Towards multifunctional agricultural landscapes in Europe: Assessing and governing synergies between food production, biodiversity, and ecosystem services – TALE

Template 2 for collecting information on the relevance, impact and governance of policy measures regarding agricultural land use and ecosystem services in the case study areas (EU Member States)

Lead authors: Heike Nitsch, Cordula Rutz

Report short title: Template 2 for policy analysis (EU)

Deliverable No.: -

Work package: 1

Version: 2

Submission date: 18.12.2015

Document information

Title: Template 2 for collecting information on the relevance, impact and governance of policy measures regarding agricultural land use and ecosystem services in the case study areas (EU Member States)

Short title: Template 2 for policy analysis (EU)

Report number:

Version: 2

Date of last version:

Lead authors: Heike Nitsch, Cordula Rutz

Contributors: Nina Hagemann, Henrike v.d. Decken, Jörg Schramek

Document history

Date	Revision	Prepared by	Organisation	Approved by	Notes
07/12/2015	Version 1	Nitsch, Rutz	ifls		
18/12/2015	Version 2	Nitsch, Rutz	ifls		
xx/yy/zzzz	Version 3				
xx/yy/zzzz	Version 4				

Acknowledgement

1. Introduction

As elaborated in the concept for the first work package, WP 1 analyses the institutional framework impacting on land use decisions regarding agricultural land use, biodiversity conservation and the supply of ecosystem services (ESS) in the TALE case study areas. The aim of this WP is to identify and understand institutional structures at the regional scale, to identify policy strategies and examples for best practice policy measures and to lay the foundation for policy recommendations in connection with land use scenarios in TALE.

In order to gather the relevant information for a comparative analysis by IfLS, the project partners are to provide information on strategies, policy instruments, policy measures and governance influencing agricultural land use decisions in their case study areas. This will be done based on two templates provided by IfLS.

This second template deals with

- an analysis of governance structures (i.e. organisational solutions), including the actors involved
- procedures for enforcement
- systems of agricultural extension,
- importance and impact of agri-environment-climate measures (and similar measures)

The template is structured as follows:

1. General characterisation of governance structures and actor(group)s
2. Enforcement mechanisms
3. Information policies and extension services
4. Area relevance and impact of AECM and support of organic farming
5. Good practice
6. Other relevant policies

Please fill in the required information relevant for your case study.

Please provide your input until 31.03.2016

2. Template [to be replaced by name of case study area]

1. GENERAL CHARACTERISATION OF GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES AND ACTOR (GROUP)S

*In this section we would like you to **explain in a graph and then in written form** which actors are involved in the design (decision making on new or amended policies) and implementation (including enforcement) of policy measures influencing agricultural land use in your case study area. This concerns pillar one and two (especially the AECM) of the CAP, environmental legislation as well as other relevant policies described in template 1.*

Graph 1.1: GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES AND ACTORS

*In the additional document **"Exemplary_graph_governance"** we provide you with an exemplary graph. Please note that the graph is only a prototype that you will have to adapt to the conditions of your case study area: please adapt names of actors (the names of the actors in the exemplary graph are just placeholders), add actors (e.g. agricultural chambers, water boards etc.) or omit others (e.g. the agricultural and the environmental ministries might be joined) and adapt the description of their role (including the level the actor is situated on and its competences).*

Table 1.1: GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES AND ACTORS
Based on the graph, please describe the governance structures in place in your case-study area with regard to the policies covered under template 1. *The following key questions provide **guidance on the aspects of interest** for the analysis.* • *Which main actors (administrations and other relevant stakeholders), are involved in the policies, including policy design and the implementation processes? At which administrative level do they act (i.e. national, regional, local)?* • *What is their role, responsibility and influence?* • *How much freedom of scope do the regions have to determine policy measures, e.g. adaptation of measures to local conditions? Which administrative level is responsible for policy design and are the policies targeted (i.e. for example spatially adjusted to local circumstances)?[1]* • *How can the interaction between key stakeholders in policy design be described? Are there particular processes in place to ensure stakeholder consultation?*

---

[1] A policy can be either centrally (on a national level) planned without targeting or centrally planned, but targeted or regionally planned and therefore targeted to regional conditions.

2. ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS

For CAP instruments requirements in relation to enforcement (control and sanctions) are set by the EU. You can find information on these requirements in the supplementary document "TALE_WP1_Enforcement rules of EU policy measures". However, there might be some mechanisms in place that are specific to your case study area. So please, in this section, provide <u>information on AECM, cross compliance and greening requirements</u> (always as a group of measures) as well as <u>the two most relevant pieces of environmental legislation</u> in your case study area as far as they are not covered by the provided list of EU enforcement requirements ("TALE_WP1_Enforcement rules of EU policy measures").

We are collecting this information to illustrate the pros and cons of certain policy measures, e.g. with regard to enforceability and enforcement related transaction costs, as we believe that aspects of enforcement should always be carefully considered when designing new agri-environmental policy measures.

