facilitate work between the public sector and NGO/private sector on issues such as protected labelling and marketing. • An analysis of the level of trust between stakeholders, and between them and the public institutions, suggest it is generally good or very good.	55% of businesses saw increase of profitability as result of the sustainable economic strategy (particularly farmers and foresters).	•The BR identity is less strongly recognised by the general public, who are more aware of specific projects such as recreation provision or branding. • Positive economic impacts may be evident at farm level as a result of projects such as the Rhön BR but may not be seen in regional economic data (Ploeg 2000)	•Cross-sectoral approach (farming, retailing, tourism, environmental management) considered as key success factor. •The Rhön BR is widely recognised for the way it has successfully combined top-down (institutional) and bottom-up (participation) approaches. Together they seem to have been much more successful than either would have been alone.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
23	111	**MS: Hungary** **Region:** National	**Objective:** Biodiversity; Water management; Soil functionality **Topic:** Information and training actions related to Agri-environment and Forestry payments **Focus:** Coordination with other EU funds	The Ministry aims at addressing specific information needs and skills for the practical implementation of agri-environment and forestry measures.	In order to ensure a good implementation of the agri-environment and forestry measures, training courses are mandatory for the farmers and forest holders who are supported by the Paying Agency. They have to attend at least two of these courses which are organised by shortlisted training institutions (scheduling, attendance, contact the beneficiaries, etc.). Training sessions are funded through measure 111 of the RDP.	The communication aspect is the training.	Being mandatory, the courses ensure that adequate training is received by all beneficiaries. The problem is that better trained farmers also have to attend, even if they already have a high level of expertise.	The existence of several training institutions required harmonization and coordination activities, resulting in greater civil staff effort devoted to the job. To be more efficient, from now on there will only be one institution responsible for the training. The participants of the training sessions receive support under Measure 111, which means some administrative burdens for both the participants and providers of the training. For the ministry an additional task is to ensure the updated training materials, and monitor the training system.	Even if the training is mandatory, most of the participants are satisfied with it – as it has been revealed by a survey. Training has the potential to allow farmers to implement environmentally sound farm management more effectively. It also helps to make farmers more willing to meet the environmental requirements.
24	111	**MS: Hungary** **Region:** National	**Objective:** Biodiversity; Water management; Water quality; Soil functionality **Topic:** Training courses connected with a series of environmental actions/ commitments **Focus:** Coordination with other EU funds; Implementation of collective approaches, Leader approach Measure aimed at promoting knowledge and improving human potential – Eligible training courses in connection with the cross-compliance requirements, SPS, forestry, organic farming, the use of environmentally sound technologies.	The Ministry supports voluntary training activities related to the implementation of specific environmental actions/activities (e.g. cross-compliance, SPS, organic farming, environmentally sound technologies, forestry, sustainable farming).	These voluntary courses are addressed to farmers and forest holders. They are organised by shortlisted training institutions (scheduling, attendance, contact the beneficiaries, etc.). Training sessions are funded through measure 111 of the RDP.	The communication aspect is the training.	The attendants receive adequate training to their needs, although sometimes was difficult to motivate them.	The existence of several training institutions required harmonization and coordination activities, resulting in greater civil staff effort devoted to the job. The participants of the training sessions receive support under Measure 111, which means some administrative burdens for both the participants and providers of the training. For the ministry an additional task is to ensure the updated training materials, and monitor the training system.	Even if the training is mandatory, most of the participants are satisfied with it – as it has been revealed by a survey. Training has the potential to allow farmers to implement environmentally sound farm management more effectively. It also helps to make farmers more willing to meet the environmental requirements.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
25	213, 211, 125, 214 and 216	**MS:** Italy **Region:** Marche	**Objective:** Biodiversity conservation; Water management **Topic:** Support for beneficiaries under Natura 2000 agreements to undertake additional interventions to improve the biodiversity status of Natura 2000 sites. **Focus:** Collective approach - Area programme for Biodiversity	Needed a new approach to implementing RDP measures to ensure collaboration between stakeholders and optimum use of measures with potential to improve biodiversity status of Natura 2000 sites. The new "Area" approach is mainly targeting farmers operating in Natura 2000 sites. This was chosen because, so far, the implementation of RDP measures did not offer a suitable opportunity for recognizing in an adequate way the environmental role played by farmers for safeguarding several natural resources. By joining farmers and Bodies that manage protected areas in a cooperative planning and implementation this is now feasible.	The Area Programme for Biodiversity (launched in 2011) is led by Natura 2000 with support from other RDP measures and developed by large consultation and participation of local farmers living in the protected area and Local Authorities. The Area plan is designed for the specific region and ensures the most relevant measures are included and given priority for funding. The main actors are the Marche regional authority (in charge of RDP planning and implementation), the bodies managing Natura 2000 , farmers and local authorities(such as Provinces and Municipalities)	Communication aspects played a major role, because many dissemination initiatives were undertaken at local level by the Regione Marche, Public Authorities and Farmers association to promote and discuss the new approach, before and during the launch of the Call for Proposal.	