



ÖSTERSJÖ-  
STIFTELSEN



SLOVENIAN RESEARCH AGENCY



ZNANSTVENORAZISKOVALNI CENTER  
SLOVENSKE AKADEMIE  
ZNANOSTI IN UMETNOSTI



sh.se | SÖDERTÖRNS HÖGSKOLA  
STOCKHOLM

# REPORT

## *Workshop*

## **PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS FOR THE GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT OF ECOSYSTEM SERVICES: Exploring Current Challenges and Potentials of Common-Pool Resources**

Held in Ljubljana, Slovenia, 19 and 20 May 2016

This workshop was a collaboration between researchers at Södertörn University and at Anton Melik Geographical Institute ZRC SAZU. This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part and in any form for educational or non-profit purposes, without special permission from the copyright holder(s) provided acknowledgement of the source is made. No use of this publication may be made for resale or other commercial purpose, without the written permission of the copyright holder(s).

Copyright © June 2016

[www.envgovcontext.net](http://www.envgovcontext.net)

<http://giam.zrc-sazu.si/en/programi-in-projekti/cultural-landscapes-caught-between-public-good-private-interests-and-politics#v>

Cite as:

Rodela, R., Šmid Hribar, M., Urbanc, M. 2016. *Public Private Partnerships for the Governance and Management of Ecosystem Services: Exploring Current Challenges and Potentials of Common-Pool Resources*. Report from the workshop held from 19 to 20 May 2016, Ljubljana.

The organizing committee and contacts:

Romina Rodela  
Södertörn University  
School of Natural Sciences,  
Technology and Environmental  
Studies  
T: 0046 (0)7 29310690  
E: rodela.romina@sh.se

Mateja Šmid Hribar  
ZRC SAZU - Research Center of  
Slovenian Academy of Sciences  
and Arts, Anton Melik  
Geographical Institute  
E: mateja.smid@zrc-sazu.si

Mimi Urbanc  
ZRC SAZU - Research Center of  
Slovenian Academy of Sciences  
and Arts, Anton Melik  
Geographical Institute  
E: mimi.urbanccsmid@zrc-  
sazu.si

### **Acknowledgments**

This workshop was organized as part to, and was co-financed, by the following research projects “*Environmental Governance in Context*” funded by the Foundation for Baltic and East European Studies and the research project titled “*Cultural Landscapes Caught between Public Good, Private Interests and Politics*” funded by the Slovene Research Agency.

# 1 Introduction

A lot of effort goes into environmental protection; environmental issues have never been that much in the public eye and received so much policy attention as they do today. However, observers from different camps (specialties) keep warning that anthropogenic pressures are increasing. We need to do more and do it faster.

Protected areas and Natura 2000 sites requires that adequate management and use are planned and implemented for maintenance of the ecological status of these. In many geographical areas e.g. the karst landscape located in the NE Italy (see: Rodela, 2012) much of the Natura 2000 sites are located on land which is owned and managed collectively (common property regimes, hereinafter CPRs). Thus, suggesting these having a role to play not only in terms of use and management (customary use) but also maintenance of Natura 2000 sites according to contemporary policy programs and standards foreseen by these. For instance the European Union, with its recently adopted EU Biodiversity Strategy 2020 (Action 5) is now pursuing the implementation of a conceptual framework which recognizes the dependence of our society on the natural environment and foresees the need to understand, identify and map **ecosystem services** across the EU <sup>1</sup>. **Ecosystem services** are identified as all benefits that people get from ecosystems and contribute to human well-being (MA, 2005). This includes all different ecosystem services including cultural aspects embedded into **landscapes**. On this specific aspect a further document, the European Landscape Convention (2003) exposes the need to take into account different stakeholders and their needs with the aims to develop a complex management and governance able to maintain cultural landscapes. There is, thus, a role to be played by CPRs to contribute at the maintenance of ecosystem services (supporting, regulating and cultural ES).

It is interesting to note that at a time that the limitations of the two dominant governance models (*state vs. free market*) have been discussed (see: Melathopoulos and Stoner, 2015; Kosoy and Corbera, 2010) there is a renewed interest for other governance models; models that can bring together different actors (see Apostolopoulou et al., 2014). Such an example are partnerships between the public and private sector (e.g. ENGOs, business, civil society) strengthened with the objective to work collaboratively towards objectives of shared interest. In the domain of nature protection the most frequently found public-private partnership (PPP) involves ENGOs, as are trusts, associations, etc., collaborating with state institutions on the management of protected areas, or parts of these. Although reasons behind the strengthening of PPP in this domain vary across the European Union often these include, among other things, difficulties encountered by state institutions to set-up and maintain alive a fully operating management team. In reaching out to well-established and competent ENGOs state authorities not only capitalize on knowledge these actors developed over time of that specific natural area, but also there are benefits attached to this type of arrangement terms of flexibility, propensity for innovation and more general capacity building opportunities, such a PPP can bring about.

