

**Civil-Public-Private-Partnerships (cp<sup>3</sup>):**  
collaborative governance approaches for policy  
innovation to enhance biodiversity and ecosystem  
services delivery in agricultural landscapes



## Inventory of existing governance model elements

Milestone M.04

<b>Authors:</b>	Angela Meyer, Gregor Giersch, Claudia Sattler, Barbara Schröter, Roy Remme, Ulrich Stachow, Dolf de Groot
<b>Version:</b>	final
<b>Submission date:</b>	31/03/2016



cp<sup>3</sup> partners:



cp<sup>3</sup> funding scheme:



cp<sup>3</sup> national funders:



**Table of content**

1. Introduction and clarifications on definitions .....	3
2. Inventory .....	4
Case study biosphere reserve Spreewald, Germany.....	4
The case study in a nutshell .....	4
Existing governance model elements.....	5
Case study nature park Jauerling-Wachau, Austria .....	8
The case study in a nutshell .....	8
Existing governance model elements.....	9
Case study Berg en Dal, Netherlands .....	13
The case study in a nutshell .....	13
Existing governance model elements.....	13
3. Literature .....	16

## 1. Introduction and clarifications on definitions

This inventory provides an overview of different policies, programs, frameworks, rules, norms, instruments, as well as actors used for environmental governance and agro-ecosystem management in the three case studies: biosphere reserve Spreewald (Germany), nature park Jauerling-Wachau (Austria) and Berg en Dal (The Netherlands). It presents the components of what can be formulated and analysed as governance models. The inventory so far is mainly based on desk top research and some first inquiries from local stakeholders. It will be regularly updated based on the data and information gathered during field research and interviews with experts and stakeholders.

Governance, in general, includes all processes of governing, encompassing processes of interaction and decision-making among actors and the creation, reinforcement or reproduction of social norms and rules. Governance includes the process of defining societal priorities and goals, setting rules for reaching these goals and controlling the outcomes of the process. It thus represents a mechanism for building the necessary institutional structures and processes that provide the social and institutional environment for the effective management of resources (e.g. Vatn 2010). Effective governance, in this perspective, helps in resolving conflicts between different interest groups.

Against this background, environmental governance is about resolving conflicts of interests over environmental resource access, use and management – including renewable and non-renewable natural resources, biodiversity and atmospheric sinks, as well as environmental safety and air and water quality – by establishing, reaffirming or changing the institutional environment (Paavola 2007).

There are different approaches to environmental governance. With reference to Vatn (2010), we suggest a differentiation between three basic types: Environmental governance can include hierarchical command and control type arrangements, incentive and market based approaches, or collaborative approaches.

In command and control approaches, rules and regulations are set by hierarchical authority, and decision-making is based on authority. Command expresses the idea of standards that must be complied with, enforcing control and application of sanctions that may be the result from non-compliance (see Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011). Allocation corresponds to the distribution of common funds and is done through authorized authorities. Hierarchical structures (e.g. governments, firms) can build on democratic processes as well as on authoritarian bases.

Market-based approaches to environmental governance rely on voluntary exchanges that are guided by individual interests and economic capacities. Decision making and activities are influenced by economic incentives and depend upon the capacity to pay of concerned actors, including individuals, households, companies, governments, etc. Such incentives may be generated, e.g. by creating payments for ecosystems services (PES) between ES providers and ES beneficiaries (see Wunder 2005; Engel et al. 2008; Adhikari and Boag 2013; Matzdorf et al. 2013). Resource allocation is determined by these actors' Willingness to Accept or Willingness to Pay (WTA/WTP). Whereas markets are generally seen as being regulated by demand and supply, it is worth noting that also hierarchies can operate here, with decisions being influenced by power relations.

Collaborative approaches refer to environmental governance that is built upon the concerned stakeholders' cooperation in formulating and aligning individual and common goals. Resource management and allocation usually follow a general rule of reciprocity, or, in some cases, more specifically defined rights of access and withdrawal. The latter may also indicate asymmetric power relations.