The new approach has been so far applied only in 2011, and funded via the measure 213. The main expected benefits are the possibility of implementing a series of integrated interventions within a given Natura 2000, agreed between Public and private operators. In this way, their implementation should prove easier, and their impact a more significant one, not just on biodiversity conservation, but also for the safeguard of soil fertility, for the safeguard of water courses and of ground water, and for landscape conservation.	The new approach required a large amount of administrative work in Regione Marche for the two involved Departments (Agriculture and Environment), to design, for the first time. The new type of "Area Programme" and fit it into the standard RDP rules. It also required substantial communication and dissemination efforts at local level. It likely involved some additional burden for interested farmers, because they needed to attend meetings and agree on a set of interventions with many other actors. However, after this initial effort, the system is now well- known (and gathered much interest also outside of the region), and next Call for Proposals should not prove so much time-demanding.	The main lesson to be learnt from this experience is that a bottom-up approach (at least to a some extent) represents a feasible way to use RDP funds in a coordinated manner, planning interventions to be undertaken in specific, protected areas, and integrating several RDP measures for funding it.
26	121	**MS:** Italy **Region:** Piemonte	**Objective:** Water management; Water quality and availability **Topic:** Collective implementation of modernisation at a water catchment scale **Focus:** Implementation of collective contracts/approaches	The innovative approach that has been recently introduced aims at concentrating the RDP measure implementation in those areas that show higher environmental pressures, and where a collective approach to water management is on-going. In this way, the implementation of measure 121 will ease the due enforcement of a key aspect	Implemented only in early 2012, novel approach linking farmers signed up to river management agreements at local level (Contratti di fiume) to premiums for modernisation (automatic recognition making them more likely candidates to receive funding for modernisation - also for measure 123). Main actors: the Piemonte regional authority (in charge of RDP planning and implementation) and its delegated offices, plus other administrative bodies (e.g. Provinces)	In order to promote participatory agreements, the Region joined with Local Authorities (Provinces, Municipalities) in a special effort to communicate the key goals and planning methods of such agreements to relevant stakeholders (e.g. public announces, meetings, etc.). In particular, at the beginning of each River agreement the Environmental Report concerning the state of the river is being spread and discussed in a participatory manner.	The new selection procedure has been so far applied only in measure 121, and partially in measure 123 of the Piemonte RDP. The call for proposals are just being launched, therefore no data are yet available, apart from the total amount of available funding (11.960.105€). However, the new procedure is expected to achieve a far higher concentration of EU funds in areas where proper water management is a priority, therefore contributing to improving the overall environmental outlook of those critical areas.	The new procedure approach does not involve any additional burden for farmers, because the regional database automatically recognises if a certain property is already part of a River agreement. Moreover, this procedure allows the geographic /basin boundaries to be taken into account, overcoming traditional administrative limits (e.g. a farmer may have its land split between different administrative boundaries).	The main lesson to be learnt from this experience is that simple innovations in the procedure to select the recipients of EU funds at local level can prove highly useful for concentrating those funds in specific, environmentally sensitive areas, and to support a participatory planning and implementation effort that represents an asset for improved water management practices and interventions.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
27	214	**MS:** Italy **Region:** Veneto	**Objective:** Biodiversity; Water quality; Preservation of landscape **Topic:** Practices: Buffer strips, hedgerows and ecological corridors **Focus:** Implementation of single measure	The quality of water sources in the Veneto region is affected through the diffuse water pollution from agriculture as a result of intensive farming patterns. The innovative approach that has been introduced in RDP measures since the late Nineties consists in fostering the set-up and maintenance of streamside trees and of buffer strips along key rivers and water courses.	The approach provides technical assistance and scientific monitoring operations to scheme applications and throughout the implementation of the practices uses. There is continuity between the practices provided under the current AES and those in past RDPs. The combination of these two factors has achieved significant results in qualitative and quantitative terms at regional scale. Main actors involved: the Veneto regional Authority (in charge of RDP planning and implementation) and its specialised agency Veneto Agricoltura, devoted to technical assistance and extension on various farming/forestry issues.	Targeting farmers and land owners in critical river basins (e.g. Venice laguna). Organisation of technical workshops at the local and regional scale to review the results of these interventions, and improve their design and maintenance by involved farmer. A manual has been issued by Veneto Agricoltura to properly manage buffer strips and streamside trees (new and/or existing ones).	Significant reduction of nitrogen content in affected rivers and water courses, as well as improving countryside landscape and biodiversity. Significant scheme uptake has resulted in maintaining a rather diverse landscape pattern and providing ecological corridors. Results have been certified also by the interim evaluation of the Veneto RDP, carried out in 2010 by an independent party.	The approach does not create any additional burden for farmers, because the regional database automatically recognizes if a certain property is already part of a given river basin for which a priority is enforced (using a GIS).	Coherence and persistence in offering the same type of measure through different programming periods helps farmers to better understand its goals and mechanism; Supporting the implementation of the measure with significant extension, technical assistance and scientific monitoring helps famers to better implement the measure.
