

Appendix C. Coding frame

Result-based contract solutions – performance features		
Main categories	Subcategories	Description and examples
RB1: Means of AECPGs result measurement	- RB1_1: Direct measurement of AECPGs performance by specific indicators - RB1_2: Scoring and point systems linked to environmental outcome/ delivery - RB1_3: Assessment of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) out of data available at farm level - RB1_4: Indirect measurement of AECPGs provision	RB1 Indication of the way of result measurement in RB cases - RB1_1: Direct measurement of the results: Example: “milk-analysis”, “soil-analysis” - RB1_2: Using scoring or point systems: Example: “RBAPS Pilot scorecards” - RB1_3: Using Key Performance Indicators based on existing data: “Example: “Share of farm`s permanent grassland area” - RB1_4: Indirect indicators are more going in the direction of result-oriented: Example: “number of visitors”, “number of implemented activities”
RB2: Knowledge provision	- RB2_1: Advice (farm advisor, ecologist, etc.) - RB2_2: Training (initial training, theoretical or practical training) - RB2_3: Educational principles and material (guidelines, factsheets, ...) - RB2_4: (Technical) supporting tools (smartphone tool, documentation app)	RB2: Elements or tools for knowledge support - RB2_1: Involvement of some sort of advice: Example: “visits of ecologists” - RB2_2: Offering some practical or theoretical training for farmers: Example: “field-training” - RB2_3: Provision of material for farmers for education purposes: Example: “logbooks” - RB2_4: Provision of supporting instruments, such as apps: Example: “documentation app”
RB3: Degree of flexibility	- RB3_1: Flexibility in the choice of measures to be implemented - RB3_2: Free to decide when to undertake management practices (e.g. mowing) - RB3_3: Flexibility in the area/field/plot involved in the contract solution	RB3: Aspects or elements indicating flexibility - RB3_1: Statements indicating a flexibility in the choice of measures to be implemented: Example: “own decisions about management measures” - RB3_2: Statements indicating that land managers are free to decide when to undertake management practices.

Supplementary to: Eichhorn et al. (2026): Design principles for result-based, collective and value chain-based environment and climate contract solutions in agriculture and forestry: Learning from 44 case studies across Europe. Land Use Policy.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2026.108196>

Appendix C. Coding frame

	- RB3_4: Farmer/forester centered-approach (objectives, local situation; contract details incl. variable contract duration)	- RB3_3: Statements indicating that the land managers decide which fields/areas they participate in or implement some measures. - RB3_4: Aspects indicating that the measures are farmer or forester-centred regarding the objective, local situation, and have a say in the contract development. Example: “Locally applicable biodiversity targets in the pilot regions were selected”; “BRIDE is locally-led and farmer driven”
RB4: Building of social and cultural capital	- RB4_1: Learning by doing and observing - RB4_2: Social components (network, exchange) - RB4_3: Environmental rewards, awards	RB4: Statements indicating that besides financial benefit, farmers or foresters also built a form of social or cultural capital through participation in the contract solution - RB4_1: Statements indicating that through the implementation of measures increasing a change in specific AECPGs the connection to environment can be observed. Example: “Farmers of all different types have bought into, and see the benefits of, the biodiversity concept on the project which has resulted in a real shift in mindsets.” - RB4_2: Social components (network, exchange) - RB4_3: Environmental rewards, awards
RB5: Hybrid solutions	- RB5_1: Combination with action-oriented schemes and collective approaches - RB5_2: Market-orientation, input to Corporate Sustainability Reporting (CSRD)	- RB5_1: Combination with action-oriented schemes and collective approaches - RB5_2: Market-orientation, input to Corporate Sustainability Reporting (CSRD)

Collective contract solutions – performance features		
Main categories	Subcategories	Description and examples
CO1: Degree of formalization of the group	- CO1_1: Formalized collective entity/No formal collective entity	- CO1_1: Formalized collective entity: organization with legal entity. Example “association”, without a formal

Supplementary to: Eichhorn et al. (2026): Design principles for result-based, collective and value chain-based environment and climate contract solutions in agriculture and forestry: Learning from 44 case studies across Europe. Land Use Policy.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2026.108196>

Appendix C. Coding frame

	- CO1_2: Collective payments - CO1_3: Individual payments	collective entity. Example: “group”, loosely facilitated with a common goal of AECPG delivering - CO1_2: Payments are provided to the entity which is distributing the payment to the entity. - CO1-3: no feature of collective payment involved, individual payments
CO2: Inclusion of a coordinator	- CO2_1: With (external or a group member) / without - CO2_2: Tasks of the coordinator	- CO2_1: Three main actors involved in CO contracts: funding body, land managers and coordinator. Two options exist for the coordinator: Coordinator external or a member of the entity. Examples: “facilitator”, “intermediary” - CO2_2: The coordinator’s task described in the CS: - o recruiting farmers - o communication - o guaranteeing compliance - o coordinating activities - o management of funding - o support Benefits of the coordinator: promote participation, increase trust, reduce administration for farmers, support knowledge exchange
CO3: Enabling common management	- CO3_1: Common goal/vision - CO3_2: Nature management plan - CO3_4: Catalogue of measures - CO3_5: Collective management requirements	- CO3_1: Statements indicating that there is a common goal/vision within the CS. Benefits of involving common goals, such as trust, efficiency, and better targeting of actions. - CO3_2: Contract solutions involving a concrete (regional) nature management plan, the plan provides precise measures. Example: “The plan must also clarify which measures are required for this, and how and where they are implemented.” - CO3_4: Catalogue of measures provided for farmers. Example: “catalogue of measures that farmers can or

