Report on the National Workshop in Czech Republic

Prague, 30 May 2017

Organised by Jaroslav Pražan, Hana Šejnohová/IAEI

This report presents the outcomes of the discussion at the PEGASUS WP5 national workshop in the Czech Republic.

The list of attendees is presented in the Annex.

The way of communication and the workshop design benefited from the experience from the national level workshop held at the end of 2016 in the IAEI on the results of the three Czech case studies comparing several case studies from PEGASUS partners. The aim of the previous national workshop was to show the participants the success factors of the Czech case studies and contrast them with more successful PEGASUS partners´ case studies, and to discuss the key differences. The workshop reported in this document (held on 30 May 2017) focused on a deeper analysis and discussion of the success factors in more detailed way and participants were asked to contribute to thinking about the way of presentation of the project results and possible policy implications.

The participant structure enabled to address all key success factors of the case studies. Some of them have already long term experience with attempts to carry out collective action for ESBO provision. They were top national experts (e.g. researchers, advisors), ministry officials (MoA and MoE), or practitioners from the field studied (administrative staff of national park, NGOs carrying out projects for ESBO provision) and also farming community was represented (farmers organisation representative, farmer).

The workshop held on 30 May 2017 in the IAEI in Prague was organised in the following way:

The first step was to explain stakeholders the purpose, concept and the approach in the PEGASUS to be able to discuss the results of the project. The Czech case studies with assessment of selected success factors organised according to SES analytical concept was presented. Some factors of success of initiatives were difficult to understand or even believed by the participants (Italy tomato case study results were hardly believed by some participants at the previous workshop), were explained using examples and at the same time contrasted with selected factors from some case studies of PEGASUS partners. The following discussion clarified some aspects of the approach and results of the case studies and helped to better present the results for the next steps of the project, too.

The second step was a participatory part of the workshop. The most important factors were written on the flip board, their role in the case studies were explained. Participants were asked to reach an agreement on the importance and whether some factors are missing in the Czech situation.

After getting feedback on the list of success factors, factors of the second group was analysed using Force Field Analysis (FFA) as a mean of assessment of the role of the factor in enabling/blocking success in ESBO provision by action situations in the Czech Republic.

The results of the analysis and the discussion associated during the process provided background for the answering the questions guiding the workshop. After the FFA the stakeholders were asked what would be the best way to share the knowledge gained from the case studies in general for facilitation of learning between practitioners. Second set of questions was focused on implications of findings for policy.

In the discussion of each success factor it was intended to reach consensus among participants. In case the consensus was not reached, the different opinions were recorded. The meeting lasted longer than anticipated and therefore some participants were not able to stay till the end, but the intention of some of them was to give feedback to all factors before they have left the room.

As a part of the introduction participants were reminded that cooperation (frequently in form of collective action) was quite common in Czechoslovakia before the Second World War, but the forced collectivization in the Czech countryside, joint with the nationalisation of the family farm and land property and farming tradition (50ties) came and left a strong negative impact/meaning of the name "cooperative" especially in the Czech country inhabitants. This negative connotation lasts until today; for example in 2002 there was only 82 marketing cooperatives with variable performance, while in countries with similar size it was at the same year for example 671 in Belgium and 629 in Denmark[1]. The book of Ladislav Feierabend (2007[2]) stated that large proportion of cooperatives were initiated just because cooperation was valued high.

---

[1] Havel, P. (2003) Odbytová družstva čelí bludům a podrazům (Marketing cooperatives face delusions and triks), downloaded on 13 June 2017 from EURO, available at: http://www.euro.cz/byznys/odbytova-druzstva-celi-bludum-a-podrazum-864761

[2] Feierabend (2007) Agricultural cooperatives in Czechoslovakia.

Factors of success of action situation for ESBO provision

The list of factors was created based on list of key findings of PEGASUS and on the list of factors investigated in the Czech case studies (most of the factors are published in the literature).

The factors were divided to two groups: 1. factors which are part of the subsystems around action situation (the centre of SES) and 2. factors critical for action situation and collective action. The two groups of factors were discussed separately.

The list of factors from SES subsystems as a starting point for action situation (the centre of SES).

These factors should actors consider when initiating and running action situation (e.g. as collective action):

Demand for the public goods in society. The case studies showed that there is at least sufficient demand (revealed by action or not revealed so far) to carry out the initiative. In case of no demand it would be difficult to run the initiative in two of the three studied case studies.