28	226*	**MS:** Italy **Region:** Tuscany - Media Valle del Serchio (Pistoia and Lucca Provinces, Tuscany)	**Objective:** Landscape preservation; Other (Hydro-geological management of the territory) **Topic:** Environmental stewardship and landscape management **Focus:** Implementation of collective contracts/approaches *Local initiative, funded by a local territorial authority (Reclamation District “Media Valle del Serchio”)	During the recent years the Media Valle del Serchio area has experienced several hydro-geological problems. The area to monitor is significant and in addition, all the territorial associations and authorities in the mountain regions have experienced a significant reduction of national funding for their activities. This project was developed by a local territorial authority (Reclamation District “Media Valle del Serchio) which has the role of management and cleaning of rivers, riverbeds, rivers banks and canals in a mountain area of Tuscany.	To address these problems, the Reclamation District “Media Valle del Serchio” has promoted an agreement with local farmers for co-production of the environmental services. The authority defined contracts, coordination, maintenance of the information database while farmers ensured environmental stewardship through periodical onsite controls (with reports and pictures) and first maintenance interventions on the rivers and canals. Specific software was also created to help the participants to communicate with the local authority for the monitoring and first intervention works.		This project is based on the network of local farmers, who are coordinated by the local authority but who act collectively to solve local environmental problems, by using their local knowledge and their proximity to canals and rivers to be monitored. In this project environmental services are provided through activities carried out by farmers outside the boundaries of their farms, with the main objective of improving the hydro-geological management of the territory, especially in relation to overflowing of rivers and flood prevention. At the same time this project also increased the multifunctional role of agriculture in the area and provided additional revenues to the most marginal and isolated farmers. The rural development funds were used to the maintenance works carried out by farmers .	the monitoring and the activities related to the dissemination and learning were not included into the RDP for Tuscany	The case study will explore the institutional arrangements related to this initiative, as well as the innovation needed in terms of policy development, regarding both technical and administrative tasks necessary to carry out the environmental services and the dissemination and communication actions.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
29	111 and 214	**MS: Italy** **Region:** Marche - Aso Valley (Ascoli and Fermo provinces, Marche region)	**Objective:** Soil functionality; Water quality; Other (food safety) **Topic:** Advanced integrated pest management **Focus:** Implementation of multiple measures	Need to adopt integrated management techniques at territorial scale, in order to protect water and soils from pesticide and nitrate pollution In response the TAEA (territorial agri-environmental agreement) established specific targets, to be achieved in a period from five to seven years including reduction and substitution of inputs.	To achieve these results, the TAEA was structured as an integrated package of measures of the regional RDP, with the aim of financing a set of initiatives that could support the adoption of more sustainable agricultural practices at territorial level. Through measure 111 a capacity building programme for farmers was established, with specific training regarding the technical guidelines on integrated agriculture. This measure covered advice and awareness raising of the impacts and benefits of certain farm practices. This advice was combined with measure 214 on specific practices including IPM, Organic farming, and maintenance of permanent grass. The approach involved a wide range of actors including: an informal association of local farmers; the local public advisory agency; the Regional administration; the Provincial administrations; and other local institutions.	In-farms visits and specific workshops were organised in order to increase information sharing among local farmers regarding the environmental, economic and health effects of IPM techniques. ASSAM agency also provided analysis of fruits to show the difference in chemical levels these results were presented in an open meeting with farmers making them aware of the substantial results of their commitment.	Significant number of farmers joined the scheme The presence of dangerous chemicals in fruit grown by farmers under the scheme were lower than required by law. Compared to the traditional top-down approach, the territorial agreement experienced in the Aso Valley area resulted in several positive effects on the local governance and on the institutional arrangements. The joint role of private and public stakeholders, together with the integration of different RDP measures in a territorial agreement, favoured the implementation of a coherent strategy more finely-tuned to the local needs.	Additional burdens for the coordination activities at different levels. Some coordination mechanisms were already in place however others proved more time and resource consuming. Local stakeholders highlighted several barriers mainly related to the local institutional arrangements and to the policy instruments currently in place: - RD policies usually lack in flexibility to efficiently support spontaneous and endogenous initiatives, Measures implemented for the provision of environmental services focus on administrative borders	Bottom-up and collective approaches through innovative institutional arrangements and integrated policies can deliver environmental services. To adopt innovative farming practices farmers need: - Effective coordination mechanisms at the local level including a broader network of local actors involved; - Presence of a local (public) advisory system, facilitating the sharing of information within the farming community; - a project 'promoter' (ASSAM) that ensures the required bridge between farmers and local institutions. Local stakeholders suggest that a sub-regional level implementation of the measures could have facilitated a more effective coordination at territorial scale; Additional payments for farmers who applied jointly to the agri-environment-climate payments should be implemented Additional funding should be provided to build farmer networks encouraging collective contracts or joint approaches to environmental local projects .

