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Adaptive methodological toolkit for practice

• Why do we need a toolkit?
  – Demand for proven methods to design and deliver initiatives

• What is the toolkit?
  – Collection of key principles and action to aid development and delivery

• What is its purpose?
  – Illustrate experience of PEGASUS case studies for replication

• What does it look like?
  – Web-based decision tree with 4 stages; from conception to delivery
Adaptive methodological toolkit for practice

- The toolkit is structured around the 4 main stages of a project/initiative:

  1 & 2
  - Initiation
  - Preparation

  3 & 4
  - Development
  - Review
Adaptive methodological toolkit for practice

• Stages 1 & 2 – Initiation and Preparation has 4 sections:
  – A: Defining the area/system, the challenge and its context
  – B: Understanding the People and their Roles
  – C: Exploring Drivers and Constraints
  – D: Finding Solutions to challenges through linkages and resources

• Stage 3 & 4 – Development and Review has 2 sections
  – E: Tips for a successful initiative
  – F: How to effectively review an initiative

• All supported by guiding principles, adaptable to local circumstances
  – The toolkit contains 18 core guiding principles across the 4 stages

• Illustrated with examples from PEGASUS Case Studies
### Stages 1 and 2 – Initiation and Preparation

#### Section A: DEFINING THE AREA/SYSTEM, THE CHALLENGE AND ITS CONTEXT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>What is missing and what problem needs to be solved?</td>
<td>What exactly is missing or what kind of ESBO-related problem needs to be solved with common action? What opportunity can be seen which has not been taken? What was the trigger that started the thinking around the initiative or where did the idea come from in the beginning? What ‘area’, ‘place’ or ‘system’ was considered to be central to the project or initiative in order for a change to be effective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>What is the situation that you are concerned about?</td>
<td>What is the situation within farming and/or forestry that you are concerned about? How do these activities relate to the levels of, and trends in, particular ESBOs? What might be the potential to change the situation for the better?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>What was the trigger and what is the challenge?</td>
<td>Why is the possibility of a multi-objective initiative to deliver a range of benefits being discussed now? How can this be articulated so that it is attractive to a range of actors and interest groups?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section B: UNDERSTANDING ACTORS AND THEIR ROLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| B1        | Understanding the relevant actors and their interests | Key to the successful context for an initiative is a good understanding of the relevant actors; how they inter-relate; and how this affects the provision of environmental and social benefits, in their specific situation. All the relevant actors in the system need to be identified, and some contact made with them. They would normally include:  
   a. land managers, farmers and/or foresters;  
   b. those to whom they supply their products and/or those that they obtain their supplies from;  
   c. those who (wish to) enjoy the environmental and social benefits that the farmed or forested land could forestry actions; and  
   e. those whose policies or institutions critically affect the behaviour and ‘room for manoeuvre’ of these key actors. This could include policy-makers, support services, social or economic institutions to which the key actors belong, community leaders, those whose role has been to deal with difficult or disruptive local  
A gradual process which allows time to reveal and consider the main concerns and needs of different groups of actors, during a period when the idea for an initiative is first explored, can enable the identification of how these concerns and needs could be addressed or supported, through the initiative. This can help to build a common vision for what it might be possible to achieve together. |
| B2        | Bringing actors together | Ideally, actors should be brought together in a variety of ways, so that they can begin to exchange information and opinions concerning their role(s) in respect of provision, and their other priorities and needs. The precise sequence of how actors become involved, and when, will vary according to the local context, but the aim is that all need to be part of the process at some stage. Leaving key actors out of the process is likely to lead to problems as the initiative develops. As a general rule, those likely to be influenced by decisions should be included from the start. Of course not all discussions go smoothly, so plans might need to be changed in order to resolve disputes or to keep the majority on board. Bringing groups together should be approached carefully and with sensitivity to social dynamics. If there is an obvious individual who could act as a ‘bridging’ person – knowing two contrasting groups who don’t generally trust each other – that person can be invaluable for making the first moves to improve communication, and advising on how it might be most simply achieved. Equally an independant person can be a crucial mediator B3A. |
# Stages 1 and 2 – Initiation and Preparation

## Section C: EXPLORING DRIVERS AND CONSTRAINTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Understanding the linkages and connections between the different actors and the context in which they are set’</td>
<td>Understanding the multiple relationships and interactions between each type of actor and the provision of environmental and social benefits ESBOs is key to identifying potential change to improve the situation. DRIVERS will include economic, human and social, cultural, natural and institutional elements and trends, as well as appreciation of the ESBO by society and the public (is it growing, declining or low?). This builds on the Stage 1 and 2 activities. There are several aspects to consider here and they are covered in C1A-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1A</td>
<td>Economic viability</td>
<td>The economic viability and/or potential returns from different production systems, including requirements to management of relevant resource can be an important influence upon structural and technical change in a land-management sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1B</td>
<td>Local Social factors</td>
<td>Social factors can be an important driver or motivator for change. The need to provide a brighter future for the next generation can stimulate action; as can a feeling that others need our help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1C</td>
<td>Cultural heritage and tradition</td>
<td>Culture, heritage and tradition can be a source of pride and energy for positive developments – where individuals or communities see a value in strengthening and preserving customs and traditions unique to a particular place or landscape; or protecting key features and symbols of regional or local identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1D</td>
<td>Signals from wider society</td>
<td>What are the signals from society towards collaborative activity and how does this impact on actors’ preferences (e.g. for cooperation, reciprocity, trustworthiness) Are the signals “loud enough” in the society/between stakeholders, or is this hidden? (this is one of the key prerequisites of healthy society, when actors can recognise each others’ preferences and aptitudes – this is regarded as negative feature of society in Czech Republic, while a large number of studies show that as an important factor for collective action success).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1E</td>
<td>Natural variables (e.g. climate, disease)</td>
<td>Natural variables like climate and disease can also be important influences or drivers of practices – e.g. where increasing presence of herbicide-resistant weeds in arable crops stimulates farmers to look for alternative husbandry techniques and learn more about soil management for crop health.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adaptive methodological toolkit for practice

