

Implementation of Eco-schemes in Fifteen European Union Member States

Mise en œuvre des éco-régimes dans quinze États membres de l'Union européenne

Umsetzung der Eco-Schemes in fünfzehn Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union

Tania Runge, Uwe Latacz-Lohmann, Lena Schaller, Kristina Todorova, Carsten Daugbjerg, Mette Termansen, Jaan Liira, Fanny Le Gloux, Pierre Dupraz, Jussi Leppanen, József Fogarasi, Enikő Zita Vigh, Tracy Bradfield, Thia Hennessy, Stefano Targetti, Davide Viaggi, Inga Berzina, Catharina Schulp, Edward Majewski, Laura Bouriaud, Gabriela Baciú, Mireia Pecurul, Irina Prokofieva and Francisco Jose Blanco Velazquez

Eco-schemes are set to play an important role in the transformation of European agriculture towards greater sustainability. By allocating a quarter of the CAP Pillar 1 budget to this new policy instrument, significantly more money will be available in the programming period 2023–2027 for measures designed to provide environmental and climate benefits. Eco-schemes are conceptually similar to the agri-environmental and climate schemes (AECS) of CAP Pillar 2 and participation is voluntary. A key difference is that farmers are legally entitled to eco-scheme payments, whereas a granting procedure is used to allocate AECS payments. Unlike the previous greening measures that were defined at EU level, Member States are free to choose eco-scheme measures as long as they respect the legal requirements in Article 31 of the Strategic Plan Regulation.¹ Member States begin with different starting points in terms of their experience with AECSs which guides their choice of eco-schemes. Furthermore, environmental preferences and natural resource settings differ across EU countries.

Against this backdrop, this article aims to provide an overview of current planning in 15 Member States regarding the national

implementation of eco-schemes. Potential coverage with respect to environmental and climate objectives is illustrated in currently discussed eco-schemes. The article also provides details of eco-schemes that directly target the objectives of the Farm-to-Fork Strategy. A significant contribution to those objectives will be required for the approval of the National Strategic Plans by the EU Commission. While this approval is due in the course of 2022, the assessment here is based on proposals as of January/February 2022. The information was gathered by researchers of two complementary projects EFFECT and CONSOLE that received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation programme.²

Impressive diversity of eco-scheme measures in the 15 countries examined

This section provides an overview of the diversity of eco-schemes measures with respect to their origin, type of land targeted, and coverage regarding environmental, climate and animal welfare aspects. For the 15 countries examined, the number of eco-scheme measures varies between 3 and 21 per country (Table 1). The complexity of individual measures is

quite heterogeneous. For example, in the Netherlands a points system is foreseen that allows farmers to combine agricultural practices of the 21 measures on offer, while in other countries (e.g. Hungary) a single measure contains a bundle of requirements to be respected. France also intends to introduce a points system, but solely for crop diversification. Furthermore, in some countries not all eco-scheme measures can be combined, as some are mutually exclusive. In France, it is foreseen that farmers will have to make a choice between three options, called 'practices track', 'environmental certification track' or 'features and surfaces favouring biodiversity track'.

All the countries target arable land as well as permanent and temporary grassland with varying emphases between these. Most Member States allow farmers to participate on land grown with permanent crops, some have designed specific measures for these. For example, Spain plans a practice that consists of depositing prunings on the ground after crushing. Some Member States have designed eco-scheme measures that directly target livestock; this is the case for Bulgaria, the Netherlands, Ireland and Italy.

Table 1: Characterisation of eco-schemes in the 15 Member States surveyed (February 2022)

