Deliverable D.2.2 Policy drivers of land use/landscape change and the role of institutions is now available.

This Volante deliverable D2.2 provides an overview and comparative analysis of the transposition and implementation of the two European policies: the Habitats Directive (HD) and the agri-environmental schemes (AES) under the second pillar of the common agricultural policy (CAP), and the role that institutions play in these processes. The report is based on the country reports from the case study countries (Netherlands (NL), Greece (GR), Romania (RO), Austria (AT) and Denmark (DK)). Each policy is analysed in separate parts of the deliverable and the results are compared in the common discussion and conclusion of report.

Both policies have been characterized according to a framework based on the type of policy intervention in question (regulatory, economic, advisory,) and addressed area of intervention (governance structure) in order to approach the subject of the policy (hierarchy, market, self-organized). (Theesfeldt et al 2010). This is supplemented by indicators of institutional fit, according to a typology made by Knill and Lehmkuhl (2002), defining three 'Europeanization mechanisms' that may be used or may define the level of change in domestic regulatory styles and structures required by regulations and directives that are implemented in member states. These mechanisms are: a) institutional compliance, b) changing domestic opportunity structures, and c) framing domestic beliefs and expectations.

Second, the EU policy transposition styles in each case study country are characterized according to a typology of compliance cultures in Member States in the EU (Falkner et al. 2007, Falkner and Trieb 2008). The following "worlds of compliance" are represented in the typology: a) Worlds of law observance, b) worlds of domestic policies, c) Worlds of transposition neglect, and d) Worlds of dead letter.

This framework proved adequate to carry out the analyses, but showed that the Worlds of Compliance theory (originally carried out on EU labour laws), did not reveal identical results for the two policies studied in the countries studied. The characterization per country seemingly depends on whether the implemented policy is regulatory or compensatory, and whether the policy implies national strict requirement for a mandatory institutional style or the policy barely demands changes of domestic institutions or constitutes a framing of domestic beliefs and expectations. Moreover, a certain 'spill over' from former domestic policies are identified. Hence, the present study supports that institutional issues are important aspects to address, if real policy outcomes are to be expected.

Implications are twofold:

Recent studies have called for more emphasis on the domestic scene, including domestic politics. Further studies on EU implementation could look more into aspects of implementation pathways (Liefferink) and 'policy sequencing' (Daugbjerg 2009)

Developing EU policy options, including ex-ante impact assessments should include institutional issues, as already foreseen by Theesfeld et al. For the Volante roadmap this implies that a set of issues are identified that may inform the design of the roadmap. These issues are categorized under five headings:

1. European level procedural issues for selection of policy option

2. European level policy issue, to be addressed in relation to different policy options

3. European level preparation of implementation of policy option

4. European level issues while implementing of a policy option

5. Domesticgovernmentframework

[Deliverable D.2.2 Policy drivers of land use/landscape change and the role of institutions](#)