Natura 2000 management plans in France and the Netherlands: Carrots, sticks, sermons and different problems
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ABSTRACT

Many EU Member States are using management plans to ensure the sustainable conservation and management of Natura 2000 sites. The decision about whether to use management plans lies with the Member States. Although management planning systems differ, in most countries the management plan is developed at local level in close consultation with relevant stakeholders. This article explores to what extent national decisions on the management planning system have influenced the content of the local plans. The comparison of French and Dutch Natura 2000 management plans shows that the plans mostly propose conservation measures that can be implemented by individual owners or users of the site and for which funding is available. The individual measures in the French plans reflect the national decision that the management plans should work primarily as a funding tool. The individual measures in the Dutch plans however do not reflect the national decision that management plans should act as a legislative tool to regulate land use activities in and around the site. In the Netherlands, the focus has shifted towards a tool for the coordination of funding. The analysis shows that in both countries the selection of particular measures in the management plans is connected to other policies and funding mechanisms that deal with the problems perceived by involved actors, such as the Common Agricultural Policy and the Dutch National Programme for Nitrogen Deposition.

If you fail to plan, you are planning to fail

(Benjamin Franklin 1706–1790)

1. Introduction

The EU Birds Directive (1979) and Habitats Directive (1992),¹ require Member States of the European Union to designate protected areas that jointly form the Natura 2000 network. The site selection of the Natura 2000 sites is based on scientific criteria and overseen by the European Commission. After site designation, Member States have to ensure that adequate conservation measures are taken and damaging activities do not occur (Sundseth & Roth, 2013). The Directives grant Member States considerable freedom in how to arrange the management of Natura 2000 sites. The Birds Directive only states that special conservation measures regarding the habitat of species listed are needed (Art 4.1) and that ‘Member States shall take appropriate steps’ to protect species and avoid deterioration in the designated sites (Art. 4.4). The Habitats Directive provides Member States with different options to arrange management as they can develop site specific management plans, integrate the measures into other development plans, or introduce appropriate statutory, administrative or contractual measures. The majority of the Member States prefer using management plans as the policy instrument to organise the management of Natura 2000 sites (Bouwma, Liefferink, van Apeldoorn, & Arts, 2016). In addition, the EC actively promotes management planning as a mechanism to ensure the adequate management of the site (Bouwma et al., 2016; European Commission, 2015). In 2012, 9271 management plans had been prepared for Natura 2000 sites designated under the Habitats Directive in 24 Member States, with an additional 4229 plans under preparation (European Environment Agency, 2015). These management plans are developed at local level within the confines of the different national or regional management planning systems. The Member States’ management planning systems vary in their legal status, required content, participation process, and finances available for their
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implementation. The majority of the Natura 2000 management plans are developed in a participatory manner although legal obligations for participation are often not in place. This reflects the overall ongoing trend of increased public participation in environmental management (Reed, 2008), but has also resulted from the severe criticism of many stakeholders on the limited participation during the phase of designation (Alphandéry & Fortier, 2001; Ferrari, Turnhout, Beunen, & Behagel, 2014; Laffan & O’Mahony, 2008; Unnerstall, 2008).

The formulation of management plans integrates national hierarchical forms of goal setting and regulation with local forms of planning and decision-making (Beunen & de Vries, 2011; Diez, Etxano, & Garmendia, 2015; Geitzenauger, Hogl, & Weiss, 2016; Kati et al., 2015). National governments designate sites, formulate conservation goals, and determine the status of the management plans, while regional or local governments, often in co-operation with site managers, users and other stakeholders decide on how those conservation goals relate to other land use activities and how they should be translated into specific measures. Furthermore, if goals are not achieved, the national government or the European Commission can undertake legal action (Sundseth & Roth, 2013). Local aspects of planning relate to the consultation and/or participation of stakeholders during the plan development. They have local knowledge about the site that is required to develop the plan as well as views on the problems that need to be addressed, the goals that can be achieved and their involvement is important for the acceptability of measures for local owners and users (Blondet et al., 2017; Brescancin, Dobinski, De Meo, Šilka, & Paletto, 2017; Diez et al., 2015).

