

EU PLATFORM ON COEXISTENCE BETWEEN PEOPLE & LARGE CARNIVORES



Minimizing
Conflicts

Finding
Solutions



Supporting good practice for coexistence
– presentation of examples and analysis
of support through the EAFRD

EU Platform on Large Carnivores: Supporting good practice for coexistence – presentation of examples and analysis of support through the EAFRD

May 2016

Katrina Marsden, adelphi consult GmbH, Tasos Hovardas, Spyros Psaroudas, Yorgos Mertzanis, Callisto, Undine Baatz, adelphi consult GmbH. This report was produced as part of the services provided as the Platform Secretariat to DG Environment of the European Commission, Service Contract No. 07.0202/2015/713809/SER/ENV/B.3. It does not necessarily reflect the views of the Platform or the official view of the European Commission. For more information, please contact lcplatform@adelphi.de.

Visit the Platform at:

http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/species/carnivores/coexistence_platform.htm

Contents

1. Introduction	4
1.1 Aim 5	
2. Sampling good practice	6
2.1 Methods	6
2.2 Results	6
2.2.1 Location and time	6
2.2.2 Species targeted	7
2.2.3 Interest group targeted	7
2.2.4 Type of case study	7
2.2.5 Source of funding	8
3. Analysis of support through the EAFRD	9
3.1 Methods	9
3.2 Results	9
3.2.1 Measures chosen	10
3.2.2 Species targeted by the measures	10
3.2.3 Beneficiaries	11
3.2.4 Stakeholder involvement	11
3.3 Discussion	12
3.3.1 Measures chosen	12
3.3.1 Species targeted by the measures	13
3.3.2 Beneficiaries	14
3.3.3 Stakeholder involvement	14
4. Future potential of the EAFRD to support coexistence between people and large carnivores	15
5. Future work and role of the Platform members	17
6. Annex 1 – Case study list	18
7. Annex 2 – Content of EAFRD measures used to support coexistence	23
8. Annex 3 – EAFRD measures and their potential to support coexistence	27

1. Introduction

The four European large carnivore species (brown bear *Ursus arctos*, wolf *Canis lupus*, Eurasian lynx *Lynx lynx*, and wolverines *Gulo gulo*) are among the most symbolic but challenging groups of species in terms of conservation and management in the European Union (EU). This is because of their biological needs – they have large ranges which cross borders – and the fact that they are controversial - they potentially conflict with human economic activities such as farming and hunting and in rare cases threaten human safety.

In June 2014, a group of eight representative stakeholder organisations agreed to work together as part of the EU Platform on Coexistence between People and Large Carnivores. These organisations are ELO - European Landowners' Organization; Joint representatives of Finnish and Swedish reindeer herders; FACE - The European Federation of Associations for Hunting & Conservation; CIC - The International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation; IUCN - The World Conservation Union, European Union Representative Office; WWF - Worldwide Fund for Nature, European Policy Office and EUROPARC Federation (Copa-Cogeca left the Platform in February 2015). The European Commission helped to establish the Platform and acts as a co-chair although it is not a member. It agreed to support the Platform members in their work by funding a service contract to provide technical support. Through this contract, adelphi Consult GmbH and Callisto provide the Platform with its secretariat.

To start their work together, the above mentioned organisations signed an agreement including a joint mission: “to promote ways and means to minimize, and wherever possible find solutions to, conflicts between human interests and the presence of large carnivore species, by exchanging knowledge and by working together in an open-ended, constructive and mutually respectful way.” At their first meeting, a work plan was agreed. An important aspect of this was the collection and sharing of good practice case studies. The Platform members, supported by the secretariat, have therefore gathered a number of case studies which are presented in this report.

At the kick-off meeting for the second year of the service contract, it was decided that the Platform members wished to focus particularly on the potential to use European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD)¹ support to fund coexistence measures. Many coexistence measures have been well tested by various EU LIFE projects (Silva *et al.* 2013 and Salvatori 2013)² and nationally or regionally funded schemes. They are therefore ripe for broader roll-out with EAFRD support. The advantage of this funding stream is that it is available across the EU, is significantly larger than LIFE Nature and Biodiversity and it is possible for individuals or groups to access it.

¹ Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:347:0487:0548:en:PDF>

² Silva, J. P. , J. Toland (ed), T. Hudson, W. Jones, J. Eldridge, E. Thorpe, S. Bacchereti, S. Nottingham, C. Thévignot and A. Demeter (2013). LIFE and Human Coexistence with Large Carnivores, Publications Office of the European Union : http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/species/carnivores/pdf/life_and_human_coexistence_with_large_carnivores.pdf and Salvatori, V. (2013) Large Carnivore Conservation and Management in Europe: The contribution of EC co-funded LIFE projects. Istituto di Ecologia Applicata for DG Environment : http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/species/carnivores/pdf/task_2_life_and_lc.pdf

1.1 Aim

The aim of this report is therefore threefold: it presents the case studies collected by the Platform members and categorises them into types of good practice relevant to coexistence. A summary of the analysis the contractors carried out of the use of Rural Development funds is then given. Finally conclusions are drawn on the current use of EAFRD support and how this could be extended in future to better cover the good practice identified in the case studies.

The Platform members are asked for their feedback and comments on the report and the listed questions. Following feedback, input of additional information and final agreement of the Platform members, the report will be published on the Platform website.

