Annex 2: Examples of good practice through the implementation, design or development of measures or complementary approaches funded under supported through the EAFRD.

Key to common acronyms: AES = Agri-environmental Scheme AEM = Agri-environment Measure LPIS = Land Parcel Information System LAG = Local Action Group For measure code translations see Annex 1

Notes: *The following inventory shows practical examples of how environmental services have been delivered using Rural Development funding across the EU. These examples have primarily been collected through consultation with the focus group on environmental services, supplemented where necessary with examples from the literature and existing projects. The five examples not provided by the focus group are indicated using square brackets, for example [45].*

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)	**Title:** ***Development of agri-environmental measures that result in economic gains for farmers and lead to self-sustaining approaches independent of subsidies*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation **Topic:** To tackle the decline of farmland biodiversity in agriculture areas based on a short chain product approach (not subsidised). **Focus:** Implementation of single measure; Other: developing agri environment measures with economic return 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).	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-environment measures among stakeholders, with 24 bakeries selling the produce. Decreased dependency on subsidies. Reduced carbon footprint due to short supply chain. Improved landscape.	The process of growing wheat to 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.	The productions of added value produce could be used more effectively as a goal to help 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 the Inagro Institute)	**Title:** ***Development of new agri-environment management practices focusing on natural pest control and functional agro biodiversity, generating win-win for farmers and nature*** **Objectives:** Biodiversity conservation; Water quality and availability; 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 in the region is based on the number of aphids counted on/in wheat, but does not consider the role of natural predators. This pilot seeks to develop 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/low cost options through the implementation of an integrated pest control system.	A pilot project 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 that, if successful, will be integrated into the agri-environment measure. The environmental services it is expected to deliver are: - benefits through the reduced use of pesticides and biological pest control; - Increased pollinator species due to more pollen and nectar availability in agricultural landscapes; - Flower strips provide cover for wildlife and deliver a colourful and attractive landscape. This approach is expected to have positive outcomes for biodiversity, landscape and water quality.	Monitoring pests can be both time consuming and expensive and costs of ensuring farmers are well informed are high. The regional plan will require a minimum coverage of measures and cooperation among farmers to share knowledge and experience to make the approach more efficient. Pilot projects, funded under experimental European programmes only support short-term experiments with little chance for continued innovation, particularly in light of scarce resources and high competition for funding.	- Training farmers should be prioritised, such as training through agricultural schools/universities or training as a condition to enter agri-environment 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-environment measures. - More funding should be devoted for research into agri-environment 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)	**Title:** ***Tailoring of agri-environment schemes towards environmental issues at the holding level in the Czech Republic.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation **Topic:** To tailor AES to the real needs at the holding level by using local knowledge and experts in nature conservation. **Focus:** Implementation of a single measure	The design and implementation of 214 schemes was deemed too complex and not sufficiently focussed on environmental issues at the holding level. 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. The Paying Agency then decides if the land management is appropriate and if it should receive funding under measure 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 AES on particular plots, which was a necessary step before farmers filled in the 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 mediated better with better training for paying agency staff. Identification of environmental priorities determined via LPIS and made available to all key stakeholders should be maintained into next programming period. Advisors should help with decisions and be involved more during initial stages. Improvements will focus on implementation and targeting. The communication between stakeholders at national and regional level was a crucial point for the success of the policy.
4	214 and 216	**MS:** Czech Republic **Region:** National	**Title:** ***Using stakeholders to raise environmental awareness and encourage participation in more demanding agri-environment schemes in the Czech Republic.*** **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 at the local level to join the scheme. **Focus:** Involvement of local communities; Combination of several measures.	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 in 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 the 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 at the local level). There is no government assistance for 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 the hunters' society was not arranged by the state administration and was voluntary there were no new costs to farmers or administrations. Costs were born on hunters' society sites, 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 attempts to create a new delivery system relying on such agents. The intention is to pay such agents in relations to schemes on valuable grasslands for the next programming period with a hope to increase the effectiveness and sustainability of demanding agri-environment schemes. It is envisaged that the agents will help increase the trust in policies, improve environmental planning on farm level and improve the 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	**Title:** ***Using advisory measures to raise environmental awareness amongst farmers and provide best practice guidance for farmers engaged in agri-environment schemes in Estonia.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation; Preservation of the landscape **Topic:** Advisory and training for farmers under agri-environment agreements **Focus:** Implementation and combination of several measures; Other: disseminating information about environmental values and services (best practices) the farmers 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 for 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-environment schemes implemented nationally (support for environmentally-friendly farming and for organic farming) farmers are required to pass the basic one-day agri-environment training (for organic farming two days) by the end of the first contracting year and an additional one-day (for the organic farming two 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. Involves farmers with the on-going evaluation process, giving them direct feedback on the impact of their management. This improved farmer knowledge may also help to support collective approaches in the future.	Two to four days per 5-year commitment period does not 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 supported (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. Training could be innovative if possible. Video clips and movies have been included into 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 training sessions etc. Training sessions should be diverse enough in subject matter to attract farmers (taking into account also their diverse management practices). This is particularly an issue for farmers who have already passed some training and would like to learn something new.
6	214	**MS:** Estonia **Region:** National	**Title:** ***Using the agri-environment measure to support the maintenance of semi-natural habitats ineligible for SAPS support in Estonia.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation; Preservation of the landscape **Topic:** Support schemes for the maintenance of semi-natural habitats **Focus:** Implementation of a single measure.	There is a problem with 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 compulsory training, also helping them in daily management questions. As they act on a local scale they are trying also to motivate farmers to take up the commitment.	The scheme has been particularly successful in protecting 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 the board of experts. An improvement could be training requirements as a 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 over time, the payments farmers are getting through the 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	**Title:** ***Providing tailored training programmes to support a range of environmental measures best suited to deliver environmental benefits in Finland.*** **Objective:** Multiple depending on the needs of the farmer **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 different kinds of environmental measures according to those which are best suited to a particular holding/area.	Measure 111 supports training actions with a 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 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 at the local level, facilitating communication beyond the training sessions.	Administrative burdens for beneficiaries. Concern that although the legislative proposal offers possibilities for actions like measure 111, the similar measure 331: Training and information which is as important as 111 will not be possible to use as broadly as currently 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 projects are usually at farm level, for example: YmpäristöAgro focuses on environmental aspects of agriculture, with the goal of providing information on new and existing environmental management methods and financing, targeting largely farmers but also other actors in the food chain. (http://www.proagriaoulu.fi/fi/ymparistoagro/). RaHa (water conservation) provides seminars and videos on project results showing farmers' experiences. (http://www.ymparisto.fi/default.asp?contentid=370861&lan=fi&clan=fi)
8	Design of Axis 2 measures	**MS:** Finland **Region:** Mainland	**Title:** ***Raising awareness and improving RDP measures by Involving stakeholders in the early stages of axis 2 measure design.*** **Objective:** Multiple depending on the measures being developed **Topic:** Consultation and design of AEM sub measures **Focus:** Other - Design of environmental measures and practices for agri-environment schemes / Axis 2 measures	This approach of large-scale involvement of stakeholders 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, farmers' organisations, environmental NGOs, researchers and advisory services. They are invited to consider Axis 2 issues under 11 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 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 to understand each other better and find solutions to problems together. This approach activates researchers to think of solutions to their findings and not only basic research. It 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 to 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-environment 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	**Title:** ***Introducing compulsory soil management and fertilisation measures within agri-environment schemes to improve water quality in Finland.*** **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:** Implementation of a single measure	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 of high priority under measure 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 to target fertilisation according to the crop and soil needs. 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 specific elements 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 programmes.	The agri-environment measure covers 93% of 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	**Title:** ***Using simple agri-environment management measures to improve soil functionality and provide forage and feed resources for wildlife in Finland.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation; Soil functionality; 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 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 agricultural practices and machinery. The area can be declared in a yearly application after the farmer has made an environmental commitment.	Not specified in the example.	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 biodiversity, 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 cultivated agricultural areas.	The measure has no additional administrative burden and is controlled through the usual on the spot checks. The future of this measure depends on the definition and management requirements of the greening proposals (the ecological focus area) for 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
11a	214	**MS:** Finland **Region:** Mainland	**Title:** ***Using the agri-environment measure to maintain traditional biotypes and preserve landscapes in Finland.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation **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 (measure 216). **Focus:** Implementation of single measure (but can involve the use of non productive investments during the start up phase of the project)	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.	Not specified in the example.	This measure is considered to be on 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 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.
