



ForestAgri GREENNUDGE

www.greennudge.eu

2nd Pan-European Green Nudges Conference

POLICY HACKATHON (SUMMARY REPORT)

21 May 2026

Authors:

Raquel Álvarez Urdiola, Alun Jones (CIHEAM Zaragoza).

Policy Hackathon Rapporteurs:

Jesús Barreiro-Hurle (EC JRC), Raquel Álvarez Urdiola (CIHEAM Zaragoza), Jacopo Bonan (CMCC) and Owen Griffiths (ADAS).

HOW TO QUOTE THIS DOCUMENT:

Álvarez Urdiola, R., and Jones, A. (2026). Summary Report: *Second Pan-European Green Nudges Conference – Policy Hackathon Summary Report*, 21 May 2026. Horizon Europe project ForestAgriGreenNudge (GA number 101133987)



**Funded by
the European Union**

ForestAgriGreenNudge project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme (grant agreement 101133987) and UK Research and Innovation (grant agreement 10133630).

Content

Overview and Methodology	3
Purpose and Objectives	3
Format and Organisation	3
Participant Composition	3
Reporting Approach	4
Group 1. System-Specific Green Nudges: Policy Impacts and Scaling	5
1.1. Session Overview	5
1.2. Participant Profile	5
1.3. Discussion Summary	5
1.4. Best Practices Highlighted During the Session	6
1.5. Main Conclusions from the Session	6
1.6. Key Policy Recommendations	6
Group 2. Behavioural Segmentation: Acceptance & Adoption of Green Nudges	7
2.1. Session Overview	7
2.2. Participant Profile	7
2.3. Discussion Summary	7
2.4. Best Practices Highlighted During the Session	8
2.5. Main Conclusions from the Session	8
2.6. Key Policy Recommendations	8
Group 3. Green Nudges, Digital Tools and AKIS: Behavioural Change and Advisory Systems in the Green Transition	9
3.1. Session Overview	9
3.2. Participant Profile	9
3.3. Discussion Summary	9
3.4. Best Practices Highlighted During the Session	10
3.5. Main Conclusions from the Session	10
3.6. Key Policy Recommendations	10
Group 4. Governance, Ethics & Co-Creation (Business Models & Social Innovations) of Green Nudges	11
4.1. Session Overview	11
4.2. Participant Profile	11
4.3. Discussion Summary	11
4.4. Best Practices Highlighted During the Session	12
4.5. Main Conclusions from the Session	12
4.6. Key Policy Recommendations	12
Overall Conclusions	13
Annex 1 – List of participant organisations	14

Overview and methodology

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The Policy Hackathon was organised as an interactive multi-stakeholder exercise designed to explore the role of behavioural approaches and green nudges in supporting sustainability transitions within agricultural and forestry systems. The activity brought together policy makers, policy advisors, researchers, representatives of advisory services, farmers, foresters and other relevant stakeholders from both EU and non-EU countries to exchange perspectives, identify barriers and opportunities, and discuss policy-relevant recommendations.

The primary objective of the Policy Hackathon was to facilitate an open dialogue between actors operating at different levels of governance and implementation. By gathering participants with diverse institutional backgrounds and practical experience, the exercise aimed to generate evidence-based insights on how behavioural approaches can be integrated into policy design, implementation and governance processes.

FORMAT AND ORGANISATION

The Policy Hackathon was structured around four thematic discussion groups, each addressing a specific dimension of behavioural interventions and green nudges:

1. **Group 1 – System-Specific Green Nudges: Policy Impacts and Scaling**
2. **Group 2 – Behavioural Segmentation: Acceptance and Adoption of Green Nudges**
3. **Group 3 – Green Nudges: AKIS and Digital Tools**
4. **Group 4 – Governance, Ethics and Co-Creation of Green Nudges (Business Models and Social Innovations)**

Each group was facilitated by an appointed Chair responsible for guiding the discussion and ensuring balanced participation among attendees. In parallel, a Rapporteur documented the main points raised, areas of agreement and divergence, and key conclusions emerging from the discussion.

