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Ireland-Landscape diversity

- E/SE fertile soils, relatively intensive
- W/NW constraints for food - soils, topography, climate and remoteness
- Advantaged - High biodiversity, landscape and socio-cultural values
- Legal nature designations (Natura 2000), common land
- 1/3 High Nature Value; 1/3 Intensive
Ireland’s CAP Green Architecture

Pillar II Environment and Climate Measures

Greening Pillar I

Cross Compliance Pillar I (GAEC+SMR)

2014-2020
Overall Structure of AES in RDP

**Tier 1**
- Natura
- Farmland Birds
- Commonages
- High Status Water
- Rare breeds
- Intensive farms

**Tier 2**
- Vulnerable water areas
- Min. tillage
- Low emission slurry
- Wild bird cover

**Tier 3**
- General env. actions e.g. bird boxes
- New hedgerows
- Low input permanent pasture
- Hay meadows
- Archaeological sites

**GLAS and GLAS+**
- (€1.450 million)

**Locally Led AES/EIP-Agri**
- Burren, Hen Harrier
- Freshwater Pearl Mussel
- Call for Proposals (€70 million)
20 years a growing ... and learning

A Vision for Sustainable Farming in the Burren

The Burren will be an increasingly attractive place to live and farm, a place where farm families enjoy the support and respect of society to produce quality food and deliver valued services, thereby sustaining the Burren’s rich heritage for the benefit of all.

Process: Trust building; co-creation; partnership; participation.
CHALLENGES FACING HNV FARMING IN THE BURREN

- Poor economic outlook
- Poor social structure
- Land abandonment and intensification
- Lack of integrated land use strategy
- Over-regulation/Bureaucracy
- Apathy and Antipathy

Our solution? A Community Stewardship Model

Providing Burren farmers with targeted Financial, Technical and Social/Cultural support (‘pocket, head and heart’) to lead in the care of their own place
Ireland’s Flagship Local Results Based Agri-Env. Programme Burren LIFE www.burrenlife.com

Payments for Ecosystem Services: Nature, Landscape and Water
The environment is the new product, we can provide it and there is a market.
RBAPS 2015-2018 Expansion of Burren Model

- Testing and developing results based AES
- €1.4 million budget
- 70% EU funded
- 30% from partners, & support from Heritage Council, DAFM & Teagasc
- 3.5 year project

www.rbaps.eu
Overarching Design Principles

• Common design approach in 3 pilot areas
• Locally adapted, practical and results focused
• Balance incentivising higher quality output and overall scheme complexity
• Facilitate flexible and adaptive management on farm
• Build local trust and capacity
• Enable co-creation and innovation
• Accounts for factors outside the farmers control
Scoring system

10 points based on results indicators

- Ecological quality (pos. and neg. species)
- Threats/condition and future prospects indicators-damaging activities, bare ground, veg structure etc.
Payment calculations:
Costs and income foregone of the farming practices which are generally required to achieve the desired result.
Local innovative Approach: Inspiration for others
Pearl mussel EIP
http://www.pearlmusselproject.ie/

Before

After

Supporting actions:
A Plugs in drain to slow run-off to river
B Cattle drinking trough
C Fencing barrier near river banks
D Rhododendron dying back following treatment

The results-based approach rewards & encourages the continuation of good management practices. Supporting actions payment allows farmers to increase their results-based payment.
Harrier EIP (Ecosystem services)
www.henharrierproject.ie/about.html

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habitat Structure</th>
<th>Scrub Structure</th>
<th>Soil Integrity</th>
<th>Hydrological Integrity</th>
<th>Impact on Water</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.E.5. Habitat structure in order</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.E.6. Soil integrity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.E.7. Hydrological integrity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.E.8. Impact of Management Actions on Water Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Hen Harrier EIP

www.henharrierproject.ie/about.html

## Results Indicators

### Negative Plant Indicators

- **Burning damage**
- **Turbary**
- **Feeding damage**
- **Bracken**
- **Other damaging activities**

### Example Table (Contents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># birds</td>
<td>Population decline in # birds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% cover</td>
<td>Percentage of area covered by specific vegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesting</td>
<td>Assessment of nest success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeding</td>
<td>Evaluation of breeding success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>Study of migration patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diet</td>
<td>Analysis of diet composition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Example Diagram

- Hen Harrier EIP logo
- Link to project website
- Summary of indicators and their effects

---

*Note: The table and diagram are placeholders and should be replaced with actual data and visuals.*
### Perceived Barriers and Weaknesses of RBAPS

- Reduced budget for Pillar 2 post 2021
- Institutional resistance, e.g., fNGOs
- Institutional stasis of lack of ambition
- Current policy framework
- Greater risk for farmers and MAs
- More challenging/expensive to deliver
- Lack of capacity and appropriate skills
- Data deficits can limit roll-out
- Budget forecasting is difficult for MAs
- No current incentive for MAs or MSs
- No current consequence for not delivering results

### Inherent and Potential Opportunities of RBAPS

- Wiser spend of a limited budget
- Supported by DG AGRI and ENV, nature authorities, eNGOs etc.
- Improved policy framework
- Greater flexibility and autonomy, trust
- Better value for money; delivers results
- Builds capacity and expertise
- Incentivises gathering of data
- Builds budgetary confidence
- Provides a market for biodiversity
- Delivers biodiversity (and other) obligations (RDP, NBP, BS2020, PAF)
Lessons Learned

• Common design approach across diverse agricultural landscapes possible.
• Time and expertise required to develop the scoring systems to:
  a) account for variations in environmental conditions outside control of the farmer
  b) ensure indicators reflect achievement of the biodiversity target (potential for wider ecosystem services targets-EIPS)
  c) ensure locally adapted, practical and results focused
• Guidance and training are key
• Integrated local farm advisory systems
• Implementation and control can be simpler but capacity and resources needed for effective design
Recommendations

• Policy framework—a clear focus on incentivising performance
• Clear objectives and targeting essential
• Co-operation, knowledge-sharing, capacity and trust building
• Long term commitments to sustain newly created market for ecosystem services
• Ensure implementation, financial management and monitoring regs facilitate RBAPS approach
• Initial investment in design will reap dividends (e.g. defining and testing indicators, of training staff, farmers, advisers and inspectors, communications etc.)
NOTE: Not all About the Money

Source: Dr. Aine Macken Walsh (agricultural sociologist)

McDonald et al. 2014
Knowledge sharing and network building: Continuing to develop and learn