Given the importance of the spatial and temporal scales of ES provision, multi-level governance approaches are often required and called for (cf. Paavola 2008). Multi-level governance explicitly takes into account the interdependences between the different actors and institutional structures at each level of the governance system (Benz 2004). Moreover, multi-level governance analysis can be used to identify governance gaps and institutional mismatch at different spatial scales (Vatn and Vedeld 2012; Ekstrom and Young 2009).

It goes without saying that these descriptions refer to mere ideal types. In reality, governance can rarely be described by just one type, but can combine elements that can be associated to more than one of the three. In this perspective, governance can be understood as a combination of elements that (formally and informally) regulate access, use and management of environmental resources. The formulation of governance as governance models, helps to describe and clarify evident linkages and interdependencies between various elements and moreover allows to analyse governance along the lines of the three typological approaches (see also Vatn 2010). For instance, governance that primarily rely on market based mechanisms, or on wide collaboration and community participation nevertheless have to comply with legal regulations and policies at different levels (European, federal and state). In a similar way, they also rely on the application and respect of state laws, rules and regulations, such as property rights. For this reason, to our understanding, defining and describing governance models that are per se “clearly” assigned to the three aforementioned categorical governance approaches does not make much sense.

This being said, for the inventory, we suggest to distinguish between various elements that contribute or relate to environmental governance in the three case studies and thus can be considered as relevant for the formulation of governance models. For these elements we suggest a differentiation between:

- Policies, programmes and frameworks which define and express goals and strategies behind governance models [marked in the inventory as P/PR/FR].
- Rules and norms which mainly describe governance institutions and ‘good practices in governance’ (rules of the game), as well as employed instruments for the implementation of the above mentioned policies, programmes and frameworks, defining overarching goals and strategies [marked in the inventory as Ru/No].
- Governance actors (including individual actors and organisations made up by groups of individual actors) which refers to all actors involved in governance (play of the game), such as in goal and strategy definition, the implementation, as well as the monitoring of the governance outcomes, etc. [marked in the inventory as A].

Such a differentiation of elements is helpful for identifying and further bringing to light participatory aspects and any collaborative dimension in each of the governance models.

For every identified governance element, the inventory indicates whether we consider that it can be associated to a command-and-control approach, a market-based approach and/or collaborative approach. If a clear association can be made between element and approach, we have marked it with 2, and if there is no association with 0. If a governance element includes dimensions of one of the three governance approaches, this is indicated with 1.

## 2. Inventory

### Case study biosphere reserve Spreewald, Germany

#### *The case study in a nutshell*

The biosphere reserve Spreewald, situated 100 km south-east of Berlin, covers an area of about 475 square kilometers. It was created in 1990 and was acknowledged the UNESCO status in 1991. Nested within the inland delta of the river Spree, it constitutes a unique landscape in Central Europe. More than 200 small navigable channels called ‘Fließe’ are crisscrossing the area. The natural floodplain provides habitat to a vast number of flora and fauna species, many of them endangered, storks, otters, amphibians and dragonflies among them. In terms of land use, about 30% are arable land, 30% are grassland, and another 30% are covered by forests. In some parts, land management is still done in a traditional fashion as many areas are

only accessible by boat which makes it difficult to use modern machinery. Approximately 3% are water areas, so fisheries play also an important role.

Ecosystem service provision relates to provisioning services such as timber and food production (e.g. fish, vegetables), regulating services such as water retention, flood protection and nutrient regulation, as well as cultural services (e.g. recreation and tourism). About 50,000 people live in the biosphere reserve. Descendants of the first settlers to the region, Sorbs and Wends, still live in the region and preserved their traditional language and customs to this day.

In terms of governance, many approaches overlay which includes command and control approaches (e.g. different regulations with respect to Natura 2000 areas, different types of protection areas), market-based approaches (e.g. agri-environmental programs specifically tailored to the area), as well as collaborative approaches, such as a citizen foundation founded in 2007.

