

SYNOPSIS OF DOCTORAL THESIS \*

WORKING TITLE  
PARTICIPATION IN THE DESIGNING OF PAYMENTS FOR  
ECOSYSTEM SERVICES (PES) - A COMPARISON OF PES DESIGN  
PROCESSES IN GERMANY AND GREAT BRITAIN.

\*

Submitted by

**KRISTIN NICOLAUS**

PhD student, Junior Research Group Civiland

[www.civiland-zalf.org](http://www.civiland-zalf.org)



Leibniz-Centre for Agricultural Landscape Research (ZALF) e.V.

Eberswalder Straße 84

15374 Muencheberg

Tel.: + 49 33432 82 - 404

Email: [Kristin.Nicolaus@zalf.de](mailto:Kristin.Nicolaus@zalf.de)

**Mentors at ZALF:** Dr. Bettina Matzdorf and Dr. Jens Jetzkowitz

**Supervisor:** Prof. Dr. Miranda Schreurs, Environmental Policy Research Centre (FFU),  
Freie Universität Berlin

## OUTLINE OF THE SYNOPSIS

1.	DEFINITION OF PROBLEM .....	3
2.	THE STATE OF RESEARCH TO DATE.....	10
3.	RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	13
4.	RESEARCH GOAL .....	13
5.	METHODS.....	14
6.	PROCEDURE.....	15
7.	TEMPORARY OUTLINE .....	16
8.	SCHEDULE.....	17
9.	REFERENCES .....	18
10.	ANNEX / APPENDIX.....	20

## 1. DEFINITION OF PROBLEM

*“Arguably, PES is the most promising innovation in conservation since Rio 1992 [...]”*<sup>1</sup> was Sven Wunder’s statement in his introduction to the fundamentals on Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES).

This makes it clear that with the instrument of PES an innovation in environmental protection has been developed on which the expectation to provide a solution for the preservation and protection of ecosystems is linked.

This has been affirmed in many publications as seen in the following citation: *“In the last decade, payment for different types of ecosystem services has emerged as one for the innovative responses for management of ecosystems.”*<sup>2</sup>

Behind this new paradigm<sup>3</sup> is the market based organisation of environmental properties that are used by humans or required as a basis for life. Some examples for such properties of nature are clean air, carbon sequestration, natural replenishment, and the value of historically distinct landscapes.<sup>4</sup> Because humans do benefit from these properties of nature they are referred to as Ecosystem Services.

From an economic perspective the unlimited access to resources results in their overexploitation. The assignment of value to these resources and their organisation into a market system are ways to counteract the overexploitation. This is realised with a financial incentive given to those who are able to secure and conserve ecosystems by changing their actions.

This is to encourage change in actions, done not only once but on a long term basis, so that ecosystems may be secured and their services would continue to be available.

Payments should come from those, who benefit from the ecosystem services. This might be a private company, a state which represents the beneficiary interest of its citizens or a civil society organisation whose aim is to secure or recreate such an ecosystem service.<sup>5</sup>

With the emergence of the debate on ecosystem services, which essentially was newly affected by the Millenium Ecosystem Assessment report and the embedding of the idea of payments for ecosystem services, some critique concerning the perception of PES as pure market instruments arose. The critique refers mainly to the masking of underlying social relations that is achieved by focussing on the efficiency of PES instruments.<sup>6</sup>

It is assumed that the process of mainstreaming ecosystem services consists of three necessary steps. They are as follow: (1.) Ecological functions must be narrowed down to a single ecosystem service, which is therefore disconnected from the whole ecosystem, (2.) an exchange value must

---

<sup>1</sup> Wunder, Sven (2005), 3.

<sup>2</sup> Kumar, Pushpam (2005), 15.

<sup>3</sup> See Wunder, Sven (2005), 1.

<sup>4</sup> A detailed explanation of the different Ecosystem Services is given within the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, a report prepared by a worldwide network of scientists.

<sup>5</sup> For better understanding an example is given in the annex of the exposé, which explains a PES scheme organised by a private company.

<sup>6</sup> See Kosoy, Nicolás/ Cobera, Esteve (2009), 2. Kosoy and Corberra had associated the focus on economic efficiency of the PES with the term „commodity fetishism“, which they took from Marx. Marx tried to reveal the fact that the production and exchange of commodities actually mask the underlying social relations.

be allocated and (3.) service provider and service consumers (sellers) must be linked to one another through a market exchange or an exchange similar to this.