To stimulate debate and ensure a productive exchange, a number of key stakeholders received a set of guiding questions in advance of the session. These participants initiated the discussion by providing reflections from their respective areas of expertise. However, all sessions were conducted as open discussions, allowing all participants to contribute equally and share experiences, concerns and recommendations.

PARTICIPANT COMPOSITION

Across the four thematic discussion groups, participants represented European institutions, national and regional public authorities, research organisations, universities, advisory and extension services, civil society organisations, and practitioner communities from the agriculture and forestry sectors.

European policy perspectives were represented through contributions from officials and experts affiliated with the European Commission, including DG AGRI and the Joint Research Centre (JRC). National and regional governance perspectives were brought by representatives of ministries and public authorities responsible for agricultural, rural development and forestry policies.

The research and academic community was represented by participants from organisations including KU Leuven, *Université catholique de Louvain*, *Universitat Jaume I*, ILVO and other research institutions working on behavioural science, governance, sustainability and agricultural innovation. Expertise in behavioural insights and policy evaluation contributed to discussions on the design, implementation and scaling of green nudges.

The advisory and innovation support dimension was reflected through the participation of organisations such as Teagasc, Inagro and EUFRAS, alongside experts working on Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation Systems (AKIS). These perspectives provided practical insights into knowledge transfer, advisory services and farmer engagement.

The Hackathon also benefited from contributions from international organisations and European stakeholder networks, including the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the European Environmental Bureau (EEB), the European Agricultural Research Association (EARA) and the International Biocontrol Manufacturers Association (IBMA). These participants contributed perspectives on policy implementation, sustainability transitions, innovation uptake and stakeholder engagement.

Practical experience from the agricultural and forestry sectors was provided by farmers, foresters and members of the ForestAgriGreenNudge stakeholder network, ensuring that discussions remained grounded in the realities of land management and day-to-day decision-making.

In total, the four discussion groups involved **50 participants**, in addition to the appointed Chairs and Rapporteurs. Group participation ranged from 9 participants in Group 1, 12 in Group 2, 15 in Group 3 and 14 in Group 4, ensuring a balanced and interactive exchange across all thematic areas (**Table 1**).

Table 1. Overview of the Policy Hackathon discussion groups, including thematic focus, facilitation roles and number of participants.

Group	Moderation: Chairs (C), Rapporteurs (R)	Number of participants
<i>System-Specific Green Nudges: Policy Impacts & Scaling</i>	C: Alun Jones (CIHEAM Zaragoza, FAGN) R: Jesús Barreiro-Hurle (EC JRC, PRUDENT)	9
<i>Behavioural Segmentation: Acceptance & Adoption of Green Nudges</i>	C: Simone Cerroni (University of Trento, PRUDENT) R: Raquel Álvarez Urdiola (CIHEAM Zaragoza, FAGN)	12
<i>Green Nudges: AKIS & Digital Tools</i>	C: Mark Ramsden (ADAS, FAGN) R: Jacopo Bonan (CMCC, PRUDENT)	15
<i>Governance, Ethics and Co-Creation of Green Nudges (Business Models and Social Innovations)</i>	C: Erwin Wauters (ILVO, PRUDENT) R: Owen Griffiths (ADAS, FAGN)	14

REPORTING APPROACH

The following sections summarise the discussions held within each thematic group. The summaries synthesise the main issues raised, key areas of consensus, and policy-relevant reflections emerging from the exchanges. They are based on the notes prepared by the Rapporteurs and, where applicable, complemented by evidence from the session discussions.

The discussion was conducted under the Chatham House Rule: Contributions presented in this report are therefore anonymised and synthesised as collective reflections rather than being attributed to individual participants.

Group 1. System-Specific Green Nudges: Policy Impacts and Scaling

1.1. SESSION OVERVIEW

This session explored how behavioural approaches and green nudges can support sustainability transitions in agriculture and forestry through their integration into existing policy frameworks. Discussions focused on the conditions for successful behavioural interventions, the governance and implementation barriers limiting their uptake, and the opportunities for embedding behavioural insights within the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and other policy instruments. Behavioural approaches were examined as complementary tools that can strengthen existing governance mechanisms, advisory systems and policy implementation, with particular attention to opportunities for scaling their application in practice.