2. Sampling good practice

2.1 Methods

Case studies were initially collected by means of an online questionnaire. Platform members and individuals who had presented information at the Platform workshops were asked to submit examples. In the second year of the Platform's work, members were simply asked to send web links and short descriptions to the secretariat. Case studies that focused on concrete, transferable good practice examples were selected. This meant that some submitted examples were excluded from the final sample either because they did not focus on good practice (they highlighted problems rather than solutions) or they described a wide range of measures implemented over the course of a project or a scientific study. In these cases, if the project or study included specific good practice elements, these were included as individual good practice examples (meaning that there can be more than one example from an individual LIFE project for example). Individual EU funded LIFE projects for example, may therefore provide more than one case study.

2.2 Results

29 case studies were included in the analysis below. A list and brief descriptions are included in Annex 1. Further information is available on the Platform website³.

2.2.1 Location and time

Case studies came from a range of Member States. Some were national or cross border in scope whereas others were on a much smaller, local level.

Table 1. List of case studies per Member State

Member State	Number of cases
Italy	5
France	4
Germany	4
Greece	4
Slovenia	3
Sweden	2
Austria	1
Bulgaria	1
Finland	1
Lithuania	1
Portugal	1
Croatia	1
Spain	1
Switzerland	1

The times that the case studies covered varied (see Annex 1). In general, those driven by environmental NGOs or funded by a national or regional government tend to be longer term.

³ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/species/carnivores/case_studies.htm

Many case studies only covered the length of a LIFE project. Some case studies covered initial information gathering (e.g. on understanding viewpoints). In this case, it is unsurprising that they cover only a specific time period. In other cases, it is likely that the action stopped because the funding source came to an end. This exemplifies the problem of seeking long-term funding for coexistence activities.

2.2.2 Species targeted

Case studies most frequently targeted the wolf followed by the bear. Several case studies targeted more than one species.

Table 2: List of case studies per species

Species targeted	Number of cases
wolf	19
bear	12
lynx	3
wolverine	1

2.2.3 Interest group targeted

A main target group was selected for each case study – although in some cases there are likely to have been secondary target groups too. The most frequently targeted stakeholder group was livestock keepers and herders. This group includes farmers, herders, shepherds, beekeepers and reindeer herders.

Table 3: List of case studies targeting each stakeholder group

Stakeholder group	Number of cases
Livestock keepers / herders	13
General public	4
All	4
Hunters	3
Business	3
National / regional government	2

2.2.4 Type of case study

The case studies were divided into five different categories as described in more detail below.

Table 4: categorisation of case studies

Category	Descriptions	Number of cases
Advice / Awareness raising	Sourcing of information from individual contact points (websites, experts, volunteers) for the general public responsible authorities or stakeholders Also information aimed very specifically at particular groups (developers, tourists).	6
	Awareness raising for tourists to avoid conflict with bears	2
	Avoiding infrastructure development in areas important for wolf breeding	1
Innovative financing	Volunteer programmes providing livestock keepers with extra capacity	3

	Eco-labelling schemes to increase value of produce	3
	Eco-tourism development based on the presence of large carnivores	1
	Payment for results scheme	1
Practical support	Practical measures to improve coexistence such as provision of fencing or livestock guarding dogs	3
	Establishment of emergency teams to respond to call-outs.	1
Monitoring	Good practice in involving stakeholders in monitoring of large carnivores and sharing the results with stakeholders.	3
Understanding viewpoints	Studies understanding stakeholder attitudes to different large carnivore species.	2
	Intensive efforts to encourage stakeholders to work together.	3

2.2.5 Source of funding

The main funding sources for the case studies are listed in the table below. Only one main source is chosen. In many cases, further funding sources will have contributed to the good practice. For example, EU LIFE funding is always co-financed generally by national or regional governments. Programmes started by NGOs may also have governmental support and support through private funds – either individuals or in the case of labelling schemes – through local businesses and farmers.

Table 5: sources of funding for case studies

Funding Source	Number of cases
National / regional government	10
EU LIFE	10
NGO Resources / volunteers	7
EAFRD	1
Private	1

The different funding sources are most commonly used for different types of good practice. Awareness raising is most often supported through national or regional governments, practical support through the EU LIFE programme and innovative financing through NGOs. Member States also fund compensation schemes for losses of livestock due to predation by large carnivores (in the case that these exist).

The use of EAFRD support was highlighted in only one submitted case study. This suggests that the EAFRD is not being used to its full potential to support coexistence. At the kick-off meeting for the second year of technical support for the Platform, it was decided that more effort should be focused on collecting information on the use of the EAFRD to support coexistence measures. A more targeted analysis of coexistence measures funded through these means was therefore carried out.

3. Analysis of support through the EAFRD

3.1 Methods

An initial situation was carried out which involved reviewing relevant literature, speaking to officials at DG Environment and Agriculture and asking the Platform members to question their own members. Based on this, a questionnaire was produced and sent either directly to managing authorities or to experts in the Member States who then approached the managing authorities to gather the relevant information. All Member States with significant Large Carnivore Populations were included in the initial survey⁴. The questionnaire covered both the 2007-13 and the 2014-20 EAFRD programming periods. Respondents were asked for information on the individual coexistence measures and their financing but also about background information on the programme, the involvement of stakeholders in the process and their views on the success of the measures (for the 2007-13 programming period).

Following initial information gathering, the results of the questionnaire were analysed statistically. See technical background paper, Hovardas *et al.* (2016) for more information on the content and methodology used⁵.

3.2 Results

15 respondents from 12 different Member States provided information on 13 Rural Development Programmes in the 2007-2013 programming period and another 29 Rural Development Programmes in the 2014-2020 programming period. 29 different regions or countries were covered (see Annex 2 for a full list of measures recorded). For Germany, France, Italy and Spain, data were collected on regional Rural Development Programmes. It is believed that all relevant Rural Development programmes were covered with the exception of Spain where further regions may include coexistence measures⁶. The countries included in the analysis are listed in the table below. For the more detailed statistical analysis of the results, they were divided along geographic axes.