Country	Number of measures	Land targeted	Originating from:		Aspects targeted					
			Greening	AECs*	Climate	Water quality	Soil protection	Biodiversity	Animal welfare	Antimicrobial resistance
Austria	4	AAGP	1	4	X	X	Pr			X
Bulgaria	9	AAAAAAGGGPPLL	2	5	X	X	Pr	Pr		
Denmark	6	AAAAAAGGP	1	1	Pr	Pr	X	Pr		
Estonia	5	AAAAAGGGGPPP	1	3	Pr		X	Pr		
France	6	AAAGGGPPP	2	6**		X	X	Pr		
Finland	4	AAAAGGGG	4	4	X	X	X	Pr		
Germany	7	AAAAAAGGGGGPPP	1	6**	X		X	Pr		
Hungary	3	AGP	3	0	X	X	X	Pr		
Ireland	8	AAAAAAGGGGGGGPPPPPLL	1	7	X	Pr		Pr		
Italy	5	AAGGPPPLL	2	1	X		X	X	Pr	Pr
Latvia	7	AAAAAAGGGGPPP	2	1	Pr	X	Pr	X		
Netherlands	21	AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA GGGGGGGGGGPPPPPLL	9	0	X	Pr	X	Pr		
Poland	17	AAAAAAGGGGGGGPPP	3	5**	X	X	Pr	X	X	
Romania	6	AAAAGP	3	5	X	X	Pr	X		
Spain	7	AAAGGGPPR	3	3	X	X	X	Pr		
		Number of countries targeting aspect			13	12	14	14	3	1

Notes: A = arable land; G = grassland; P = permanent crops; L = livestock; X = aspect addressed by eco-schemes; Pr = aspect targeted with priority (measures specifically designed to target one particular aspect); * including organic farming; ** at least in some regions. For countries in which the number of eco-scheme measures (column 2) is lower than the sum of their origins (columns 4+5), multiple original measures have been merged into a single eco-scheme. This applies to Austria, France and Romania.

Regarding the **origin of eco-scheme measures**, the majority either build upon components from greening obligations that did not become compulsory under conditionality³ or stem from AECs that are currently offered at national or regional levels. Even though only land that is eligible for the basic payment (now called Basic Income Support for Sustainability - BISS) is to be targeted by eco-schemes, some Member States foresee an extension of the eligible area beyond this. For example, Spain intends to include land used for grazing as a fire prevention measure in woody and nature-sensitive areas. In Ireland an afforestation measure is foreseen in which farmers will have to plant native trees, with the land remaining eligible for eco-scheme payments even though it will be forested.

Regarding the **environmental aspects targeted**, Member States have to ensure that their eco-schemes comply with needs at the national level and that they cover at least two 'areas of action'. The eight areas

listed in the regulation are: climate mitigation; climate adaptation; water protection; soil protection; protection of biodiversity; sustainable and reduced use of pesticides; and enhanced animal welfare or actions addressing antimicrobial resistance.

“ Alle fünfzehn untersuchten Mitgliedstaaten haben sich mit den Zielen des Green Deal befasst, wobei sie eine große Vielfalt bei der Gestaltung der Eco-Schemes aufweisen. ”

In fourteen countries, **protection of biodiversity** is an area of action; in

eleven countries biodiversity is addressed as a priority (Pr) with dedicated measures. Typical measures are the establishment of landscape features; in Romania a measure targets environmentally sensitive grassland at risk of encroachment by forest vegetation. Other options for biodiversity enhancement are the maintenance of non-productive arable land beyond conditionality obligations, extensive grazing (e.g. Bulgaria) and species-diverse permanent grasslands, but also reduced or pollinator-friendly plant protection practices. Germany foresees a measure targeting Natura 2000 areas.

Soil protection is addressed in fourteen countries; in five countries particular emphasis is given to dedicated soil measures. The eco-scheme measures mainly address maintaining soil cover through vegetation on arable land, with requirements going beyond the respective conditionality rules,

measures to prevent erosion and non-ploughing requirements. Finland, Hungary, Latvia, the Netherlands, Poland and Spain foresee measures for reduced or zero-tillage (e.g. direct seeding or strip tillage). Plant cover in interrows is to be supported in Italy and Spain to prevent erosion in vineyards, in Romania and France in vineyards and orchards, and in Austria also for hops. In Latvia, Ireland and Poland liming on arable land based on soil sampling is an eco-scheme measure with the objective of maintaining an agronomically optimal soil pH.