1.2. PARTICIPANT PROFILE

The discussion group comprised nine participants, in addition to the appointed Chair and Rapporteur, representing European institutions, national authorities, research organisations and stakeholder networks. Organisations represented included the European Commission (DG AGRI, DG ENV and the Joint Research Centre), the Ministry of Rural Development and Food (Greece), the Polish Agricultural Advisory Centre (KPODR), KU Leuven Public Governance Institute, CIHEAM Zaragoza, the Agricultural University of Athens, Forest Research, Green & Digital and Racines de France, providing complementary perspectives on behavioural interventions from policy, research and implementation.

1.3. DISCUSSION SUMMARY

The discussion revolved around **three interrelated themes**: i) the conditions for successful behavioural interventions, ii) the governance barriers that limit their uptake, and iii) the opportunities for integrating behavioural insights within the CAP and wider agricultural systems.

Green nudges were considered most effective when embedded within existing policy frameworks rather than implemented as isolated or short-term projects. Behavioural interventions are more likely to generate lasting change when they build on established administrative processes, advisory systems and policy instruments. Their adoption by public administrations also depends on clear evidence that they contribute to policy objectives and deliver tangible outcomes.

Timing and contextual relevance emerged as essential conditions for success, as well as trust and credibility. Interventions should align with farmers' decision-making cycles and address priorities that are meaningful within specific farming and forestry contexts. Behavioural messages are unlikely to succeed if they are perceived as disconnected from everyday realities or fail to demonstrate practical and economic benefits. In addition, farmers are more likely to adopt new practices when they can observe results directly, learn from peers and receive support from trusted intermediaries. Effective advisory services therefore extend beyond technical guidance, providing assistance with administrative procedures, facilitating collective learning and supporting decision-making throughout the implementation process. This highlighted the need for advisors with behavioural competences capable of translating policy objectives into practical actions.

At the governance level, participants pointed to the disconnect between policy design and implementation. Policy intentions formulated at European level are often reshaped as they pass through national, regional and local governance layers, while administrative complexity and limited opportunities for experimentation further constrain implementation. Simplification, flexibility by design and greater scope for testing innovative approaches were identified as important enabling conditions.

The discussion concluded that behavioural approaches should complement rather than replace existing financial and regulatory instruments. Opportunities were identified to integrate behavioural principles into eco-schemes, agri-environment-climate measures (AECMs), advisory services and CAP Strategic Plans, while pilot schemes, regulatory sandboxes and regional experimentation were seen as valuable mechanisms for testing and scaling behaviourally informed policy design.

1.4. BEST PRACTICES HIGHLIGHTED DURING THE SESSION

- **Demonstration farms and peer-to-peer learning:** Farmers' confidence in new practices increases when they can observe results directly on farms and learn from other farmers.
- **Landscape-level advisory approaches:** Regional intermediary organisations working with groups of farmers were highlighted as effective mechanisms for addressing shared environmental challenges such as erosion.
- **Collective advisory services:** Group-based support and training were seen as more conducive to behavioural change than purely individualised advisory models.
- **Provision of practical opportunities:** Examples such as shared access to specialised machinery and free accompanying advice were presented as ways to reduce barriers to adoption.
- **Regional experimentation spaces:** Participants highlighted the value of pilot territories and local experimentation frameworks that allow farmers and authorities to test innovative practices under more flexible conditions.

1.5. MAIN CONCLUSIONS FROM THE SESSION

- Green nudges are most effective when integrated into existing policy and governance frameworks rather than implemented as standalone initiatives.
- Trust, timing and relevance to farmers' real-world decision-making contexts are essential conditions for successful behavioural interventions.
- Advisory and intermediary organisations play a pivotal role in translating policy objectives into practical action and supporting behavioural change.
- Administrative complexity and the gap between policy design and implementation remain major barriers to the uptake of sustainable practices.
- Behavioural approaches should complement existing CAP instruments and be tested through pilot schemes, experimentation spaces and CAP Strategic Plans.