Table 6: regionalisation of case studies

Geographical axes	Member States
Mediterranean	Croatia, Slovenia, Italy, Spain, Portugal
Balkan	Greece, Bulgaria
Central European	Germany, France
Nordic	Sweden, Finland, Lithuania

⁴ Member States approached were: Croatia, Slovenia, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Greece, Bulgaria, Romania, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland, Germany, France, Sweden, Finland, Lithuania, Latvia. Not all Member States had measures in their programmes (compare this list with Table 6).

⁵ Hovardas, T. and K. Marsden (2016) Use of Rural Development funding to support large carnivore-human coexistence measures. Technical background paper provided to the Platform.

⁶ Regions with further measures may include Castilla y Leon. Information on Asturias and Aragon was added late and not included in the full analysis.

3.2.1 Measures chosen

The responses covered 41 “implementations of measures” (i.e. different measures implemented in different programmes, the same measures implemented in different programmes and different measures implemented in the same programme). A summary of the measures used is shown below.

Table 7: implementations of measures

Measure	2007-13 code	Programmes	2014-20 code	Programmes
Support for investment in agricultural holdings	121	Italy (Marche, Toscana)	4.1	Finland; Croatia; Sweden; Italy (Marche), Spain (Aragon)
Support for non-productive investments linked to the achievement of agri-environment(-climate) objectives	216	Greece, Italy (Abruzzo), Sweden, Germany (Saxony)	4.4	Germany (Saxony, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern); Greece; Italy (Abruzzo, Emilia Romagna, Lazio, Marche, Piemonte, Toscana), Spain (Asturias)
Support for non-productive investments linked to the achievement of forest environment objectives	227	Spain (Rioja)	8.5	
Agri-environment(-climate)	214	Bulgaria, Slovenia, Greece	10.1	Bulgaria, Slovenia, Spain (Rioja), Portugal
Village renewal	323	Germany – Brandenburg;	7.6	Germany – Brandenburg; France (Alsace, Auvergne, Champagne-Ardennes, Franche-Comte, Languedoc Rousillon, Midi – Pyrenees, Alpes Cote D’Azur, Rhones Alpes)
LEADER	412	Germany - Saarland	19	Germany - Saarland

The largest number of measures are used to fund damage prevention methods, namely, establishment of electric fences (5 instances in the former programming period and another 12 instances in the current programming period) and distribution of livestock guarding dogs (3 instances in the former programming period and another 7 instances in the current programming period). Other approaches involved alert systems and video surveillance (Croatia, Toscana-Italy), adaptation of grazing patterns, when livestock had been exposed to the risk of wolf depredation (Alsace and Auvergne in France) and additional agri-environment area payments in areas where the presence of wolf or bear might prevent delivery of environmentally beneficial grazing practice (Bulgaria, Spain-Rioja, Finland).

3.2.2 Species targeted by the measures

All four large carnivore species were targeted by various implementations of measures in RDPs (Table 8). The wolf was the species addressed most frequently. In many cases several species were targeted by a single measure implementation.

Table 8: Frequency with which large carnivore species were targeted per programming period (more than one large carnivore can be targeted by a particular measure)

Species	Programming Period		
	2007-2013	2014-2020	Total
Wolf	10	26	36
Bear	8	10	18
Lynx	2	6	8
Wolverine	0	1	1
Total	20	43	63

More detailed analysis of the species targeting along the geographical axes (Hovardas *et al.* 2016) demonstrates that in the Balkan area, measures are focused more strongly on the bear, while measures in Nordic areas are relatively more concentrated on the lynx. Wolves are targeted equally in both programming periods and across all geographical scales.

3.2.3 Beneficiaries

The main beneficiaries were stockbreeders/herders and farmers followed by bee keepers, rural residents, and environmental non-governmental organizations (Table 4).

Table 9: beneficiaries per Programming Period

Beneficiaries	Programming Period		
	2007-2013	2014-2020	Total
Stock breeders/herders	11	24	35
Farmers	9	20	29
Bee keepers	4	3	7
Rural residents	2	5	7
Environmental NGOs	2	5	7

3.2.4 Stakeholder involvement

National authorities/ministries and regional/local authorities were (unsurprisingly) most frequently involved in the design of measures, followed by environmental NGOs. The involvement of the latter seems to have decreased between the programming periods according to the questionnaire respondents.

Participation in the Programme Monitoring Committee (PMC) was more evenly distributed among stakeholders with greater direct involvement of farming unions and farming cooperatives. Overall, stakeholder involvement appears to have increased in the new programming period in comparison to the 2007-13 programme.

Table 10: stakeholder involvement in the programmes

	Design of measures		Programme Monitoring Committees of Rural Development Programmes	
	Programming Period 2007-2013	Programming Period 2014-2020	Programming Period 2007-2013	Programming Period 2014-2020
	National Authority/Ministry	3	11	5
Regional/Local Authority	1	9	4	17
University or Research Institute	2	1	0	5
Professional Chambers	1	5	3	16
Farmers' Unions/Associations	2	3	7	13
Farmers'	1	2	4	11

Cooperatives				
Private Enterprises	0	0	1	10
Environmental NGOs	6	2	5	13

Statistical analysis (correspondence analysis) carried out in the more detailed examination of the results (Hovardas *et al.* 2016) highlighted geographical differences in the involvement of stakeholders with a tendency for stakeholders to be more involved in design of measures in the Mediterranean and Central Europe in the 2007-13 programming period and in the Programme Monitoring Committees in Central European and Nordic areas in the current programming period.