Twelve countries target **water protection** through their eco-schemes. While water quality is the primary focus, Hungary supports the use of water-saving irrigation in permanent crops, and Poland has a measure for water retention on permanent grassland. Examples of water quality measures are reduced fertiliser application, sometimes combined with the use of precision technology and grassed buffer strips along ditches (the Netherlands). Poland foresees support for a fertilisation plan based on soil sampling as an eco-scheme measure. In Spain it is planned that farmers with irrigated land who engage in eco-scheme measures will be required to have a fertiliser plan and to account for the quantities of irrigation water and phytosanitary products they use.

Measures to adapt to and to mitigate **climate change** are to be offered in thirteen countries. Measures reducing soil disturbance on arable land and limiting nutrient surpluses are considered to be climate friendly. Planting trees (Ireland), crop production adapted to wet conditions (the Netherlands) or agroforestry (Germany) are options to foster carbon sequestration. Dedicated climate measures include site-specific maintenance of undisturbed permanent grassland, as well as fertiliser injection or climate friendly spreading of organic fertiliser (Latvia). Romania plans a measure to foster carbon sequestration in meadows through



Beehive in oilseed rape, Estonia © Jaan Liira

reduced fertilisation and minimal maintenance activities. In Denmark, a dedicated measure for soils with high organic matter under crop rotation is planned with the aim of reducing greenhouse gas and nitrogen emissions through extensification. Land under this scheme must not be fertilised and vegetation must be cut and removed on an annual basis. The longer-term objective is to take the land out of production by reducing its productivity for agricultural use and raising the water level. Estonia also targets carbon-rich soils for coverage by permanent grassland to reduce carbon emissions.

Although not foreseen in the initial CAP reform proposal as presented in 2018 by the European Commission,⁴ some Member States (Austria, Italy and Poland) target **animal welfare** through dedicated eco-scheme measures. Grazing is seen as being beneficial for animal health and therefore requirements defining the minimum grazing period are set. In a combined measure Italy also addresses **antimicrobial resistance** through veterinary medicine reduction.

Eco-schemes targeting specific Green Deal objectives

The Farm-to-Fork Strategy targets a reduction in fertiliser use by at least 20 per cent by 2030 and nutrient losses by at least 50 per cent. It further calls for a reduction of 50 per cent in the use and risk of chemical pesticides as

well as a 50 per cent reduction of the sales of antimicrobials for farm animals. Furthermore, biodiversity-rich landscape features (including set-aside) shall be established on at least 10 per cent of farmland until 2030 as laid down in the EU Biodiversity Strategy. The target for farmland under organic production is 25 per cent by the same date.

“ Les quinze États membres interrogés répondent aux objectifs du Pacte vert tout en affichant une grande diversité dans la conception des éco-régimes. ”

Table 2 provides an overview of eco-schemes specifically targeting **fertiliser and pesticide reduction** in the 15 Member States examined. Some measures target reductions in the quantity of fertiliser or pesticides applied, in some cases to zero, other measures target the use of precision technology to increase efficiency in the application of agro-chemicals. Even though organic farming also implies renouncing the use of mineral fertilisers and chemical-synthetic pesticides this will be addressed later (see Table 4) as it

Table 2: Eco-schemes targeting reduced fertiliser use and/or pesticide application