1.6. KEY POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Embed behavioural design within existing CAP instruments.** Integrate behavioural principles into eco-schemes, AECMs, advisory services and other CAP interventions rather than creating separate behavioural programmes.
- **Strengthen behaviourally informed advisory systems.** Support advisors and intermediary organisations that can provide technical guidance, administrative support, collective facilitation and long-term accompaniment to farmers and foresters.
- **Reduce administrative friction.** Simplify procedures, improve accessibility of support measures and design implementation processes that minimise unnecessary cognitive and bureaucratic burdens.
- **Create spaces for experimentation.** Enable Member States and regions to test behaviourally informed approaches through pilot projects, regulatory sandboxes and locally adapted experimentation frameworks.
- **Invest in peer learning and collective action.** Support demonstration activities, farmer-to-farmer learning and landscape-level cooperation mechanisms that strengthen trust and accelerate the diffusion of sustainable practices.

Group 2. Behavioural Segmentation: Acceptance & Adoption of Green Nudges

2.1. SESSION OVERVIEW

This session focused on how behavioural segmentation can improve the acceptance and adoption of green nudges in agriculture and forestry. Discussions examined the role of context, trust and local realities in shaping behavioural responses, as well as the opportunities and limitations of segmentation as a policy tool. Particular attention was given to ethical considerations, co-creation and the integration of behavioural approaches into future CAP and agri-environmental policies.

2.2. PARTICIPANT PROFILE

The discussion group comprised twelve participants, in addition to the appointed Chair and Rapporteur, representing European institutions, international organisations, academia, agricultural and forestry practitioners, and stakeholder networks. Organisations represented included the European Commission (former DG AGRI), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), *Université catholique de Louvain*, the Organic Centre (Poland), the State Forests Service (Poland), *Association d'Éducation Environnementale pour les Futures Générations* (AEEFG), CIHEAM Zaragoza, alongside members of the ForestAgriGreenNudge stakeholder network, bringing complementary perspectives from policy, behavioural science and practical land management.

2.3. DISCUSSION SUMMARY

The discussion focused on how behavioural segmentation can improve the design and implementation of green nudges while remaining practical, ethical and responsive to the diversity of farming and forestry systems.

There was broad consensus that context is fundamental to successful behavioural interventions. Segmentation can increase the relevance and effectiveness of policy measures by recognising that farmers and foresters differ in their motivations, risk perceptions, production systems and socio-economic circumstances. At the same time, participants cautioned that increasingly sophisticated segmentation may become costly, difficult to implement and challenging to scale across diverse contexts.

Trust was recognised as a central condition for acceptance, closely linked to ethical considerations and effective communication. Behavioural interventions are more likely to succeed when they are transparent, developed collaboratively and communicated through trusted local actors. Peer influence, community leaders and ambassador-based approaches were identified as valuable mechanisms for encouraging behavioural change, while recognising that farmers' decisions are shaped not only by social norms but also by economic realities and local conditions. Behavioural approaches were also recognised as common practice in commercial settings, yet they often face greater scrutiny when applied in public policy. Transparency, stakeholder involvement and clear communication were therefore considered essential to building legitimacy and avoiding perceptions of manipulation. Participants further noted that language and framing can strongly influence acceptance, suggesting that terms such as *nudge* or even *green* may generate resistance in some contexts, whereas concepts linked to sustainability, resilience and shared benefits may resonate more positively.

Looking ahead, participants emphasised that behavioural segmentation should support broader policy objectives rather than becoming an end in itself. Future CAP and agri-environmental policies should better integrate environmental, economic and social objectives while remaining adaptable to local

realities. A progressive approach based on testing, learning and continuous stakeholder feedback was considered more effective than highly complex interventions designed from the outset.

2.4. BEST PRACTICES HIGHLIGHTED DURING THE SESSION

- **Ambassador-based approaches**, where respected local farmers or foresters encourage behavioural change through peer influence and practical demonstration.
- **FAO Farmer Field Schools**, illustrating the value of experiential and peer-to-peer learning in supporting behavioural change.
- **Demonstration farms in Poland**, showing how behavioural segmentation can recognise different motivations, risk profiles and innovation pathways among farmers.
- **Co-creation cycles**, involving stakeholders in understanding local needs, designing interventions, and testing and refining solutions before wider implementation.
- **Incremental policy experimentation**, using pilot projects to adapt behavioural interventions before scaling them across different farming and forestry contexts.