Studies in relation to management plans for Natura 2000 sites have mainly focussed on the planning process (Alphandéry & Fortier, 2010; Beunen & de Vries, 2011; Kovacs et al., 2017; Young et al., 2013), with a few exceptions that focus on financing issues (Geitzenauger et al., 2017), the plans themselves or resulting management measures (Duhalde, Level, & Guyader, 2017; Winter et al., 2014). This study complements the process oriented studies by reviewing the management plans, paying particular attention to the kind of measures included in the plans, the problems addressed by these measures, and the way in which implementation of these measures will be guaranteed. We are particularly interested in the extent to which national authorities can influence the type of measures that are included in the management plans. National, or regional2 authorities set the boundary conditions for Natura 2000 management plans. Following these conditions the exact content of the plan is negotiated between the involved actors at the local level. As a result the policy instrument for site management is a nested instrument consisting of the management planning system, the management plans for specific areas, and the individual measures proposed in the plans.

National authorities can to some extent influence the individual measures through decisions they make regarding the management planning system. They can, for instance, decide whether the measures included in the management plans are legally binding or whether there is national funding available for plan development or specific measures. The mechanism (or mechanisms) by which the government chooses to influence the behaviour of actors sets the boundary conditions for the formulation of measures included in the management plan and is referred to as authoritative force (Salamon, 2002). Usually three main mechanisms of authoritative force are distinguished for policy instruments: motivation through financial incentives (‘carrots’), motivation by using laws and regulations (‘sticks’) and motivation through information provision (‘sermons’) (Vedung, 1998).

At the local level the exact measures which are incorporated in the management plan are negotiated (Beunen & de Vries, 2011; Cent, Grodzinska-Jurczak, & Pietrzyk-Kaszynska, 2014; Duhalde et al., 2017). Here the authoritative force of the management system will influence which measures are included in the plan, but also how it is ensured that those measure will actually be taken and complied with. Authoritative force thus plays a role both at the level of the management system as a whole, i.e. regarding the range of instruments that are available for inclusion in management plans, and for the individual measures determined at local level. In order to clearly distinguish between the authoritative force of the management system as a whole and that of the individual measures as included in the plans, we use the term authoritative mechanism to indicate the authoritative force behind the individual measures.

This brings us to the research question that guides this study (see also Fig. 1); To what extent does the authoritative force of the national planning system influence the types of measures included in the management plans that are developed locally?

Understanding how national decisions on Natura 2000 instruments influence the selection and implementation of measures at site level is important. Many of the species and habitats for which the Natura 2000 network was created are still in an unfavourable conservation status (European Environment Agency, 2015). Measures to improve this situation are therefore required in many Natura 2000 sites. Insight in the selection and implementation of measures proposed in the first round of management plans enables an assessment of the effectiveness of different types of policy instruments. Currently, the management of the sites is an issue of considerable debate (Birdlife Europe, EEB, Friends of the Earth, & WWF, 2018; Kati et al., 2015; Young et al., 2005). Some nature conservationist call for more stringent action from the side of the government to ensure good management, whilst private land owners look sceptical towards interference of the government with management. Although much of the actual management decisions will be decided on a local level it is important to better understand how national authorities can facilitate the selection of effective and legitimate measures through the design of policy instruments available for inclusion in management plans. In the end national governments have to decide how they want to use their authoritative force for achieving the goal of improving the conservation status of Natura 2000 habitats and species.

To answer the research question, the individual measures incorporated in thirty management plans from two Member States with a different authoritative force were reviewed. For the analysis of the plans an analytical framework was developed based on instrument choice literature (see Section 2). In Section 3 the selection of countries and sites is explained, Section 4 describes the results. In Section 5 the results are discussed and in Section 6 conclusions are drawn. The article does not assess the effectiveness of measures, i.e. whether measures are adequate to ensure the conservation of the species and habitats in the site.

