

## CONSOLE

CONtract Solutions for Effective and lasting delivery of agri-environmental-climate public goods by EU agriculture and forestry

Research and Innovation action: H2020 - GA 817949

### Deliverable D3.4

#### EIP-AGRI abstract on acceptance and behaviour by actors about AECPG contract design

Emmi Haltia, Katri Hamunen, Mikko Kurttila, Jussi Leppänen, Oili Tarvainen, Esa-Jussi Viitala, Meri Raggi, Riccardo D'Alberto and Davide Viaggi

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Project             | CONSOLE   |
| Project title       | CONtract Solutions for Effective and lasting delivery of agri-environmental-climate public goods by EU agriculture and forestry |
| Work Package        | 3   |
| Deliverable         | D3.4  |
| Period covered      | M6-M38  |
| Publication date    | July 2022   |
| Dissemination level | Public  |

## Project Consortium

| N° | Participant organisation name   | Country |
|----|---|---------|
| 1  | ALMA MATER STUDIORUM - UNIVERSITA DI BOLOGNA  | IT      |
| 2  | REGIONE EMILIA ROMAGNA  | IT      |
| 3  | CONSORZIO DELLA BONIFICA DELLA ROMAGNA OCCIDENTALE  | IT      |
| 4  | UNIVERSITAET FUER BODENKULTUR WIEN  | AT      |
| 5  | Ecorys Brussels N.V.  | BE      |
| 6  | EUROPEAN LANDOWNERS ORGANIZATION  | BE      |
| 7  | ASSOCIATION OF AGRI-ENVIRONMENTAL FARMERS   | BG      |
| 8  | INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS   | BG      |
| 9  | JOHANN HEINRICH VON THUENEN-INSTITUT,<br>BUNDESFORSCHUNGSINSTITUT FUER<br>LAENDLICHE RAEUME, WALD UND FISCHEREI | DE      |
| 10 | EVENOR TECH SL  | ES      |
| 11 | ASOCIACIÓN AGRARIA JÓVENES AGRICULTORES DE SEVILLA  | ES      |
| 12 | UNIVERSIDAD POLITECNICA DE MADRID   | ES      |
| 13 | LUONNONVARAKESKUS   | FI      |
| 14 | ASSEMBLEE DES REGIONS EUROPEENNES FRUITIERES LEGUMIERES ET<br>HORTICOLES  | FR      |
| 15 | ASSOCIATION TRAME   | FR      |
| 16 | CENTRE NATIONAL DE LA RECHERCHE SCIENTIFIQUE CNRS   | FR      |
| 17 | INSTITUT NATIONAL DE LA RECHERCHE AGRONOMIQUE   | FR      |
| 18 | UNIVERSITY COLLEGE CORK - NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND,<br>CORK   | IE      |
| 19 | UNIVERSITA DI PISA  | IT      |
| 20 | ZEMNIEKU SAEIMA   | LV      |
| 21 | STICHTING VU  | NL      |
| 22 | STICHTING HET WERELD NATUUR FONDS-NEDERLAND   | NL      |
| 23 | SZKOLA GLOWNA GOSPODARSTWA WIEJSKIEGO   | PL      |
| 24 | UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS   | UK      |
| 25 | UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI FERRARA   | IT      |

## EIP Practice abstract

### Short title:

New contract solutions for provision of agri-environmental-climate public goods — Land managers' willingness to enrol and stakeholders' views on implementation

### Short summary for practitioners (in English):

The acceptance of the new contract solutions for increasing the provision of agri-environmental-climate public goods (AECPG) were studied from the land managers', i.e. farmers and forest owners who make the land-use decisions on the land they manage, and the other stakeholders' point of view. The stakeholders represented organisations acting at different levels (local, regional, state) and in different roles regarding the land-use. The studied types of contracts were result-based, collective, value chain and land tenure.

The results showed that land managers prefer the result-based and, secondly, the value chain contract solutions. These contract solutions were perceived as both easier to understand and apply on their holdings, as well as more economically beneficial. In contrast, land tenure and collective contract solutions were considered less easy to understand, and less economically beneficial for the holdings. The land manager survey data consisted of 2,721 individual responses from 12 European countries.

Considering the specific features potentially characterizing a contract solution, annual compensation, technical assistance or training offered to the land managers by the authority as well as the flexibility in determining the measures to adopt within the contract, and the idea that better results bring higher payment, were among the most appreciated characteristic that a contract solution should have. Instead, characteristics that are considered as less desirable are the payment to be shared within a group and its periodical nature.

The stakeholders' opinions about the different contract types were very similar to the land managers' views, and they also presumed that the result-based contract would be the most preferred among the land managers. The result-based contract was thought to fit especially for the protection of biodiversity as well as soil health and quality protection. Collective contracts were thought to fit especially for water quality and quantity provision. The survey for the stakeholders included 486 survey respondents from 12 countries.

The main results of landowner and stakeholder surveys were presented and discussed in the stakeholder workshops (altogether 167 participants). According to the workshops, the willingness to participate in different types of contracts depends on how well the contract type is known. Therefore, the continuous information sharing, and promotion of existing examples is important.

According to the stakeholder workshops, the most important issues regarding the adoption of the result-based contracts were defining good, measurable, and

science-based monitoring indicators that land managers can have influence on. A basic prerequisite for increasing the uptake of result-based contracts is a sufficient monetary compensation.

To be able to increase the uptake of collective contracts it is important to ensure the fair distribution of compensation between participating landowners. Collective contracts also often need a leader or intermediary to gather the landowners together and to lead the group. A collective feature could be offered as one option in hybrid solutions and it could provide a collective bonus for landowners.

The private sector has significant potential in value chain contracts, and possibility to offer flexibility for agri-environmental contracts. In value chain contracts, next step is to search and support private organizations or businesses, who might have interest to arrange these types of contracts. There is a need to investigate existing and potential value chains and define the benefits, as well as fair distribution of responsibilities and risks among different actors.

One of the main issues in land tenure contracts is the lack of available land for rent in several regions. Moreover, stakeholders were concerned, that too strong power of the landowner (landlord) reduces farmers (tenants) willingness to participate in this type of contracts. Precise regulations of obligations and rights as well as the transparent system for control and result monitoring are needed.

[www.console-project.eu](http://www.console-project.eu)