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
30	214	**MS:** Italy **Region:** Veneto	**Objective:** Soil quality; Water quality; Climate stability. **Topic:** Introduction of conservative agri cultural techniques **Focus:** Implementation of single measure; Implementation of collective approach	This measure aims at protecting and improving soil structure and fertility and its water richness, also with the aim of reducing carbon emissions. The project aims at introducing at territorial scale conservative agriculture techniques, by relying on the agri-environmental measure 214i (Action 1) of the 2007-2013 Rural development programme (RDP) for Veneto.	These objectives are reached using specific agricultural techniques allowing minimal soil disturbance, permanent soil cover and crop rotations. These techniques are very innovative in an area characterised by high intensive agriculture such as the Po Valley. The measure was designed by the Veneto Regional government in association with experts on conservative agriculture techniques and, above all, in association with the local farmers who were already experiencing those techniques. To adhere to this RDP measure, farms must be located in plain or hill areas of Veneto region.	Veneto Agricoltura played a very significant role, by setting experimental trials for conservation agriculture by encouraging exchanges and discussion amongst farmers through periodical meetings. Cooperation and discussion was promoted between actors.	The measure was included in the RDP as result of the CAP Health Check recovery and the application rate is quite positive (about 78 farmers joined the project during 2010). The initiative included a strong cooperation both among the regional authority and farmers/beneficiaries and also among farmers/beneficiaries themselves. This role of cooperation amongst local stakeholders makes this an interesting case of "collective approach" to agri-environmental measures.		The experience of the conservation agriculture project looks promising and a similar approach has been implemented in the Lombardy region.
31	214*, 211 and Regional law	**MS: Italy** **Region:** Alta Val d'Ayas (Aosta Valley region)	**Objective:** Biodiversity; Landscape maintenance; Hydro-geological management of the territory **Topic:** Environmental stewardship and landscape management **Focus:** Implementation of multiple measures *214.2 (apiculture), D1214.1 (*foraggicoltura*), 214.5 (organic farming)+ Regional law 32/2007 (III, Article 51, Conservation of traditional rural buildings and traditional landscapes)	To support grazing in alpine areas. Grazing alpine areas plays a fundamental role in maintaining the traditional alpine landscape, protecting soils and preserving biodiversity. Finally, a correct management of these pastures also contributes to increase the tourism during the summer and to maintain the ski runs during the winter.The Aosta Valley regional government has traditionally supported and funded the alpeggi . At the same time, the sustainable management of these mountain pastures relies on a complex network of local actors, involving local breeders, the owners of the alpeggi, cow's milk buyers, the regional government and other local public and private agencies.	Collective management of alpine pastures supported by a range of RDP and other funds. The present study will focus on a limited area, the Alta Val d'Ayas The dynamics observed in Alta Val d'Ayas were considered particularly relevant, since a local co-operative of farmers has started to manage the alpeggi (alpine grazing) according to the organic agriculture requirements and has created a local dairy to process and commercialise the local cheese (Fontina).	Communication aspects are not referred to the collective approach to exploit forage systems but to public support linked to RDP and other specific State Aids. Public support is considered absolutely necessary in order to optimize the exploitation of regional forage systems and to assure the supply of environmental services useful for community. RDP's support opportunities are deeply and in detail communicated by Regional Government and farm advisory services (Measure 114).	The case of Alta Val d'Ayas shows how, through the collective management of mountain pastures, it is possible to successfully combine farmers' economic interests with the provision of environmental public goods. A correct use of pastures in Aosta Valley may contribute to preserve grazing livestock system, whose products are very important for the local economy. Moreover, there are several environmental benefits which may be jointly provided, such as biodiversity conservation and soil functionality. Finally, a correct use of meadows and pastures allows conservation of typical alpine landscape, with positive effects for the tourism industry.	This approach does not involve additional burdens for its implementation. *However, we notice that - in order to promote relationship among farms - Regional Government has created a specific agreement called "Hay-Manure Agreement" (see Attachment 6 of RDP 2007-2013 of Aosta Valley Region). This agreement is a useful instrument for the correct adhesion to AES practices;* *The agreement consists in a sort of exchange of hay and manure between a farm without cattle that produces forage and a grazing livestock farm. The first one receives manure to fertilize its meadows and pastures, the second one gets forage to feed animals; this agreement is essential in order to respect Disciplinary production rules of Fontina PDO cheese.*	The analysis of relationship among farms underlines the importance of correct use of mountain pastures in order to support farmers' incomes, to reach social benefits and to deliver environmental services. It is suggested to maintain support to farms that follow the approaches listed here for the future of rural development policy.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