2. Analytical framework

2.1. Policy instrument theory and Natura 2000 management plans

For our analysis of the management plans we considered them as a policy instrument with a nested character. Policy instruments are defined as the tools at the disposal of the government to implement its policy objectives (Bemelmans-Videc & Rist, 1998; Howlett, 1991). In policy instrument literature, much attention has been given to the authoritative force of instruments (‘carrot’, ‘sticks’, ‘sermons’) and how this influences the behaviour of involved actors. The behaviour required by policy instruments is usually referred to as action content, for example actions that should or should not be undertaken by a certain actor (Vedung, 1998). Instruments with a high authoritative force (sticks) force actors to comply to set rules, even in cases where they rather would not. Instruments with a lower authoritative force, such as financial (carrots) or communicative instruments (sermons), leave more freedom to actors. A carrot stimulates actors to act in a certain way by

---

2 In federally organised Member States the decision on management plans is taken at the regional level.
(financially) rewarding or discouraging certain behaviour. A communicative instrument (sermon) tries to influence behaviour by disseminating information to actors with the intention to entice them to change their behaviour.

Reviewing the authoritative force of a particular instrument is not always clear-cut. In practice, many policy instruments have a mixed character and do not always neatly fit the theoretical distinctions made (Salamon, 2002). The nested character of Natura 2000 management planning system amplifies this problem. The management plans are developed in a multilevel setting, where national authorities set boundary conditions and local actors decide on specific measures. Local actors have significant freedom to ensure that conservation goals are met, to discuss problems, and to decide which measures are needed to solve these problems, and who will be responsible for undertaking action. Yet the actual choices should meet the conditions set by the legal framework of the EU Birds and Habitats Directives and a particular management planning system. The article reviews the relationship between the grey boxes in the figure by analysing the content of the local plan. The local negotiation process is not analysed.

2.2. Operationalization of theoretical concept for analysis

To assess at what extent the authoritative force of the management planning system may influence the content of the management plans, four different aspects of these plans will be reviewed: the type of measures proposed, the problems these measures address, the number of measures proposed, the problems these measures address, the number of parties involved in executing the measures, and how these parties are motivated to take the proposed measures. Each of these aspects is elaborated below (see also right side of Fig. 1). Based on this analysis conclusions are drawn as to how the selection of particular measures and the plans as a whole relate to the authoritative force of the management planning system.

2.2.1. Action content

The Habitats Directive provides the basis for the typology of the action content of the plans. Conservation measures are defined by the Directive and the Guidance Note (European Commission, 2013) which supports it as a ‘a series of measures required to maintain or restore the natural habitat and population of species of wild flora and fauna at a favourable conservation status. In the Guidance Note it is stated that a conservation measure is a positive and pro-active intervention. A conservation measure therefore refers to an action that is required to ensure that the species and habitats are conserved (‘to do or ‘to do more’). In addition, Art. 6.2 requires the Member states to ‘take appropriate steps to avoid deterioration of natural habitats and natural habitats of species as well as disturbance of species’. The Guidance document also refers to conflicts that may occur with current land use. For the purpose of this article we refer to such activities as ‘restrictive measures’, i.e. measures that are proposed to avoid deterioration of habitats and disturbance of species resulting from current land use. The activity should not occur or its intensity needs to be reduced (‘do not’ or ‘do less’). Our review of the plans will show that several measures in many of the plans are described in such a generic way that it is unclear whether they constitute a conservation or a restrictive measure (see Table 1) For the purpose of this analysis, therefore, a distinction will be made between three main types of measures; conservation measures, restrictive measures and general measures. In Table 1 the definitions of the measures are provided as well as some examples, in the Supplementary material (Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples of measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation measure</td>
<td>Positive and pro-active intervention to ensure the conservation status or to improve it</td>
<td>Grazing or mowing of grasslands. Development of natural banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive measure</td>
<td>Intervention that should not occur to ensure the conservation status or to improve it</td>
<td>No use of fertilizer No clearcutting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General measure</td>
<td>Intervention of a more generic kind that can both lead to a positive intervention or describe an intervention that should not occur</td>
<td>Maintain the diversity of the area Develop a programme of measures to manage the area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1** Action content of the plan.
2.2.2. Problems addressed