3.3 Discussion

The study was based on data provided by experts and it did not involve collection of primary data. Responses were gathered from a mixed group of experts - eight respondents from national / regional authorities, five respondents from environmental NGOs, one private enterprise and another one affiliated to a university. Finding experts who had both the knowledge of how the Rural Development programmes functioned and of coexistence measures was not easy. In many cases, the initial expert contact, sought information from additional sources or passed the questionnaire on to other contacts and further respondents were thus identified through a snowballing method.

The data collected through this means was of varying completeness and potentially of varying quality. Most respondents did not complete every question. There was a tendency for respondents to provide more information on the second programming period in Member States where coexistence measures were only introduced for 2014-20. Results on stakeholder involvement in the PMC, for example, must therefore be treated with caution. Nonetheless, the information gathered provides the most complete picture to date of inclusion of coexistence measures in the Rural Development programmes and gives the Platform members a good starting point to for their discussions on how to improve use of EAFRD funding to support coexistence.

A more complete analysis of the gathered data including analysis over geographical axis and the factors important for measures being regarded as a success is included in Hovardas *et al.* (2016).

3.3.1 Measures chosen

Four main (sub-)measures were used to provide support for coexistence in both programming periods.

Two additional measures were highlighted by respondents. In the programme in Spain-Rioja, the measure for the preservation and care of the spaces of the Natura 2000 network in forest areas was used. In Saarland, Germany, the potential to use LEADER funding was highlighted. It does not appear that it has yet been used for this purpose.

Similar actions were funded under different measures for example, measures 4.1, 4.4 and 7.6 (support for investment in agricultural holdings, support for non-productive investment, village renewal) were all used to deliver damage prevention measures. The reasons for the choices of the particular measures in the different Member States therefore need to be explored further. In general, regional programmes in a Member State employed the same measure (e.g. in France measure 7.6 was used in all programmes even though regional emphasis varied slightly). However this is not always the case. In Germany, measure 7.6 was used in Brandenburg while 4.4 was used in Saxony and Mecklenburg-Vorpommern. This likely reflects how much direction is given through the National programme or framework. In general, with

the exception of Spain-Rioja, Greece (for agri-environment) and Italy-Toscana where Member States had included a measure in their 2007-13 programme, they continued using the equivalent measure in the 2014-20 programme presumably as this delivers most continuity for beneficiaries.

There were few cases of Member States making use of more than one measures. Greece used two measures in the previous programming period but only one in the current one. Italy-Marche seems to use both investment measures (4.1 and 4.4) currently.

The table below suggests some advantages and disadvantages for each of the main measures chosen (based on the measure requirements as laid out in the regulation). This needs further exploration through targeted questions to the Member States about why they have chosen particular sub-measures above others and in the above-mentioned cases, where Member States have chosen to change the measure selected or use more than one, their reasons for their choices.

Table 11: strengths and weaknesses of the main measures used for coexistence

Code	Measure	Strengths	Weaknesses
121 / 4.1	Support for investment in agricultural holdings	Farmers do not need to prove that the measures are linked to agri-environment-climate objectives under the regulation. Measures may therefore also provide additional economic benefits.	Not fully financed (the beneficiary must also contribute). Open only to farmers / groups of farmers. Only covers costs of infrastructure.
216 / 4.4	Support for non-productive investments linked to the achievement of agri-environment(-climate) objectives	100% financed. Open to all land managers.	Need to prove the link to agri-environment-climate objectives and that the measure is "non-productive". Land manager cannot benefit financially from the measure. Only covers costs of infrastructure.
214 / 10.1	Agri-environment (-climate)	Potentially available to all land managers. Continued payment which can cover additional costs and income foregone on an annual level, not just initial costs.	Annual payment which does not cover the initial investment in infrastructure. The link with providing area-based environmental benefits should be clear - therefore needs to include land management requirements.
323 / 7.6	Village renewal	Open to wide range of rural actors. Can cover a wider range of measures related to coexistence including information and awareness raising, waste management, local infrastructure management.	Have to be in accordance with plans for the development of municipalities and villages in rural areas.

3.3.1 Species targeted by the measures

In general, measures target species based on their occurrence and the strength of local conflicts. Often measures target more than one species – there are for example no measures specifically targeted at wolverine or lynx, in all cases wolf is also included. Measures tend

therefore to be generic measures to improve coexistence which can be focused based on local needs rather than very specific measures suited to each carnivore species.

3.3.2 Beneficiaries

Despite the broader focus of the EAFRD in both programming periods compared with previous iterations, stock-breeders and farmers are the most frequently targeted beneficiaries. This reflects the focus of the chosen measures which are largely on protecting livestock. Implementation of measures is therefore largely targeted at individuals (i.e. individual stockbreeders not their associations).

The number of environmental NGO-beneficiaries, which appear to have increased in the second programming period, may reflect increased opportunities to target stakeholders on an institutional level. This has the potential benefit, that outreach through local institutions may be greater i.e. they may be able to reach groups of breeders or farmers in a particular area and potentially reduce the bureaucratic burden for them in applying for support. This aspect needs to be researched further to examine whether institutions such as environmental NGOs or farming associations (rather than individual farmers) are really succeeding in accessing funding and using it to support groups of stakeholders.

3.3.3 Stakeholder involvement

Stakeholders seem to have been more involved in the Programme Monitoring Committees in the second programming period (the number involved has increased more than the number of measures has increased). Tree modelling carried out as part of the statistical analysis of results, suggested that for respondents, the involvement of stakeholders in the process was not regarded as crucial for perceived effectiveness of the measures for the 2007-13 programming period (respondents were only asked about the 2007-13 period as the new programmes have only recently been launched). Instead, the use of outreach measures to target beneficiaries was regarded as more important for the success of the measures. Given the small sample size of respondents for these questions however, this result should be interpreted cautiously and needs further examination.