11b	Leader approach	**MS:** Finland **Region:** Mainland	**Title:** ***Using the Leader approach to maintain traditional biotypes and preserve landscapes in Finland.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation **Topic:** Management of traditional biotopes on land not owned or managed by farmers using the Leader approach. **Focus:** Delivery of environmental measures through the Leader approach	Need to maintain diverse flora and fauna of traditional biotopes and preserve landscape values related to long-term land use. The approach 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. 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.	Communication is based on providing people at the local level with the opportunity to participate in planning and implementing 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.	According to an assessment of endangered biotopes all traditional rural biotopes are endangered in Finland. This approach is considered important to the delivery of environmental service on land not managed by farmers.	The implementation of the Leader approach has had some administrative problems.	

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
12	214	**MS:** Finland **Region:** Mainland	**Title:** ***Reducing the impact of organic (manure and urine) fertiliser application on surface and ground waters through the agri-environment measure in Finland.*** **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-environment 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.
13	214 ,216 and Leader approach	**MS:** Finland **Region:** National	**Title:** ***The creation and management of multi-functional wetlands in Finland using agri-environment support and the Leader approach.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation **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 a map with the 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 the area predicted to be impacted and benefits foreseen for water quality, biodiversity, and landscape. LEADER groups are asked to approve the projects where they fit with 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 wetland creation and planning).	Communication between beneficiaries and advisors is needed and different planning and supporting guidelines are required. The combination of two different measures requires extensive communication with administrations which frequently did not have experience with the measures (e.g. with LEADER approach, with agri-environment 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 the 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 wetland creation) is experience and institutional learning which are ready to be transferred to the next programming period for improved performance of the policy. Also a greater range of stakeholders were involved which also provides an opportunity to learn from and plan for their participation better for the next programming period.	The delivery process became quite complicated because several procedures, which were in the 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 the national and regional levels concerning rules of implementation. 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 sufficient effort should be put into 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, both '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.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
14	**214**	**MS:** France **Region:** Aquitaine	**Title:** ***Making environmental certification a prerequisite of entry into agri-environment schemes in France.*** **Objective:** Multiple **Topic:** Environmental certification as a prior condition to sign an agri-environment contract **Focus:** Implementation of a single measure		Relates to 7 areas of agricultural practices: fertiliser application, PPP inputs, biosecurity, plant effluents, biodiversity, energy and water. To be certified, farms must comply with the measures that relate to the relevant themes/agricultural practices. They have a period of one year from the date of certification to follow the agronomic advice and to make an assessment of irrigation equipment, as appropriate.	Not specified in the example.	Only came into being for AEM in 2011 http://agri-agro.aquitaine.fr/toutes-les-actualites/candidature-mae-area-2011/		Viewed as successful from a mid-term evaluation of the French RD programme
15	214	**MS:** France **Region:** Parc National des Cévennes (PNC) Languedoc-Roussillion (Lozere)	**Title:** ***Using territorial agri-environment schemes to address environmental issues whilst taking account of farmers socio-economic situation in Parc National des Cévennes (PNC) Biosphere Reserve, France.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation; 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 economic development with environmental protection in the Parc National des Cévennes (PNC) Biosphere Reserve Since 2007, the 'Territorial agri-environment measure – 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 for specific targeting to address 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 an improved level of understanding and trust.	Besides the high levels of administration associated with 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 a coherent approach to support provided to farmers in relation to environmental services. Farmers are the biggest economic beneficiaries of the measures implemented, together with actors involved in tourism activities who benefit indirectly 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. However, it is impossible to distinguish the impact of MAET from those of the general policy implemented, the CAP as a whole and initiatives related to marketing of products.	The implementation of the measure requires a lot of coordination and mediation. 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 the coordination of national, regional and local agencies in these types of area. 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 a 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 too short a time to witness significant environmental impacts.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
16	n/a	**MS:** France **Region:** Pays Houdanais	**Title:** ***Using fiver year river basin contracts for the coordinated management of water resources in the Pays Houdanis region in France.*** **Objective:** Water quality and availability; water management; resilience to flooding **Topic:** Basin contracts for the 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 areas, develop heritage related to water, manage runoff to control floods, monitor water quality. Need for coordinated actions at territorial level by establishing watershed contracts (to cover water catchment area).	Two river 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.	Not specified in the example.	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 being restored.		Territorial approach involving multiple stakeholders is important, particularly at the local level.
17	n/a	**MS:** France **Region:** Languedoc – Roussillon (Lozere) – National Park of Cévennes	**Title:** ***Developing a food quality label to improve income from agricultural products whose production delivers environmental services in the National Park of Cévennes, France.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation; 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 the needs for livestock to spend 90 days on outdoor pasture as a key element.	Communication to consumers includes the need to raise consumer awareness on seasonality and characteristics of products which are produced according to environmentally friendly methods, 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 initiative 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.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
18	214	**MS:** Germany **Region:** National	**Title:** ***The use of targeted and site specific contractual nature conservation schemes under the agri-environment measure to improve nature conservation in Germany.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity; preservation of landscapes **Topic:** CNC Contractual Nature Conservation **Focus:** Implementation of a single measure.	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 RDPs has implemented a CNC subprogramme under the AEM to meet conservation needs. Environmental agencies/ administrations develop contracts with targeted and specific practices within specified regions or settings. CNCs fund contracts to the value of €170 million annually (compared to €400 million 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 conservation needs and farming situations. There is very good evidence for the higher nature conservation value of the specialized Nature conservation contracting programmes. Thuringia and Rhineland-Palatinate have very good monitoring data, documenting that the more ambitious and nature conservation oriented programmes are much more effective in delivering higher nature conservation benefits.	The administration efforts for CNC are higher than for classical AES; Requires identifying and acquiring land parcels that are known to have the 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 result in higher administrative burdens. Possible suggestions to overcome burdens: using local mediation 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.