It is considered critical for it remains unknown, who actually profits from the price calculation and the commercialisation of the ecosystem services.<sup>7</sup> One answer is that valuing legitimises the actions and behaviour of those who decreed rules for such instruments: *„Selling nature to save it’ legitimises the behaviour of those who frame policy for their own direct benefit and advocate for markets as the best strategy to strike a balance between nature conservation and the expansion of capitalism.“*<sup>8</sup>

From an economic point of view the price that is paid to the service provider is fair as long as he or she agrees to the instrument contract, for enrolling in the programme is voluntary and not statutory.

A PES programme is efficient as long as opportunity costs are covered, the land use type conforms to sustainable goals and maximal results for the ecosystem service are generated.<sup>9</sup> This perspective however masks underlying social relations that support the mechanism and gives no insights on the role of hierarchies and power structures.

Which is why Kosoy and Corbera made this statement: *“However it is our view that such perspective masks underlying power asymmetries in defining what represents a fair price and in PES decision-making processes.”*<sup>10</sup>.

Muradian et al. also acted on this suggestion, expanding at the same time the hitherto dominant understanding of PES – characterised by the definition from Sven Wunder<sup>11</sup>. In this case, they understood PES rather as a collection of methods and courses of action for rural development than perceived it solely as a market instrument.

In doing so, they placed the relation among social actors into the focus. They framed PES as a “multi goal policy instrument” and thereby tried to avoid looking at PES exclusively from an efficiency perspective.<sup>12</sup>

They defined PES as *“[...] a transfer of resources between social actors which aims to create incentives to align individual and/ or collective land use decision with the social interest in the management of natural resources [...]”*<sup>13</sup>. This transfer can then take place through a market mechanism or a mechanism similar to that.<sup>14</sup>

They highlighted the transfer of resources among social actors that operate in different ways. Therefore the relation among these actors gained importance, while the payment itself (and its mechanism) took a backseat. Kosoy and Cobera (2009) described social relations as relations consisting of hierarchies and power structures.

---

<sup>7</sup> See Kosoy, N./ Corbera, E. (2009), 2.

<sup>8</sup> Mc Afee, K. (1999) Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 17(2) 133 -154, cit. in: Kosoy, N./ Corbera, E. (2009), 2.

<sup>9</sup> See Pagiola, S. (2005): Assessing the Efficiency of Payments for Environmental Services Programs: A Framework for Analysis; World Bank: Washington D.C, cit. in: Kosoy, N./ Corbera, E. (2009), 6.

<sup>10</sup> Kosoy, N./ Corbera, E. (2009), 6.

<sup>11</sup> Sven Wunder defines PES as *„[...] voluntary transaction where a well defined ES (or land-use likely to secure that service) is being ‘bought’ by a (minimum one) ES buyer from a (minimum one) ES provider if and only if the ES provider secures ES provision (conditionality).”* (ES = Ecosystem Service), (Wunder, Sven (2005), 1) and therewith foregrounds the market mechanism.

<sup>12</sup> See Muradian, R. et.al (2009), 4.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> See ibid.

The research project assumes that a deliberative approach in the design of PES can have a corrective effect on power asymmetries and offer a chance for positive impacts on the success<sup>15</sup> of PES.

For that reason the research work will analyse the design processes of PES and pose questions regarding participation possibilities in these processes, their pre- and general conditions, the motives behind the decision for a participatory approach and their impacts. The theoretical concept of deliberation should serve within the scope of the research to develop the 'highest level' in participation, to enable the assessment and evaluation of the investigated participatory processes.

Deliberation is understood as an open process of democratic debate, in which anyone who is affected by the decisions and/ or its consequences may participate.

Deliberation therefore differs from the limited participation of an elite circle in a consulting process and from the pure creation of legitimacy through participation without deliberation.<sup>16</sup>

Since participation should always be considered against the backdrop of its cultural and political context<sup>17</sup> which offers insights on the basic conditions for participation – the research work is therefore structured as a comparative study. The study will compare PES design processes in Germany and Great Britain.

Bettina Lösch defined the public sphere, democracy and political participation as constitutive categories for deliberation.<sup>18</sup> These categories are used to build up the comparison between the two states. For that reason the historical development of the understanding of public sphere, the democratic structures and the participation possibilities in decisions focused on shaping the environment are analysed and compared.

The comparison of PES-design processes in two different systems should make it possible to gain insights into structural and cultural conditions for participation and as a consequence to be able to draw inferences from the effects of participation on the success of PES.

The comparison of PES design processes in both countries should provide the opportunity for gaining research findings on the structural and cultural conditions for participation and, as a consequence, allow conclusions on the impacts of participation on the success of the PES scheme.