4. Future potential of the EAFRD to support coexistence between people and large carnivores

In order to identify how good practice could better be supported through the EAFRD, a comparison between the categories of good practice identified through the case studies and the support available through the EAFRD was carried out.

There are 20 measures and 60 sub-measures in the EAFRD regulation. Some of these have direct relevance to protected species such as large carnivores whereas others have broader cross-cutting aims. Coexistence with large carnivores is a complex area, including a range of activities (as demonstrated by the case studies). Theoretically therefore, most of the measures could be put to some use related to coexistence. An effort has been made here to concentrate on the most relevant measures to the good practices identified.

Following the example of Allen *et al.* (2012)⁷, measures were identified as being key to delivering coexistence (K in the table below); with potential to deliver coexistence (P); or as having cross-cutting potential (C) to deliver for coexistence amongst other objectives. For a fuller description see Annex 3.

Table 12: potential use of EAFRD measures to support best practice (compare with table 4 for a description of the best practice categories)

Code	Measure name	Advice / Awareness	Innovative financing	Monitoring	Practical support	Understanding viewpoints
1	Knowledge transfer / Information	C	C	C	C	C
2	Advisory Services	C	C	C	C	C
4.1	Investment in physical assets				K	
4.4	Non-productive investment				K	
6.2	Business start-up aid		P			
6.4	Non-agricultural activity development		P			
7.1	Basic services / village renewal		P			
7.5	Tourism infrastructure		P			
7.6	Studies / investments natural heritage	K	K	K	K	K
8.5	Forest ecosystem investment				K	
10.1	Agri-environment-climate		K		K	
12.1	Compensation Natura 2000 areas				K	
14	Animal welfare payments				P	
15.1	Forest-environment-climate				K	

⁷ Allen B, Keenleyside C and Menadue H (2012) Fit for the environment: principles and environmental priorities for the 2014 - 2020 Rural Development Programmes. Report produced for the RSPB. Institute for European Environmental Policy, London.

16	Cooperation	P	P			P
19	LEADER	C	C	C	C	C
20	Technical support	C	C	C	C	C

Key measure	K
Measure with potential	P
Cross-cutting measure	C

5. Future work and role of the Platform members

This report gives a short overview of the collection and analysis of case study examples and the review of the use of EAFRD measures undertaken by the Platform secretariat. The Platform members contributed to this work by suggesting case study examples and in a few cases, suggesting experts on rural development to contact in the Member States. The bulk of the evidence gathering and analysis was however carried out by the secretariat.

It is now up to the Platform members to decide how to use the evidence presented. The Platform's main purpose is to work together to reduce conflict and improve the potential for coexistence with large carnivores. The case studies, gathered from across Europe, suggest that the means to promote coexistence already exist, but they need to be better implemented in the areas with the most serious conflicts. A significant barrier in many locations is lack of access to financial support. The analysis of EAFRD measures shows that they are already used in a number of different ways in different Member States to support coexistence. They also have the potential to be used more innovatively, for example to further support awareness raising and advice, target different stakeholders or establish new business opportunities.

In order to determine the next steps, Platform members may wish to discuss the following questions:

Case studies

- Do the members believe that the case studies represent the most important aspects of good practice in the EU? Are there serious gaps? If so, how can they be filled?
- How can the best sources of funding for good practice be identified?
- How can best practice from the case studies be better drawn out, presented and transferred to different settings?
- Do the members agree to endorse the case studies as examples of good practice?

Rural development programmes

- Is more evidence gathering needed on use of the EAFRD e.g. into the role of stakeholders in design, implementation and monitoring of the measures or the reasons Member States have used particular measures? If so, how can the members contribute to this by engaging their own members?
- How can members best provide their own members with guidance on engaging with the design of the Rural Development programmes? How can they be supported in doing this?
- How can use of EAFRD funding to support coexistence be optimised in the areas with large carnivore conflict?
- Should support provided through the EAFRD be focused on livestock breeders / herders or is there also the potential to target measures at other interests represented by Platform members?

6. Annex 1 – Case study list

For fuller descriptions, see the Platform website⁸.

Member State	Title	Short description	Dates	Stakeholders	Species targeted	Funding source
Advice / Awareness raising						
Lithuania	Safe-sheep – advice website	Website gathering and ranking measures on protecting livestock from wolves.	ongoing	Livestock keepers / herders	Wolf	NGO resources / volunteers
Germany	NABU – Wolf Ambassadors	A network of more than 500 volunteers acting as wolf ambassadors, spreading objective information on wolves.	ongoing	General public	Wolf	NGO resources / volunteers
Germany	Contact Office “Wolves in Saxony”	Office delivering information about wolf biology, behaviour, distribution and livestock protection methods.	2004-ongoing	General public	Wolf	National / regional government
Finland	Large carnivore expert - western Finland	Documentation of LC observations, damage inspection and mediation of information between research, authorities, hunters, organizations and local people.	2013-ongoing	Livestock keepers / herders	Wolf, bear, lynx	National / regional government
Austria	National advice centre for herders	Consultation with sheep and goat farmers to minimise negative impacts of wolf and other large carnivores through collection and provision of information.	2011-ongoing	Livestock keepers / herders	Wolf	National / regional government
Bulgaria	Central Balkan National Park – tourism	Efforts to prevent conflicts between LCs and people by raising awareness and elaborating information material.	1999-ongoing	General public	Bear	National / regional government

⁸ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/species/carnivores/case_studies.htm