Taking into account that a non-negligible amount of natural areas functional for the provision of ecosystem services is found on private land owned collectively, with an interest for community involvement and self-governance arrangements as (Berge and Laerhoven, 2011; Bromley and

---

<sup>1</sup> More at <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/biodiversity/comm2006/2020.htm> and <http://biodiversity.europa.eu/maes>

Feeny, 1992; Ostrom 1990) the objective of this event was to discuss the PPP as platforms involving commoners.

Common-pool resources are inextricably linked with landscapes and are particularly attention-grabbing due to their benefits to the general public. Numerous common-pool resources can be found all across Europe. But while substantial literature describing and analysing commons located in the North and West Europe is available offering useful insight into how these changed /evolved over time (eg. De Moor, 2012; Gerber et al., 2008) less is available about commons located in Central and Eastern Europe. However, only in recent years researches begun to study commons in this region and this mostly in relation to common land. As a result we have an incomplete picture and do not know details of how many have endured over time and are well functioning to the present day. Also we do not know details what natural resources are they accessing to and the way commoners are coping with new requirements and issues coming from the European policy (e.g. Habitat Directive, EIA). Therefore, recognizing the need for meaningful involvement of communities in shaping and constructing more sustainable futures, identifying a role for communities in coping with global environmental change processes (Van Laerhoven and Ostrom, 2007), we believe there is a need for research on *common-pool resources* targeting Central and Eastern Europe, which could help to disclose the un-tapped potential of these governance arrangements vis-à-vis current environmental challenges as well as policy needs arising from EU policy programs (e.g. Nature Protection, Common Agriculture Policy, Energy Policy).

## 2 Objective and scope

The purpose of this workshop was to bring together researchers interested in the topics above in order to reflect and explore ways to conduct and enable research which could contribute to disclose the un-tapped potential of *common-pool resource institutions* (rules-in-use<sup>2</sup>) for ecosystem services maintenance and governance in Central and Eastern Europe. We aimed especially at looking into current challenges and opportunities of PPP that have had commoners at their core as those adhering to and contributing to shape CPR institutions.

The objectives were 1) to explore different views on the potential role of CPR institutions can play vis-à-vis public policies, 2) to explore differences (for given cases) between ecosystem services provided by common-pool resources vs. private goods), 3) to examine the potential role commoners can play in PPP that are contributing at the ecosystem services management and governance, 4) to look at possibilities of PPP proactive participation in landscape and CPR governance. Also, with this workshop we wanted to 5) to build synergies and facilitate for collaborative activities among the workshop participants.

---

<sup>2</sup> What may, what must, or what must not be done.

## 2 Summary of the Sessions

The event lasted two days. Participants had an opportunity to share the latest research outcomes and exchange ideas about current challenges CPR organizations face on day one. On day two we worked in small groups in order to exchange ideas about future collaborative activities. Participation was based on invitation and speakers were selected on the basis of their expertise and track record in one of the thematic areas listed above, with consideration of balanced distribution of expertise across topics of interest.

### Day 1: Morning slot on subject area: Common-pool resources and their governance

**Catherine Tucker** (Florida University, USA) opened the workshop and gave a key note speech titled: *Understanding Common-Pool Resources and Their Governance: Ostrom's Legacy and Current Challenges*. During her talk she presented the key ideas that contributed to Ostrom's scholarly work and have been the basis for research many scholars did and are doing around the world. Tucker presented the outcomes of her own empirical research based mainly on working with communities engaged with coffee plantations for many years. She commented on the role of trust and success as key aspects that influence communities' attitudes toward failures.



Fig. 1. Key note by Prof. Tucker

**Tine Premrl** (Association of the Representatives of Slovenian Agrarian Commons) gave a presentation focused on the Slovene experience and discussed the challenges that Slovene commons face and have to cope with today. The presentation titled the *"From Restitution to Revival: A case of Commons Re-establishment and Restitution in Slovenia"* was a nice summary of different steps taken over the past decades for commons to be moved from shadow into a

more visible position in a society. Currently, commons are recognized by policy and their operations are regulated by law, but this does not suffice them to be fully empowered.

**Gorazd Maslo** (Municipality of Ljubljana) presented a recent initiative of the current city administration to set up a City Orchard in Ljubljana consisting of about 100 fruit trees planted. This orchard is widely accessible; there is no fence or other measures restricting access. The project was implemented in collaboration with a local social cooperative. Municipality of Ljubljana is now working in parallel on other related initiatives, such as “bee track” and city vineyard. However, Gorazd Maslo clearly expressed the community’s responsibility for taking benefits of and managing the orchard. The municipality is very eager to see how future “users” will develop rules regulating access and harvest of fruits.

