



What's working well

Eco-schemes are working well. They are simple and annual. It is a good example of simplification. SE

Eco-schemes put in light the fact that Pillar 2 (P2) is quite complicated. P2 should be simplified (similar to pillar 1). Natagriwal - BE

Interventions focusing on diversity and soil. Environmental Defense Fund

Provide more flexibility for the farmer to choose. We should expect farmers to change what they have been doing in the past. EDF

Integrating eco-schemes in the already existing Green Architecture, not having eco-schemes separate from other agro-environment measures for farmers to apply. AT

Making farmers part of the solution. Highclere consulting

Eco-schemes are seen as an opportunity but they are very rigid (timelines, etc.)

Good practices



Use EIP funding to target local problems. Local communities are making suggestions on how to address environmental problems. IE NN

Package approach. Farmers choose the measures using top-up payments. AT

The use of smartphones to take specific geo data. Allowing farmers to having inspections through pictures and uploading it to the PA platform. EDF

Flexibility with funds to guarantee farmers who applied to benefit from eco-schemes. SE

Incentive based measures work well in AT

First year, farmers preferred the certification scheme. Farmers prefer commitments that are linked directly with the support rate. The payments are less related to commitment and more related to results - easier for farmers to apply. They understand the need for some AEM to be applied. GR MA

Result based should be the way forward. However, there should be more reliability of the income. CEJA

A transition from effort base to result base is needed, but it should be well planned. CEJA

What's working less well

Farmers' perspective on eco-schemes

Eco-schemes estimation of uptake. There is an issue to farmers since they are not guaranteed even if they apply. GR MA

Fixed dates are very stressful for farmers. In IE the government responded and they are trying to be flexible. IE NN

If eco-schemes are too ambitious it limited the success of Agri-env measures. DE

Diversity of options are limited. Adding more options would mean an improvement (menu approach). CEJA

Frustration on eco-schemes and its uptake. There should be more flexibility. IE NN

Readability for farmers is poor. It should be improved. CEJA

Simplification - allow annual payments. Multi annual commitments should still be allowed. SE MA

Top-down process. It is hard for farmers to understand regulations and commitments. EDF

Flexibility is needed also in the way eco-schemes are implemented. IE NN

Clarify the difference between commitment and yearly payment. SE MA

Farmers might not take the risk to make changes because the don't rely on getting payments from eco-schemes because of the complexity. EDF

Need to change the way farmers are perceived in the society. IE NN

Systemic and holistic approach involving as many stakeholders of the supply chain as possible.

Results vs Effort based approaches

Unforeseen weather conditions can be a disadvantage for farmers to receive payments following the result base approach. DE

Payments by incentives should also be possible DE

It might be difficult for farmers to measure results. PT MA

Farmers are some times not trained to collect data for the analysis, which make it more complicated to implement. natagriwal BE

Farmers need support from advisory services. PT NN