Poland	Tatra National Park - tourism	Information and education campaigns aimed at tourists, hunters and local communities, devoted to increasing awareness about appropriate behaviour and the consequences of bear feeding.	1991-ongoing	General public	Bear	National / regional government
Portugal	Protection of wolf breeding sites for infrastructure development	Advice to developers on the protection of wolves in processes of land use planning and in strategic tools for infrastructure development through Priority Areas for wolf conservation, minimization measures and a long-term wolf-monitoring programme.	2007-2017	Business	Wolf	Private
Germany	National wolf competence centre	The centre provides of up to date information and science based consultancy services on wolf related issues for regional and national nature conservation authorities.	2016-2019	National / regional government	Wolf	National / regional government
Innovative financing						
France	Pasturaloup volunteer programme	Volunteer programme supporting shepherds to protect their flocks against wolves.	1998-ongoing	Livestock keepers / herders	Wolf	NGO resources / volunteers
Italy	Pasturs volunteer programme	Volunteers and shepherds - facilitating co-existence with large carnivores in the Bergamo Alps through training of volunteers to support shepherds.	ongoing	Livestock keepers / herders	Wolf	NGO resources / volunteers
France	Loupastres volunteer programme	Volunteers spend a period of time in the mountains assisting a shepherd put in place measures to protect sheep against wolves.	1998-ongoing	Livestock keepers / herders	Wolf	NGO resources / volunteers
France	Labelling schemes for farm cheeses in the Haut Béarn	Marketing approach using the bears' foot imprint to give value to cheese creating some socio-economic benefit for shepherds through the presence of bears.	1995-ongoing	Livestock keepers / herders	Bear	NGO resources / volunteers

France	Labelling schemes for "broutard" free range lamb	A label that reflects a sustainable mode of production and in particular compatible with the presence of bears.	2001-ongoing	Livestock keepers / herders	Wolf	NGO resources / volunteers
Slovenia	Bear friendly products through Dinalp	A label promoting socio-economic benefit for those producers who use bear friendly practices or who through actively promote bear conservation in the local environment.	2014-2019	Livestock keepers / herders, business	Bear	EU LIFE
Italy	Ecotourism through the WolfAlps project	An ecotourism program to raise awareness among visitors regarding the presence of the predator and to ensure an economic return for the territory.	2013-2018	Business	Wolf	EU LIFE
Sweden	Conservation performance payments	The Swedish government replaced compensation payments with conservation performance payments (CPP), paying reindeer herders for the number of successfully breeding wolverines in their area.	1996-2011	Livestock keepers / herders	Wolverine	National / regional government
Monitoring						
Slovenia, Croatia	Involving stakeholders in bear monitoring - Dinalp project	Addresses collaboration and monitoring by engaging volunteers and stakeholders in the monitoring of bears using personal sampling kits for bear scats.	2014-2019	Hunters	Bear	EU LIFE
Sweden	App to allow rapid sharing of monitoring results	An internet-database, in which everyone can register observations of tracks, signs or sightings of large carnivores in Scandinavia - app is available for reporting information on LCs.	ongoing	Hunters	Wolf, bear, lynx	National / regional government

Italy	Standardization, co-ordination and implementation of a damage-compensation-prevention-mitigation assessment system for wolves in the Apennines (LIFE WOLFNET)	Coordinated and agreed method developed to assess and monitor damages to livestock caused by wolves and insure that all institutions involved worked in the same way.	2010-2013	National / regional government	Wolf	EU LIFE
Practical support						
Italy	Livestock protection measures through Medwolf	LIFE-project encouraging collaboration between provincial administration, environmental NGOs and professional agricultural associations in representation of livestock breeders.	2012-2017	Livestock keepers / herders	Wolf	EU LIFE
Greece	Greek Bear Emergency Response Team	Development of a general framework, plan intervention scenarios and evaluate bear incidents through a case by case ranking/scoring.	2011-2014	all	Bear	EU LIFE
Greece	Developing a network of Livestock Guarding Dogs	A network of owners of Livestock Guarding Dogs (LGDs) was created facilitating coordination and the exchange of puppies and adult dogs between the livestock breeders.	2009-2012	Livestock keepers / herders	Wolf, bear	EU LIFE
Greece	Damage prevention measures (e.g. fences) through the RDP in Greece	Installation of electric fences around apiaries and sheepfolds for minimising damages caused by bears.	2004-2013	Livestock keepers / herders	Wolf, bear	EAFRD
Understanding viewpoints						
Germany	Transfer and Communication Project – Baden-Württemberg	Management of conflicts about large carnivores and development of sound solutions to these conflicts, mainly by enlarging the awareness on conflict dynamics among the conflict parties through mediated discussions.	ongoing	All	Wolf, lynx	National / regional government

Switzerland	Core Group Wolf	Cantonal (regional) Wolf Groups have been established in several Swiss cantons with the main goals to objectify discussions and improve relationships between stakeholders.	2006-ongoing	Livestock keepers / herders	Wolf	National / regional government
Greece	Stakeholder attitudes to bears in Greece	Examination of stakeholder's perceptions and responses to conflicts or opportunities for cooperation in bear conservation using interviews, questionnaires, and focus group discussions to prepare a SWOT-analysis.	2009-2013	All	Bear	EU LIFE
Italy, Slovenia	Public attitude survey - LIFE WolfAlps	A study focused on stakeholders in core wolf areas in the Alps to gauge their overall knowledge and views on wolves using questionnaires in seven key areas.	2013-18	All	Wolf	EU LIFE
Spain	Cooperation of stakeholders in the Cantabrian mountains	A project facilitating cohabitation and collaboration using formal agreements with Hunting Associations and Federations to foster the social acceptance of bears, reduce poaching with illegal snares and avoid the indirect impacts of hunting activities.	1993-2015	Hunters	Bear	EU LIFE