### **Existing governance model elements**

Table 1: Governance elements in case study Spreewald

Name	Abbreviation	Type	Level	Est.	Description	C&C	M-B	COLL
Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora	Habitat Directive - NATURA 2000 (German: FFH)	Ru/No: EU Directive	EU	1992	To set up a network of Special Areas of Conservation, which together with the existing SPA form a network of protected sites across the EU (Natura 2000)	2	0	0
Council Directive 2009/147/EC on the conservation of wild birds	Birds Directive - NATURA 2000	Ru/No: EU Directive	EU	2009	To protect all European wild birds and the habitats of listed species, in particular through the designation of Special Protection Areas (SPA).	2	0	0
Water Framework Directive	WFD	Ru/No: EU Directive	EU	2000	Committed EU member states to achieve good qualitative and quantitative status of all water bodies by 2015; prescribes steps to reach the common goal.	2	0	0
Bundesnaturschutzgesetz	BNatSchG	Ru/No: Federal Law	Federal	1977 (rev. 2010)	Federal Law on Nature protection and landscape conservation. Co-exist with the state laws and any form of mismatch or inconsistency has to be avoided.	2	0	0
Brandenburgisches Naturschutzgesetz	BbgNatSchG	Ru/No: State Law	State	1992 (rev. 2013)	Nature protection laws on the state level. Since 2010, state laws on nature protection are related to the Federal laws and any form of mismatch has to be avoided.	2	0	0
Landschaftsrahmenplan (Landscape framework)	LRP	Ru/No: Management Plan	Regional		Planning for private settlements, industrial areas, agriculture, forestry, hunting, fisheries, water management, waste management, energy, and traffic	2	0	1
Pflege- und Entwicklungsplan (Care and development plan)	PEP	Ru/No: Management Plan	Regional		Conservation planning in specific for the Biosphere Reserve			

Name	Abbreviation	Type	Level	Est.	Description	C&C	M-B	COLL
Kulturlandschaftsprogramm (Cultural Landscape Programme)	KULAP	P/PR/FR:	EU-Fed-State	CAP changes every 6 years, current period: 2014-2020	Programme funding actions that promote and support sustainable use of natural resources and climate protection. The aim is to contribute to the protection of the environment and preservation of rural living areas, the landscape and its characteristics, water resources, soil and genetic diversity.	1	2	1
Spreewaldwiesenprogramm (Spreewald meadows programme)		P/PR/FR:	State	2007	Compensation for disadvantages for farmers linked to nature protection. Aim: preserve small-scale land use on wetlands and pastures (< 3ha), promote extensive farming. <a href="http://www.spreewald-biosphaerenreservat.de/unser-auftrag/naturschutz/">http://www.spreewald-biosphaerenreservat.de/unser-auftrag/naturschutz/</a>	1	2	1
Entwicklung des ländlichen Raums/ Funding for rural development	ELER	P/PR/FR:	EU	Act: 2014-2020	European agricultural fund which was set up for the financing of EPLR actions by European Union Council Regulation (EC) No 1290/2005 of 21 June 2005 on the financing of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP)	1	2	1
Entwicklungsprogramm Ländlicher Raum (Rural area Development programme)	EPLR	P/PR/FR:	State	Act: 2014-2020	Implementation of ELER on the State level	1	2	1
Dachmarke Spreewald (Umbrella trademark label)		Ru/No	Local	1992	Promotes marketing of regional and local products and services.	1	2	1
Spreewaldwiesenaktie (Spreewald meadows share)		P/PR/FR:	Local	01/2015	Share to support conservation measures on meadows, created by the civil foundation Bürgerstiftung Kulturlandschaft Spreewald. Works like a donation: one share of 50 euro covers the costs for the conservation of 1000 m <sup>2</sup> of wet meadow for one year. Shareholders are companies (such as the insurance group Allianz through the „Allianz-Umweltstiftung“) and private individuals.	1	2	2
Niedrigwasserkonzeption (Low water conception)		P/PR/FR:	Regional	2006				
Gewässerrandstreifenprojekt (riparian strips projekt)		P/PR/FR: Management Plan	Regional	Projects 2004-2014	Large-scale nature protection projects. <a href="http://www.gewässerrandstreifenprojekt-spreewald.de/">http://www.gewässerrandstreifenprojekt-spreewald.de/</a>	1	0	2