19	323	**MS:** Germany **Region:** National	**Title:** ***Using rural heritage projects to support the implementation of Natura 2000 management and water protection actions in Germany.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity; preservation of landscapes; water management; water quality and availability **Topic:** Rural heritage projects in support to Natura 2000 **Focus:** Combination of measures	Project developed 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 the rural heritage programme. Annually about €90 million are spent on 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.	Not specified in the example.	Highly flexible tool and provided tailored and accepted solution for addressing specific needs.	The administration efforts for developing, approving and controlling are high. 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 that environmental results are often linked to dissemination and PR.The development, approval, implementation and control must be simplified both for applicants and for administration.The high flexibility allows efficient solutions to be implemented and secures a solution that meets needs best and is regionally accepted.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
20	323	**MS:** Germany **Region:** National	**Title:** ***Coordinating environmental management between different stakeholders using the conservation and upgrading of rural heritage measure in Germany.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity; preservation of landscapes; water management; water quality and availability **Topic:** Land care organisations, local biological stations, regional partnership**s** **Focus:** Combination of measures, coordination with other EU funds, Involvement of local communities	There is a need for coordination and management between relevant stakeholders where environmental targets need action that do not relate to farming practices.	Local organisations act as intermediaries for actors between local and national levels to support planning and implementation of local projects with an environmental focus. For example: Landcare organisations (including farmers associations, conservationists and cultural landscape organisations); Biological stations (NGO driven); Regional partnerships (similar to landcare organisations); Plenum Baden-Württemberg (5 pilot regions 'nature protection through use' - applies to all land users in pilot regions).	Varies by organisation. For example: Landcare 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-Württemberg: 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. The 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 from projects e.g. article 57 Natural Heritage projects.	Environmental services must be delivered locally in many situations. Landcare 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.
21	214, 216, 323	**MS:** Germany **Region:** Eifel Region (mountainous region bordering LU and BE)	**Title:** ***Developing a regional pilot project for cooperative conservation actions in the Eifel Region of Germany.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity; preservation of landscapes **Topic:** Regional pilot project for cooperative conservation actions ("conservation by use") **Focus:** Combination of measures, coordination with other EU funds, Involvement of local communities.	Biodiversity loss due to intensive farming and over-exploitation of rich grasslands. Intensive farming has to lead to changes in farm structure and intensification of grassland which in turn endangers the existence and biodiversity of meadows, mountain pastures, heath land, neglected grassland, etc. Within the Eifel region, 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 a grassland conservation programme together with University of Bonn. The scheme also includes public land. The conservation programme involved implementing farming practices that allow biodiversity to thrive. For example, integrating hay into the cows' diets (also increased milk yields). The scheme also implemented a monitoring system and research on nature conservation, farming, and regional development.	Over the past 30 years in the Eifel region communication networks have been developed and maintained on a personal, rather than formal, basis via the personal commitment of Prof. Schumacher (University of Bonn) and his ability to communicate with farmers, conservationists and administrations (local and federal state).	More than 4000ha of selected grasslands is under the nature conservation contracts with up to 20% of the intensive dairy farms now deemed to be on nature conservation grassland. Loss of (phyto) biodiversity has 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 increasing milk yields further.	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 visible results and regional acceptance. EAFRD-Funding/ nature conservation contracting/ agri-environment schemes must be accompanied by very flexible instruments like investment support by foundations, provision of public land to farmers and flexible scientific support.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
22	n/a	**MS:** Germany **Region:** Rhön Region	**Title:** ***Using the Biosphere reserve concept to revitalise neglected rural areas and deliver environmental services in the Rhön Region of Germany.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity; preservation of landscapes **Topic:** Rhön biosphere reserve **Focus:** --	To revitalise a neglected rural areas, address abandonment and agricultural decline, with farmers at the centre of this process.	Use of the Biosphere reserve concept (UNESCO) and implementation of a series of activities through bringing together public sector, NGOs, and private sector. Main action: reintroduction of local sheep breeds (meat and organic milk). AE payments used to pay for management of grazing land and meadows. Additional EAFRD support comes from organic farming measure, LFA payments and Leader. Other EU national and private funds are involved.	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 individual stakeholders and between them and public institutions, suggests it is generally good or very good.	55% of businesses saw increase in 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	Cross-sectoral approach (farming, retailing, tourism, environmental management) considered to be the 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.
23	214	**MS:** Germany **Region:** Result oriented AEM fostering species rich grassland: Baden-Württemberg, Lower-Saxony, Thuringia, Rhineland-Palatinate; Result oriented reduction of N-balance scheme: Thuringia, Saxony-Anhalt, Brandenburg, Lower-Saxony	**Title:** ***Developing a result oriented agri-environment measure for a range of environmental services in Germany.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity; water quality and availability; water management **Topic:** Result oriented agri-environment measure**s** **Focus:** Implementation of a single measure.	A key problem with classic action oriented AEM is that farmers are required to follow rules defined by the regional administration which tend to dominate the focus of the farmers rather than seeking to deliver the required environmental outcomes. Here AEM have been designed to be result oriented, with the aim of changing the mind-set and practices of farmers and administrations in delivering environmental services as opposed to following measure prescriptions.	Instead of defining activities that are permitted, obligatory and banned, farmers and administrations agree on a measureable result. For example: The delivery of species rich grassland: At least four indicator species must be present on the grassland under the scheme. Reduction of N-balance: The aim is set for a whole-farm- or field-nitrogen-balance being lower then cross compliance or other national regulations. The contract and implementation of the scheme is similar to ordinary AEM approaches. The contract is for 5 years, farmers implement and record their actions and results and administrations provide the control monitoring and financial support.	When starting a result oriented AEM there is a need for a certain level of education surrounding the desired results and how these are presented on farm, for example the beneficial weed species which are desirable in grassland mosaics. Therefore documents and information and special group and individual information actions are provided by agricultural ministry or advisory services.	Many participating grassland farmers are keen to understand more about the weed species and their ecology. They start to pay more attention to their grasslands and understand the results they are seeking to achieve. Farmers participating in the nitrogen-balance schemes increase their fertiliser planning and reduce N-balances.	Administrations feel that they have problems with controlling result oriented measures. Once a year they must count weed species in grassland or review fertiliser records. However in reality controlling the results at a defined time is easier than controlling the implementation of measures throughout the year. This approach does present some risks to the farmers in developing individual strategies adapted to their individual situation and achieving the required results. Even when doing many things right, circumstances and acts of nature could lead to them not meet the objectives, for example the appearance of weeds in arable land is less predictable and more dependent on the weather than in grassland. Tests show that there was a high percentage failure to achieve weed rich arable fields due to environmental variables e.g. a very dry spring, hot summer etc.	Result-oriented AEM have the potential to deliver environmental aims with higher accuracy for two reasons: farmers and administrations agree on the required results and farmers start to become more engaged with the aims of the AEM and the ecological contexts. Additionally farmers have a wider freedom in their choice of farming activities and the number of detailed regulations (do's and don'ts) is reduced. Control is limited to measureable outcomes and not restricting farmer activities. Not all environmental aim can be implemented with result orientated AEM. To date there have been only successful examples for species rich grassland, meadow birds (not EAFRD-funded in Germany) and nitrogen-balances.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
24	Leader	**MS:** Germany **Region:** Kehlheim LAG, Region Hallertau, Babaria	**Title:** ***Using the Leader approach to improve groundwater protection in Hop growing regions of Germany.*** **Objective:** Water management **Topic:** Groundwater protection project implemented through LEADER. **Focus:** Implementation of a single measure; Delivery of environmental measures through the Leader approach	The region of Hallertau, Bavaria is the most important hop growing region in Germany. Hop growing is very intensive in fertiliser and plant protection use and the regulations implementing the Water Framework Directive are strict and demanding. This LEADER approach is intended to help farmers adapt the production of hops to the requirements of the WFD.	The Leader-Project, organised by the Kehlheim LAG, brings together hop growers, water suppliers, administrations and scientists to find new and innovative ways to adapt hop production to the WFD and other water protection aims. Leader funding was used to gather information and analysis about different hop growing strategies to develop new approaches to help farmers adapt and inform advisory services. (*A similar LEADER+-Project 'groundwater Protection the region Jula' also dealing with groundwater protection is carried out by the same LAG. The Jura Region is dominated by significant nitrogen leaching to groundwater from agricultural soils*)	The basis and concept of Leader is to foster communication and is an integral part of all Leader approaches. Examples of communication approaches include: brochures, articles, flyers, meetings, conferences etc.	Hops are only grown in some regions of Germany. So the (scientific and practical) knowledge is limited and very little is known about the environmental impacts of different hop growing strategies. This approach is expected to lead to a greater understanding of the requirements of hop growing in the Hallertau Region (the only significant hop growing area in Germany) and act as an evidence base on which to develop future growing strategies that help to deliver environmental services (predominantly water quality protection).	Leader only provides funding possibilities if the topic 'protection of environmental resources' is defined in the regional development strategy. Additionally Leader in Germany is often dominated by regional development and it is hard for environmental and agricultural stakeholders to get involved in the LAG and get projects funded. Generally, the LAG application and funding process is often a burden for stakeholders who are not used to the "project application business".	In special cases, like the limited production of hops in only a few regions, there is a lack of general and scientific information about the environmental impacts of different growing strategies. In some cases Leader were able to close this knowledge gap with a project. But there are many similar projects in the field of environment and agriculture, financed from other EAFRD measures or national funding sources.