Most management plans also specify the problems that the measures will address. For the typology of the problems addressed we will use the existing coding system developed by the European Commission for the latest Article 17 reporting. As part of the reporting Member States indicate possible threats to Natura 2000 species and habitats (http://bd.eionet.europa.eu/activities/Reporting/Article_17). This typology distinguishes threats based on the sector (f.i. agriculture or urbanisation) or on specific themes (pollution, non-native species, natural system modifications). Seventeen main categories of threats are identified (see Table 2).

Furthermore if the plan includes measures addressing a certain threat, this is taken as an indication that the actors involved consider this threat an actual problem requiring action.

2.2.3. Involved party to execute measures

Management plans normally indicate which actors are required to execute the conservation measures or which actors should not undertake specific damaging activities. Management plans can include measures that can be taken by a single party and measures that require cooperation of more parties. To assess whether the measure requires single party action or multiple party action a simple coding system was developed using two values only (1, 2). If the execution of the measure depends on the action of one party the score assigned was 1, if the action depends on the cooperation of more than one parties to execute the action the score assigned was 2. As the general measures were too vague or ambiguous to assess the number of parties required, these measures were not reviewed and excluded from this part of the analysis.

2.2.4. Authoritative mechanism

To determine the authoritative mechanism behind each measure the typology prevalent in policy instrument theory is used (see section 2.1). If funding is available for either undertaking a measure or as compensation for the restriction is stipulated, the authoritative mechanism used is financial (carrot). If the measure can be enforced through existing law or due to the legal status of the plan the authoritative mechanism is regulatory (stick). If neither funding nor a legal requirement is in place the authoritative mechanism used is communicative (sermon). Due to their generic and often ambiguous character, it turned out to be impossible to assess the authoritative mechanism behind the category of general measures (see Table 1).

In sum, the following four aspects of the plan will be reviewed;

- Action content of the plan (conservation measures, restrictive measures, general measures)
- The problems the measures address (17 problem categories)
- The parties needed to implement the measure (single or multi party action)
- The authoritative mechanism used to ensure that the measures are taken (stick, carrot, sermon)

To compare the plans within as well as between countries, for each plan metrics were developed for the four aspects described above (action content, problems reviewed, number of parties for execution, authoritative mechanism). In the Supplementary material (Table B) the metrics used are described in more detail. A statistical t-test or Mann Whitney U test was carried out to assess the significance of differences between the country’s plans with regard to the four aspects ($p > 0.05$).

3. Country and site selection

The management planning systems of Member States differ considerably, based on national choices regarding, among other things, enforceability, funding available for measures, required content and participation procedures. Furthermore they also feature different levels of authoritative force (European Commission, 2013; Unnerstall, 2008). Whilst in some of the Member States management plans were primarily introduced to be legally binding and enforceable, in other Member States the management plans are voluntary and the plans primarily acts as a communication tool or a funding mechanism. Given the large variation between Member States and sites the selection of the management plans to be reviewed was complex and consisted of two distinct steps. In a first step the Member States for which the review would take place were selected, in the next step the sites for review within the Member States were selected. The following criteria were used to select the Member States for this research:

1) Existence of a decision at Member State level to develop management plans for Natura 2000 sites (Bouwma et al., 2016);
2) Variation between the selected Member States with regard to the authoritative force of the planning systems
3) Existence of a more or less comparable socio-economic and ecological background in the selected Member States
4) Availability of a large number of plans within the selected Member States;
5) Easy accessibility of management plans, preferably through the internet.