**Primož Pipan** (Anton Melik Geographical Institute ZRC SAZU) talked about the field work conducted in remote alpine village where the community choose to self-manage drinkable water supplies. His talk titled *Water Management in the Čadrg village* focused on the way this small community goes about everyday activities and water management.

**Romina Rodela** (Södertörn University & WUR) gave a presentation about the way commons on the Italian Karst go about current obligations in terms of nature protection. In her talk titled a *Collaborative Partnerships: the Role of Commons in the Management of the Natural reserve Glinščica*, she illustrated how the municipality of Dolina (IT) went about strengthening a fruitful collaboration with commons and who the stakeholders that have managed the Natura 2000, are. In her talk she gave some examples of how this partnerships benefits the local community.

## **Day 1: Afternoon slot on subject area: Ecosystem services and landscapes**

**Maurizia Sigura** (University of Udine) presented the results of the research project run by her team that focused on ecosystem services. In her talk titled *Ecosystem services at farm and landscape scale* she gave an insightful overview of how they analyzed transitional landscapes by multivariate spatial analysis, landscape pattern analysis, and Principal Component Analysis and characterized structural features of fringe areas.

**Mateja Šmid Hribar** (Anton Melik Geographical Institute ZRC SAZU) has talked about commons and their roles in our everyday landscapes. In her presentation titled *Do Commons Generate More Numerous and Diverse Ecosystem Services?*, she was speculating on how much power is in our hand to influence on providing diverse ecosystem services that enable our existence and also our well-being. She set the hypothesis that commons generate more numerous and diverse ecosystem services and gave 3 examples. Further research studies need to be taken, but if the hypothesis turns out right, it will generate optimism that residents can influence and should get engage more proactively in managing and governing their every day landscapes.

**Romina Rodela** (Södertörn University & WUR) gave a presentation about the challenges of participatory ecosystem services mapping. She gave examples of too often overlooked needs different stakeholders had when it came to sharing knowledge and challenges that emerged when this knowledge needed to be integrated and accounted for. In her talk titled *Ecosystem Services Identification and Mapping: A Knowledge Intensive Activity*, she warned against participatory processes done only to tick the box and pointed at the normative and instrumental aspects that were involved in meaningful participation. She ended the talk with some recommendations for current initiatives in participatory ecosystem services mapping.



At the end of the first day a guided tour to the city orchard planted in November 2015 was organized. The city orchard is located at the edge of Ljubljana close to a residential area and is an example of new generation “*practicing the commons*”: it has been put in place and will be managed by citizens.



Fig. 2. Fieldtrip to the city orchard, Ljubljana.

## **Day 2: Hands-on activities: working on collaborative outcomes**

During the second day participants worked in small groups and discussed prospective activities of shared interest which bring together Commons, CPR and Ecosystem Services. Participants explored opportunities and talked about co-authoring publications, realized that more research work should be done on searching for connections between above mentioned topics and also about the so called “new commons” which have not been yet well defined.



Fig. 3. Working in groups.



Fig. 4. Registration desk.

### **3 Concluding Reflections**

The purpose of this event was to bring together researchers interested in the potential of *common-pool resource institutions* (i.e. rules-in-use) for ecosystem services maintenance and governance in Central and Eastern Europe. Specifically, participants have talked about opportunities and barriers for public private partnerships for ecosystem services maintenance and governance involving commoners. Participants have given and discussed examples of public private partnerships in this region and beyond. While current barriers involve largely legal and institutional aspects, which however differ from country to country, there is also substantial untapped potential for local communities / commoners to take up a more active role in ecosystem services governance. These are aspects that will be subject of future work with participants already engaged and taking the lead of three different collaborative activities.



## References

Bartley, T., Andersson, K., Jagger, P., Laerhoven, F.V., 2008. The Contribution of Institutional Theories to Explaining Decentralization of Natural Resource Governance. *Society & Natural Resources* 21, 160-174.

Berge, E., van Laerhoven, F., 2011. Governing the Commons for two decades: A complex story. *International Journal of the Commons*.

Bromley, D.W., Feeny, D., 1992. *Making the commons work: Theory, practice, and policy*. ICS, San Francisco.

De Moor, T., 2012. What Do We Have in Common? A Comparative Framework for Old and New Literature on the Commons. *International Review of Social History* 57, 269-290.

European Landscape Convention (ELC), 2003.

Gerber, J.-D., Nahrath, S., Reynard, E., Thomi, L., 2008. The role of common pool resource institutions in the implementation of Swiss natural resource management policy. *International Journal of the Commons* 2, 222–247.