Name	Abbreviation	Type	Level	Est.	Description	C&C	M-B	COLL
Deutsches Patentrecht (Patent law)		Ru/No	National		National law, relevant for the case study with regard to local and regional labels.	2	0	0
Markenbeirat (Trademark label advisory board)		A: Advisory board	Regional		The biosphere reserve Spreewald is represented in the Markenbeirat. The Markenbeirat is responsible for awarding and managing the regional Dachmarke Spreewald (Umbrella trademark label).	1	2	0
Masterplan naturverträglicher Wassertourismus/ Masterplan environmentally-friendly water tourism		P/PR/FR: Master Plan	Regional	05/2012	Masterplan on canoeing that has been developed within a broad participatory process, involving representatives from the concerned communities and local tourism industry. Funded as Leader project implemented by Spreewaldverein e.V. and co-funded by the Land Brandenburg.	0	1	2
Bürgerstiftung Kulturlandschaft Spreewald (Citizen foundation cultural landscape Spreewald)		A: Citizen foundation	Local	2007	Foundation to raise additional funds to promote the preservation of the unique cultural landscape. <a href="http://www.spreewaldstiftung.de/front_content.php">http://www.spreewaldstiftung.de/front_content.php</a> ; <a href="http://www.luebbenau-spreewald.de/fileadmin/user_upload/STVV/2013/vorstellung_buergerstiftung.pdf">http://www.luebbenau-spreewald.de/fileadmin/user_upload/STVV/2013/vorstellung_buergerstiftung.pdf</a>	0	1	2
Regionalkonferenz Spreewald (regional conference)		A: Conference, every two years	Society	1999	100 members from all society spheres. To increase the understanding and acceptance of the BR's mission	0	0	2
Leader ("Liaison Entre Actions de Développement de l'Économie Rurale"),		P/PR/FR:	EU/local		European Union initiative to support sustainable rural development projects at the local level in order to revitalise rural areas and create jobs.	1	1	2
Beteiligungsprozess der Kommunen zur Ausweitung der Kernzone (Participatory process on core zone extension)		P/PR/FR: Participation process	Local	2010	Participation process of communes to extend the core zone	0	0	2
Staubeirat		A	Local	90er?	Meets twice annually to plan the water management for the next six months (e.g. impoundment depths, maintenance of water infrastructure, etc.). Implementation is done in cooperation with several so-called area councils. All concerned stakeholder groups participate.	0	0	2

Name	Abbreviation	Type	Level	Est.	Description	C&C	M-B	COLL
Spreewaldverein e.V.		A	local	1991	Association representing interests of communes, companies, institutions and other associations in the region, organizing the process of rural development, and promoting networking of stakeholders within the economic area Spreewald. Activities to promote the rural economy and tourism and in the social, cultural and nature protection field. Owner of the label Dachmarke Spreewald. Since 1995, the focus has been shifting from primarily nature protection to economic development.	0	1	2
Tourismusverband Spreewald		A	Local	2006	Umbrella association for the region's tourism interests and concerns. A major aim is to develop tourism and recreation activities in the economic area Spreewald by respecting social and env. sustainable aspects.	0	2	2

## Case study nature park Jauerling-Wachau, Austria

### *The case study in a nutshell*

The nature park Jauerling-Wachau along the Danube river in Lower Austria, was created in 1984 and covers about 11,500 ha. The park offers a rich biodiversity, providing habitats for rare orchids, butterflies, fish, birds, and other species. Agricultural production concerns mainly wine and fruit production, as well as some dairy farming. Farming is rather small scale, partly conventional and intensive, partly organic and extensive. Over the last years, the region has become Austria's most important producer of Christmas trees. ES delivery relates to provisioning services (wine, fruits, Christmas trees) and cultural services (tourism), given the park's location in the wider Wachau region which is an important tourist region.