25	Leader	**MS:** Germany **Region:** Different LAG partnerships in different regions have implemented this approach eg Mittlerer Schwarzwald, Göttingen etc	**Title:** ***Using the Leader approach to support extensive grazing through the marketing of agricultural products based on their contribution towards environmental services.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity; water quality and availability; resilience to flooding and fire; preservation of landscapes. **Topic:** Extensive grazing project implemented through the LEADER approach. **Focus:** Delivery of environmental measures through the Leader approach.	Many mosaic or grassland dominated landscapes depend on grazing for keeping the landscape open. Extensive use by sheep, goat, suckler cows provides the most benefits for nature conservation and the provision of public goods. But these types of production are often less profitable, especially when following special environmental requirements or restrictions. These production systems require some sort of support in order to maintain their economic viability which is in turn one of the more efficient means of managing and maintaining extensive grasslands.	Several Leader regions have used projects to implement the marketing of meat or other products, providing support for specific management, including new fences, water supply, mobile milking, shelter etc. Support can also be used to fund: - Purchase of a mobile milking machine for goats; - Re-establishing wandering shepherds in the County of Göttingen; - Supporting the establishment of a private small scale mozzarella dairy; and - Supporting marketing for regional products from extensive grazing.	The basis and concept of Leader is to foster communication and is an integral part of all leader approaches. Examples of communication approaches include: brochures, articles, flyers, meetings, conferences etc.	Most other Axis 1 and 2 measures in Germany are becoming concentrated on allowing funding only to standard investments or standard measures. Leader projects can be used to fill gaps in existing support mechanisms and provide more flexible approaches such as supporting extensive grazing independently if they are carried out by farmers on their own land or on public / nature conservation land.	Leader only provides funding possibilities if the 'protection of environmental resources or conservation of grassland/ extensive farming' is defined in the regional development strategy. In addition Leader in Germany is often dominated by regional development and it is hard for environmental and agricultural stakeholders to get involved in the LAG and get projects funded. Often only where landcare organisations became part of the LAGs were they able to develop a bridge between the two areas of regional development and farming and environment Generally, the application and funding process is often a burden for stakeholders who are not used to the "project application business".	For special aims and special situations support other than "mainstream" programmes (Agricultural investments, Agri-environment schemes, diversification and marketing) is needed. Leader is sometimes the solution. But there are many similar projects in the field of environment and agriculture, financed from other EAFRD measures or national funding sources.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
26	323, 114, with additional national support	**MS:** Germany **Region:** n/a (different elements taken forward across different regions)	**Title:** ***Using a combination of measures to provide integrated environmental advisory services to farmers in Germany.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation; water management; water quality and availability; soil functionality, climate stability; resilience to flooding and fire; preservation of landscapes **Topic:** Environmental advisory services **Focus:** Implementation of a combination of measures.	Farmers require specific knowledge to help them correctly implement Agri-environment schemes (AES) and contractual conservation measures. Maximising ecological benefits and integration in farm processes needs additional efforts and support. RDP land management measures are only one tool to change farming processes. To understand measures and their environmental rationale, more information is needed. Within the last decade consultancy and extension services have changed from a state service to a private business. Thus farmers have to pay for consultancy and are only willing to pay for consultancy that raises their income at farm level. This is currently a significant barrier to use of these services by farmers.	To overcome both financial and institutional burdens several types of measure are implemented in Germany. All are aimed at an integrated advisory service combining the agricultural and economic perspective with environmental services. Lower-Saxony: Supported through measure 323, advisors at county level provide general and farm specific advice for participation in contractual conservation schemes (214). Lower-Saxony: Supported through measure 114, farmers are paid 80% of the advisory costs in the fields of water protection, biodiversity and climate protection. Rhineland-Palatinate: Use of national money to support the integration of environmental measures into farm practice. Support provided from qualified ecologists.	Yes but not specified in the example.	Acceptance of and participation in AES is rising. For example in selected counties in Lower-Saxony, information and advisory services for conservation schemes has lead to a significant increase in scheme uptake. Satisfaction and understanding of farmers implementing AES has been improved. The measures are better suited to existing farm processes and the results have led to more effective delivery of environmental services and can help to increase farm profitability through more efficient implementation of measures.	To develop a farm plan takes at least 6-12 contact hours between farmer and advisor. For one mid size farm, the advisor has to allow at least 4 days work. Sending an ecologist to a farm is not a good idea. The advisor needs the trust of the farmer, agricultural knowledge and ecological and AES knowledge. The number of advisors with sound ecological and agricultural knowledge is very limited. Training courses and certification systems are currently being developed without rural development money as part of an initiative in some Länder, e.g. Lower-Saxony.	The benefits of relatively cheap advisory activities are impressive: Advice is making agri-environment measures better accepted and raises ecological effectiveness of the measures. Integrated environmental advisory services are very important tools to boost sustainable land use. Those providing the advice need to be knowledgeable and trusted by the farmer.