32	214	**MS: Poland** **Region:** National	**Objective:** Biodiversity; Preservation of landscapes; Water management; Soil functionality **Topic:** Agri-environmental programmes to reduce the decreasing of natural grassland areas, based on regionalised approach in mountainous areas. Extensive farming methods in the meadow to reduce the loss of biodiversity and for water and soil protection - farm scale **Focus:** Implementation of single measure	To tackle the declining of natural grassland areas. Particularly, to deal with: abandonment of extensive grazing and cutting, afforestation, intensification of agricultural production, non-agricultural land use (urbanisation). The approach adopted can also help to protect landscape diversity to ensure sufficient breeding, nesting and forage sites for farmland biodiversity and protect soil and water quality.	AE packages are used and targeted in a regional fashion, the packages are not compulsory. The packages used are: P4 and P5 for the protection of endangered bird species and natural habitats inside and outside of Natura 2000 sites; and P8 Protection of soil and water (maintaining soil cover) Taking a regional approach to the design of these packages, can ensure that restricted management dates and requirements for land management are best suited to mountainous region. Main actors: Farmers, NGOs, the National State Forests, AE advisors, experts.	Information and promotion actions are organised to encourage farmers to increasingly use the agri-environmental program: Experts - prepare flora and fauna documentation. Advisors - advisory services for farmers and inhabitants of rural areas - prepare agri-environmental plans - prepare an application of the cross-compliance principle, inform about production standards, public health, animal welfare, food quality and application of good agricultural and forestry practice.	Landscape protection – pasture use in mountainous areas protect meadows from encroachment by weeds, shrubs and trees. Cultural services (recreational, educational) – pastoralism in mountain area gave the opportunity to organise local festivals in order to promote meat and milk products from sheep and goats. Proper use of meadows provides an effective protection of species and biodiversity. Conservation of the blossoming flowers preserves the various and valuable food for pollinators and the species that feed on them. Due to site conditions (soil, climate) growing winter catch crop provides significant soil protection functions.		Need more frequent uptake of these packages - to this end would recommend Package 8 becomes an annual commitment not a 5 year one. Agri-environment support for habitat management can have wider benefits such as promotion of products based on conservation principles.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
33	214	**MS:** Slovakia **Region:** National	**Objective:** Biodiversity **Topic:** Improved targeting of agri-environmental measure on valuable grasslands **Focus:** Implementation of a single measure	Need to improve targeting under budgetary restrictions. The NGO Daphne initiated thinking on targeting improvement and agreed with Ministry of Agriculture to take the approach, which also supported the need of the Ministry to select only some grassland for support because of shortage in budget.	Between 2004 and 2006 the NGO Daphne has undertaken detailed mapping of grasslands and other potentially important habitats on the whole national territory. This information was cross analysed with LPIS to identify management needs for particular sites. When farmers apply for one of seven relevant AES (on semi-natural grasslands), they identify a particular field block in the application form. The State Nature Protection Agency (SNPA) cross checks this information with that of the important grassland areas identified through the mapping approach. A scheme relevant to the biotopes on that particular plot is identified with corresponding management prescriptions and payment) before the application proceeds. At the beginning this process was administered by Daphne and now is managed by the SNPA.	Depending on the stage of the implementation. The main actors are the State Nature Protection Agency (at first Daphne was involved), farmers and Paying Agency. Currently the involvement of other stakeholders than farmers and Paying Agency is limited.	