In Austria, nature parks are to fulfill four major functions (protection, recreation, education and regional development) in an equal way, leading to sustainable development where conservation, agriculture and tourism go hand in hand. This is in contrast to national parks and for instance the German case study, where the prior focus is on conservation.

In terms of governance, it is possible to identify command and control, market-based and collaborative approaches that are of relevance for the nature park's management and the use of land and resources.



**Existing governance model elements**

Table 2: Governance elements in case study Jauerling-Wachau

Name	Abbreviation	Type	Level	Est.	Description	C&C	M-B	COLL
Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora	Habitat Directive - NATURA 2000 (German: FFH)	Ru/No: EU Directive	EU	1992	To set up a network of Special Areas of Conservation, which together with the existing SPA form a network of protected sites across the EU (Natura 2000)	2	0	0
Council Directive 2009/147/EC on the conservation of wild birds	Birds Directive - NATURA 2000	Ru/No: EU Directive	EU	2009	To protect all European wild birds and the habitats of listed species, in particular through the designation of Special Protection Areas (SPA).	2	0	0
Water Framework Directive		Ru/No: EU Directive	EU	2000	Committed EU member states to achieve good qualitative and quantitative status of all water bodies by 2015; prescribes steps to reach the common goal.	2	0	0
Niederösterreichisches Naturschutzgesetz (State nature protection law)	NÖ NSchG 2000	Ru/No: State Law		2000	<p>§ 13 of NÖ NSchG 2000 regulates under what conditions protected areas (Landschafts-, Europa- oder Naturschutzgebiete) or parts thereof can be declared as Naturpark by the State government (NÖ Landesregierung): (1) if suitable for recreation and knowledge transfer; (2) if it has suitable infrastructure for man-nature contact; (3) if land users or the majority of those who own 3/4 of the area agree; (4) a Naturpark concept has been set up (incl state-of-the-art, landscape conservation and development plan, tourism concept, park's contribution to regional development, and plans for info, education and recreation infrastructure); (5) there is an authority to implement the concept and manages the infrastructure.</p> <p>§ 13 also regulate Park visits can be regulated (Naturparkordnung) by the park authorities (Naturparkträger) with a view to reach the aims of the Naturpark concept. This may include entrance fees with the exclude goal of covering the park management costs.</p>	2	0	0
Management Plan "Wachau - Wachau-Jauerling"		Ru/No: Management Plan	State		The plan aims at the preservation or restoration of a good state of conservation of protected areas under NATURA 2000. It includes all necessary conservation and protection measures.	2	0	0

Name	Abbreviation	Type	Level	Est.	Description	C&C	M-B	COLL
Agrarmarkt Austria	AMA	A	Austria	1992	Public corporation for national and international market monitoring with regard to specific products, quality improvement and quality standards, and marketing of Austrian products. Besides managing milk quota, licenses, market interventions and bovine identification, AMA was assigned by the Federal Ministry of Agriculture to process performance-based payments and support programmes for farmers if not directly handled by the ministry. Moreover, AMA is in charge of transacting most of the compensation payments, including market regulation premiums, payments for ÖPUL and compensation payments for farmers in mountain and other less-favored areas.	2	2	0
AMA Gütesiegel (Label)		P/PR/FR	Austria	1992	AMA-Gütesiegel is the most famous quality label in Austria. Officially approved label administered, delivered and controlled by Agrarmarkt Austria Marketing GmbH. It labels food with clear origins and of quality surpassing the legal requirements. Directives for the delivery of the label have to be approved by the Federal Ministry for Agriculture and Forestry, Environment and Water management. Strict controls by independent state-accredited agencies and labs and supervisory inspections.	2	2	0
AMA Bio Gütesiegel (Label)		P/PR/FR	Austria		The Bio-Siegel (AMA organic label) ensures that food and resources are produced in organic farming, i.e. not genetically modified, no use of chemical-synthetic pesticides or easily soluble mineral fertilizers, and principles of animal welfare, organic feeding and promotion of biodiversity and nature protection are respected. The label can also specify the regional origin of products (for resources if 100%, for products if 2/3 of their resources come from the region). Organic farms, companies and traders are subject to at least 1 control per year by independent agencies.	2	2	0