Information availability for action situation

The case studies results show that the information availability is not a factor, which could prevent successful initiatives from providing ESBO in the Czech Republic (e.g. geographical knowledge). But some type of information was in later stages of the workshop recognised as preventing successful action situations. One example is scientific knowledge on cause-effect relationship between management and its effects on ESBO. Measuring of ESBO provision and monitoring the action effects are also not carried out sufficiently. But in the case studies there was quite good knowledge for decisions on the habitats management. But in some case studies the information on the achievements in ESBO was not shared with stakeholders sufficiently (e.g. White Carpathians) while in other case study the sharing was quite sufficient (Wet meadows in Josefov).

Initial trust between stakeholders (and in society in general) before the action situation/collective action starts. This directly influence difficulties and easiness of the initial involvement of stakeholders and level of their participation.

Number of stakeholders potentially participating in the region/value chain. The number of participants influence to a significant degree coordination and the stability of the action situation/collective action. The initial number is usually given by the size and boundaries of the SES. A small number could mean low stability (e.g. in case of free riding) and large number requires more effort in coordination.

Characteristics of **resource and resource unit** at stake and their management. For example, the degree of assets specificity influence needed actions of stakeholders.

Initial **property rights** of the action situation concerning the resource and resource units and their distribution between stakeholders.

Degree of similarity/difference of interests of the key stakeholders, influence to a large extent effort in reaching agreement between stakeholders. Too different interests could require big effort of a coordinator to bridge them for example.

Motivation of stakeholders to participate on the same issue.

Institutional environment/framework, including rules of the play in institutional environment, administration and coordination of policy measures influencing the action situation and similar factors.

Availability of **information about actors´ preferences** (over reciprocity, cooperation, trustworthiness) for a relatively large population. This factor makes it possible to initiate collective action by those actors, who value reciprocity, cooperation, trustworthiness. If this information is not available, the risk of free riders and/or rational egoists' involvement is higher and success of the action situation/collective action is endangered.

Results of discussion on the factors of success in the initial stage of action situation:

Participants were asked whether there are any missing factors and what factors are the most important in the Czech conditions (responding to the question under session 1).

Stakeholders agreed that one key factor is missing and it is the structural aspect of Czech farming sector. Large/corporate farms behave in action situations in most cases differently than family farmers (higher willingness to cooperate in general). If this factor is not considered, the actors would face difficulties in trying to initiate collective action. The factor is important also because majority of agricultural land is in hands of corporate farms (represent 69,7 % of agricultural land in CZ[3]). Farms with a size above 500 hectares represent 70,3% of agricultural land.

When discussing missing supporting factors the maps were not mentioned as an important missing factor. Actually the mapping information on the public goods provision in biodiversity is quite precise in the Czech Republic[4].

The most important factor determining the success of the initiative is the institutional environment/framework according to participants. This is not in favour of success of action

---

[3] UZEI (2012). Report on the state of Czech agriculture in 2011, the „Green report". Prague. Preport prepared for the Czech Ministry of Agriculture.

[4] The maps produced in PEGASUS for discussion at the national workshop were not for Czech Republic available.

situations and collective actions especially because of frequent change in rules and in targeting policies to not profit/NGO actors, who play frequently important role in attempts of initiation/running the collective actions. As an example, the potential key actors in action situation for ESBO provision were identified also LAGs, but the changing targeting and some rules of their support endanger sustainability of several initiatives if based on LAG sustainability. Another example of the institutional framework influence is that the policies are not tested on their effects to different groups and frequently the side effects of new/reformed policy is negatively affected group of stakeholders (e.g. rules for bids for supply of milk to schools excluded some type of farms from competition).

The other factors from the subsystems of SES surrounding action situation were understood as also important for to the success of discussed initiatives, but in details most of these were discussed in the next step.

Discussion of success factors of action situation and collective action[5]

Several factors of success presented in previous step were the starting point for the action situation (part of the subsystems of SES except the action situation) and are usually addressed by stakeholders in action situation/collective action (e.g. effort to increase initial level of trust between stakeholders, bridging different interests).

Thus some of these factors appear also in the list of success factors of action situation/collective action. Discussed factors all support the successful action situation and collective action if mature and well working (also supported by quite rich literature for example of Elinor Ostrom). But the question is how these factors of success are perceived by stakeholders in the Czech Republic.

In order to answer this question the success factors were assessed by participants using Force Field Analysis (FFA), which facilitated the discussion of their role in the ESBO provision and their maturity under the Czech conditions. The discussion and results of the FFA facilitated collection. The following section presents the result of Force Field Analysis.

---

[5] This step helped to answer questions listed under Session 2 of guidelines for the workshops.