Millennium Assessment, 2005. *Ecosystems and Human Wellbeing: Current State and Trends*, Volume 1, Island Press, Washington D.C.

Rodela, R., 2012. *Soupravljanje naravnih virov: vaške skupnosti in sorodne oblike skupne lastnine in skupnega upravljanja*. Wageningen University and Research Centre Wageningen.

Ostrom, E., 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Van Laerhoven, F., Ostrom, E., 2007. Traditions and Trends in the Study of the Commons. *International Journal of the Commons*.

## Appendix 1 Program

### Day ONE – May 19, 2016

09:30-09:45	Registration and refreshments: networking among participants
09:45 - 10:00	<b>Welcome and Opening: aims and objectives of the event</b> Mimi Urbanc, Anton Melik Geographical Institute ZRC SAZU Romina Rodela, Södertörn University, WUR Mateja Šmid Hribar, Anton Melik Geographical Institute ZRC SAZU
10:00 - 11:00	<b>Key note lecture</b> <b>Understanding Common-Pool Resources and Their Governance: Ostrom's Legacy and Current Challenges</b> Catherine Tucker, Florida University, USA
11:00 – 11:40	<b>Short presentations on common-pool resources and their governance</b> <b>From Restitution to Revival: A case of Commons Re-establishment and Restitution in Slovenia</b> , Tine Premrl, ZPASS <b>City Orchard in Ljubljana</b> , Gorazd Maslo, Ljubljana Municipality <b>Water Management in the Čadrg village</b> , Primož Pipan, Anton Melik Geographical Institute ZRC SAZU <b>Collaborative Partnerships: the Role of Commons in the Management of the Natural reserve Glinščica</b> , Romina Rodela, Södertörn University & WUR
11:40 – 12:00	Discussion
12:00 - 13:00	Lunch Break ( <i>catered in loco</i> )
13:00 - 13:30	<b>Short presentations on ecosystem services and landscapes</b> <b>Ecosystem services at farm and landscape scale</b> , Maurizia Sigura, Univeristy of Udine <b>Do Commons Generate More Numerous and Diverse Ecosystem Services?</b> , Mateja Šmid Hribar, Anton Melik Geographical Institute ZRC SAZU <b>Ecosystem Services Identification and Mapping: A Knowledge Intensive Activity</b> , Romina Rodela, Södertörn University & WUR
13:30 – 14:00	Discussion
14:00 – 14:30	Coffee break
14.30 – 16.00	Group work on selected questions/issues
16:00 – 17:00	Reports to plenary, roundtable discussion and wrap up
17:00 – 18:00	Visit of a city orchard in the edge of Ljubljana (bus shuttle)
18:30 –	Dinner @ Stari Tisler ( <a href="http://www.stari-tisler.com">www.stari-tisler.com</a> )

### Day TWO – May 20, 2016

09:00 - 10:30	Working in groups on selected outcomes I.: <i>sharing ideas and working on prospective multi-authored collaborative paper(s)</i>
10:00 - 10:30	Coffee Break
10:30 – 12:00	Working in groups on selected outcomes II.: <i>sharing ideas about prospective project proposals</i>
12:00 - 13:00	Lunch Break
13:00 – 14:00	Working in groups on selected outcomes III.: <i>special session proposal for IASC 2017</i>
14:00 – 15:00	Coffee Break with Summary of Workshop and wrap up

**Public Private Partnerships for the Governance and Management of Ecosystem  
Services:  
Exploring Current Challenges and Potentials of Common-Pool Resources  
Ljubljana, Slovenia, May 19-20, 2016**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Surname</b>	<b>affiliation</b>
Marco	Acri	University of Nova Gorica
Nevenka	Bogataj	Slovenian Institute for Adult Education
Matej	Gabrovec	Anton Melik Geographical Institute ZRC SAZU
Gorazd	Maslo	Municipality of Ljubljana
Mojca	Nastran	University of Ljubljana
Lucia	Piani	University of Udine, Italy
Primož	Pipan	Anton Melik Geographical Institute ZRC SAZU
Tine	Premrl	Association of the Representatives of Slovenian Agrarian Commons
Daniela	Ribeiro	Anton Melik Geographical Institute ZRC SAZU
Romina	Rodela	Södertörn University & Wageningen University
Maurizia	Sigura	University of Udine, Italy
Mateja	Šmid Hribar	Anton Melik Geographical Institute ZRC SAZU
Catherine M.	Tucker	University of Florida, USA
Gregor	Torkar	University of Ljubljana
Andrej	Udovč	University of Ljubljana
Mimi	Urbanc	Anton Melik Geographical Institute ZRC SAZU
Marica	Uršič Zupan	Primorskse novice