Name	Abbreviation	Type	Level	Est.	Description	C&C	M-B	COLL
Bio Austria		A	Austria	2005	Bio Austria is an organic farmers' Association with 13.000 members and 250 cooperating companies. It is the result of a fusion of small organic farmers' associations with the intention to be the main point of contact for politics, civil society, the economy and the media. Bio Austria aims at promoting organic farming and ensuring markets for organic food products. Offices are in Vienna and Linz, with 100 staff members and a 14-members board. Bio Austria represents some 70% of the 20.000 Austrian organic farmers, with a total turnover of ca. 300 million €, which makes it one of the EU's largest organic food associations. Major principles are ecology, dignity of animals, research and innovation, fair prices and organic farming food culture.	0	2	2
Bio Austria - Gütesiegel (Label)	Bio Austria	P/PR/FR	Austria	2005	Label delivered by Bio Austria. The Bio Austria label can only be used by members for food produced according to EU Directive 834/2007, Codex Directives A8 (National Directives for organic farming) and Bio Austria Directives.	0	2	2
Wachauer Marille (Wachau apricot)		P/PR/FR	Local		Designation of origin, acknowledged by the EU: The quality label "Original Wachauer Marille" is used by 220 apricot farmers from the Wachau to guarantee the fruits' origin and quality. Label can only be carried by farms that produce the typical apricot variety of high quality. Since 2003, these farmers are organised within the association „Wachauer Marille“ with the aim of ensuring the cultivation, preservation and protection of the local apricots.  1996: label “Wachauer Qualitätsmarille” created as AOC. Regulation.  2006: Label renamed „Wachauer Marille“.  2012: Regulation amended, e.g. also apricots that are from non-organic farming can get the label.	0	2	2
Verein „Wachauer Marille“		A	Local	2003	Local association with the aim of ensuring the cultivation, preservation and protection of the local apricots. Marketing activities.	0	1	2

Name	Abbreviation	Type	Level	Est.	Description	C&C	M-B	COLL
Österreichische Programm für umweltgerechte Landwirtschaft (Austrian Environmental Programme) Agri-	ÖPUL	P/PR/FR	Austria	1995	Broad agrar-political support measure within the Austrian environmental policy and landscape management. Co-funding EU (EFRE), Federal and states.	2	2	2
Arbeitskreis Wachau (Working group)		A	Local	1972, 2001	Aims at conservation of Wachau as natural and cultural landscape by preserving the small scale structure and natural resources. Active involvement of citizens and visitors of all age and social groups. Topics include: settlements, nature protection, transport, viticulture, fruits, agriculture + forestry, infrastructure, tourism, culture + arts, communication, etc.  Established 1972 as Arbeitskreis zum Schutz der Wachau, name changed in 2001	0	0	2
Naturpark Jauerling-Wachau		A	Local		Association that aims at the conservation and protection of the park and its environment, with activities including awareness raising, information, community-based projects, etc.	0	0	2
Jauerlinger Saftladen (School project „Juice shop“)		P/PR/FR	Local	2011	Project to sensitize for regional products, traditional agriculture and climate change. Main motivation is the decrease of traditional fruit production over the last years in the region as less and less economic benefits. Every year, around 150 pupils, teachers and parents from the 7 local schools take part in the production of some 2000-3000 liters apple juice from local fruits which is given for free to the schools. The idea is to raise awareness about central topics such as regionality, traditional agriculture, climate change, etc; to promote a knowledge transfer within the community, also from children to adults, and to promote a hands-on strategy. The project is one of the Naturpark's lighthouse projects. In 2013, the Austrian UNESCO Commission and the Federal Ministry for Culture have awarded the project as Best-Practice Example within the "UN Decade for Sustainable Development 2003-2014".	0	0	2