Based on these criteria France and the Netherlands were chosen for the research. Whereas in France the management planning system primarily plays a role as a funding mechanism, in the Netherlands the plans have a more stringent legal status as a review of current land use is required and damaging activities can be forbidden, require a permit, or conditions can be set. Also conservation measures stipulated in the

---

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mining, quarrying &amp; energy production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Transportation &amp; service infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Urbanisation, residential &amp; commercial development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Use of living resources (other than agriculture &amp; forestry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Disturbances due to human activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Non-native species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Modification of natural conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Natural processes (excluding catastrophes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Geological events, natural catastrophes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Unknown threat or pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>No pressures or threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XE</td>
<td>Threats and pressures from outside the EU territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XO</td>
<td>Threats and pressures from outside the Member State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 The coding system of the Article 17 reporting for measures we deemed not suitable for our analysis. Whereas this system provides a sectoral typology, our typology is based on the character of the measure itself regardless of the sector executing the measure (see Supplementary Material A).
4 This typology is not mutually exclusive as overlap between codes is possible for instance pollution caused by agriculture. We addressed this by closely reviewing the text – if a sector was mentioned as threat the corresponding code was used, if no sector was indicated the specific theme code was used.
5 Note that this implies the possibility that certain threats, e.g. climate change, are not regarded as problems by the actors involved.
Box 1
Short description of the management planning system in France and the Netherlands.

Management planning in France

The management plans in France are called DOCOB (‘Document des Objectives, DOCOB’). In France the process started in 2000 (Alphandéry & Fortier, 2010) and for many of the sites the management plans have now been concluded. A guideline is available on both the content and how to organise the process of the development of these management plans (Souheil, Germain, Boivin, & Douillet, 2011). DOCOBs are prepared under the responsibility of the Prefect of each Department, assisted by a facilitator and with full stakeholder participation. In each site a Comité de Pilotage is established by a decree of the Prefect in which stakeholders are present. This committee is involved in drafting the plan and approves it. Once the DOCOB is approved, land owners or users can accept the provisions of the management plan by entering into different types of contracts, signed by the Prefect (the State) for a minimum of five years. The contracts include specification of the work to be carried out to conserve or restore habitats and species, the nature of funding from the State and the conditions of the payments. State funding can be in the form of investment subsidies or annual payments per hectare. Given the focus of the French planning system on funding the authoritative force of the system can be characterised as primarily financial.

Management planning in the Netherlands

In the Netherlands the decision to draft management plans is incorporated in law (Natuurbeschermingswet, 1998). Each management plan must indicate which current use is allowed, whether conditions apply and/or whether a permit is required. The responsibility for drafting the management plans is divided amongst fifteen different parties being the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality, the Ministry of Defence, the Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment or one of the 12 regional governments. Like in France there is a guideline on the content and drafting process of the management plan (Ministerie van Landbouw Natuurbeheer en Visserij, 2005). The organisation responsible for the drafting process provides the person(s) that will draft the plan (either their own staff of commissioned). In most sites, a ‘Steering Group’ has been established in which the main stakeholders in the area are represented as well as a ‘Klankbord Group’ that encompasses a larger group of involved stakeholders. The process in the majority of the sites in the Netherlands started in 2008/2009. The majority of the plans were approved in 2015 and 2016.

plan that need to be taken by the government (whether national, regional or local) are binding (see Box 1).

The next step involved the selection of sites within these two Member States. Overall there is a high variation between sites in terms of land cover, ownership, and the occurrence of Natura 2000 species and habitats. As management measures are likely to relate to the conservation features (e.g. habitat types and species) of the sites, sites were selected that contained similar habitat types occurring in both countries. In order to compare the two countries the review restricted itself to the measures taken for habitats present in both countries. Species were excluded as there are many species covered by the Directives and selecting a comparable sample would be difficult. Using the EEA database on Natura 2000 sites,6 30 sites were selected that contain 33 habitat types belonging to eight major ecosystem groups (Table 3). The site selection started with Dutch sites as the number of sites in France is lower. In a first step sites were selected that contain at least 5 habitat types that also occur in France. Then a French site with similar habitat types was selected for which a management plan was available. In case more options were available the site with the highest number of overlapping habitat types was selected. For all sites and for each of the 33 habitat types occurring in both countries, the corresponding measures were fed into a MS access database. Finally a check was undertaken to establish whether the selection covered most frequently occurring habitat types in both countries (e.g. habitat types that are present in more than 10 sites in the country).