2.5. MAIN CONCLUSIONS FROM THE SESSION

- Behavioural segmentation can improve the relevance and effectiveness of green nudges when adapted to local contexts and stakeholder motivations.
- Trust, transparency and co-creation are fundamental to achieving socially accepted and ethically sound behavioural interventions.
- Overly complex segmentation approaches risk reducing scalability, increasing implementation costs and generating resistance.
- Communication, framing and the choice of language can significantly influence the acceptance of behavioural policies.
- Future CAP and agri-environmental policies should integrate behavioural approaches that balance environmental, economic and social objectives while remaining practical and adaptable.

2.6. KEY POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

- Tailor behavioural interventions to local contexts, motivations and risk perceptions rather than relying on one-size-fits-all approaches.
- Involve farmers and foresters throughout the policy cycle to strengthen trust, legitimacy and the effectiveness of behavioural interventions.
- Promote transparency in the design and communication of behavioural policies to improve public acceptance.
- Avoid overly complex segmentation systems that are difficult to scale or implement effectively.
- Support local ambassadors, demonstration farms and peer-learning networks as trusted channels for behavioural change.
- Pilot and refine behaviourally informed interventions before scaling them within future CAP and agri-environmental policy frameworks.

Group 3. Green Nudges, Digital Tools and AKIS: Behavioural Change and Advisory Systems in the Green Transition

3.1. SESSION OVERVIEW

This session examined how behavioural approaches, digital tools and AKIS can work together to support the uptake of sustainable agricultural and forestry practices. Discussions focused on the role of advisory systems, digital innovation and stakeholder engagement in overcoming behavioural barriers, building trust and facilitating the adoption of green nudges across diverse farming and forestry contexts.

3.2. PARTICIPANT PROFILE

Fifteen participants took part in the session, alongside the appointed Chair and Rapporteur. They represented European institutions, research organisations, advisory services, industry associations and civil society organisations. Organisations represented included the European Commission (DG AGRI), ILVO, Teagasc, Inagro, EUFRAS, the European Environmental Bureau (EEB), the International Biocontrol Manufacturers Association (IBMA), the European Alliance for Regenerative Agriculture (EARA), the Plants for the Future European Technology Platform, the IRWIR Polish Academy of sciences, ADAS, KPODR, the Agricultural University of Athens (AUA), CONSULAI and Forest Research, providing complementary expertise in agricultural innovation, advisory systems, sustainable crop protection and policy development.

3.3. DISCUSSION SUMMARY

Discussions centred on how behavioural insights can strengthen AKIS by improving the way knowledge, advisory support and digital innovation reach farmers and foresters. Participants agreed that behavioural change depends on effective collaboration between researchers, advisors, farmers and other actors across the agrifood chain, with AKIS providing an important framework for connecting these communities.

A recurring theme was that digital tools alone are unlikely to change behaviour. While technologies can improve access to information and decision support, their effectiveness depends on trusted advisory relationships, clear communication and opportunities for practical learning. Behavioural barriers such as status quo bias, risk aversion and uncertainty require personalised support rather than simply providing more information. Participants stressed that farmers need confidence not only in the recommendations provided by digital tools but also in how their data are collected, managed and used. Transparency regarding data ownership, commercial interests and governance arrangements was therefore considered essential for maintaining participation and long-term engagement.

Co-creation was identified as another critical success factor. Participants emphasised that digital tools and behavioural interventions should be developed with, rather than for, their intended users. Moreover, AKIS should recognise that innovation pathways involve a wide range of actors beyond farmers, including advisors, suppliers, cooperatives and other agrifood stakeholders who influence management decisions.

Demonstration activities and peer learning were consistently recognised as the most effective mechanisms for supporting behavioural change. Pilot farms, field demonstrations and farmer-to-farmer exchanges allow new practices to be tested under real conditions, helping to reduce uncertainty and increase confidence in sustainable innovations.

