Cooperation in Natura 2000 area benefiting biodiversity (Measure 16.5)

The measure incentives the local coordination and collaboration of public and private actors in projects aimed at the conservation of biodiversity.

CONSOLE

Summary

This operation targets effective interventions for biodiversity protection in areas with Natura 2000. These environmental efforts require synergic and coordinated actions to protect biodiversity, primarily removing any critical issues that may exist in the Natura 2000 areas (coming from the implementation of measures by the Habitats and Birds directives). The cooperative approach allows to reach specific objectives not effectively achieved with individual interventions. This method starts with a "mutual agreement" phase, where the involvement of the largest number of beneficiaries is required. It evolves in the creation of a "local cooperation agreement", approved by the local competent authority for biodiversity.

Objectives

Safeguarding, restoring and improving biodiversity in Natura 2000 areas.



Problem description

The driving force of this measure is "Safeguarding, restoring and improving biodiversity, in Natura 2000 areas and in areas subject to natural or specific obligations ". The RDP and therefore the political region has supported during the last three Rural Development Programs (from 2000 to 2019) measures that push towards a more careful approach toward protected area.

It is important, for the purpose of maintaining a sustainable management and moreover for the restoration of forest, agricultural ecosystems and natural/seminatural habitats, to financially support farmers who actually have a low-income due to the protection of natural areas.

Data and Facts - Contract

Participation: The cooperation activity is be carried out by the public body that proposes the local cooperation agreement, in order to reach the involvement of the largest number of beneficiaries.

Involved parties: The following types of beneficiaries can take advantage of the aid provided:

- single and associated agricultural enterprises;
- other land managers including environmental NGOs, public bodies, collective properties.

The benefits for the farmers and for the organization: Farmers receive a financial support for covering some of the costs that are due to the implementation of Natura 2000 constraints. The advantage of the financial body is a maintenance in biodiversity levels of the area and on the other hand the solution of the critical issues coming from the conservation rules.

Management requirements for farmers: It depends on the specific objectives described in the RDPs.

COLLECTIVE



local cooperation public body - Natura 2000 areas

PUBLIC GOODS



Biodiversity

INDIRECT EFFECTS



Landscape and scenery

LOCATION

ITALY



Emilia-Romagna region

Legal notice: The compilation of the information provided in the factsheets has been done to our best knowledge. Neither the authors nor the contact persons of the presented cases may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

CONTRACT

Government (with EUfunding)



Contract conclusion: Written agreement



Payment mechanism: incentive payments



Start of the program: 2013

End: 2020

Funding/Payments: In Natura 2000 areas funding can be provided for:

- cooperation activities,
- non-productive investments
- area management activities etc.
- The EU contribution can be up to 100% of the eligible expenditure. The cost of the cooperation project is set at a minimum of 20,000 euros and a maximum of 200,000 euros: up to 5% for cooperation costs and the remaining for project implementation.

SUCCESS OR FAILURE?



Failure. Only two applications, and both of them were rejected as they were not in compliance with the call requirements.

Reasons for failure:

The measure was highly complex and set a number of constraints and rules that made the realization of the project extremely difficult. Eligible projects should have indicated a target in terms of biodiversity. The same target was aimed to resolve the critical issues for farmers, coming from the restrictions on agricultural practices, imposed by the regulations for the protection of biodiversity in the area where the applicants are located.

SWOT analysis

Main Strengths

strategies was foreseen

2. It would have covered all the cost for

Main Weaknesses

- 1. It was too complex from
- imposing constraints

Main Threats 1. Low response rate

