Locally-led results-based innovations: setting the scene
Separate but potentially overlapping concepts

- Locally-led
  - Probably, some Irish locally-led schemes
  - e.g. Burren
  - DFF?

- Results-based
  - e.g. Austrian whinchat measure
## Locally-led vs. Centrally-directed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centrally-directed</th>
<th>Locally-led</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responds to national priorities</td>
<td>Responds to local needs, locally perceived. Ownership...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily ensures level playing field</td>
<td>Responds where possible to differences in pressures, economics..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less development cost</td>
<td>Potentially more effective delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less complex monitoring, evaluation, reporting</td>
<td>Locally-tailored monitoring, evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The national could be framed around the local
- False economies if results are poor
The chicken and egg problem

- How can it be locally-led and programmed along with everything else?
- How can it be allowed, if not programmed for?
- Previous innovative locally-led schemes have been developed outwith or ‘on top of’ the normal RDP framework
  - Life (Burren, AranLife) – allows full scheme development
  - Post-RDP adjustments (DFF) – limits room for manoeuvre
- Very innovative experiment in Ireland – developing schemes under the EIP measures
  - How to keep it locally-led, given demands of process
  - All ‘local’ initiatives are led by someone, it’s an issue of buy-in and when
What is results-based?

- ‘Success’ not only defined in biodiversity terms for Govt., but for the participating farmer, and is the focus throughout
- Indicators of success chosen to be meaningful but generally-applicable and, where possible, amenable to change by the farmer
- Rules kept to a minimum, as unprescriptive as possible
- Use of farmer initiative in how to achieve ‘success’
- Level of ‘success’ linked somehow to amount of payment
- Penalties play a much smaller role
Results-based vs. Prescription-based

**Prescription-based**
- Simple to explain and easy to understand – ‘tick box’
- Clear payment rationale and calculation (even if BS!)
- Sure of getting paid (or penalised)
- Doesn’t risk damaging practice
- Could be easier to integrate into other measures/regs.

**Results-based**
- Requires clear explanation and real engagement
- Responds where possible to differences in pressures, economics..
- Depends on farmer’s skill and experience
- Trusts farmer

- Both *should* be results-based from the perspective of Govt.
- And *then* integrated (dynamically – not ‘fire and forget’!)
- Both should need engagement from all relevant actors
Examples

- National results-based package in Austria, including one measure targeting whinchat
Examples

- Innovative schemes for meadow birds in the Netherlands, including some with farmers bidding for contracts
Examples

Shannon Callows & lowland Leitrim, Ireland
Hay meadow measures in numerous countries
Examples

The Burren
Examples

- Yorkshire Dales National Park
Dartmoor

- Only one on common land
- Farmer engagement is striking
- Time to boast!
- Time to move to the next step?