Differences within the constitutive categories between the two countries will be described in brief in the following section.

In both countries a different understanding of the public sphere evolved linked respectively to the historical development of these countries. The Western European – Anglo Saxon understanding follows one of Roman antiquity, where decisions are not only made by the ruler but where citizens also take responsibility for them. In contrast to that Germany has developed a far more authority

---

<sup>15</sup> What precisely is understood as the success of the PES, should be defined in the context of the work process with the help of existing publications on the success of PES and instruments in environmental and nature conservation.

<sup>16</sup> See Lösch, B. (2005), 197/198.

<sup>17</sup> See Habermas, Jürgen (1969), 13, 17 and also Kohout, Franz (2002), 38.

<sup>18</sup> See Lösch, Bettina (2005), 198.

based attitude regarding decision making in public affairs, following a Germanic-medieval understanding of the public sphere.<sup>19</sup>

Both countries also differ from each other in terms of democratic structures. Accompanied by the historical significance of their constitutions that formed their democratic structures, the attitude of the people on sovereignty differs as well.

While Germany follows a liberal tradition that limits the sovereignty of the people (that is why it is called a semi-sovereign state), the constitution of the United Kingdom draws on the tradition of common law, which is seen as a limitation to the power of the government.<sup>20</sup>

In terms of participation possibilities in the decision making for shaping the environment both countries have had different historical developments.

In publications on participation in Germany two main different approaches could be ascertained. One described participation as an instrument that is used to equip decisions with a consensus after a circle of politicians and experts have already decided on what to do.

This approach follows the political proceedings from the mid 60s where policy instruments in planning processes were supplemented by participatory elements like the granting of the permission of power of veto and the right to demand for information. The aim of participation in this case was the enhancement of quality and acceptance of the decision.<sup>21</sup>

The problem with this approach is that environmental decision making is often coupled with expert knowledge, which concentrates on environmental objectives, while social connections, social goals and demands often have minor significance.

The second approach frames participation as a form of common shaping of society. This way of thinking was derived from the political mood of optimism, supported by the speech by Willy Brandt "Mehr Demokratie wagen" (given on 28<sup>th</sup> of October in 1969; "Take a chance on more democracy"). Out of this optimistic spirit of change New Social Movements developed, which claimed rights on participation in political decision making.<sup>22</sup>

The strict representative constitution of the Federal Republic limited participation elements at the federal level with the exception of territorial plebiscite (Article 29GG) in the voting act.<sup>23</sup>

Thereby political elites were formed, who decided and still decide common issues, legitimised through votes. With the development of historical events this form of democracy was criticised more and more. Max Kaase described these developments with the term "participatory revolution" through which political elites were challenged and extensive democratization of society was deemed necessary.<sup>24</sup>

These claims entailed until today a greater inclusion of direct democratic elements, but they are still limited to the community level and the federal state level.

---

<sup>19</sup> See Bahr, Hans-Eckehard (1970), 93.

<sup>20</sup> See Scholl, B.(2006), 95ff and 135.

<sup>21</sup> See Baranek, Elke/ Walk, Heike (2005), 75 und Querschnittsarbeitsgruppe Partizipation (Hrsg.) (2005), 6.

<sup>22</sup> See Baranek, Elke/ Walk, Heike (2005), 75f und Querschnittsarbeitsgruppe Partizipation (Hrsg.) (2005), 8.

<sup>23</sup> See Enquete-Kommission „Zukunft des Bürgerschaftlichen Engagements“ (2002), 285.

<sup>24</sup> See *ibid.* 152.

Furthermore it must be stressed that the representative forms of political decision-making processes were complemented with direct democratic elements but did not replace them.<sup>25</sup>

As pointed out in a report by the committee of investigation (Enquete-Kommission des Deutschen Bundestages zum bürgerschaftlichen Engagement), the state is calling for a strong civil society today and defines civic engagement as the necessary condition for societal cohesion<sup>26</sup>.

This discussion can be seen as a political attempt to find a remedy for the actual crisis situation faced by the state <sup>27</sup> which is under pressure to legitimise its actions, due to decreasing political party members and low voter turnout.

From the perspective of a common shaping of the environment it is true in Germany that possibilities for participation on the national level are rather limited, despite the strong environmental movement that had developed with the historical events (arising of the New Social Movements) in the late 60s. The environmental groups had a rather oppositional relation to the state which was caused by the absence of environmental topics within the political debate (for example concerning the Anti-nuclear power movement). The Green Party emerged out of this movement, moved into the German Bundestag in 1983 overstepping the threshold of 5 % and even became part of the governing parties in 1998 (in coalition with the Social Democratic Party (SPD)).