Name	Abbreviation	Type	Level	Est.	Description	C&C	M-B	COLL
Volunteering for Natura 2000/ Wachau Volunteers		P/PR/FR: LEADER Project/ Initiative	Local/ Civil Society / UNESCO	2010	Initiated by the Naturpark Jauerling, and based on the UNESCO World Heritage Decade on Biodiversity (2011-2020), the annual 2-week youthcamp gathers about 40 young volunteers that help with care and protective work for 6-8 ha of dry grasslands annually.	0	0	2
Bio Wachau		A			Certified organic farms within the UNESCO Worldheritage Wachau, the Naturpark BIOthek in Spitz/ Donau, and the Naturpark Jauerling-Wachau form the cooperative BIO-Wachau. These farmers produce according to the principles of regionality, high quality and a sensitive use and protection of landscape and nature.	0	0	2

## Case study Berg en Dal, Netherlands

### *The case study in a nutshell*

The municipality of Berg en Dal, situated between the Waal river, Nijmegen and the German border and with a population of 34,000 inhabitants, makes up an important part of the national landscape Gelderse Poort. The designation 'national landscape' signifies that the area is of agricultural, natural and historic value for the Netherlands. The area contains a varied cultural landscape with a variety of landscapes. The municipality can roughly be split into three zones: (1) the floodplains on the southern banks of the Rhine/Waal river (Ooijpolder and Duffelt), that harbor an important nature restoration area; (2) the forested ridges surrounding Nijmegen in the central western area; and (3) mixed agricultural lands south of the floodplains and surrounding the town of Groesbeek.

Berg en Dal has many different types of nature areas, including forests, open water, swamps, natural grasslands, shrublands and many small patches with special vegetation. The municipality harbors (parts of) three Natura 2000 areas: Gelderse Poort, De Bruuk and Sint Jansberg, together covering 6.7% of the area.

Different governance approaches are used for the municipality's management, including command and control approaches, market-based approaches and collaborative approaches.

### *Existing governance model elements*

Table 3: Governance elements in case study Berg-en-Dal

Name	Abbreviation	Type	Level	Est.	Description	C&C	M-B	COLL
Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora	Habitat Directive - NATURA 2000 (German: FFH)	Ru/No: EU Directive	EU	1992	To set up a network of Special Areas of Conservation, which together with the existing SPA form a network of protected sites across the EU (Natura 2000)	2	0	0

Name	Abbreviation	Type	Level	Est.	Description	C&C	M-B	COLL
Council Directive 2009/147/EC on the conservation of wild birds	Birds Directive - NATURA 2000	Ru/No: EU Directive	EU	2009	To protect all European wild birds and the habitats of listed species, in particular through the designation of Special Protection Areas (SPA).	2	0	0
Water Framework Directive		Ru/No: EU Directive	EU	2000	Committed EU member states to achieve good qualitative and quantitative status of all water bodies by 2015; prescribes steps to reach the common goal.	2	0	0
Omgevingsvisie and Omgevingsverordening Provincie Gelderland		P/PR/FR and Ru/No: Strategy and regulations	Provincial	2014 (nature and water update 2015)	Vision and regulations for the built and natural environment of Gelderland province. The vision and regulation documents frame 'the playing field and the accompanying rules'. Goals and quality are central themes. The means and instruments to reach goals are not determined.	2	0	2
Landschapsontwikkelingsplan (Landscape development plan)	LOP	P/PR/FR: Strategy	Local	2015-2025 (first version 2004-2014)	The LOP Berg en Dal aims at the conservation and improvement of biodiversity in the municipality Berg en Dal. In line with the slogan „Landschap van iedereen!“ (Landscape for everyone), every inhabitant, company and visitor should be able to benefit. The first LOP was jointly implemented by the communities Millingen, Ubbergen und Groesbeek. In 2015 a new LOP was designed by multiple stakeholders for 2015-2025 and adapted to new development. The plan is implemented by the community Berg en Dal, following administrative reforms. Participants included government, civil society and businesses. This plan specifies possible landscape developments and conservation activities for fourteen sub-regions/ zones within the municipality. The development of the new LOP was subject to public participation and open for public inspection and written comments over a 6-weeks period in June and July 2015.	2	1	2
Landschapscommunity (Landscape community)		A: stakeholder platform	Local	2011	Active platform for landscape development that stimulates collaboration between stakeholder groups. The community started to grow over a decade ago and is an active and important platform for the area.	0	0	2


