Mid-term report and review – May 31, 2020
Case Areas level (CA)

CA Leaders

No.	Name	Leader
1.	Kutno County case area, Poland	Katarzyna Izydorczyk
2.	Zuvintas Reserve and agriculture case area, Lithuania	Elvyra Miksyte
2.	Gurjevsk case area, Kaliningrad, Russia	Irina Popova
3.	Jelgava case area, Latvia	Ingars Rozitis
4.	Pöltsamaa case area, Estonia	Kaja Peterson
5.	Ljuga River case area, Leningrad, Russia	Mikhail Ponomarev
6.	Southern Finland drainage case area, Finland	Mikko Ortamala
7.	Result-based payments scheme case area, Sweden	Emma Svensson
8.	Västervik case area, Sweden	Gun Lindberg
9.	Odense case area, Denmark	Frank Bondgaard

Name of CA and location

Result-based payments scheme case area, Sweden Location is south of lake Roxen in county Östergötland. The area has appr. 17 000 hectars of agricultural land.

Name of CA leader and rapporteur:

Emma Svensson

Names of contributors to the mid-term review:

Emma Svensson

Status of report

In working progress: Yes
Finalized/closed and date: No still open

Report:

1. What is the CA objective in bullet points? (max 2000)

   - The aim is to develop the concept of agri-environmental schemes by involving farmers and local stakeholders.
   - Develop and test tools and models for design and implementation of result based schemes
   - Understand farmers decisions in relation to agri-environmental schemes
   -

2. Describe the key elements of your CA and progress of work until end of P3. (max 6000)

- We will discuss possible design and technical solutions with stakeholders for making a set of predefined and well known existing measures more resultbased. Our case study is a theoretical study.
- We have selected a geographical area which is also one of the 20 selected areas where catchment officer concept is tested. In this area we have contact with farmers, advisors and catchment officers.
- For this area SLU have created a decision support tool (WP3). This will be used in interviews and meetings.
- Parallell we are also searching for input to the study by following relevant policy discussions on EU level, talking to experts from other memberstates as well as national experts and other ongoing projects.

- Participated in 3 group meetings in case area (farmers, catchment officers, advisors)
- Did 8 individual interviews with farmers
- Had 1 skype discussion with advisors and catchment officers in the area
- Until now we have had several meetings with the County Administration Board including catchment officer and advisors in the area.
- Discussions with researchers, other projects and participation in seminar on EU-level.

3. Describe the final CA outputs like (focus groups, implementation plans, investment plans and other). (max 6000)

- Give proposals and recommendations on how implement result-based schemes to on a national level

4. Please, list the five most important experiences from your work in the CA that you would like to share with the Waterdrive target groups. (max 3000)

| Farmers and advisors are interested in discussing the construction of CAP measures |
| Resultbased approach based on models result in many questions from the farmers regarding the indata |
| Advisors play in many cases, but not all, an important role in the marketing of agri-environmental measures. |

Many stakeholders have high expectations on result-based schemes but at the same time there are little experience on how this concept can be designed, there is also a fear that a system based on models can be unfair.

5. What makes your CA unique in relation to the other CAs we have in Waterdrive?

• We are involving farmers in a pilot to develop a resultbased approach for agri-environmental payment schemes • It is a theoretical case that has a policy approach rather than to perform physical actions in the area

6. Please, list what you consider the five most important <u>innovations</u> (technological or methodological) that can bring added value to water management in agricultural landscapes of the Baltic Sea Region.

1.Engagement of farmers in development of agri-environmental schemes
2.Experience on how to use result based approach based on modelling
3.Decision support tools that are easy to access for farmers and that are integrated with system for payment applications

7. <mark>List some unexpected outcomes from the Waterdrive cooperation so far. (max 3000)</mark>

1.
2.
3.

8. Estimate how the workload in your CA is distributed over time by estimating workload in % by Period?

Period 1-3:   50   %
Period 4:   30 %
Period 5:   20 %
Total: 100 %

9. List and motivate any changes required in P4 and P5 compared to descriptions in the original application. (max 3000)

Change desired	Motive

10. List the most important agri-environmental measures you work with in the case area.

1.The measures that are included in our case study are catchcrops, spring tillage, bufferstrips, structural liming and wetlands.
2.
3.
4.
6.
7.

11. List Waterdrive partners/persons and their roles/responsibilities in completing the CA outputs.

Persons/Partners	Roles/Responsibilities
Kaja Peterson	WP4 leader, integrate outcomes in policy recommendations
Ainis Lagzdiņš	WP3 leader, decision support tool
SLU	Decision support tool WP 3
SWA	Input to case study e.g. modelling and policy recommendations

12. Up-date the CA workplan for P4 and P5 by completing the below table/workplan. You find the Waterdrive master workplan on the SharePoint site.

Activities, bench-marks, deliverables, outputs	Deadline
Material for new interviews (appr. 5 farmers incl. advisors)	Autumn 2020
Exchange with other national projects	Autumn 2020
Interviews with farmers	Autumn 2020
Meeting with national stakeholders, presentation/discussions of results	Autumn 2020
Meeting with stakeholders in case area	Autumn 2020/Spring 2021

13. Perform a SWOT analysis for the CA process as a management support for P4 and P5. List at least five considerations for each category.

Category	Considerations
Strengths	Stakeholders are interested in resultbased approach
Weaknesses	The models undes can be questioned-not showing the reality enough good- lack of acceptance
Threats	Obstacles related to EU legistlation will be difficult to tackle

	To high expectations from political level
Opportunities	Timeline for next CAP is delayed so we have more time to adjust existing measures

14. List the most important cooperation initiatives with Waterdrive groups of activities and/or case areas. (max 3000)

Group of activities/case areas	Type of cooperation
WP 3	Development of decision support tool

15. List the target groups most relevant for your CA results communication. (max 1000)

Target groups
Ministry and other relevant national agencies as well as county administration
EU (network for resultbased payments as well as DG AGRI, DG ENV)
Farmers associations, advisory service and relevant national projects

16. List the five most important elements in a participatory toolbox to support strong local action. (max 2000)

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

17. List the five most important considerations when it comes to leadership and coordination to support strong local action. (max 2000)

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

18. List the five most important policy recommendations to support strong local action. (max 3000)

1.Coordinated and comprehensive funding/funds
2.National plan and prioritization for/of measures and where they first and foremost should be done/implemented
3. Expansion of catchment officers to all areas where there is a risk of deteriorating status.
4.Secure access to advisors and officers that can work with both on-field and in-water actions on local level
5.

19. Any other comments or issues?

Add attachments:

a. Add a PPP with approx. 5-10 slides for presentations of your CA at the Waterdrive website. The PPP should be understandable for the target groups. Use the Waterdrive presentation template.
b. Add any other material supporting mid-term review and reporting as you wish.