Country	Name of measure	Brief description
Bulgaria	Reducing the use of pesticides	Use of science-based and suitable application technologies.
Estonia	Environmental practices	Possible components: Prohibition of the use of glyphosate during the growing period for certain arable crops, on green fallow, in orchards and on vegetables; or precision farming.
France	Environmental certification track	Practices for balanced fertilisation and reduced use of pesticides (organic and high environmental value farming).
Germany	Renouncing use of plant protection	No use of chemical-synthetic pesticides at plot level (except for products allowed in organic farming).
Ireland	Use of precision technology for fertiliser application	Fertiliser to be applied with GPS-controlled spreaders.
Ireland	Limiting chemical nitrogen input	Farmers will have to keep within a specified chemical nitrogen usage limit (73 kg/ha) for the calendar year.
Ireland	Sowing of multi-species swards	Practice must be applied to a minimum of 6 per cent of eligible hectares in a year.
Ireland	Soil sampling and liming	This action can be chosen once every three years.
Ireland	Enhanced crop diversification	Where a farmer has a crop diversification requirement, they plant a break crop as their second or third crop. The break crop must cover at least 25 per cent of the arable area.
Italy	Extensive forage crops	Introduction of rotation of forage or leguminous crops with herbicide and pesticide limitations.
Italy	Vegetation cover in permanent crops	Natural or artificial revegetation, herbicide limitations including on field margins.
Italy	Pollinator measure	Pollinator-friendly crops (also as intercrop) without herbicides and pesticides (including on field margins).
Latvia	Precision farming	Precision fertiliser and/or plant protection product application.
Netherlands	Conversion from temporary grassland to arable cropping without pesticides	No use of pesticides when destroying the existing sward before ploughing temporary grassland.
Netherlands	Natural pest control	Pest control through accommodating predators.
Netherlands	Strip cropping	Pesticide reduction by growing several crops in combine-wide, long strips instead of blocks.
Poland	Biological pest control	Use of biological options for pest control (introduce/gain experience).
Poland	Use of liquid manure injection equipment	Improved technology.
Poland	Fertilisation plan	Preparing a plan based on soil sampling, fertilisation in accordance with the plan.
Poland	Fast incorporation of solid manure	Ploughing under of solid manure within 12 hours after application on the field.
Spain	Fertiliser plan (as a component for land under irrigation)	As an add-on measure when participating with irrigated land accounting for fertilisation, as well as phytosanitary products and irrigation water.

is a whole-farm approach, while the measures listed in Table 2 address single plots to be chosen by farmers.

Besides the specific measures in Table 2, there are others that contain reductions of external inputs as a component. In Estonia no use of pesticides is allowed when participating in the eco-schemes for 'grazing permanent grassland' and 'forage areas for bees'. In Bulgaria, in addition to the dedicated measure to reduce the use of pesticides, prohibition of the use of plant protection products is foreseen on environmentally sensitive grassland, when receiving funding through eco-schemes. Measures targeting crop diversification beyond conditionality requirements also aim at reducing pesticide application. In Austria, farmers

can only obtain support for cover crops if they do not use plant protection products for these, and in Romania chemical fertilisers are prohibited for cover crops grown as an eco-scheme measure. Reduced fertilisation of meadows is foreseen in Romania, even though the main objective is to increase carbon sequestration.


A special position is occupied by eco-scheme measures targeting **non-productive land** as their design is closely interwoven with the respective conditionality standard for the 'minimum share of agricultural area devoted to non-productive areas or features' (GAEC 8). The minimum percentage of arable land at the farm level to be devoted to this requirement has been set at 4 per cent. Member

States can design enhanced eco-scheme commitments to complement the GAEC standard. One design option is to offer farmers the opportunity to reduce the mandatory share (GAEC) to 3 per cent as long as they commit to devoting at least 7 per cent of their arable land to non-productive areas and features through conditionality and eco-schemes combined. Table 3 shows which Member States offer such measures and how they are intended to be combined with the GAEC obligation.

In addition to a quantitative extension of non-productive areas, measures to enhance their environmental value are also planned. For example, the use of flower strips or flower areas on non-productive land can receive

Table 3: Eco-schemes targeting non-productive land and their connection to the respective conditionality