Overall, participants highlighted the importance of maintaining an inclusive AKIS that supports different farmer profiles, particularly smaller-scale and risk-averse producers. Younger farmers and advisors were recognised as important drivers of innovation, but behavioural and digital approaches should remain accessible to all users through continuous learning, trusted advisory support and practical demonstration.

3.4. BEST PRACTICES HIGHLIGHTED DURING THE SESSION

- **Integrated Pest Management (IPM)** was highlighted as an example of how behavioural approaches, advisory services and digital knowledge platforms can work together to support sustainable farming practices.
- **Demonstration farms and "seeing is believing" approaches** were repeatedly identified as the most effective means of encouraging the adoption of biocontrol solutions and other sustainable practices.
- **Cross-border knowledge exchange initiatives** under Horizon Europe were presented as valuable mechanisms for sharing experiences through study visits, case studies and national dissemination activities.
- **Forestry demonstration networks** illustrated how practical exchanges and pilot activities can also support behavioural change within forest management systems.
- **The CECRA (Certificate for European Consultants in Rural Areas)** programme was recognised as a valuable initiative for strengthening advisors' communication, facilitation and behavioural competences.

3.5. MAIN CONCLUSIONS FROM THE SESSION

- Effective AKIS depend on trust, co-creation and collaboration between farmers, advisors, researchers and other agrifood actors.
- Digital tools are valuable enablers but are insufficient on their own to overcome behavioural barriers and stimulate sustainable practice adoption.
- Demonstration activities, pilot farms and peer-to-peer learning remain the most effective approaches for encouraging behavioural change.
- Transparency regarding agricultural data, digital platforms and commercial interests is essential for maintaining trust and participation.
- Inclusive AKIS should respond to the needs of diverse farmer profiles while supporting younger generations as drivers of innovation.

3.6. KEY POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

- Strengthen co-creation within AKIS by systematically involving farmers, advisors and other agrifood actors in the development of digital tools and behavioural interventions.
- Invest in behavioural, communication and facilitation skills for advisors alongside technical training.
- Expand support for demonstration farms, peer-learning networks and pilot activities that enable farmers to test innovations under real-world conditions.
- Establish transparent governance frameworks for agricultural data, ensuring clarity on data ownership, access and use.
- Design AKIS services that are accessible to diverse farmer profiles, including smaller-scale, traditional and risk-averse producers.

Group 4. Governance, Ethics & Co-Creation (Business Models & Social Innovations) of Green Nudges

4.1. SESSION OVERVIEW

This session addressed the governance, ethical and co-creation dimensions of green nudges, focusing on how legitimacy, transparency and stakeholder engagement can strengthen behaviourally informed policies. Discussions considered whether ethical principles should underpin the design and implementation of behavioural interventions, the potential need for an EU-level ethical framework, and how behavioural approaches can be integrated into existing policy instruments, particularly the CAP.

4.2. PARTICIPANT PROFILE

The session brought together fourteen participants, alongside the appointed Chair and Rapporteur, representing European institutions, research organisations, universities, advisory organisations and international bodies. Organisations represented included the European Commission (DG AGRI and the Joint Research Centre), FAO, ILVO, Forest Research, ADAS, Green & Digital, LAB University of Applied Sciences, *Université libre de Bruxelles* (ULB), *Universitat Jaume I*, the Jožef Stefan Institute, Earthscape Network, the Flanders Research Institute for Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (ILVO) – Social Sciences Unit, and BSB. Together, they contributed expertise in behavioural science, governance, ethics, public policy and agricultural innovation.

4.3. DISCUSSION SUMMARY

Discussions centred on the relationship between legitimacy, ethics and the effectiveness of behaviourally informed interventions. Participants challenged the common assumption that transparency necessarily reduces the effectiveness of nudges, arguing instead that legitimacy should be viewed as a prerequisite for long-term behavioural change. Behavioural interventions were considered more likely to succeed when their objectives, methods and expected outcomes are openly communicated and aligned with the interests of those affected.