The use of targeting to focus agri-environment management. Low administrative burden following initial expenditure on mapping and system development and removing the need for onsite investigations in most cases. The application approach is simpler with one application form and has led to significant uptake (101 000 hectares in the programming period 2004-6 and 38 000 in 2007-2013). In framework of SAPARD the uptake was rather low (nearly 5 000 hectares) due to a more complicated administration and because AEMe was implemented only as a pilot scheme. The effects of the measures have not been monitored sufficiently on ground so far, therefore the real impact is assumed and based on expert knowledge.	The initial total costs were rather high (estimates around a maximum of 1 EURO/ha) especially for mapping of rather large areas of the national territory. Also work with GIS (e.g. transfer of data to LPIS) was rather demanding. In a first stage this process was managed by Daphne and was rather costly to administer, because the NGO was not supported from national budget and had to recover the costs associated with providing approval to farmers through higher fees. Now, that the database of semi-natural habitats is controlled by the State Nature Protection Agency, the administration is rather simple and current running costs are expected as rather low (in addition farmers pay lower fees for data on habitats on field level).	Initial investment can lead to reduced on-going running costs overall. This way of targeting of semi-natural grassland, is the most efficient approach for the country, and it is likely it will be used in future RDPs. The experience suggests that the positive effect of improvement of one part of the implementation process could be partly reduced by other negative factors in design or implementation. There should be more monitoring and some improvement in the management of the contract in order to assure further improvement of effectiveness of the schemes. For example some farmers are not discouraged from non-compliance with the management prescriptions despite of quite strict penalties in case of non-compliance; and there should be clearer differentiation of payments in case of different management prescriptions to reflect farmer's effort.
34	Plan 42 linked to RDP measures	**MS:** Spain **Region:** Castilla Y Léon	**Objective:** Fire prevention **Topic:** Fire prevention through extensive grazing **Focus:** To prevent wildlfire on 'monte' (Forest and grassland) through the re-introduction of farming in abandoned areas *Restoration measures under the RDP Plan 42 is the forest fire prevention strategy of Castilla y León, set up by the regional Ministry of Environment in 2002	There has been significant abandonment of the forest and grassland or 'monte' farming systems in Spain. The aim is to maintain the crucial function of extensive grazing on forest lands, while changing the attitude of graziers to using fire as a pasture regeneration tool. Importantly, the project officers can offer a financial incentive in the form of a Rural Development programme (RDP) grant for scrub clearance in the pastures, grazed scrub and woodland of monte.	"Plan 42" is the forest fire prevention strategy of Castilla y León, set up in 2002. It targets the 42 municipalities with the highest incidence of wild fires. Includes action toward livestock farmers to maintain extensive grazing systems and combating regenerative use of fire. Importantly, the project officers can offer a financial incentive in the form of a Rural Development programme (RDP) grant for scrub clearance in the pastures, grazed scrub and woodland of monte.		Under plan 42, fires in the region have decreased by 70% since 2002.		

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
35	214 and other measures*	**MS:** Sweden **Region:** Uppland, Roslagen. Island of Gräsö, Baltic sea	**Objective:** Biodiversity; Preservation of landscapes **Topic:** Restoration of HNV area **Focus:** Combination of several measures *(Environmental support for pastures, mown meadows, natural and cultural heritage, investment support)	Restoring and preserving natural coastal meadows (HNV areas) through active use of meadows and forest (grazing). Improve rural population in the area.	A project focused on one small farm. The farm initiated a long-term project to restore old pasture and grassland (30ha) through the use of environmental payments under the RDP. These payments go to the tenant and not the landowner.		Win-win situation: business development including creation of employment at local level; restoration of better environmental conditions, and increased stability of the farm. Central role of AE support in maintaining vital a marginal rural area.	The farmer has to finance the whole project before receiving any payment. This can be quite difficult for a big restoration. In this specific project, the problem was solved with the help of Upplandsstiftelsen, a regional foundation acting as bank during the project before RDP-support could be paid.	Without environmental support and investment support, it would be impossible to do restorations like this, followed by grazing and management of the area. The environmental support highly increases the possibility to work with this type of valuable marginal areas. Generally, extensive farming cannot compete with large scale intensive farming. On Gräsö the conditions of the landscape decides what you can do. But the poor farming area also gives possibilities when you include the public interest in high values. The environmental support acts as the necessary additive to maintain farming also on this marginal but valuable land.