Supplementary to: Eichhorn et al. (2026): Design principles for result-based, collective and value chain-based environment and climate contract solutions in agriculture and forestry: Learning from 44 case studies across Europe. Land Use Policy.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2026.108196>

Appendix C. Coding frame

		should apply. These are specified as management requirements.” - CO3_5: Statements indicating that collective management requirements are defined. Example: “at least 26% of the area of the collective zone must be dedicated to crops favorable to the European Hamster”)”
CO4: Group composition	- CO4_1: Exclusively farmers / foresters - CO4_2: Involvement of NGOs, other local actors - CO4_3: Farm characteristics - CO4_4: Attitudes	- CO4_1: Statements regarding who is part of the group: Exclusively farmers/foresters - CO4_2: Involvement of NGOs, other local actors, see connection with CO2_1 - CO4_3: Farm characteristics: size, farming practices, farming specifications. - CO4_4: Statements indicating that shared attitudes and a common vision are present and increase success. Example: “Cohesion of the group as members have common goals which are easier to achieve as part of a group”, or if absent, can be perceived as a challenge
CO5: Knowledge diffusion and exchange	- CO5_1: Settings of the meeting - CO5_2: Peer-to-peer exchange - CO5_3: Group bonding and networking	- CO5_1: Settings of the meeting, who coordinates it, and how often they take place (monthly, irregular, etc.) - CO5_2: Peer-to-peer exchange to discuss various practices. Example “[...] group was set up to improve knowledge sharing and provide training in farm practices aimed at improving natural flood management” - CO5_3: Statements indicating that the exchange and meetings are fostering group bonding and networking

Appendix C. Coding frame

Value chain-based contract solutions – performance features		
Main categories	Subcategories	Description and examples
VC1: Relationship between AECPGs and private good production	- VC1_1: Type of private good - VC1_2: Type of public good - VC1_3: Environmental standards: Existing certification standards (e.g. organic farming)	- VC1_1: AECPG delivery is often coupled to production of private goods such as “honey”, “meat”, “crops”, and “olives” - VC1_2: Via the production of the private goods, several AECPGs are produced, such as “animal welfare”, “water protection”, and “quality and security of products” - VC1_3: Statements indicating that specific environmental standards are included. Example: “organic certification”, statements regarding benefits and attributes of the standard
VC2: Incentive system	- VC2_1: Price premium - VC2_2: Purchase guarantee	- VC2_1: Statements indicating price premium as well as benefits and risks of price premium. Example: “Strength: Fair price premium at farm and processing levels, secures economic viability of the chain members” - VC2_2: Statements indicating that farmers receive a purchase guarantee
VC3: Value-chain characteristics	- VC3_1: Stages included - VC3_2: Regionality	- VC3_1: Aspects indicating value-chain characteristics: Short value chains (Seller-buyer relationship), long value chains (covering all downstream stages from producers to consumers), Actors involved in the value chain, such as “NGOs”, “research partners”, “third-party control body” - VC3_2: Statements indicating a regional focus/connection of the CS: Benefits of the regional focus of the value chain, such as personal contracts, benefits for the regional economy, selling argument,

Supplementary to: Eichhorn et al. (2026): Design principles for result-based, collective and value chain-based environment and climate contract solutions in agriculture and forestry: Learning from 44 case studies across Europe. Land Use Policy.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2026.108196>

Appendix C. Coding frame

VC4: Marketing	- VC4_1: Branding - VC4_2: Communication strategy - VC4_3: Highlighting of additional product qualities	- VC4_1: CS involving some specific branding activities, such as creating a logo - VC4_2: Statements indicating that some communication strategy was involved. Example: “The initiative encompasses a communication strategy targeted towards the consumers.” - VC4_3: Highlighting of additional product qualities such as environmental advantages, higher product quality. Example: “The quality of the honey is very high due the characteristics of the region”
VC5: Collective element (cooperation in VC contract solutions)	- VC5_1: Bargaining weight - VC5_2: Production benefits - VC5_3: Networking and knowledge sharing	- VC5_1: Statements indicating that cooperative elements were included to increase bargaining power and receive better prices. “The Cooperative program provides an alternative for the farmers to the less profitable value chain in the global competitive market.” - VC5_2: Production benefits, such as joint marketing, storage, processing and distribution of goods. - VC5_3: Statements indicating that the collective element is increasing networking and knowledge sharing among participants, Example: “Knowledge transfer between organic producers”