

Exploring experiences of the design and interaction of Green Architecture



Group 3

What's working well

NL - we have higher uptake than expected esp in eco-schemes - worked well in AECM (costs have increased) but we have growing waiting lists for this/

IE - good levels of uptake at intervention level - oversubscribed

- payment rates reduced on additional national funds used to cater for demand

IE - good communication tools are really key - a lot of change in one year is difficult for stakeholders to absorb.

FI - having CSP in two different boxes is not relevant as far as communicating with farmers is concerned - farmers do not draw distinction between pillars.

NL PA does a good job at communicating rules.

What's working less well

FR - AECM - green algae & vineyards - uptake low - criteria in AECM were not adapted to local specificities

IE - a transitioned approach would be welcome

NL - regulations need to be decided before implementation - need to timely transition for introduction of new regime.

DE-H - we need to think outside the box - would be easier to have one special component - such as certification with farmers using that certification to get the funding - e.g. organic

IT - good uptake of 1st and 2nd pillar - challenge is how AECMs are performing as they started a little later

NL - high demand could be due to fact that AECM is a way to enable farms to take steps to be more sustainable

FI - we have good uptake of measures - too popular perhaps. there are some that do not have high uptake - payment level too low (not competitive with other measures)

DE-Hessen - good communication key - running events for farmers.

ie - how can we drive demand for low uptake of sub measures - difficult to pin down.

E - sub measures - uneven uptake - which may impact on outcomes

HU - need to make measures simpler and easier to access.

FI - issues with one measure can impact on another - esp when in different pillars

NL - we have new CAP - we had assimilation tool, events, presentations but still difficult for farmers to understand what they have to do.

DE H We need to learn more over time - rule changes do not aid effective communication.

NL - farmers work together.

FR - uses certification - which enables farms to apply to ecoschemes (with different environmental requirements)

FR - ecoschemes uptake and green investments - is there a functioning relationship there - any insights?

NL - rule changes can be problematic - farmers cannot follow minor changes - farmers to no appreciate differences between the 2 pillars

NL - control systems for each pillar could be simpler and harmonised in the future

Good practices



IT - low spend on investments - as procedures are timely and longer - co-operation, knowledge- all take longer that could be beneficial in terms of outcomes.

NL - uses co-operation that does both investments and knowledge transfer.

DE-Hessen regional dynamic a big challenge - communications, rule changes tricky too

IT - challenges are 21 regional specificities in payments - avoiding double funding - we will see if system set up to deal with this will work.

FI 0 certification - this is not just about adding certification to the system - there needs to be a push to reduce the burden on farming

FI - organics - market issue - competing with other env certifications, - farmers may choose those in preference to the organic measure.

IE - how do we present certification to the farmer - how does this impact on budgets

NL - we want to work more with certification