• Here is an example to illustrate how the toolkit works

Hay milk in mountains in Austria - Murau

Issues
• Small farms producing milk in disadvantaged area
• Potential farm abandonment, economic decline
• Potential for high quality milk - later organic,

Trigger
• Need to utilise resources
• Need for added value to secure economic viability
• Demand for ESBO/quality milk identified

Action
• Collective action across the value chain
• Rules of milk production agreed
• New ZZU brand created – „Hay milk“
Adaptive methodological toolkit for practice

• Feedback: We would like your feedback on the toolkit
  – What is the best way to make the toolkit accessible to the people and organisations who need it?
  – What experiences do you have of toolkits that we can learn from?

• Timescale: will be ready by the end of the project
  – Launch in January 2018
  – Chance to discuss over lunch-time
Implications for policy and practice

This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 633814
Implications for policy and practice: current situation

• There is a range of drivers of ESBO provision in rural areas – policy is only one of these and often not sufficient to trigger action

• Current policies include useful tools but have not led to the long-lasting changes required

• Policy weaknesses:
  – Do not motivate sustained shifts in behaviour
  – Collective/collaborative action is limited - viewed as too complicated
  – Budget requirements for incentive schemes (mainly CAP)
  – Lack of connection with the market and private entrepreneur solutions

• Regulation can be a powerful driver:
  – improving water quality in catchments,
  – safeguarding biodiversity
New approaches required

• ‘How’ is as important as ‘what’

• Increased engagement and commitment to ESBO provision amongst stakeholders at all points in the policy cycle

• Greater investment in fostering collective approaches:
  – territorial
  – supply / value chains

• Adjust policies to enable:
  – More facilitation
  – Innovation
  – Focus on outcomes and results
  – Pilot projects
  – Working with the private sector
  – Greater coherence and less overlap between policy tools
  – Greater interaction with market mechanisms

• Build on the Cork agenda
More emphasis on collective approaches

Rationale:

- to achieve action at the landscape/territorial scale or along supply/value chains;
- to sustain practitioners’ engagement in the long run

+ Greater ownership → greater commitment
+ Commonly agreed objectives
+ Better identification of synergies and trade-offs between objectives
+ More tailored and effective design of tools

- Governance issues - challenges of:
  - higher transaction costs?
  - clear accountability
  - building trust – cultural / historical issues in some parts of EU
  - uncertainties over outcomes
- Individual group priorities vs. local, regional, national and wider EU priorities
Collective approaches – emerging ideas

- Mainstreaming collective action in policies – to become the norm rather than the exception
- Mix of top-down guidance with bottom-up approaches
- Use funding to increase the use of advisers and facilitators to support collective initiatives for ESBO provision
- Prioritise opportunities to pilot new approaches
- Rethink accountability - remove the fear of failure
Better deployment of market mechanisms

Rationale:
- to sustain long term engagement of practitioners and consumers
- to increase resources for ESBOs and reduce reliance on public budget

+ ESBOs seen as something that can be rewarded via the market
+ Highlights alignment between consumer demand for ESBOs and production
+ Private actors in the supply chain can have a wide ranging and rapid impact on ESBO provision → establish new norms

- Green washing
- Risks of impermanence in markets
- Accountability issues
- Reluctance to involve private entities in delivery of public policy objectives
Improving interaction with market mechanisms

- Involve private actors more in the policy process:
  - Identify market opportunities that fit with ESBO priorities
  - Blend private and public money to achieve desired outcomes
  - Ensure land managers receive a fair return for the delivery of ESBOs
  - Incorporate an environmental dimension within economic focused groups – e.g. producer groups / inter-branch organisations etc

- Apply more market-like thinking to policy:
  - Focus on performance, results and outcomes
  - Mechanisms for purchasing ESBOs – e.g. auctions
  - Marketing to motivate ESBO delivery e.g. rewards for first movers, free training / resources
  - More tailored advertising of policy measures available linked to relevant priorities, issues and related benefits in a local area.
New dynamics in rural development ...

- Cultural shift required to fundamentally increase ESBO provision on a far larger scale than currently
- Social dimension must become more central, motivating behavioural change and long-lasting action
- Turn Cork 2.0 declaration into action:
  - strategic refresh of rural development policy with strong focus on ESBO delivery
- Greater emphasis on collective approaches alongside the development of more market and results based policy focus;
- Greater subsidiarity and flexibility with appropriate accountability
- This implies:
  - More multi-actor engagement, including private sector
  - Different governance structures to facilitate delivery on the ground
Thank you for listening!

For more information, contact us!
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