Country	Name of measure	Brief description
Bulgaria	Maintaining and improving biodiversity and ecological infrastructure	Landscape elements on arable land that include: hedges or rows of trees, individual trees, trees in a group, wooded anti-erosion belts, wetlands, green areas around watercourses and terraces. No information about connection to conditionality available.
Denmark	Support for non-productive arable farmland (fallow land or biotopes)	Minimum 7 per cent of arable land in total, including the option to reduce the mandatory share (GAEC 8) to 3 per cent for farmers who commit to devoting more than 7 per cent of their arable land to non-productive areas.
Estonia	Ecological focus areas and landscape elements	At least 10 per cent of the arable land should be maintained as ecologically functional areas (e.g. fallow, set-aside), grassland strips or other green landscape elements (hedgerows, tree-lines, ditches etc) or N-fixing crop areas, where the use of agrochemicals is forbidden and only extensive grazing is allowed.
France	Non-productive features and surfaces	Basic level: maintenance of at least 7 per cent of the utilised agricultural area (UAA) for non-productive elements and surfaces favouring biodiversity. Superior level: 10 per cent of the UAA. At least 4 per cent must be on arable land to comply with the conditionality obligation.
Germany	Voluntary extension of non-productive land	Quantitative extension of non-productive areas on arable land eligible for basic income support for sustainability (BISS) beyond the 4 per cent share resulting from conditionality (GAEC 8); no option to reduce it to 3 per cent. A maximum 6 per cent of the arable land of a farm is eligible for support with staggered payments (summing up to 10 per cent with GAEC 8). Farmers have the option to undertake a qualitative upgrading by establishing flower strips or flowering areas on non-productive land.
Hungary	Maintaining and enhancing ecosystem services for agriculture	Targeting margins of arable land, including if grassed. Possibility to include habitats of high ecological significance (map-based approach) that are not on arable land. No information about connection with conditionality (GAEC 8) available.
Ireland	Non-productive areas	At least 7 per cent of a farmer's holding must be devoted to biodiversity, habitats or landscape features.
Latvia	Ecological focus area	Sowing of legumes, bee meadows, catch crops, green manure. No information about connection to conditionality available.
Poland	Set-aside	10 per cent of the agricultural land. No detailed information about connection to conditionality available.
Spain	Non-productive areas on farmland (space for biodiversity)	It consists of leaving uncultivated a percentage of arable land in addition to the 3 per cent of non-productive elements required by conditionality. For rainfed areas, the additional percentage shall be 7 per cent and, in the case of irrigated areas, 4 per cent. In areas of permanent crops, in which 3 per cent of non-productive areas of conditionality do not apply, the area percentage to comply with this practice shall be 4 per cent.



Bees foraging plot, Estonia © Jaan Liira

financial support in Estonia, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands and Italy. While in Germany this measure is restricted to land enrolled in the eco-scheme measure for non-productive land, in the Netherlands and Italy farmers can introduce flower strips on their entire arable land as a stand-alone measure. In Estonia, the establishment of foraging areas for bees is possible with melliferous plants as a pure or mixed culture (i.e. together with other crops). As a special eco-scheme measure, France has designed a hedgerow bonus as a voluntary top-up, in combination with the 'environmental certification track' or in the 'practices track'. Farmers can obtain the bonus if at least 6 per cent of their land is covered by hedgerows.

In the current programming period, Member States can provide financial support for conversion to and maintenance of **organic farming** under the second pillar of the CAP. This will continue to be possible. But while programming under Pillar 2 always requires national co-funding, Member States can also offer an

eco-scheme for organic farming in which 100 per cent of the funding comes from the CAP budget. All the countries in Table 4, except for the Netherlands, are currently financing organic farming under Pillar 2 and are planning to shift the support measure to their eco-schemes. France has included support for organic farms under its 'environmental certification track'. All countries listed in Table 4 foresee the provision of support for organic farming on arable land, grassland and for permanent crops, Bulgaria also for livestock.

More diversity, more complexity: success of eco-schemes will hinge upon farmers' willingness to participate

In comparing proposed measures, a great diversity among the eco-schemes of the 15 countries becomes apparent. This diversity reflects differences in natural resource settings, environmental preferences and experience with AECSS. At the same time, many eco-scheme measures are derived from existing greening measures designed at EU level and/or AECSS. Member States are free to

decide what measures to offer as eco-schemes or AECSS. This results in a situation in which similar measures are programmed as eco-schemes in some countries and as AECSS in others.

For some of the proposed measures, in particular those relating to catch crops or the maintenance of permanent grassland without soil disturbance, the practices required hardly represent significant enhancements of the current greening or AECSS measures. It is apparent that Member States are in a delicate situation. On the one hand, they have to ensure that there is no backsliding compared to the environmental and climate achievements under the current CAP programming period, on the other hand, the new measures must be sufficiently attractive for farmers to engage on a voluntary basis.