Name	Abbreviation	Type	Level	Est.	Description	C&C	M-B	COLL
Landscape fund Via Natura		P/PR/FR: Strategy. A: organisation	Local	2005	Provides multiple types of financing opportunities to generate funds for landscape management, including a frequent landscape auction, in which citizens and businesses can adopt parts of the local landscape and finance landscape management.	0	2	2
Bestemmingsplan/ Land use plan		Re/No	Local		Plan that defines the specific uses for the whole municipality. Changes in spatial planning can only be implemented if they are in accordance with the 'Bestemmingsplan'. For agriculture multiple restrictions exist, concerning issues such as emissions, fertilizer use and manure production. Established by the municipality but with public consultation.	2	0	0




### 3. Literature

- Adhikari B. and G. Boag, 2013. Designing payments for ecosystem services schemes: some considerations. *Environmental Sustainability*, 5: 72-77
- Baldwin R., M. Cave, and M. Lodge, 2011. *Understanding Regulation: Theory, Strategy and Practice*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, ref. to in: Scanlan, A.; Nießen, L.; Jelkmann, L. (et. al.) (2013) *Diverging Approaches to EU Environmental Policy: An Explanation of the Implementation Deficit*, Maastricht University Journal of Sustainability Studies \_ 2013 \_ Vol. I, Issue 1.
- Benz A., 2004. Multilevel Governance: Governance in Mehrebenensystemen. In: A Benz and N Dose (eds.), *Governance: Regieren in komplexen Regelsystemen. Eine Einführung*. VS-Verlag, Wiesbaden, pp. 111-135.
- Ekstrom J. A., and O. R. Young, 2009. Evaluating functional fit between a set of institutions and an ecosystem. *Ecology and Society*, 14: 16 [online].
- Engel S., S. Pagiola, and S. Wunder, 2008. Designing payments for environmental services in theory and practice: An overview of the issues. *Ecological Economics*, 65: 663-674.
- Matzdorf B., C. Sattler, and S. Engel, 2013. Institutional frameworks and governance structures of PES schemes. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 37: 57-64.
- Mickwitz P. 2003. A framework for evaluating environmental policy instruments: contexts and key concepts. *Evaluation*, 9: 415-436.
- Paavola J. 2007. Institutions and environmental governance: a reconceptualization. *Ecological Economics* 63, 93–103.
- Vatn A. 2010. An institutional analysis of payments for environmental services, *Ecological Economics* 69 (2010) 1245–1252
- Vatn A., and P. Vedeld. 2012. Fit, interplay, and scale: a diagnosis. *Ecology and Society*, 17(4): 12
- Young O. R. 2002. *The institutional dimensions of environmental change - fit, interplay and scale*. The MIT Press, Cambridge

#### Impressum

This milestone is an outcome of the research project cp<sup>3</sup> [  ]:

**‘civil-public-private-partnerships (cp<sup>3</sup>): collaborative governance approaches for policy innovation to enhance biodiversity and ecosystem services delivery in agricultural landscapes’**


 is funded through the 2013-2014 BiodivERsA/FACCE-JPI joint call for research proposals





with the national funders BMBF (Germany), FWF (Austria), and NWO (Netherlands)



© cp<sup>3</sup> (03/2016)

 has three project partners:

 Leibniz-Centre of Agricultural Landscape Research (ZALF)

 Organisation for International Dialogue and Conflict Management (IDC)

 Wageningen University, Department of Environmental Sciences (WUR)

Contact info project coordination:

Leibniz-Centre for Agricultural Landscape Research (ZALF)  
Eberswalder Strasse 84 |  
15374 Müncheberg | Germany  
E: [cp3@zalf.de](mailto:cp3@zalf.de) | W: [www.cp3-project.eu](http://www.cp3-project.eu)