Principles/factors of successful actin situation/collective action and their Force Field Analysis (assessment of current situation). Score 1=not important for success of action situation/collective action; 5=necessary for success

Supporting collective action for ESBO provision	Score	Blocking collective action for ESBO provision	Score
Demand for ESBO - PG/ESS	+4		
		Interplay between public and private actors	-4
		Rules observation	-3
		Institutional framework	-5
Increasing the public's appreciation of, and transforming this into demand for ESBO	+5		
		Establish causal linkages between management actions on agricultural or forestry systems and the related ESBO	-5
Action situation/collective action			
		Knowledge of the principles of collective action	-5
		Trust level between actors	-5
		Capacity to agree on the balanced share of costs and benefits from action situation	-5
Rules - their creation and compliance check	+5		
		Observation of rules	-5
		Effects of action situation monitoring	-5
		Mechanism of enforcement, penalisation, and conflict resolution system	-5
		Availability of information about players' preferences over reciprocity, trustworthiness, cooperation	?
Creation of links between actors, coordination and management	+5		
Information sharing	+5		
		Action situation/collective action leadership (are right leaders available?)	-5

All factors received high score and participants agreed that without them it would be difficult to carry out a successful action situation.

Factors which are regarded as supporting the success of the action situation and collective action are rather technical and are close to managerial skills (creation of rules and their compliance check, information sharing, creation links between actors).

A positive sign was an agreement on the growing **demand for ESBO** in the Czech Republic, which was documented by the leader of the family farmers' association, who reported growing number of farm customers, interested how and with what consequences for the environment the farm production is carried out. The growing interest is mirrored in proposal for new farmers' competition in this association for the best performing farmer regarding environment (while not considering CAP influence).

Participants agreed that the **creation of links** between actors and **coordination and management** are supporting factors and are well developed in Czech conditions. The same is seen in **information sharing.**

But there is quite high number of factors which are understood as deficient and at the same time critical for the success of initiatives, where actors should cooperate (action situation/collective action).

The only factor, where there was not unanimous agreement on assessment was "whether the increased **public appreciation** is persuaded sufficiently". One participant did not believe this factor is supporting the ESBO provision and relevant action situations, but the rest of the group did.

After the discussion of the results of case studies and explanation of experience of several participants, all agreed that the knowledge how to run successful action situation and collective action is lacking and this is one of the key factor preventing the success of relevant initiatives.

The level of **trust** was identified as so low, that it prevents the collective action usually from the success. A similar factor is a low reliability of partners in complying with agreed rules. These deficiencies could be compensated by strong leadership, but long term the leaders use to be exhausted. One advisor commented: "there is currently an investment support of farmers (under Ministry of Agriculture), who are ready to share the new asset. But nearly no applications because people does not trust others to share facilities."

The PEGASUS Czech case studies and experiences of participants proved, that the stakeholders do not pay sufficient attention to **reciprocity** and do not share costs and benefits of the action fairly, which undermine the collective action and long term performance of the action situation. A similar factor is a sharing of the effects or outcomes of action situations between actors, which is not systematically done. This factor was also recognised as crucial for long term cooperation under action situation.

Participants recognised the capacity of actors to agree **common rules and control them** in general. But in practice it was mentioned that stakeholders even do not dare to agree any rules of cooperation in the action situation. The mechanism of **monitoring and enforcement the rules** is not

usually implemented in action situations and this is seen as deficient factor too. The same is valid for **conflict resolution** mechanisms – there is not a tradition of creating of that.

Agreement was also on quite insufficient performance of **monitoring of effects** of action situation, namely the measuring the effect of action situation on ESBO provision. Participants had in mind mainly environmental ESBO. In cases the monitoring is sufficient it is not usual practice to **share the results/effects on ESBO** between stakeholders in the action situation. This deficiency has negative impact on the long-term cooperation motivation to support action situation activities. Stakeholders mentioned that without results of the monitoring actors do not have sufficient arguments for extending the experience – to start similar activities elsewhere.

Factor **"Available information about players' preferences over reciprocity, trustworthiness, cooperation"** as a condition for a successful collective action was not possible to assess, because despite quite long explanation and examples description, the participants were hesitating to accept that this factor is a positive sign of society. From several comments, it became finally clear this factor has a negative meaning for the participants. One participant put a comment to the factor, which was commonly used as saying during communist era: "To rat on somebody is wrong, but somebody must inform right places about him/her". This showed a controversy over the meaning of this factor, which is understood as a sign of ill society, while it is regarded by literature as a quite substantial condition of successful collective action. Thus, the stakeholders were not able finally to assess this factor.

As showed above if collective action is initiated usually a **leader** should compensate by huge effort their deficiency. And therefore there are not enough leaders and several present are already exhausted.