Even though the level of environmental ambition may be not high, a quarter of direct payments is earmarked for eco-schemes. This could lead to a significant uptake by farmers and areas under commitment. With this and the prospect of reaching more productive agricultural regions with the

Table 4: Support for conversion to and/or maintenance of organic farming as an eco-scheme

Country	Conversion	Maintenance	Remarks
Bulgaria		x	Area-based payments and support for livestock
Denmark	x	x	To benefit climate, management of natural resources, biodiversity, reduce antimicrobial resistance
Estonia		x	Possibility to engage in further eco-schemes
France	x	x	Not as a separate measure; certified organic farming automatically fulfils the requirements of the 'environmental certification track' measure
Latvia		x	Flat rate payment per hectare
Netherlands		x	Only certified organic agriculture, certified by Skal Biocontrole, the Dutch national certification body
Poland		x	
Romania	x		Growing of vegetables, medicinal and aromatic plants included

eco-schemes, it can be assumed that at least some positive environmental effects can be achieved. Interestingly, all Member States foresee dedicated measures for arable land and also include land used for permanent crops. The emphasis on arable land is new compared to the current AECs where measures for grassland dominate in many countries and provides new opportunities for arable farms to participate. The uptake of eco-schemes could be further facilitated if supported by the agricultural knowledge and

innovation system (AKIS), a mandatory element of the new CAP for fostering training and advice.

Even though the majority of the eco-scheme measures mirror existing schemes, there are examples of new measures, as well as novel combinations of requirements. One example is the strip cropping proposed for the Netherlands through which several crops are grown side by side in wide long strips instead of blocks with the aim of fostering diversity through a

diverse micro-landscape and reduced pesticide use. Germany foresees a results-based measure with grassland indicator species. The Austrian measure 'always green' requires comprehensive vegetation cover for at least 85 per cent of a farm's arable land throughout the year. Such a measure, targeting all arable land, is quite innovative with farmers being free to decide what crops to grow, including cover and undersown crops. In Poland, a fertilisation measure explicitly uses photos with geo-referenced location information as proof of compliance. Other countries are planning to make use of remote-sensing technologies to facilitate monitoring.

However, this all is likely to come at the cost of much greater cognitive load and administrative burden for

“All fifteen Member States surveyed address Green Deal targets while displaying a great diversity in eco-scheme design.”

both farmers and policy administrators. By adding yet another policy instrument to the CAP's toolbox, which is conceptually similar to both conditionality and AECs, the complexity of the policy is vastly increased. In particular, the complicated interplay of individual policy instruments, combined with the prohibition of double support, makes the CAP much more error-prone in its implementation at the farm level. The option to reduce the mandatory share of non-productive land to 3 per cent of a farm's arable land if a farmer commits to devoting at least 7 per cent of their arable land to non-productive areas is just one example of the new complexity. If the level of complexity exceeds farmers' cognitive capacity or willingness to deal with it, they may turn their back on the CAP and voluntarily forgo the cash benefits



Flowering plot, Lower Saxony, Germany © Tania Runge

– not a good prospect for the environment either.

Notes

1 Regulation (EU) 2021/2115 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 2 December 2021 establishing rules on support for strategic plans to be drawn up by Member States under the common agricultural policy (CAP Strategic Plans); <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2021/2115/oj> – access in all EU languages.

2 Grant Agreement N° 817903 and 817949.

3 Conditionality will replace cross-compliance and partially the

greening measures in the current programming period. Conditionality with its SMRs (Statutory Management Requirements – based on Union law) and the GAECs (Standards for good agricultural and environmental condition of land) sets the baseline for commitments that can receive financial support under eco-schemes.

4 Proposal - https://eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:aa85fa9a-65a0-11e8-ab9c-01aa75ed71a1.0003.02/DOC_1&format=PDF

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by the European Commission via the two sister projects EFFECT (Environmental public goods From Farming through

Effective Contract Targeting) and CONSOLE (CONtract SOLUTIONs for Effective and lasting delivery of agri-environmental-climate public goods by EU agriculture and forestry) under grant agreement No 817903 (EFFECT) and No 817949 (CONSOLE).