Table 2.1: ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS
• What mechanisms are used for control of compliance (e.g. responsible bodies for selection and control, administrative and/or field checks, control rate, selection of farms to be controlled, e.g. randomly or risk-based)?
• Which sanction mechanisms are in place if non-compliance is detected? If available, please include information on the severance of sanctions, e.g. height of fines or subsidy cuts?
• Are there any known problems or best practice approaches regarding enforcement mechanisms in your case study area?
• Is there any information available pointing to adverse effects of the policy, e.g. that farmers removed landscape elements (or converted permanent grassland) just before a policy prohibiting the removal of such elements came into force?
• Is there a gap between legal requirements (formal rules) and actual delivery of action on the ground (rules-in-use), i.e. an implementation gap? If yes, why?

3. INFORMATION POLICIES AND EXTENSION SERVICES

Table 3.1: INFORMATION POLICIES AND EXTENSION SERVICES	
How are policy measures communicated to become effective (information policies, such as brochures or extension services)?	
Provision of agricultural extension (public bodies, private companies, associations etc.) *Who is responsible for carrying out extension services to farmers? Of course, there can be a mix of different providers in place.*	
Funding (public, private) of agricultural extension services *Who is funding agricultural extension? Do farmers have to pay for services?*	
Advice on environmental aspects (e.g. water protection, advice on contractual nature conservation) offered to farmers	

Is extension on environmental aspects offered in the same way and be the same actors as extension on production issues? Is it funded in the same way? *What programmes (issues covered, target groups) are in place and how well are they accepted?*	

4. AREA RELEVANCE AND IMPACT OF AGRI-ENVIRONMENT-CLIMATE MEASURES (AECM) AND SUPPORT OF ORGANIC FARMING

Please provide information on the measures offered in the current programming period in your case study area (EU: 2014-2020; CH: AP14-17). **Restrict yourselves to describing measures for relevant land use in your case study area** *(e.g. if vineyards or alpine pastures are only of little importance in this region, such measures do not have to be included).*

For the EU, data on the area coverage will probably not be publicly available for the year 2015 yet. As table 4.1 should provide answers rather on the overall relevance of AECM in the case study areas, numbers from 2014 (old programming period) will be sufficient. If you use data from a different year (2015 is always welcome), please indicate.

Table 4.1: GENERAL RELEVANCE OF AECM AND ORGANIC FARMING	
% of UAA covered by AECM	
% of grassland covered by AECM	
% of arable land covered by AECM	
% share of organic farming of UAA	

In tables 4.2 and 4.3 please use the figures as <u>*projected in the rural development programme (new programming period)*</u> *(EU 2014-2020) of your case study area. We believe that this information should be publically available. If not, you should be able to get it from the ministry in charge. If the data is only publically available on a more aggregated level than your case study area (for instance on national level), please try to obtain the regional data from the regional authorities or, if not possible, comment on potential regional variation.*

Table 4.2: IMPORTANCE OF AECM REGARDING AREA COVERAGE AND FUNDING (without support of organic farming)	
Two most widely spread AECM on arable land with regard to area coverage *Please list (including area).*	
Two most widely spread AECM on permanent grassland land with regard to area coverage *Please list (including area).*	
If another type of land use other than arable land and permanent grassland (e.g. traditional orchards) is important in your case study area, please add the respective information.	
Three AECM that most public funds have been allocated to *Please list (including funds).*	

Table 4.3 INFORMATION ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SET OF AECM OFFERED IN THE CASE STUDY AREA
Please describe the range of AECM offered in your case study area with regard to their effectiveness (e.g. give examples for acceptance and for especially effective measures and the reasons for this). *Information on this subject can be obtained from official evaluation reports (ex-ante evaluation), scientific studies, NGO reports or experts (including you), for measures that have already been offered in the programming period from 2007-2013 also from the mid-term evaluation. You may want to include stakeholders at this point. Please indicate clearly, from which source you obtained which piece of information.* *Questions could be:* • *Which kinds of AECM are well accepted / not accepted by farmers and why?* • *Which AECM are considered to be the most effective and / or efficient with regard to the respective objects of protection (soil, water, biodiversity etc.)? Which AECM are considered to be the most cost-effective taking public costs, private costs and transaction costs into account?* • *Which AECM can be considered as "entry level schemes" with basic requirements and little environmental impact?*

5. GOOD PRACTICE

Are there particular agri-environmental policies in place in your case-study area that could be termed good practice or that follow an innovative appr*oach **regarding impact and governance** (e.g. exemplary stakeholder involvement, very well accepted and effective, very efficient enforcement)? Which and why?*

Project acronym: TALE
Short title: Template 2 for policy analysis (EU)
Work package 1
Version 2 | Date: 18/12/2015

6. OTHER RELEVANT POLICIES

If you have named policies in this section in the first template, please include information on issues of effectiveness, monitoring and implementation here that you consider relevant.