

Report on the National Workshop in the Netherlands

Woerden, 15rd May 2017

Organised by Floor Brouwer, Martijn van der Heide, Nico Polman and Judith Westerink

This report presents the outcomes of the discussions at the PEGASUS WP5 national workshop in the Netherlands.

The list of attendees is presented in the Annex.

Lessons emerging from the project so far

The main points of the discussion with stakeholders covered:

ESBO terminology:

- Attendees of the workshop had an interest in the mechanisms to provide ESBOs of the different cases.
- Moreover, there was the issue of ESBO-data. The question was how to deal with monitoring the ESBOs and – at the same time – steering the case study into a certain direction (without knowing exactly that this is the right direction because you do not have all the information and data beforehand)?
- It is difficult to translate the concept of ecosystem services into the jargon of firms and economic sectors. What does PEGASUS offer to deal with this issue?

Case studies and action research:

- Results were appreciated by attendees because it allows learning from the other cases all over Europe. It was recognized that cases are diverse from what we have shown. Therefore, the question came up: Is it possible to think of a common thread running through all these case studies? Or are they united in diversity (*in varietate concordia*)?
- Perhaps one common thread is that all Dutch case studies have (more or less) a focus on processes that generate learning, meaning, knowledge, and experience.
- It was emphasised that due to the local / regional character of the case studies, the role of local government is fundamental to the success of the case study. Moreover, also the involvement of local stakeholders was acknowledged by the attendees of the workshop. This means that researchers must be sensitive to the local reality when engaging stakeholders or policy representatives.
- At a much higher policy level is the CAP. So, when dealing with local governments but also with European, the questions was: How do the case studies deal with multiple scale issues? If the goal of the case study is to go to, say, a certain direction, what does this aim mean for the various scales / governments levels?



- Insight in the governance aspects of the cases was found to be interesting.
- Intrinsic motivations, related to values such as life satisfaction and fairness but also to the desire to work for good cause, are in all Dutch case studies important to ensure compliance with producing ESBOs. Extrinsic motivations, related to economic incentives, can be used for scaling up the initiatives.
- It was asked if the case study stakeholders received feedback. What are the lessons learned?
- We explained that drawing conclusions taking into account the different case-studies is still a task for the coming period.

Maps:

- It was asked how intensity is defined. Intensity has been expressed in energy use (fertilizer, energy, etc.). Therefore, irrigated areas become more energy intensive compared to other areas because of energy use for irrigation purposes.
- There were some discussions on the use of aggregates of crops, e.g. grain is an aggregation of different crops.
- It seems that Norway is full of sheep, which was confusing. Adding sheep and goats as one category can be misleading as – for instance – for the Netherlands because keeping goats in the Netherlands is relatively intensive compared to sheep farming.
- Does the mapping exercise take the difference between beef and dairy cattle into account? Another question was with respect to the difference between agricultural and non-agricultural land.

Messages for policy and practice

The main points of the discussion with stakeholders covered:

- Participants were very curious for our advice to the European Union. How could the CAP deliver societal objectives in a better way? It was argued that the CAP is sometimes counterproductive. What should the CAP stimulate, what certainly not, and what should be left to the member states? What are the opportunities for results based payments?
- It was recognised that societal objectives are nowadays important for several countries. Especially those values that are not supported directly by a market mechanism. Suppose there is (almost) no budget restriction for the CAP: what priorities would we advise to target?
- In the summer the window of opportunity for the CAP in Brussels closes. It is difficult for different countries to view Europe from the perspective of another country.
- The budget of the CAP is under pressure. What are the consequences for results based payments schemes? Measurement of results is often difficult for policy implementation.
- Moreover, it was suggested to make an explicit link with a circular economy, as this is one of Europe's ways to move to a more resource-efficient society, as set out in the Europe 2020 strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.
- Farmers should be involved in policy design taking into account regional collaboration and tailor made solutions. It has been emphasised that we should not only talk *about* them, but





also *with* them, because then a wealth of local knowledge becomes available. Farmers should be called upon their entrepreneurship. They are often reticent to implement measures because they are afraid of not following the (too strict and detailed) rules and therefore to be fined in a way they perceive as unfair. It was suggested to allow for more local solutions.

- Room for experimenting was thought to be important, but also the ability to exchange knowledge. If more and more farmers participate initiatives will scale up. However, successful experiments sometimes provoke opposition. If an experiment is successful, more people are willing to participate.
- It was advised not to focus on the CAP alone. “Look also beyond the CAP!” For instance, EU environmental directives (and the new Dutch Omgevingswet (“Environmental Planning Bill”) too) are important as well for stimulating the provisions of ESBOs.



Attendees to the PEGASUS WP5 national workshop in the Netherlands		
Name	Organisation	Type of stakeholder
Annelie Boogerd	Ministerie Economische Zaken	Public sector - Ministry
Karel van Bommel	Ministerie Economische Zaken	Public sector - Ministry
William van Dijk	CLM - Centrum voor Landbouw en Milieu	Research
Inge van de Wiel	CLM - Centrum voor Landbouw en Milieu	Research
Gerda Hendriks	Gemeente Laarbeek	Public sector – Municipality
Jan Sprengers	Gemeente Laarbeek	Public sector – Municipality
Jeen Nijboer	Rabobank	Bank
Remco Schreuder	RVO	Public sector
Hedwig Boerrigter	Stichting Veldleeuwerik	Skylark Foundation
Henk van Zeijts	PBL – Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency	Public sector – knowledge organisation
Judith Westerink	Wageningen Research	Partner PEGASUS
Nico Polman	Wageningen Research	Partner PEGASUS
Martijn van der Heide	Wageningen Research	Partner PEGASUS
Floor Brouwer	Wageningen Research	Partner PEGASUS