The authors thank an anonymous reviewer and the Editor for helpful comments and suggestions to improve the manuscript.

Funding Statement

Open Access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL.

[Correction added on 27 August 2022 after first online publication: Projekt DEAL funding statement has been added.]

Further Reading

- Lampkin, N., Stolze, M., Meredith, S., de Pórras, M., Haller, L. and Mészáros, D. (2021). *Using eco-schemes in the new CAP: a guide for managing authorities*. IFOAM EU, FIBL and IEEP, Brussels. Available online at: https://www.organicseurope.bio/content/uploads/2020/06/ifoam-eco-schemes-web_compressed-1.pdf?dd
- Latacz-Lohmann, U., Termansen, M. and Nguyen, C. (2022). The new eco-schemes: Navigating a narrow fairway. *EuroChoices*, **21**(1).
- Pe'er, G., Birkenstock, M., Lakner, S. and Röder, N. (2020). The Common Agricultural Policy post-2020: Views and recommendations from scientists to improve performance for biodiversity. *Thünen Working Paper 175*, Braunschweig. Available online at: https://www.thuenen.de/media/publikationen/thuenen-workingpaper/ThuenenWorkingPaper_175_Vol2.pdf
- For a more extensive and detailed version of the present article see Runge, T., Schaller, L., Todorova, K., Daugbjerg, C., Termansen, M., Liira, J., Le Gloux, F., Dupraz, P., Leppänen, J., Fogarasi, J., Zita, V. E., Berzina, I., Schulp, N., Bradfield, T., Hennessy, T., Targetti, S., Viaggi, D., Majewski, E., Pecurul, M., Prokofieva, I., Jose Blanco Velazquez, F., Bouriaud, L. and Baciu, G. (2021). Eco-schemes as a core element of the new green architecture of the CAP – what can farmers and nature get out of it? Insights from 15 countries. Available online at: http://project-effect.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Eco-schemes-in-15-countries_CONSOLE-and-EFFECT.pdf
- CAP strategic plans of all Member States can be found online here: https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-fisheries/key-policies/common-agricultural-policy/cap-strategic-plans_en#publishednationalstrategicplans

Tania Runge, Thünen Institute of Rural Studies, Germany. *Email: tania.runge@thuenen.de*

Uwe Latacz-Lohmann, Department of Agricultural Economics, Kiel University and Johann Heinrich von Thünen-Institut, Bundesforschungsanstalt für Ländliche Räume, Wald und Fischerei, Germany. *Email: ulatacz@ae.uni-kiel.de*

Lena Schaller, University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Austria.

Kristina Todorova, University of National and World Economy, Bulgaria.

Carsten Daugbjerg and Mette Termansen, University of Copenhagen, Denmark.

Jaan Liira, University of Tartu, Estonia.

Fanny Le Gloux and Pierre Dupraz, National Institute for Agriculture, Food, and Environment, France.

Jussi Leppänen, Natural Resources Institute, Finland.

József Fogarasi, Óbuda University, Hungary.

Enikő Zita Vigh, Institute of Agricultural Economics, Hungary.

Tracy Bradfield and Thia Hennessy, University College Cork, Ireland.

Stefano Targetti and Davide Viaggi, University of Bologna, Italy.

Inga Berzina, Farmers Parliament, Latvia.

Catharina Schulp, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Edward Majewski, Warsaw University of Life Sciences, Poland.


Gabriela Baciu and Laura Bouriaud, Stefan cel Mare University of Suceava, Romania.

Mireia Pecurul and Irina Prokofieva, Bioeconomy and governance programme, Spain.


Francisco Jose Blanco Velazquez, Evenor-Tech SL, Spain.