The discussion showed, that when several factors of success are deficient (or blocking the action situation), they should be compensated by **higher effort of a leader**. The comment from experienced stakeholder, who carried out several collective initiatives was: "Under current conditions (e.g. unstable institutional settings, low trust) the leaders are exhausted soon, so I am looking forward to times, when the factors are right and leadership is just a normal work of a normal manager." It was also an explanation why the leadership is regarded as not available or rare.

Discussion on the policy implications of the project (questions under Session 2)
Policy role in ESBO provision: the Czech case studies reported both positive influence and also deficiencies in contribution to ESBO provision. When touching policy role some participants mentioned only negative contributions of policies (specifically mentioned were CAP measures e.g. AECM) to biodiversity provision (NGO representatives mentioned lack of flexibility and tailoring).
There is not a strategic approach in creation of supportive environment for successful action situations. It means the decisions are not made on the basis of systematic collection and assessment of information about the state of the ESBO and there is not sufficient mirroring of these insights to the policy changes. Ministries of Agriculture and Environment confirmed that for

PEGASUS
Public Ecosystem Goods and Services from
land management – Unlocking the Synergies

relevant monitoring is not sufficient budget. And even less there is not a policy evaluation culture in the society to utilise the experience from already implemented policies in the next policy adjustments.

Policies do have other deficiencies which inhibit to some extent the success of action situations. For example there is not sufficient support of good practice experience sharing. The bureaucracy represents too heavy burden to actors. And the law reliability is low.

Participants saw a large potential in the needed for changes in polices. First, there is a strong need for the stable institutional and policy environment as a basis for any long-term actions. Second, participants stated several areas where policy can help in the ESBO provision and relevant action situation success.

The need for improvement is also in the public-private interactions. LAGs role was mentioned several times in this sense as a potential actor who can play a role. In addition the improvement of public-public relationship was mentioned as deficient and that there is a need for improvement (also identified as factor negatively influencing several action situation outcomes. No practical suggestions were raised in this sense.

Concerning questions under Session 3:

The participants mentioned that the core condition for success of actions for ESBO provision are the improvement in the institutional settings and support the learning how to carry out actions situation

Concerning the type of actors which should be involved in the action situation the strongest comment was regarding those stakeholders whose property rights are touched by the decisions under action situation/collective action. If somebody is missing (as it happened in the Czech case studies), than the success of the collective action is undermined. For example it happened in the the case study in Josefov wet meadows supporting waders and amphibians. Some farmers did not come to the initial meeting and did not want to participate on the collective action, but those who came decided substantial changes in water regime without those excluded actors, which were limited in their property rights to use the grasslands to some extent. Despite significant effort from the coordinator of the initiative in involving them later and informing them on the decisions, some of the excluded farmers take actions sometime against the initiative.

The discussion on the ways how to spread the experience gained in the case studies, following ways were proposed by participants:

- Successful cases presented as "public days" (for example on farm) with explanation of the conditions for successful action situation.
- Using social media.
- TV short presentations (as is used by Ministry of Environment - e.g. "Minute from nature" presenting protected species).
- Introduction of success cases in the school system.

- Farm visits – excursions.

After putting the question concerning format by which should PEGASUS' tools and guidance be spread across rural areas, participants proposed following:
- Present good practice
- Use the well-known price contests for farmers as way of promoting the successful cases of cooperation.
- Regional media and TV presentations.

PEGASUS
Public Ecosystem Goods and Services from
land management – Unlocking the Synergies

Attendees to the PEGASUS WP5 national workshop in Czech Republic

30. 5. 2017

Name	Organisation	Type of stakeholder
Čámská Klára	AOPK	
Hlavsa Tomáš	ÚZEI	
Jelínek Ladislav	ÚZEI	
Lípa Martin	EC Meluzína RCAB	
Makovský Josef	MZe	
Medonos Tomáš	ÚZEI	
Němec Stanislav	MZe	
Pekárková Andrea	ÚZEI	
Pražan Jaroslav	ÚZEI	
Ratinger Tomáš	Technologické centrum AV ČR	
Scharf Roman	MŽP	
Stehlík Josef	ASZ	
Svobodová Andrea	Správa KRNAP	
Šejnohová Hana	ÚZEI	
Štolbová Marie	ÚZEI	
Trávníček Petr	PRO-BIO, obchodní společnost s r.o.	
Vačkář David	CzechGlobe	
Vejvodová Anna	PV-Agri s.r.o.	
Zámečník Václav	ČSO	
Ncoralová Barbora	ÚZEI	
Douch Tomáš	ÚZEI	