27	114	**MS:** Germany **Region:** Lower Saxony	**Title:** ***Voucher like scheme approach to advice provision in Lower-Saxony, Germany*** **Objective:** Multiple depending on the objective of the scheme being supported with advice. **Topic:** Environmental advisory services **Focus:** Implementation of a single measure	In Lower-Saxony a range of different advice provision is available for the implementation of rural development measures as well as cross-compliance. Advice is provided through the agricultural chamber, farmers unions, consulting engineers and other specialist, farmers associations and clubs etc. This wide range of advisory bodies is important to provide advice to different groups of farmers for different purposes. However, due to this heterogeneous advisory service structure a payment scheme for an (environmental) advisory service was needed which did not conflict with and did not disturb the existing structures.	In February 2012, farmers were able apply for support for advisory services for cross-compliance plus the new CAP challenges under measure 114 and were able to choose the number of hours of advice they required. The advice has to be received by August with up to 80 per cent of the costs covered (to a maximum of €1,500). 2 000 farmers have applied for this service.	Not specified in the example.	The system of handing the money to the farmer and allowing them to choose the advisor (which could be compared to a voucher-system) does not disturb the market competition between existing advisory services. Nor does the administration decide which advisors are employed. The level of knowledge of the advisors is secured by courses and certification / accreditation.	There is currently a lack of advisors who are qualified to provide advice regarding the 'new challenge' of biodiversity (as introduced via the Health Check of the CAP). In response, the agriculture and environment ministries are setting up a joint education system to fill this gap. In addition the relative acceptance of the approach by farmers may be limited by the 80 per cent remuneration costs rather than full re-imbursement.	A cross compliance advisory service has been implemented since 2006. Now it has been updated to include cross compliance and advice for at least one new CAP-challenge. As this approach has only been running a short time the new challenges that the advisory service is focused upon are still unknown.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
28	111	**MS: Hungary** **Region:** National	**Title:** ***Using mandatory training to ensure more effective implementation of the agri-environment and forestry measures in Hungary.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation; 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 to address specific information needs and skills for the practical implementation of agri-environment and forestry measures.	In order to ensure effective implementation of the agri-environment and forestry measures, training courses are mandatory for those farmers and forest holders who have RD agreements. They have to attend at least two of these courses which are organised by shortlisted training institutions (responsible for scheduling, attendance, contact the beneficiaries, etc.). Training sessions are funded through measure 111 of the RDP.	The communication aspect is the training itself.	Being mandatory, the courses ensure that adequate training is received by all beneficiaries. The problem is that more experienced farmers also have to attend, even if they already have a high level of expertise.	The existence of several training institutions required harmonisation and coordination activities, resulting in greater public agency staff effort devoted to the job. To be more efficient, from now on there will only be one institution responsible for the training. Support is provided under measure 111, resulting in some administrative burdens for both the training participants and providers. For the ministry an additional task is to ensure training materials are updated, and monitoring of the training system.	Even if the training is mandatory, most of the participants are satisfied with it – as 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 environmental requirements.
29	111	**MS:** Hungary **Region:** National	**Title:** ***Using voluntary training to improve the implementation of specific environmental management activities in Hungary.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation; water management; water quality and availability; soil functionality **Topic:** Training courses connected with a series of environmental actions/ commitments **Focus:** Implementation of a single measure; coordination with other EU funds. Measure aimed at promoting knowledge and improving human potential – Eligible training courses in connection with cross-compliance requirements, SPS, forestry, organic farming and 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 aimed at 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 itself.	The attendants receive adequate training for their needs, although sometimes it 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 training materials are updated, and monitoring of the training system.	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
[30]	225	**MS:** Hungary **Region:** n/a Bakony Mountains	**Title:** ***Promoting close to nature forest management in the Bakony Mountains, Hungary.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation; soil functionality; Other (needs of local communities) **Topic:** To balance the long-term sustainability of almost 1,000 ha of hardwood forest and the local needs of the seven villages associated with the forest **Focus:** Implementation of a single measure	The slow-growing hardwood high forests are in separate private holdings, some quite small. Differences in objectives, age classes and stand structures meant that annual felling volumes varied considerably, causing long-term deterioration of the forest. The owners' equipment was mostly second-hand and more than 10 years old, but income from the harvested timber did not cover the cost of new, more nature-friendly machinery.	The work is split into sub projects which each require planning, purchase of equipment, basic tools, and other services. Professional staff were recruited and trained by Ihartü-2000 ltd., and a monitoring and control system set up. The field-work for a sub-project may run for several years or just one, but preparation and planning is always done a year ahead. The project as a whole covers the costs of payments to forest owners, professional staff and training, IT equipment (computers, GPS, printer, GIS, software), services and databases (forest stand data, cadastral records) and the modern logging tools and foresters to work the forest.	Not specified in the example.	Changing a large forest to a selective felling system is a slow process that takes up to 60 years to complete, but early results are evident in the favourable perceptions of forest owners, the modernisation of forestry machinery, and the experience of implementing an unfamiliar management regime. The benefits of nature-friendly transportation can be seen already in the forest and among the workforce. Using modern technology and machinery to haul the felled timber out of the forest means there is much less damage to the trees and the soil than there was with the old methods.	The forest owners found the process of applying for forest-environment payments difficult and bureaucratic. This, together with delays in approving applications and making payments, is making it more difficult to persuade the owners to become involved.	The administrative requirements were very complicated for costing some types of environmental management, for example using manual labour and hand tools to establish native tree seedlings following regenerative felling. In future, the forest owners would like to see a less complicated and more timely application and payment process.
31	213, 211, 125, 214 and 216	**MS:** Italy **Region:** Marche	**Title:** ***Using a range of RDP measures to improve the biodiversity status of Natural 2000 sites in the Marche region of Italy.*** **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	A new approach was needed to implement RDP measures to ensure collaboration between stakeholders and optimal use of measures with potential to improve the 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 the opportunity to recognise adequately the environmental role played by farmers for safeguarding several natural resources. By joining farmers and official bodies that manage protected areas in cooperative planning and implementation this is now feasible.	The Area Programme for Biodiversity (launched in 2011) is lead by the Body managing Natura 2000 site and is developed in consultation with local farmers living in the protected area, and Local Authorities. The programme can be jointly supported by several RDP measures. 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 sites , farmers and local authorities (such as Provinces and Municipalities)	Communication played a major role, because many dissemination initiatives were undertaken at local level by the Regione Marche, Public Authorities and Farmers associations to promote and discuss the new approach, before and during the launch of the Call for Proposal.	The new approach has so far only been applied in 2011, and funded via measure 213. The main expected benefits are the possibility of implementing a series of integrated interventions within a given Natura 2000 area, agreed between Public and private operators. In this way, their implementation should prove easier, and their impact more significant, not just on biodiversity conservation, but also for safeguarding soil fertility, 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 Departments involved (Agriculture and Environment), to design, for the first time, the new type of "Area Programme" and ensure that this fits it into the standard RDP rules. It also required substantial communication and dissemination efforts at local level. It is likely to have 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 the next Call for Proposals should not prove so time-consuming.	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 the use of several RDP measures.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
32	121	**MS:** Italy **Region:** Piemonte	**Title:** ***The collective modernisation of agricultural holdings to improve water management at the catchment scale in the Piemonte region of Italy.*** **Objective:** Water management; water quality and availability **Topic:** Collective implementation of farm modernisation at a water catchment scale **Focus:** Implementation of collective contracts/approaches	This innovative approach has been recently introduced and aims to focus RDP measure implementation in those areas that show the greatest environmental pressures, and where a collective approach to water management is ongoing. In this way, the implementation of measure 121 will ease the enforcement of water protection requirements under the WFD.	Implemented only in early 2012, this is a 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 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 statements, meetings, etc.). In particular, at the beginning of each River agreement the Environmental Report concerning the state of the river is circulated and discussed in a participatory manner.	The new selection process so far has been applied only through 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 process is expected to achieve a far higher concentration of EU funds in areas where water management is a priority, therefore contributing to improving the overall environmental quality of these critical areas.	The new process 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 limitations (e.g. a farm may have its land split between different administrative boundaries).	The main lesson to be learnt from this experience is that simple innovations in the process for selecting 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.