36	214*	**MS:** Sweden **Region:** Öster Götland (archipelago area)	**Objective:** Biodiversity; Preservation of landscape; Preservation of natural and cultural heritage **Topic:** Restoration of HNV area **Focus:** Combination of several measures; Small farms; Implementation of collective approaches; Involvement of local communities *(Restoration support, environmental support for pastures and mown meadows)	Restoration of HNV farmland affected by abandonment of agricultural activities linked to traditional management of meadows and forest and grazing. The area covered required a cooperative approach between landowners and farmers	Restoration project carried out during 2009-2011 in the view of creating the conditions for future AES eligibility. Coordination of local actors (local association, landowners, WWF, county administration) and support from RDP measures, WWF and donations. Since there is no active farmer on Harstena today, much effort was given to raise an interest among the landowners to preserve the traditionally agriculture landscape. This was done by presenting the high natural and cultural values, making a detailed restoration plan and presenting a strategy for future long term management of the islands pastures and meadows.	Communication was a very important part of the project in order to get the landowners of the area interested in the project and to make them actually contribute to the restoration. Local knowledge was well used, and stories written and told about how the area was managed in earlier days. Also there was good scientific documentation both on the traditional land use and from botanical inventories.	Restoration of natural and cultural value of the island and its farmland. Active involvement of landowners. The project opened possibilities for tourism and created employment in the island. AE payments central to maintain lively rural areas. Increase of tourism in the area in the summer The small island farmer produce environmental service in a landscape that many people really appreciate. They produce high natural and cultural values by keeping grazing animals all the year on the islands. A complete farming cycle with production of fodder, cultivating the land, handling manure etc. gives extra qualities to the high values.	Significant communication and participation demands in the early stages of the work	Because of the poor economy in the small islands farming, many farms have been shut down. The islanders have turned to more profitable work, in carpentry and tourism. The agri-environmental payments and direct support to a sufficient level are absolutely necessary to maintain this kind of farming. The environmental payment really becomes a support for the production of common environmental goods.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
37	Focus on Nutrients linked to other RDP measures	**MS:** Sweden **Region:** National	**Objective:** Water quality and availability Water management **Topic:** Advisory services for environmental friendly nutrient management: offers farmers knowledge and tools to implement cost-effective environmental and climate measures. **Focus:** Other - Focus on Nutrients, is an advisory service* which adopts innovative approaches towards training and advice in order to implement cost-effective environmental and climate measures.	New environmental quality objectives were introduced in Sweden in 2000. The Swedish agricultural sector is responsible for reducing nitrogen and phosphorus emissions.	Focus on Nutrients calculates the nutrient balance on farms providing the base for evaluating how inputs are used in production and uses and integrated advice programme to share best practice. It is coordinated by the Swedish Farmers' Union. *agriculture advisory companies; the county administrative boards (for admin and management in their counties), in cooperation with the Federation of Swedish Farmers (LRF)) - cooperative model The new approach to advisory services includes: Follow-ups, the use of menus and checklists to ensure everything is covered; minimum training requirements for advisors (degree from SE Uni of Ag Sciences and 2 day training course); holistic view of livestock farms both of animals and crop production; dissemination of results with administrative board and farmers; Individual advice on climate issues; coordination for safer plant protection.	Communication. The advice given by Focus on Nutrients is given to practically every farmer in Sweden. However, this does not always take the form of an individual visit but can be through leaflets, advertisements and newspaper supplements. Focus on Nutrients has an active website which monitors new developments in research and environmental legislation both in Sweden and abroad. The website www.greppa.nu is an information channel for farmers, advisers, researchers, and environmental officials.	A sufficient number of farmers have signed up to the scheme to ensure outcomes can be delivered. The advice is free which has ensured high update (farms with more than 25LU or more than 50ha do not pay for advice). Good cooperation between livestock and arable farmers. Good cooperation between organisations (e.g. local county boards and farmers unions). Well-established concept that is well communicated between farmers. Good cooperation/communication between conventional and organic farmers.	Even with advice, it is difficult to change attitudes, for instance with regard to agriculture's share and role in eutrophication. People usually need to be convinced that a measure is important in order to do it, otherwise they tend to "do what they have always done".	Change is possible: 9/10 farmers say they implemented measures after receiving advice. Change takes time: need realistic expectations Coordination: with AE scheme, with the market, with other schemes. It is not possible or necessary to convince everyone to sign up

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