4. Results

The review of the management plans shows that the content of the plans shows a fair amount of variation, both between sites in the same country as well as between France and Netherlands (see Supplementary material – Table A and B). The following overall picture at country level emerges. In both countries the majority of the proposed measures are conservation measures (51% France, 65% Netherlands; see Fig. 2). Only a limited number of restrictive measures is proposed (21% France, 12% Netherlands). The measures in the Netherlands are taken primarily to address pollution (both of air and water) and natural system modification (mostly related to changes in hydrology). In France the majority of measures relate to natural biotic and abiotic processes (e.g. to avoid succession) and measures to stimulate less intensive forest and agricultural management. Although similar problems are mentioned in the management plans in both countries, the main difference appears to be that in France the measures address mainly problems related to the biotic condition of the area itself (e.g. abandonment leading to succession as well as intensity of the management) whilst in the Netherlands measures are more often related to abiotic conditions of the site which tend to be influenced by land use activities in the surrounding area (pollution and natural system modifications) (see Fig. 3).

The majority of measures proposed in the plans in both countries are measures that can be carried out by a single party (Fig. 4). The majority of these measures in France and the Netherlands relate to mowing and grazing of grasslands and heathlands, removal of top soil and the removal of trees and bushes. Multi party measures mentioned are related to hydrological measures as well as measures for recreational activities.

The main authoritative mechanism used in both countries is financial (85% France; 84% Netherlands). Regulatory or communicative mechanisms are rarely used to ensure that measures are taken (Fig. 5). If regulatory force is used in France and the Netherlands, it is mainly to reduce recreation pressure in the areas based on pre-existing regulations. Additionally in the Netherlands, a few measures related to water quantity and quality can be regarded as regulatory due to the legal status of the plan.

Table 4 presents the outcome of the statistical tests performed to verify whether there are significant differences between the 15 French and 15 Dutch plans regarding action content, problems addressed, parties or authoritative mechanism used. A t-test was performed for data with normal distribution, a Mann-Whitney U test for data with a non-normal distribution.

The table shows that there are a number of differences. First, French management plans propose more restrictive measures than those in the Netherlands (p = 0.04). No difference is noticed in the percentage of

---

6 The European database on Natura 2000 sites consists of a compilation of the data submitted by Member States to the European Commission. It is managed by the EEA and available for downloading at https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/natura-8.
The Netherlands measures are proposed mainly to address pollution and natural system modifications. Second, in terms of the problems addressed, French plans include significantly more measures related to agriculture and forestry whilst in the Netherlands measures are proposed mainly to address pollution and natural system modifications.

There is no significant difference found in the number of restrictive measures included. Instead, the French plans show no significant difference in the number of restrictive measures included. Compared to French plans, the Dutch plans show no significant difference in the number of restrictive measures included. Instead, the Dutch plans mainly include conservation measures that are funded by financial incentives (carrots) and thus reflect the national authoritative force of the system.

This raises the question why in the Dutch situation the majority of the measures included in the French plans are based on financial incentives (carrots) and thus reflect the national authoritative force of the system. In the Dutch case the relationship between the national management system and the measures taken locally is less obvious. The Dutch management system was aimed at assessing the impact of various land use activities on protected habitats and providing clarity about the need to put forward restrictions on these activities. The plans were supposed to determine, by way of permits, which activities could or could not be allowed. However, almost no restrictive measures are actually included in the management plans. Compared to French plans, the Dutch plans show no significant difference in the number of restrictive measures included. Instead, the Dutch plans mainly include conservation measures that are funded by the government. This raises the question why in the Dutch situation the content of the management plans has shifted towards a system based on financial incentives and consequently a lower authoritative force than might be expected on the basis of the character of the national planning system.