7. Annex 2 – Content of EAFRD measures used to support coexistence

	2007-13 Programming Period		2014-20 Programming Period		
Member State	Measure code	Measure description	Measure code	Measure Description	Species targeted
Bulgaria	214	Traditional livestock breeding. Traditional practices of seasonal grazing (pastoralism). Pastoralism in National parks Pirin and Central Balkan - Bear, Wolf, Lynx	10.1	Traditional practices for seasonal grazing (pastoralism). In the frames of this, traditional alpine grazing in summer is supported.	Bear, wolf, lynx
Croatia			4.4	purchase of fences and sheep dogs - bear and wolf	Bear, wolf
Finland			4.4	Building costs of a predator control fence paid for for a traditional rural biotope or natural pasture site under an environment contract on managing biodiversity in a farming environment if fulfilment of an existing contract is otherwise impossible because of a significant threat of large carnivores to grazing livestock.	Bear, wolf, lynx, wolverine
France - Alpes Cote D'Azur			7.6	Financial support and Investment related to the maintenance, restauration and rehabilitation of natural and cultural heritage in villages, rural landscapes and sites of high natural value including socio-economic aspects as well as awareness raising actions	Wolf
France - Alsace			7.6	Financial support and Investment related to the maintenance, restauration and rehabilitation of natural and cultural heritage in villages, rural landscapes and sites of high natural value including socio-economic aspects as well as sensitisation actions	Wolf
France - Auvergne			7.6	Assistance to the adaptation of process of livestock grazing patterns exposed to the risk of wolf depredation.	Wolf

France - Champagne - Ardennes			7.6	Baseline Services and village renovation in rural zones (areas)	Wolf
France - Franche - Comte			7.6	Financial support and Investment related to the maintenance, restauration and rehabilitation of natural and cultural heritage in villages, rural landscapes and sites of high natural value including socio-economic aspects as well as awareness raising actions	Wolf
France - Languedoc Rousillon			7.6	Financial support and Investment related to the maintenance, restauration and rehabilitation of natural and cultural heritage in villages, rural landscapes and sites of high natural value including socio-economic aspects as well as awareness raising actions	Wolf
France - Midi - Pyrenees			7.6	Financial support and Investment related to the maintenance, restauration and rehabilitation of natural and cultural heritage in villages, rural landscapes and sites of high natural value including socio-economic aspects as well as awareness raising actions	Wolf
France - Rhones Alpes			7.6	Financial support and Investment related to the maintenance, restauration and rehabilitation of natural and cultural heritage in villages, rural landscapes and sites of high natural value including socio-economic aspects as well as awareness raising actions	Wolf
Germany - Brandenburg	323	Framework for the promotion of natural heritage and environmental awareness under which wolf prevention measures are targeted	7.6	Framework for the promotion of natural heritage and environmental awareness under which wolf prevention measures are targeted	Wolf
Germany - Mecklenburg-Vorpommern			4.4	non productive investment - increasing acceptance of particular species	Wolf
Germany - Saarland	412	LEADER	19.2	LEADER	Wolf

Germany - Saxony	216	Framework Natural Heritage - wolf prevention measures	4.4	Investment in measures securing the natural biological diversity under which wolf management prevention measures and PR	Wolf
Greece	216	Support actions for the protection of wildlife, Action 1.1: Purchase and installation of electrified fence, Action 1.2: Purchase and maintenance of Greek shepherd dogs	4.4	Protection of farming from the Bear (purchase and installation of electrified fence)	Wolf, bear
Greece	214	Promoting agricultural practices to protect wildlife (leaving aside production of particular/eligible species of crops corresponding to 10% of the cultivated surface and up to 1 Ha)			Wolf, bear
Italy - Emilia Romagna			4.4	Prevention of damage caused by wildlife. Includes payment for fences, acoustic deterrents, purchase of livestock guarding dogs	Wolf
Italy- Abruzzo	216	Interventions for the control of wildlife and protection of flocks in montane areas - bear, wolf	4.4	Includes funding for building of fences or other measures for making stock raising and agriculture compatible with protection of wildlife at risk. - bear, wolf	Wolf, bear
Italy- Marche	121	Investment for improvement of holdings and productivity, including fences for flocks	4.1	Investment for improvement of holdings and productivity, including fences for flocks	Wolf
Italy- Marche			4.4	Measures for mitigation of conflicts between wolf and stock breeders. Includes non productive investments for reducing probability of depredations (including purchase of livestock guarding dogs)	Wolf
Italy- Toscana	121		4.1	Enhancement of reddy and competitiveness of agricultural holdings - includes interventions for the protection of flocks from attacks by predators through fences, alert systems and video surveillance.	Wolf
Italy-Lazio			4.4	Funds to install fences and other structures for prevention of damages by large carnivores	Wolf, bear