33	214	**MS:** Italy **Region:** Veneto	**Title:** ***Improving water quality using the agri-environment measure in the Veneto region of Italy.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity; water quality and availability; preservation of landscapes **Topic:** Practices: Buffer strips, hedgerows and ecological corridors **Focus:** Implementation of single measure	The quality of water sources in the Veneto region is affected by diffuse water pollution from agriculture as a result of intensive farming patterns. The innovative approach, introduced in RDP measures since the late 1990s, consists of 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 for scheme applications and throughout the implementation of the practices used. 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 basin). Organisation of technical workshops at the local and regional scale to review the results of these interventions and improve their design and maintenance by the farmer. A manual has been issued by Veneto Agricoltura on how 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 improvements in 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 GIS).	Coherence and persistence in offering the same type of measure through different programming periods helps farmers to better understand its goals and the way it works in practice; Supporting the implementation of the measure with significant extension, technical assistance and scientific monitoring helps famers to improve their implementation of the measure.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
34	226*	**MS:** Italy **Region:** Tuscany - Media Valle del Serchio (Pistoia and Lucca Provinces, Tuscany)	**Title:** ***A local initiative using a network of farmers to improve river management in the Media Valle del Serchio (Tuscany), Italy.*** **Objective:** Preservation of landscapes; 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 recent years the Media Valle del Serchio area has experienced several hydro-geological problems. The area requiring monitoring 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 responsibility for the 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 environmental services. The authority defined contracts, coordination, and maintenance of the information database, while farmers ensured environmental stewardship through periodic onsite controls (with reports and pictures) and respond with initial management interventions, where necessary on the rivers and canals. Specific software was also created to help participants to communicate with the local authority for monitoring and first intervention works.	Not specified in the example.	This project is based on a network of local farmers, which is coordinated by the local authority but which acts collectively to solve local environmental problems, by using their local knowledge and their proximity to the canals and rivers that are 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 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 support the maintenance works carried out by farmers	Monitoring activities and those related to the dissemination and learning were not included into the RDP for Tuscany	The institutional arrangements related to this initiative are currently being investigated, as is the innovation needed in terms of policy development, in relation to both the technical and administrative tasks needed to deliver the environmental services and the dissemination and communication actions.
35	111 and 214	**MS:** Italy **Region:** Marche - Aso Valley (Ascoli and Fermo provinces, Marche region)	**Title:** ***Increasing the adoption and delivery of integrated management approaches through the development of a territorial agri-environment agreement (TAEA) to in the Aso Valley (Marche), Italy.*** **Objective:** Soil functionality; water quality and availability; 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 Territorial Agri-Environment Agreement (TAEA) established specific targets, to be achieved over a five to seven year period, including reduction and substitution of inputs.	The TAEA was structured as an integrated package of measures in the regional RDP, aimed at financing a set of initiatives that could support the adoption of more sustainable agricultural practices at the territorial level. Through measure 111 a capacity building programme for farmers was established, with specific training and technical guidelines on integrated agriculture. This measure covered advice and awareness raising in relation to the impacts and benefits of certain farm practices. This advice was combined with measure 214 on specific practices, including Integrated Pest Management (IPM), organic farming, and maintenance of permanent grass. The approach involved a wide range of actors including: an informal association of local farmers; the public advisory agency; the regional and provincial administrations; and other local institutions.	One of the main characteristics of this approach was the word-of-mouth communication between farmers, with a key role played by the Association Nuova Agricoltura. Thanks to the farmers of this association other farmers became interested and joined the project. On-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. Analysis of the difference in chemical levels in fruit grown was 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 was lower than required by law. Compared to the traditional top-down approach, the territorial agreement experienced in Valdaso area resulted in several positive effects on local governance and on 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 local needs.	Additional burdens to coordinate 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 local institutional arrangements and to the policy instruments currently in place: - RD policies usually lack the flexibility to support efficiently 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' 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 apply jointly to the agri-environment-climate payments should be implemented and additional funding should be provided to build farmer networks encouraging collective contracts or joint approaches to local environmental projects

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
35	214	**MS:** Italy **Region:** Veneto	**Title:** ***Using the agri-environment measure to protect and improve soil functionality in the Veneto region of Italy.*** **Objective:** Soil quality; water quality and availability; climate stability. **Topic:** Introduction of conservative agri cultural techniques **Focus:** Implementation of single measure; Implementation of collective approach	This measure aims to protect and improve soil structure and fertility and its water holding capacity, also with the aim of reducing carbon emissions. The project aims to introduce, at territorial scale, conservation agriculture techniques, by relying on the agri-environment measure 214 (Action 1) of the 2007-2013 Veneto RDP.	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 highly intensive agriculture such as the Po Valley. The measure was designed by the Veneto Regional government in association with experts on conservation agriculture techniques and, above all, in association with the local farmers who were already using such techniques. To adhere to this RDP measure, farms must be located in the plains 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 regular meetings. Cooperation and discussion was promoted between actors.	The measure was included in the RDP as result of the CAP Health Check and the application rate is quite positive (about 78 farmers joined the project during 2010). The initiative involved strong cooperation both between 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 a "collective approach" to agri-environment measure implementation.		The experience of the conservation agriculture project looks promising and a similar approach has been implemented in the Lombardy region.
36	214*, 211 and Regional law	**MS:** Italy **Region:** Alta Val d'Ayas (Aosta Valley region)	**Title:** ***Supporting collective grazing in alpine areas of the Alta Val d'Ayas (Aosta Valley region), Italy.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation; preservation of landscapes; hydro-geological management of the territory **Topic:** Environmental stewardship and landscape management **Focus:** Implementation of multiple measures (214.2 (apiculture), 214.1 (for agriculture), 214.5 (organic)+ 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. Beneficial management of these pastures also contributes to increasing tourism during the summer and maintaining the ski runs during winter. The Aosta Valley regional government has traditionally supported and funded the alpeggi (alpine pastures). 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, milk buyers, the regional government and other local public and private agencies.	Collective management of alpine pastures is supported by a range of RDP and other funds. A local co-operative of farmers has started to manage the alpeggi according to organic agriculture requirements and has created a local dairy to process and sell the local cheese (Fontina).	Communication aspects are not referred to the collective approach to manage forage systems but to public support linked to RDP and other specific State Aids. Public support is considered absolutely necessary to optimize the management of regional forage systems and to ensure the supply of environmental services useful for the community. RDP's support opportunities are communicated in detail 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. The appropriate management of pastures in the Aosta Valley may contribute to maintain grazing livestock systems, 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, the appropriate management of meadows and pastures allows the conservation of typical alpine landscapes, with positive effects for the tourism industry.	This approach does not involve additional burdens for its implementation. However, it was noticed that in order to promote relationships between farms, the Regional Government has created a specific agreement called "Hay-Manure Agreement". This agreement is a useful instrument the ensure the correct adherence to AES practices; The agreement consists of an agreement to exchange hay and manure between a farm without cattle that produces forage and a grazing livestock farm. The first receives manure to fertilise its meadows and pastures, the second one gets forage to feed animals; this agreement is essential in order to respect the strict production rules for Fontina PDO cheese.	The analysis of the relationship between farms underlines the importance of the correct use of mountain pastures in order to support farmers' incomes, to achieve social benefits and to deliver environmental services. It is proposed that support should be maintained to farms that follow the approaches listed here in the future rural development programme.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
[37]	226	**MS:** Latvia **Region:** n/a (Levlīči)	**Title:** ***Restoring storm damaged forests using Rural Development funding in Latvia.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation; Other (long term sustainability and resilience of the forest ecosystem) **Topic:** Restoring a storm damaged forest **Focus:** Implementation of a single measure	In August 2010 a storm destroyed two hectares of trees on one 60 hectare forest holding in Levlīči. Forest advisory services in the region explained that RDP funds were available for forest restoration and could be used to replant the damaged part of his forest. The aim was to restore the forest to long-term sustainable management as quickly as possible and at the same time to make the forest more resilient to wind damage in future.	The fallen and damaged trees have been cleared and the land is being replanted with a mixture of spruce and birch, over three growing seasons. The RDP funding covers the cost of obtaining the replacement trees, planting and looking after them. For the first few years it is important to clear away overgrown grass and bushes around the young trees, to give them space and light to grow. Because the RDP funds are not released until the new trees are established, the owner initially funded the work himself using the income from the windblown timber he had cleared off the site.	Not specified in the example.	The owner is very pleased to have been able to replant the windblown area so quickly, minimising the impact that the storm has had on the long-term future of the forest and its productivity. Planting a mixed stand, rather than just one type of tree, means that the forest will be better able to withstand storms in future. When the site was cleared, much of the damaged timber was fit only for firewood, so most of its value was lost. The owner explained that the RDP funding helped to make up for some of this loss.	At the moment all the RDP funding is paid after the work has been completed whereas most expenditure is undertaken at the start of the project.	The Ievlīči project is seen as a success by both the forest services and the owner. The only thing that needs to change is the phasing of the payments. At the moment all the RDP funding is paid after the work has been completed and it would be very helpful if part of the funding could be made available at the start of the project, when most of the expenditure is needed.