38	214	**MS: The Netherlands** **Region:** National	**Objective:** Biodiversity **Topic:** Implementation of agri-environment schemes through collective contracts. Pilot project that promote ownership by farmers as related to specific measures. Successful thanks to regional management approach and regional planning. **Focus:** Combination of several measures; Implementation of collective approaches; Involvement of local communities	1. To improve the realization of environmental objectives by: - Cohesive measures, improved structure of connecting measures. - To advance active interaction in-between farmers, but also with non-farmers, which stimulates engagement - Awareness raising with a new product (biodiversity), leading towards more sense of responsibility - To introduce flexibility with preservation of biodiversity infrastructure (casco) 2. To improve cost effectiveness 3. Implementation, organisation and management (hands on) from within (bottom up) 4. To enlarge options for collaboration with other stakeholders (like civilians, nature organisations, health care, schools etc.) 5. To improve long-term commitment and cooperation	1. Coordination from within the region to communicate with: governmental organisations; other beneficiaries; other regional stakeholders like civilians, nature organisations, local industries etc. The coordination has been formalised by the government. In this way the strength/power of the region is used by the government to organize regional specific coordination. Scale differs between and within the examples. 2. Agreement between government and beneficiary's (represented by the Union of Farmers for Nature (ANV)) based on actual objectives, (regional) vision and realistic targets 3. A balanced plan which is independently assessed by a governmental organisation (e.g. SNL is based on scientific model for improving meadow bird population) 4) Implementation of measures in region/area by collective approach. 5) Accountability on quality by collective 6) After the approval of the plan each individual beneficiary has to apply by an internet application. However this is done in most cases by the ANV 7) Each individual beneficiary is responsible and has to deal with control on the measure and ha on parcel level. This leads to an administrative burden. 8) Each individual beneficiary receives payment based on its performed ha	Significant communication and feedback Government provides a variety of information to the ANV which draws up the balanced plan. The ANV provides communication with members and other stakeholders the area. Some ANV's have communication with schools, other ANVs etc. At the end of the year; the ANV makes a report towards the government about the results (quality and quantity) of the year.	It increases the effectiveness of the investment It leads to a higher level of involvement Increased realisation of objectives (examples in case of farmland birds, hamsters, meadow birds, landscape features are available) More responsibility leads to social and self-control and to self-cleansing power The acceptance has increased also leading to better relation to other stakeholder and even to regional branding	At this moment the collective approach brings too much administrative burden (red tape) and more people/organizations are involved or want to get involved. The approach has showed that it is difficult to share responsibility, e.g. on control. In the end the administrative system that is used turned out to be complicated and overlapping [meadow birds see example 54]. Partly this is also related to national culture (poldermodel). The flexibility needed for a more cost effective approach conflicts with the rigid measure approach in regulations. Area management by an approach on partnership needs area specific measures which are linked and will deliver cost effective results in the end.	Need to reduce admin burden through a regulation built around the process and objectives rather than to specific measures. Need regional approach in regulation, not payments to individual. Give more responsibility to the collective (e.g. auditing). Need to plan across programming periods (Long-term commitment, long term goals, no cure no pay). The collective approach leads to horizontal democracy. This opens new opportunities for society. Facilitate knowledge transfer between the different partnerships in order to improve organisation, specific measure development, e.g. success factors and fail factors.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
39	214	**MS:** The Netherlands **Region:** Regional	**Objective:** Biodiversity **Topic:** Approach to Meadow Birds Conservation based on collective conservation plans. [See Example 38] **Focus:** Local coordination and targeting for implementing agri-environment practices designed to protect meadow birds and hamster populations within specific areas	Maintenance of the existing species populations, specifically meadow bird and hamsters. Existing approach ineffective due to three factors: - The size and area of the farms under contract are smaller than the area occupied by the bird population - the birds needed a mosaic or scattered pattern of different "biotopes" which is larger than individual farm sizes. - without coordination between different agri-environment agreements the mosaic pattern was not realised. Considering the differences between the current collective approach and the pilots is that the specific measures are designed by the joint action groups of farmers themselves. The expectation is that these specific measures are more effective and probably “cheaper” than measures designed on the national level as these are regional specific and can be also more species specific.	In the provincial nature conservation plan, meadow bird focus areas are designated. A farmer can only apply for a specific contract in a designated area and if they participate in the collective conservation plan. The collective conservation plan has been developed to combine efforts of farmers and nature conservation organization. Within these areas eight specific practices are developed: Grassland with resting period, grassland with early (pre-grazing) grazing, supplement for chick strips, wet areas, nest protection, grassland for feeding chicks, extensive grazed grassland, and supplement of straw manure. An area coordinator oversees the writing of a collective management plan which includes a mixture of the above listed practices. Yearly monitoring and evaluation will lead to changes in the management plan (e.g. place and occurrence of measures) in order to increase effectiveness.	The collective conservation plan is communicated to farmers by means of a brochure as well as at the point of negotiation when farmers apply for entry into an agri-environment contract.	This combined effort leads to a better conservation and enhanced cost effectiveness. This management plan leads to better circumstances for meadow birds, e.g. parcels with a resting period in the breeding season, and parcels where young chicks could be raised and enough land for the chick to feed on.	This process involves a complicated system for applications, designating areas, monitoring and evaluation. The pilot approaches were set up to see how this process could be made less complicated.	