Italy-Piemonte			4.4	Livestock protection from wild predators. Includes the financing for purchase of livestock guarding dogs and fences.	Wolf
Lithuania			4.1	Aims to increase competitiveness of agriculture. Some of protective measures (electric fences and meshes, portable enclosures, etc.) are treated as applicable expenditures, i.e., constructions and buildings for bio-protection.	Wolf
Portugal			10.1	Support for maintaining dogs. Payment per hectare dependig on ratio dogs per herd.	Wolf
Slovenia	214	Animal husbandry in central areas of appearance of large carnivores.	10.1	Livestock rearing in area of the occurrence of large carnivores	Wolf, bear
Spain - Aragon			4.1	Bear proof corrals to protect the sheep which overnight in the mountains. Breeders who have the livestock in natural parks (or buffer areas) and who have suffered damages in the last year can apply to this measure.	Bear
Spain - Asturias			4.4	Subsidies to avoid damages caused by wild animals to agriculture and livestock: mobile fences, electric fences, mastiff dogs and protection for beehives in bear areas.	Bear
Spain - Rioja	227	Support for non-productive investments in forest areas - building wolf proof corrals to protect sheep during the night in forest where wolves were present. This is considered a measure to improve the habitat for livestock in areas with wolves.	10.1	Maintenance of extensive livestock increased premium (15€/ha) in areas where wolves are confirmed to be present. Extensive farmers are compensated for grazing a minimum number of days, respecting stocking density, management plans, etc. In the municipalities with wolves, the livestock breeders must have at least one Large Guarding Dog for every 150 sheep/goats	Wolf
Sweden	216	Subsidies for building large carnivore deterring fences or improving existing fences	4.1	Carnivore deterring fences	Wolf, bear, lynx

8. Annex 3 – EAFRD measures and their potential to support coexistence

Measure for the 2014-20 period	Measure code	Sub-measure codes	Sub-measure description	Potential use for LC coexistence good practice	Current use
Article 14 Knowledge transfer and information actions	1	1.1, 1.2, 1.3	Support for vocational training and skills acquisition actions; demonstration activities and information actions, short term exchanges and visits	Cross cutting measure – all, especially advice / awareness raising / understanding viewpoints could be used to support good practice from the advice and awareness raising category	None
Article 15(1) Advisory services, farm management and farm relief services	2	2.1, 2.2, 2.3	Support to help benefiting from the use of advisory services; for the setting up of services and for training advisors	Cross cutting measure – all, especially advice / awareness raising could be used to support good practice from the advice and awareness raising category	None
Article 17 Investments in physical assets	4	4.1	support for investments in agricultural holdings	Key measure – practical support can be used for establishing fencing or livestock guarding dog provision	Finland, Croatia, Sweden, Italy (Marche)
Article 17 Investments in physical assets	4	4.4	Support for non-productive investments linked to the achievement of agri-environment-climate objectives	Key measure – practical support can be used for establishing fencing or livestock guarding dog provision	Germany (Saxony, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern), Greece, Italy (Abruzzo, Emilia Romagna, Lazio, Marche, Piemonte, Toscana), Greece

Article 19 Farm and business development	6	6.2; 6.4	Business startup aid for non-agricultural activities in rural areas; for investments in creation and development of non-agricultural activities	Measure with potential – innovative financing could be used to support business activities related to large carnivores and tourism e.g. eco-labelling and eco-tourism	None
Article 20 Basic services and village renewal in rural areas	7	7.1	Support for drawing up and updating of plans for the development of municipalities and villages in rural areas and their basic services and of protection and management plans relating to Natura 2000 sites and other areas of high nature value	Measure with potential – innovative financing could be used to support business activities related to large carnivores and tourism e.g. eco-labelling and eco-tourism or for habitat management planning to avoid conflict.	None
Article 20 Basic services and village renewal in rural areas	7	7.5	Support for investments for public use in recreational infrastructure, tourist information and small scale tourism infrastructure	Measure with potential – innovative financing to be used to support business activities related to large carnivores and tourism e.g. eco-labelling and eco-tourism	None
Article 20 Basic services and village renewal in rural areas	7	7.6	Support for studies/investments associated with the maintenance, restoration and upgrading of the cultural and natural heritage of villages, rural landscapes and high nature value sites including related socioeconomic aspects, as well as environmental awareness actions	Key measure – all can be used for establishing a range of coexistence measures such as changes in grazing activities and awareness ranging activities	Germany (Brandenburg), France (Alsace, Auvergne, Champagne – Ardennes, Franche – Comte, Languedoc Rousillon, Midi – Pyrenees, Alpes Cote D’Azur, Rhones Alpes)

Article 21 Investments in forest area development and improvement of the viability of forests	8	8.5	Support for investments improving the resilience and environmental value of forest ecosystems	Key measure – practical support which can be used to support coexistence measures or habitat management	Spain (Rioja) – 2007-13 only
Article 28 Agri-environment-climate	10	10.1	Payment for agri-environment-climate commitments	Key measure – practical support, innovative financing can be used to support coexistence measures or habitat management through areal payments in large carnivore territories	Bulgaria, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain (Rioja)
Article 30 Natura 2000 and Water Framework Directive payments	12	12.1	Compensation payment for Natura 2000 agricultural areas	Key measure – practical support could be used to support coexistence measures or habitat management in Natura 2000 areas designated for large carnivores	None
Article 33 Animal welfare	14	14	Payments for animal welfare	Measure with potential – practical support could potentially be used to reduce stress to livestock caused by large carnivores	None
Article 34 Forest-environmental and climate services and forest conservation	15	15.1	Payment for forest-environmental and climate commitments	Key measure – practical support could be used to support coexistence measures or habitat management in large carnivore territories in forest areas	None
Article 35 Cooperation	16	16.2, 16.3, 16.5, 16.8, 16.9	Pilot projects, cooperation amongst small operators, joint approaches to environmental projects, drawing up	Measure with potential – especially advice / awareness raising, understanding viewpoints could help to fund a range of	None

			forest plans, diversification into education about the environment	measures related to collaborative efforts on coexistence	
Article 35 Support for LEADER	19	19.1, 19.2, 19.3	Preparation and implementation	Cross cutting measure – all categories could help fund work identified by a LAG as important for coexistence in a particular area	Highlighted by Germany (Saarland) as potential to use
Article 51-54	20	20.1	Technical support	Cross cutting measure – all categories, especially monitoring could potentially help fund monitoring necessary for coexistence measures	None