[38]	223	**MS:** Latvia **Region:** n/a	**Title:** ***Creating a new productive forest on the holding Kūlēji using Rural Development funding in Latvia.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation; Other (sustainable forest management) **Topic:** Creating a new productive forest on the holding Kūlēji **Focus:** Implementation of a single measure.	There was a need to make more effective use of land that was not being farmed and to improve forests that had naturally colonised non-agricultural land. The aim of the project is to make effective use of land that is not at present being managed or producing an income, in a way that will maintain its biological diversity, contribution to the rural landscape and recreational and aesthetic value.	The naturally grown forest stands were improved by clearing out damaged, undesirable, low productivity trees and then planting additional birch and spruce. To create the new forest on non-agricultural land the soil was first prepared then birch and spruce seedlings were planted. All the work was done by the family of the forest owner. The RDP funds were spent on preparing project documentation, purchasing the plants, land works, soil preparation, planting, looking after the young trees and protecting them from damage by wild animals.	Not specified in the example.	The project is not yet complete, but so far the owner has successfully created a pine plantation that will later be extended with more planting, and has planted a new young forest of spruce and birch. At this early stage in the development of a forest the trees need careful management and protection. This continues to be provided through the project until the trees have been established safely.	The main challenge was at a very first stage of the project, when the decision on participation in the programme needed to be taken. It was difficult to venture into the project implementation, but if there was a need to repeat the project, nothing would be done differently.	See left

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
39	214	**MS:** Poland **Region:** National	**Title:** ***Targeting and tailoring agri-environment schemes to maintain natural grassland areas in the mountain areas of Poland.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation; 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 decline 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 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 on a regional basis. 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 regions. Main actors: Farmers, NGOs, the National State Forests, AE advisors, experts.	Information and promotion actions are organised to encourage farmers to increase their use of the agri-environment programme: Experts prepare flora and fauna documentation. Advisory services for farmers and inhabitants of rural areas provide information and support in the: - preparation of agri-environment plans; - implementation of cross-compliance; and - provide information about production standards, public health, animal welfare, food quality and the 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 provided the opportunity to organise local festivals in order to promote meat and milk products from sheep and goats. The appropriate management of meadows provides an effective means of protecting biodiversity. Conservation of 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 higher uptake of these packages - to this end, it is recommended that 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.
[40a]	Integrated Territorial Intervention (ITI) (214, 216, 225, 227 and 323)	**MS:** Portugal **Region:** n/a (Tejo Internacional)	**Title:** ***Using a combination of measures under the Integrated Territorial Intervention approach to restore High Nature Value agro-forestry and improve bird habitats in Portugal.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation **Topic:** Restoring High Nature Value agroforestry to the habitats of threatened populations of rare birds **Focus:** Implementation of a combination of measures.	In the case of the Tejo Internacional ITI, the specific biodiversity objectives are to: promote the re-naturalisation and the reforestation of natural spaces in the oak forests; to improve the quality of the landscape; and to preserve the characteristic bird fauna and biodiversity more generally. The area is well known for its birds, which include the Eurasian Black Vulture, Eurasian Griffon Vulture, Egyptian Vulture, Bonelli's Eagle, Short-toed Eagle, Black-winged Kite, Red Kite, Eagle Owl and Tawny Owl. It is also planned to use the ITI to open up opportunities for marketing new goods and services linked to the biodiversity of this area, which will help to improve the economic vitality of these rural communities.	Integrated Territorial Interventions (ITI) are unique zonal RDP schemes for nine Natura 2000 areas in Portugal. Each area has its own ITI with a particular mix of integrated Axis 2 and 3 measures matched to specific local needs, within the common aim of promoting agricultural and forestry systems to achieve biodiversity conservation and landscape maintenance in the Natura 2000 area. Four of the Axis 2 and 3 measures (214, 225, 216, 227 and 323) are used in different combinations to achieve a range of environmental service outcomes, enable public partnerships and help to build local capacity through public-private partnerships known as Local Support Structures (LSS).	The engagement of public/private partnerships	See example 40b below	n/a	See 47b below

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
[40b]	225 implemented as part of the ITI approach (see 47a)	**MS:** Portugal **Region:** n/a (Tejo Internacional)	**Title:** ***Using the forest environment measure to deliver Natura 2000 site management requirements under the Integrated Territorial Intervention approach in Portugal.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation **Topic:** Restoring High Nature Value agroforestry. **Focus:** Implementation of a single measure.	The ancient oak woods of this Natura 2000 site are evidence of a centuries–old agroforestry system, growing oak alongside cereal and forage crops, and livestock grazing the natural grasslands. The gradual replacement of this by cereal rotations, olive groves and Eucalyptus plantations, threatened the rich biodiversity and in particular the populations of the rare birds closely associated with the traditional system. Local administrators, environmentalists and farmers, from five separate organisations, came together to develop the ITI project for Tejo Internacional.	The farm Herdade do Fervedouro illustrates the type of individual project supported by the Tejo Internacional ITI. The property has more than 200 ha of oak, and the management of 50 ha of this is being supported by annual forest-environment payments over a five-year period, to maintain groves of native trees and shrubs (including notable or relict specimens) and conserve the network of ecological corridors. To complement this, the farm will also apply for non-productive investment support, for new fencing to protect the naturally regenerating native trees from browsing by wild deer.	Not specified in the example.	Although the ITI measures are not yet fully implemented, it is expected that the project on Herdade do Fervedouro and the other ITI projects will: - maintain extensive grazing systems and traditional forestry practices, reducing the risk of land abandonment and other changes which may lead to biodiversity loss; - conserve the high nature value oak groves and croplands that heavily depend on the continuation of specific agroforestry systems and practices; - preserve landscapes features of outstanding aesthetic, historical and cultural value; - increase Natura bird populations.	n/a	The most important lesson has been the vital role of the Local Support Structure (LSS) in boosting local implementation of agri-forest-environment measures. The mix of complementary skills and expertise that five organisations contributed to the LSS has had a significant leverage effect on its effectiveness. The target population responded very positively, immediately showing their appreciation of a structure that provides monitoring and support, and which is committed to remedying the previous lack of information about existing support measures and Natura regulations.