To some extent the differences between the types of measures included in the French and Dutch plans can be explained by the particularities of the problems that are addressed. In France measures mainly relate to halting natural succession and to stimulate less intensive agricultural and forest management of the sites themselves. In the Netherlands the main problems for the sustainable conservation of Natura 2000 are pollution and natural system modification. These problems differ considerably in complexity and possible measures. In France many problems can be tackled through measures requiring single party agreement and for which compensation or subsidy
mechanisms are either in place or can easily be designed. Furthermore, and particularly for the measures to halt natural succession due to agricultural land abandonment, the interests of nature conservation are to a large extent in line with those of agricultural owners. In the Netherlands the solutions are more difficult due to the nature of the predominant problems of environmental pollution and water management.

One of the most prominent environmental pollution problems in the Netherlands is the high level of nitrogen deposition. Although high

**Table 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of plan</th>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of measure</td>
<td>Conservation measure</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restrictive measures*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems addressed</td>
<td>Agriculture*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modification of natural conditions*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural processes (excluding catastrophes)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pollution*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unspecified*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parties needed for execution</td>
<td>Single party</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple party</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative force Carrot</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative force Sermon</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative force Stick</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U Test (Critical Value = 64, p &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems addressed</td>
<td>Disturbances due to human activities</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forestry*</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-native species</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation &amp; service infrastructure</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urbanisation, residential &amp; commercial development</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of living resources (other than agriculture &amp; forestry)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
levels of nitrogen deposition occur in some parts of France too, the problem is much more prominent in the Netherlands. Nitrogen deposition has many sources ranging from local to global. Addressing it tends to require multiparty co-operation (Van Grinsven, Tiktak, & Rougoor, 2016; Vitousek et al., 1997). Water management also constitutes a complex governance problem that is strongly connected with intensive agriculture land use in the Netherlands (Bressers & Kux, 2004; Gaalen et al., 2016; Hoppe et al., 2016). Ensuring a favourable conservation status by addressing these problems would require stringent and far-reaching restrictive measures not only impacting stakeholders in the direct vicinity, but also in a wider area around the sites (Ministerie van Economische Zaken & Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu, 2017; Wamellink et al., 2013). When the extent of the problem of nitrogen deposition was acknowledged, the process of the development of management plans halted in many sites (Regiebureau Natura 2000, 2011Regiebureau Natura 2000, 2011). Eventually, a national approach to tackle this problem was elaborated, the Dutch National Programme for Nitrogen Deposition (Programmatische Aanpak Stikstof, PAS) (de Heer, Roozen, & Maas, 2017; Ministerie van Economische Zaken & Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu, 2017). This programme introduced a dual approach consisting of (1) an overall reduction of emissions and (2) a reduction of the negative effects of nitrogen through conservation measures that remove nitrogen from the habitat, like sod-cutting, mowing, or grazing. Due the expected positive effect of these measures on the conservation status of the Natura 2000 sites responsible authorities are currently able to allow activities that lead to nitrogen deposition. The policy came with a substantial budget to fund necessary measures and this might explain the shift to more financial, incentive-based measures in the Dutch management plans. Many of the proposed measures aim to reduce (in the short term) the effect of N-deposition and are funded through the PAS. Although that programme aims to reduce the total emission in the Netherlands, it is rather uncertain if it will indeed lead to the reduction levels needed to ensure the long term favourable conservation status of habitat types sensitive for N-deposition (PBL, 2014). Similar problems are also faced in relation to water quality in the Netherlands. Recent studies show that current policies will fail to meet the Water Framework Directive (WFD) objectives by 2027 (Gaalen et al., 2016; Van Grinsven et al., 2016). Nutrient levels, mainly from agricultural activities, are also too high and delimit ecological improvement; but no policy has been put in place to address this problem.