Transparency emerged as a recurring theme throughout the session. Participants emphasised that involving stakeholders from the earliest stages of policy and project design strengthens procedural legitimacy, builds trust and reduces perceptions of manipulation. Co-creation was therefore viewed not only as a participatory process but also as an essential component of ethical behavioural design.

The discussion also explored whether an EU-level ethical framework for behavioural interventions should be established. While participants agreed that practices involving manipulation or conflicting with the interests of those being nudged should be avoided, most considered that the current evidence base remains insufficient to justify binding regulation. Instead, there was broad support for developing shared principles or best practice guidelines that could assist Member States and policymakers in applying behavioural insights transparently and responsibly.

Several participants noted that valuable lessons could be drawn from disciplines such as medicine and psychology, where ethical standards, informed consent and professional guidance are already well established. Participants also highlighted the need to recognise differences between stakeholder groups and to ensure that behavioural interventions remain proportionate, transparent and tailored to the needs of those they intend to support.

Building on these discussions, participants agreed that behavioural elements should be embedded within existing policies and projects from the outset rather than added retrospectively. Future research should further examine the relationship between ethics and effectiveness, providing stronger evidence to inform guidance and future governance frameworks.

4.4. BEST PRACTICES HIGHLIGHTED DURING THE SESSION

- **Co-creation from the earliest stages of policy and project design**, ensuring transparency, stakeholder ownership and procedural legitimacy throughout the intervention process.
- **Low-friction opt-out mechanisms**, allowing participants to retain autonomy while supporting trust and acceptance of behaviourally informed interventions.
- **Application of behavioural elements within existing CAP instruments**, such as redesigning communication, simplifying application processes and providing timely feedback, rather than creating new schemes.
- **Interdisciplinary learning from medicine and psychology**, particularly regarding ethical governance, informed consent and professional standards for behavioural interventions.
- **Best practice guidelines**, rather than binding regulation, as a practical first step for supporting ethical and transparent implementation across Member States.

4.5. MAIN CONCLUSIONS FROM THE SESSION

- Ethics and transparency should be considered conditions for effective behavioural interventions rather than constraints on their implementation.
- Co-creation and stakeholder engagement strengthen legitimacy, trust and the long-term effectiveness of green nudges.
- Behavioural interventions should always operate in the interests of those being nudged, with transparency and easy opt-out mechanisms where appropriate.
- At this stage, ethical principles and best practice guidelines were considered more appropriate than binding regulation for governing behavioural interventions.
- Further research is needed to better understand how ethical design influences the effectiveness and public acceptance of green nudges.

4.6. KEY POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

- Consider what ethical experiments could take place to show the impact of ethical vs unethical nudges and how this could be added to the research mix.
- Consider where other disciplines (particularly medicine or psychology) already have established ethical guidelines and what we could learn from this.
- Consider how behavioural elements could be introduced into pre-existing projects or should be embedded at the start of projects.
- Progress best practice guidelines for the use of nudges and how they should provide for transparency and governance within their work, allowing for nudgees interests to be protected.

Overall conclusions

The Policy Hackathon provided an opportunity to bring together policymakers, researchers, advisors, farmers, foresters and other stakeholders to reflect on the role of behavioural approaches in supporting the transition towards more sustainable agricultural and forestry systems. Although each discussion group addressed a distinct thematic area, several common messages emerged across the sessions.

First, participants consistently agreed that **behavioural approaches should be regarded as complementary policy instruments rather than standalone solutions**. Green nudges are most effective when integrated into existing governance frameworks, advisory systems and financial instruments, particularly within the CAP. Rather than replacing regulatory or economic measures, behavioural interventions can strengthen their implementation by reducing friction, improving communication and supporting more informed decision-making.

Second, **trust was identified as a prerequisite for successful behavioural change, as well as ethics and legitimacy**. Whether discussing policy design, behavioural segmentation, digital advisory tools or ethical governance, participants repeatedly emphasised that trust is built through transparency, stakeholder engagement and long-term relationships. Participants recognised that transparency, fairness and respect for individual autonomy should not be viewed as constraints on behavioural interventions but as conditions that strengthen their credibility, public acceptance and long-term effectiveness. While opinions differed regarding the need for future regulation, there was broad support for developing common principles and best practice guidelines to promote the responsible use of behavioural insights in policymaking. **Co-creation** emerged as a recurring principle, with participants highlighting the importance of involving end users from the earliest stages of policy and intervention design to ensure both legitimacy and practical relevance.