41	214	**MS:** Slovakia **Region:** National	**Topic:** ***Improving the targeting of agri-environment schemes to ensure the more efficient use of RDP and national funds in Slovakia.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation **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 undertook 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 or holding 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 lead to significant uptake (101,000 hectares in the programming period 2004-6 and 38,000 in 2007-2013). Under SAPARD the uptake was rather low (only 5,000 hectares) due to a more complicated administration and because AES was implemented only as a pilot scheme. The effects of the measures have not been monitored sufficiently on the 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/ha) especially for mapping of rather large areas of the national territory. Work with GIS (e.g. transfer of data to LPIS) was also rather demanding. In the first stage this process was managed by Daphne and was rather costly to administer, because the NGO was not supported from the 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 to be much lower (in addition farmers pay lower fees for data on habitats at the 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 quite strict penalties in cases of non-compliance; and there should be clearer differentiation of payments in case of different management prescriptions to reflect farmer's effort.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
42	Plan 42 linked to RDP support	**MS:** Spain **Region:** Castilla Y Léon	**Title:** ***Maintaining extensive grazing in the 'monte' farming systems in the Castilla Y Léon region of Spain.*** **Objective:** Fire prevention **Topic:** Fire prevention through extensive grazing **Focus:** To prevent wildfires on 'monte' (Forest and grassland) through the re-introduction of farming in abandoned areas 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 land, 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 farm systems.	"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.	Not specified in the example.	Under plan 42, fires in the region have decreased by 70% since 2002.		
43	214 and other measures	**MS:** Sweden **Region:** Uppland, Roslagen. Island of Gräsö, Baltic sea	**Title:** ***Using the agri-environment measure to promote the use of natural coastal meadows in Sweden, leading to the restoration of HNV farming areas and improving the viability of jobs and livelihoods in rural areas.*** **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 forests (grazing). Improve the viability of jobs and livelihoods of the 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. Investment support was used to build a new cow shed capable of housing more cattle (60 during winter and 75 during summer) These payments go to the tenant and not the landowner.	Not specified in the example.	Win-win situation: business development including creation of employment at local level; restoration of better environmental conditions, and increased economic 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 project. In this specific case, 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 carry out restoration like this, followed by grazing and management of the area. The environmental support significantly 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 decide what you can do. But the poor farming area also provides opportunities if you include the public interest in high values. The environmental support acts as the necessary additive to maintain farming on this marginal but valuable land.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
44	214*	**MS:** Sweden **Region:** Öster Götland (archipelago area)	**Title:** ***A HNV restoration project in the Öster Götland region of Sweden, using agri-environment funding to support land management actions and promote a cooperative approach between landowners.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation; preservation of landscape; Other (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) *in combination with a pre-scheme pilot project.	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 are no active farmers on Harstena today, much effort was put into raising an interest amongst the landowners to preserve the traditional agriculture landscape. This was done by presenting the high natural and cultural values, developing a detailed restoration plan and presenting a strategy for the future long term management of the island's 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 opportunities for tourism and created employment on the island. AE payments were central to maintain lively rural areas. Increase of tourism in the area in the summer The small island farmers 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 both cultural and natural values.	Significant communication and participation demands in the early stages of the work	Because of the poor economy of small island farming, many farms have closed down. The islanders have turned to more profitable work in carpentry and tourism. The agri-environment payments and direct support at a sufficient level are absolutely necessary to maintain this kind of farming in these important areas. 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
45	Focus on Nutrients linked to other RDP measures	**MS:** Sweden **Region:** National	**Title:** ***Improving nutrient use on farms in Sweden through advice and monitoring provided by the 'Focus on Nutrients' project.*** **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 an integrated advice programme to share best practice. It is coordinated by the Swedish Farmers' Union with the involvement of 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 all actions are covered; minimum training requirements for advisors (degree from SE Uni of Agricultural Sciences and a 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.	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. Approximately 7,250 farmers receive recurrent advisory services with a total of 10,050 farmers taking part in the Focus on Nutrients approach. The advice is free which has ensured high uptake (farms with more than 25 livestock units 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 example with regard to agriculture's share and role in preventing 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 so we need realistic expectations within the programming period. Coordination: with AE scheme, with the market, with other schemes. It is not possible or necessary to convince everyone to sign up Further information on Focus on Nutrients can be found here: http://www.greppa.nu/download/18.6f9b86741329df6fab480004797/FocusonNutrients_en_w.pdf

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
46	214	**MS:** The Netherlands **Region:** National	**Title:** ***The implementation of agri-environment schemes through collective approaches in the Netherlands – a pilot approach.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation **Topic:** Implementation of agri-environment schemes through collective contracts. A pilot project that promotes ownership by farmers as related to specific measures. Success is 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 delivery of environmental objectives by: - using measures in a coherent and joined up way. - To improve and encourage interaction between farmers and non-farmers to improve engagement between a wide range of stakeholders. - To raise awareness of the importance of biodiversity leading towards a greater sense of responsibility of the farmer. - To introduce flexibility in the approaches used to preserve biodiversity. 2. To improve cost effectiveness of biodiversity conservation actions 3. Bottom-up approach to Implementation, organisation and management. 4. To increase options for collaboration with other stakeholders (like civilians, nature conservation organisations, health care organisation, schools etc.) 5. To improve long-term commitment of farmers and cooperation between farmers and with stakeholders	1. Coordination from within the region to communicate with: governmental organisations; other beneficiaries; other regional stakeholders like civilians, nature conservation 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 organise regional specific coordination. Scale differs between and within the examples. 2. Agreement between government and beneficiaries (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 4) Implementation of measures in region/area through a collective approach. 5) Accountability on quality by collective 6) After the approval of the plan each individual beneficiary has to apply via 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 at a parcel level. This leads to an administrative burden. 8) Each individual beneficiary receives payment based on its managed area.	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 to the government about the results (quality and quantity) achieved throughout the year.	It increases the effectiveness of the investment provided under the measure It leads to a higher level of involvement and engagement with farmers. Increased realisation of objectives, for example an increase in numbers of farmland birds and hamsters as compared to conventional approaches. More responsibility leads to greater engagement and responsibility for the farmer to deliver environmental services. The increased acceptance of the approach has lead to a better relationship between stakeholders and has been used in regional branding of regional produce.	At the moment the collective approach has too high an administrative burden (red tape) with increasing numbers of individuals wanting to be involved in such approaches. The approach has showed that it is difficult to share responsibility, for example on scheme controls. In the end the administrative system used turned out to be complicated and overlapping. Partly this is also related to national culture (polder model). The flexibility needed for a more cost effective approach conflicts with the rigid measure approach in regulations. Area management through a participatory approach requires 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 RD measures. Need regional approach in rural development regulations. Give more responsibility to the collective (e.g. auditing). Need to plan across programming periods (Long-term commitment, long term goals). 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. factors that cause success and failure.

No.	M	MS/Region	Objective(s) and Topic	Reason for the approach	Implementation	Communication	Benefits/Improvements	Burdens/Barriers	Lessons learnt
47	214	**MS:** The Netherlands **Region:** Regional	**Title:** ***Improved meadow bird conservation collective approaches in the Netherlands – a pilot approach.*** **Objective:** Biodiversity conservation **Topic:** Pilot approach to Meadow Birds Conservation based on collective conservation plans. [See Example 46] **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 birds and hamsters. The current approach to meadow bird conservation is ineffective due to three factors: - the size of the farms under contract are smaller than the area occupied by the bird population - the birds need 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 can not be achieved. The differences between the current collective approach and the pilots are 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 at the national level as they are region and 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 organisations. 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 better conservation and enhanced cost effectiveness. The management plan leads to better habitats for meadow birds, for example, parcels with a resting period in the breeding season, and parcels where young chicks could be raised with enough land to provide feed and foraging sources.	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.	