Another explanation might be that responsible authorities are reluctant to include restrictive measures in the management plans, because those would likely generate opposition from land owners, farmers or other users and the interest groups that represent them. The issue of land owners rights played a dominant role in both countries during the decision making process on the new management planning system (Alphandéry & Fortier, 2001; Nederlandse overheid, 2002). The French system that resulted from this discussion was based on the premises of compensation, whilst the Dutch system was not. Consequently, the French system provided the mechanism to negotiate at local level on compensation, whilst the Dutch system was not. Rather this requires a different approach that combines considerable resources, a higher authoritative force, and a high level of political commitment. Earlier criticism of collaborative planning of natural resources has already alluded to this problem by concluding that if success was achieved this could be attributed to the fact that the management agreed between the parties focused on obvious solutions to easy problems, the long-term effectiveness of which was not guaranteed (Kenney, 2000; Liefferink, 1999). The potential of stakeholder involvement for solving environmental problems depends on power relations amongst involved stakeholders and on the possibilities and limits decided at a national level, taking into account that various stakeholders, both at a local level and in national politics, might not favour sustainable solutions (Blondet et al., 2017; Goodwin, 1998; Jentoft, 2017; Sarvašová et al., 2017; Van Assche, Beunen, & Duineveld, 2016).

This article only reviews the Natura 2000 management planning systems of two of the twenty-eight EU Member States. This raises a question about the extent to which the results found may be expected to be representative for other Member States. First, the problems addressed in the management plans in France and the Netherlands are representative for the overall threats for Natura 2000 species and habitats in the entire EU (European Environmental Agency, 2015). High ranking pressures and threats reported for habitats are agriculture, modification of natural conditions, natural processes and pollution. These are therefore also the most urgent problems that management plans can be expected to address in other Member States. Second, almost all Member States are developing management plans, although not all of them have developed new management planning systems (Bouwma et al., 2016). In the majority of Member States the designation of Natura 2000 sites has increased the protected area in private
ownership. Consequently new management plans increasingly need to deal with private owners and their property rights. In sites with private ownership restrictive measures cannot be introduced without a discussion about subsidization and financial compensation. This is also reflected by the discussion at EU level on Natura 2000 that also centres on how land owners could be compensated (European Commission, 1998; Ferranti et al., 2014).

6. Conclusions

This article explores to what extent the authoritative force of the national planning system influences the types of measures included in the management plans that are developed for Natura 2000 sites. Our review of 30 management plans developed in two Member States reveals that both Dutch and French plans mainly propose conservation measures that can be executed by a single party and for which funding from the government is available. Only a limited number of restrictive measures is proposed. Restrictions are only included if they are accompanied by financial compensation. The study shows that largely irrespective of the original ambitions of the national authorities the main emphasis is on financial instruments. The authoritative force of the instruments for governing and managing Natura 2000 sites therefore seems rather low. This shifting emphasis, from sticks to carrots as main emphasis is on financial compensation. The authoritative force of the instruments for governing and managing Natura 2000 sites could be described as ‘the carotisation’ of nature conservation policy. The Natura 2000 management plans appear to have become a tool to elaborate the necessary pro-active measures in discussion with stakeholders, and to organize the financial opportunities for funding these measures. However, the extent to which the management plans can fulfill this role depends on their interaction with other policies and the availability of financial resources. Apart from that, it remains to be seen to what extent a largely carrot-based management of sites will provide sufficient protection to prevent further deterioration of habitats and species. This study suggests that moving back from carrots to sticks will require a significant tightening of the national boundary conditions for management plans.

On the basis of this study, it may be wondered to what extent management plans can help solving complex problems such as nitrogen deposition, that require the co-operation and agreement of many parties and more fundamental changes in current land use activities. The results indicate that this might be difficult, especially if no funding is available, because decision-makers seem reluctant to put in place restrictions to prevent further deterioration of protected habitats. Further research could therefore investigate how policies and measures are actually negotiated (process), the role that adjacent policies play in this, and the eventual effectiveness of those policies. Such research should take into account the extent to which national policies shape the possibilities and limits for stakeholder involvement and local decision-making. From a Natura 2000 perspective it would be most relevant to focus on complex problems related to natural systems modification, pollution and its relationship with agricultural practices, as these are major threats for Natura 2000 species and habitats EU-wide.
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