



## [Case studies cross comparison]

Stéphanie Arnaud, Yann Desjeux, Pierre Dupraz, . Itaes

### ► To cite this version:

Stéphanie Arnaud, Yann Desjeux, Pierre Dupraz, . Itaes. [Case studies cross comparison]. [0] 2006.  
hal-02812437

**HAL Id: hal-02812437**

**<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02812437>**

Submitted on 6 Jun 2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



### ITAES Newsletter n°3

"Integrated Tools to design and implement Agro Environmental Schemes"

This Newsletter 3 deals with a cross-comparison of AESs in the ITAES case-studies. Indeed, the different circumstances for the development of AESs in the member states have resulted in a large number of programmes which may lead to contrasted environmental and economic outcomes.

#### 1/ Focus on WP3: General presentation of AESs

Case-studies are classified according to the focus (Wide/ specific) and the horizontality/verticality of AESs. Thus, an horizontal programme is accessible to a large population of farmers and is not based on any geographical zoning whereas a vertical programme targets a geographical zone with specific objectives.

**Table 1: Description of AESs in the ITAES case-studies**

Compulsory menu of prescriptions and voluntary schemes	Environmental targeting Schemes (vertical Schemes)	Combination of wide Schemes with Schemes targeting specific zones	More complex combination of Schemes and measures
<p><u>Ireland</u>: Package of compulsory basic measures for all farmers with more than 3ha and supplementary measures optional and sometimes restricted to particular areas.</p> <p><u>Finland</u>: Package of mandatory measures targeting all farmers and additional measures can be chosen according to Farm types.</p>	<p><u>England</u>: Environmentally Sensitive Areas are related to the management of a variety of landscape in specific areas. All farmers who are not eligible to ESA can benefit the Countryside Stewardship Schemes.</p> <p><u>Netherlands</u>: Package of measures are proposed to farmers according to their location.</p>	<p><u>Belgium</u>: Combination of measures offered to a large population of farmers with some measures targeting specific areas (zoning for the management of meadow birds; or for water management for instance).</p> <p><u>Italy</u>: Single actions that can be combined. Some are proposed to all farmers and some are specific to targeted areas.</p> <p><u>Czech Republic</u>: SAPARD environmental Schemes are made up of unitary measures based on a zoning approach and the measures under the Rural Development Plan are proposed to all farmers.</p>	<p><u>Germany</u>: there are three general schemes. The Cultural landscape programme with several measures from 4 different categories proposed to all farmers. A programme with adjustable package of activities to protect the Spreewald areas. And the last includes a set of 7 measures to compensate restrictions in land management within protected areas.</p> <p><u>France</u>: High number of measures proposed to farmers within the framework of Farming territorial contracts (CTE or CAD).</p>

## 2/ Focus on WP4: Institutional arrangements of AESs in Europe (see [WP4 P5 D8](#))

Successful implementation of AESs supported by the EU depends on the interactions between many institutions at different regional levels, including the EU, national, regional and local level.

Depending on the level of centralisation or decentralisation, different administrative levels of the member states are involved in programming, and implementation. Within this scope, the responsibilities of regional and local levels and the kinds of organisation dealing with AESs differ a lot among the member states. (see table 2).

**Table 2: Involvement of different policy levels in design and implementation of AESs**

<b>Design of AESs</b> <b>Implementation</b>	<b>Schemes designed nationally</b>	<b>Schemes predominantly designed at regional level</b>
<b>Centralised management mainly at national level</b>	<u>Ireland</u> : REPS implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture. <u>England</u> : ESA and CSS (with local adaptations) managed by the Rural Development Service (part of the Ministry) <u>Netherlands</u> : Subsidy Agricultural Nature Management managed by National Agencies of the Ministry.	<u>Belgium</u> : 2 NUTS 1 RDPs with different schemes managed by ALT-ADL part of the Ministry of Agriculture and VLM (Land Agency)
<b>Decentralised management at regional or local level</b>	<u>Finland</u> : General Protection Scheme and Supplementary Protection Scheme managed by agricultural administrations at NUTS 3 level. <u>Czech Republic</u> : Measures under RDP implemented by Agricultural Agencies.	<u>Italy</u> : NUTS 2 RDPs with different schemes managed by the Regions (NUTS 2) <u>Germany</u> : NUTS 1 RDPs with different schemes. Implementation is carried out at NUTS 3 level but is under responsibility of <i>Laender</i> (NUTS 1). <u>France</u> : NUTS 3 measures within CTE or CAD (national frameworks) implemented at NUTS 3 level.

National programming and implementation involve rather low administrative efforts. However, conflicts with AESs targeted at a specific local situation might occur when national or regional design of AESs does not sufficiently take into account local conditions and needs. On the other hand, better local adaptation can create a more complex system which needs more flexibility and creates more interactions between the different institutions and regional levels involved. Between these extremes, suitable administrative procedures have to be found.

The further, more analytical step should provide insights into determining factors for administrative cost and the corresponding preciseness and targeting of AESs. This analysis is built on expert interviews. A focus is on both administrative procedures and cost as well as on the degree of potential or evaluated outcomes of AESs in order to provide elements for cost-effectiveness-analysis.

This document presents results obtained within the EU project SSPE-CT-2003-502070 on Integrated tools to design and implement Agro Environmental Schemes (<http://merlin.lusignan.inra.fr/ITAES/website>). It does not necessary reflect the view of the European Union and in no way anticipates the commission's future policy in this area.