Summary


Implementation of Eco-schemes in Fifteen European Union Member States

 Eco-schemes are set to play an important role in the European Union's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) post-2022 for the delivery of environmental and climate benefits and enhanced animal welfare. This article surveys current plans for the design of eco-schemes in fifteen European Union Member States. The number of eco-scheme measures to be offered per country varies between 3 and 21, and the complexity and level of ambition of the individual measures are quite heterogeneous. The majority of the proposed eco-scheme measures either build upon components from greening obligations or stem from agri-environmental and climate schemes currently offered under Pillar 2. All fifteen Member States address Green Deal targets, with particular emphasis being given to biodiversity enhancement and non-productive land. Eight of the countries surveyed are planning to provide support for organic farming through an eco-scheme. The greater creative freedom offered by the CAP's New Delivery Model has resulted in a situation where similar measures are programmed as eco-schemes in some countries and as Pillar 2 measures in others. By adding yet another policy instrument to the CAP's toolbox, the complexity of the CAP is vastly increased. It remains to be seen how farmers will respond.

Mise en œuvre des éco-régimes dans quinze États membres de l'Union européenne

 Dans la politique agricole commune (PAC) de l'Union européenne après 2022, les éco-régimes sont appelés à jouer un rôle important pour la fourniture d'avantages environnementaux et climatiques et l'amélioration du bien-être animal. Cet article passe en revue les projets actuels de conception d'éco-régimes dans quinze États membres de l'Union européenne. Le nombre de mesures d'éco-régimes à proposer par pays varie entre 3 et 21, et la complexité et le niveau d'ambition des mesures individuelles sont assez hétérogènes. La majorité des mesures d'éco-régimes proposées s'appuient sur des éléments des obligations de verdissement ou découlent de mesures agro-environnementales et climatiques actuellement proposées dans le cadre du pilier 2. Les quinze États membres répondent aux objectifs du Pacte vert, un accent particulier étant mis sur l'amélioration de la biodiversité et le foncier non-productif. Les quinze États membres répondent aux objectifs du Pacte vert, un accent particulier étant mis sur l'amélioration de la biodiversité et les terres non productives. Huit des pays étudiés envisagent de soutenir l'agriculture biologique par le biais d'un éco-régime. La plus grande liberté créative offerte par le nouveau modèle de mise en œuvre de la PAC a abouti à une situation où des mesures similaires sont programmées en tant qu'éco-régimes dans certains pays et en tant que mesures du Pilier 2 dans d'autres. En ajoutant encore un autre instrument de politique à la boîte à outils de la PAC, la complexité de cette dernière est considérablement accrue. Reste à savoir comment réagiront les agriculteurs.

Umsetzung der Eco-Schemes in fünfzehn Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union

 Eco-Schemes werden in der Gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik (GAP) der Europäischen Union nach 2022 eine wichtige Rolle spielen, wenn es darum geht, einen Nutzen für Umwelt und Klima zu erzielen und den Tierschutz zu verbessern. Dieser Artikel gibt einen Überblick über die aktuellen Pläne für die Ausgestaltung der Eco-Schemes in fünfzehn Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union. Die Anzahl der Maßnahmen, die in einem Land angeboten werden sollen, schwankt zwischen 3 und 21. Hierbei sind die Komplexität und Zielsetzung der einzelnen Maßnahmen recht heterogen. Die meisten der vorgeschlagenen Eco-Schemes bauen entweder auf Komponenten von Greening-Verpflichtungen auf oder stammen aus Agrarumwelt- und Klimaregelungen, die derzeit im Rahmen der zweiten Säule angeboten werden. Alle fünfzehn Mitgliedstaaten befassen sich mit den Zielen des Green Deals, wobei der Schwerpunkt auf der Förderung der biologischen Vielfalt und der nicht produktiven Flächen liegt. Acht der untersuchten Länder planen, den ökologischen Landbau durch ein Eco-Scheme zu unterstützen. Die größere kreative Freiheit, die das neue GAP-Modell bietet, hat dazu geführt, dass ähnliche Maßnahmen in einigen Ländern als Eco-Scheme und in anderen als Maßnahmen der zweiten Säule definiert werden. Durch das Hinzufügen eines weiteren Politikinstrumentes zum Portfolio der GAP wird die Komplexität der GAP erheblich größer. Es bleibt abzuwarten, wie die Landwirte und Landwirtinnen darauf reagieren werden.

summary