A third cross-cutting finding concerned the **importance of context**. Behavioural interventions should recognise the diversity of agricultural and forestry systems, adapting to local conditions, socio-economic realities and the varying motivations of farmers and foresters. One-size-fits-all approaches were considered unlikely to achieve widespread uptake, while tailored interventions informed by behavioural segmentation and local knowledge were regarded as more effective and socially acceptable.

The discussions also highlighted the **central role of AKIS and advisory services in translating behavioural insights into practice**. Participants stressed that knowledge transfer depends not only on technical information but also on communication skills, peer learning, demonstration activities and trusted intermediaries. Digital tools can support these processes, but technology alone is insufficient to overcome behavioural barriers without appropriate advisory support and transparent data governance.

Finally, participants acknowledged that **achieving sustainable transitions requires continuous learning and experimentation**. Behaviourally informed interventions should be tested, evaluated and refined through pilot projects, demonstration activities and iterative policy design before being implemented at larger scale. Building a stronger evidence base, while fostering collaboration between policymakers, researchers, advisors and practitioners, will be essential for ensuring that behavioural approaches contribute effectively to future agricultural and forestry policies.

Overall, the Policy Hackathon demonstrated that behavioural insights have significant potential to support the green transition when they are embedded within existing policy frameworks, developed through transparent and participatory processes, and adapted to the realities of those responsible for implementing change on the ground.

Annex 1 – List of participant organisations

Annex 1 provides an overview of the organisations represented during the conference. The list includes institutions whose representatives participated either in person or online and illustrates the broad range of policy, research, advisory and practitioner perspectives involved in the event. In total, 50 institutions from 16 countries (13 Member States) were represented during the conference.

Table 2. Participating organisations and countries represented at the conference, including in-person and online attendance.

INSTITUTION	COUNTRY
IIASA	Austria
Earthscape Network	Belgium
EU CAP Network	Belgium
European Commission	Belgium
European Economic and Social Committee	Belgium
European Environmental Bureau	Belgium
Flanders research institute for agriculture, fisheries and food - Social Sciences Unit	Belgium
IBMA - International Biocontrol Manufacturers Association	Belgium
ILVO	Belgium
Inagro	Belgium
Joint Research Centre, European Commission	Belgium
KU Leuven Public Governance Institute	Belgium
Plants for the Future European Technology Platform	Belgium
ULB	Belgium
Université Catholique De Louvain	Belgium
Vlaamse Landmaatschappij (VLM) Vlaamse Landmaatschappij	Belgium
LAB University of Applied Sciences	Finland
Burgundy School of Business (BSB)	France
Racines de France	France
Vitagora	France
Weedresearch	Germany
Agricultural University of Athens (AUA)	Greece
Green & Digital	Greece
Ministry of Rural Development & Food	Greece
Teagasc	Ireland
Confindustria Piemonte	Italy
FAO	Italy
University of Milan and Euro-Mediterranean Centre on Climate Change (CMCC)	Italy
University of Trento	Italy

INSTITUTION	COUNTRY
KPODR	Poland
Organic Center	Poland
Orlen	Poland
Polish Academy of Sciences	Poland
Politechnika Bydgoska im. Jana i Jędrzeja Śniadeckich	Poland
Polskie Radio PiK	Poland
Regional Directorate of the State Forests in Torun	Poland
Uniwersytet SWPS	Poland
2BForest	Portugal
CONSULAI	Portugal
Association of Balkan Eco Innovation (ABE)	Serbia
Biosense	Serbia
Jozef Stefan Institute	Slovenia
CIHEAM Zaragoza	Spain
UNED	Spain
Universitat Jaume I	Spain
European Alliance for Regenerative Agriculture	The Netherlands
Maastricht University	The Netherlands
Association d'Éducation Environnementale pour les Futures Générations (AEEFG)	Tunisia
ADAS	UK
Forest Research	UK