Nevertheless possibilities for participation in environmental decision making remained limited. Founded in the understanding of law and administration and the federal system in Germany, it is rather interest groups that are tied to collective decisions. Activism and engagement of initiatives, associations and other forms of civil society are limited to the local level – as described previously.<sup>28</sup>

Great Britain in contrast, did not experience the development of New Social Movements. Rather moderate environmental organisations still dominate the scene. These long-established organisations also existed in Germany but no longer play this leading role today as seen in the Great Britain.

The Royal Society of the Protection of Birds, the Council for the Protection of Rural England and the Royal Society for Nature Conservation for example belong to this group of organisations. They instead have a cooperative relation to the state.<sup>29</sup>

A collective decision-making process was not within the political system of Westminster. Although the first governmental institutions devoted to environmental issues were established in the 70s, the government at that time was not very interested in solving environmental problems. So these institutions could not achieve much during that time. In addition, some quasi-autonomous government authorities that had strong relations to environmental groups but barely any political influence were able to develop.<sup>30</sup>

The biggest possibilities for interest groups to exert their influence at that time were through advisory committees. For that reason most environmental organisations started to interrelate with the state.

---

<sup>25</sup> See *ibid.* 285.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.

<sup>27</sup> See Priller, Eckard (2002), 40.

<sup>28</sup> Dryzek, John S. et al. (2003), 37ff.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*

*“Britain’s mainstream environmental groups responded to these opportunities by cultivating relationships with government.”<sup>31</sup>*

In 1988 the British government first acknowledged the need for solving environmental problems with the famous speech by Margret Thatcher in front of the Royal Society.

Up until then the possibilities for the engagement of associations and initiatives was decreasing while access to co-determination for moderate environmental groups strengthened.<sup>32</sup>

After the speech by Margaret Thatcher the relationship between the government and environmental organisations changed for the better. The European Community also exerted great influence on this.<sup>33</sup> Even in the 90s environmental activists outside of the moderate environmental organisations were still excluded from the political debate: *“The early 1990s saw something like a ‘dual state’ that welcomed the most moderate environmental groups into dialog while taking the actively exclusionary hammer to any sort of action that stepped outside these carefully prescribe limits.”<sup>34</sup>*

For that reason the discourse in Great Britain is still determined by organisations which were established long before the 70s.

So it is clear in both countries that possibilities for participation in environmental decision-making are limited, even when it is unequally rooted. This is exactly the same with participation in PES. Their design is often “top-down” (based on the level of policy-maker): *“PES programmes and projects do not make strong claims about their participatory nature. Often they evolve as top-down, managerial policies and projects where maximising participation whilst at the same time increasing effectiveness would be a function of setting the right procedural framework.”<sup>35</sup>*

This is also apparent in a study by Birgit Mueller. As a possibility to participate she agreed to set up a local committee consisting of voluntary members, local organisations, and interest groups. The committee was awarded discretionary competence. In her survey of the relevant ministries it became clear that they did not want to share the discretionary competences.<sup>36</sup>

Scientific reports however argued that participation in PES could enhance efficiency and acceptance of the schemes. Financial incentives appeared to be most promising when they are designed in a participatory manner.<sup>37</sup>

Albeit there are attempts to increase participation in the design of state-run PES (for example EU member states are required to widen possibilities for participation by relevant actors in the Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005<sup>38</sup>). However, it must be said that within the procedures of preparation and development of a decision, discursive or cooperative approaches are underrepresented<sup>39</sup>.

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 47.

<sup>32</sup> Dryzek, John S. et al. (2003), 51.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid. 52f.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid. 53.

<sup>35</sup> Kosoy, Nicolas/ Corbera, Esteve/ Brown, Kate (2008), 2074.

<sup>36</sup> Müller, Birgit (2009), 55.

<sup>37</sup> See Matzdorf, Bettina (2004), 274.

<sup>38</sup> Council Regulation ( no 1698/2005 Of 20th September 2005 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) Chapter III, Article 6.

<sup>39</sup> See Hagedorn, Konrad (2001), 15.

Therefore the research here will examine the role of civil society organisations in such design processes. The research will attempt to find out if new perspectives for participation are emerging in contrast to the actual situation in state-run PES design.

As stated in the problem-section the research work sees PES in a wider sense as understood in the definition by Muradian et al. This means that PES is understood as an instrument for rural development, designed for the exchange of resources to conserve and secure ecosystems. The critique regarding the masking of power asymmetries (developed by Kosoy/ Corbera(2009)) will be dealt with and PES design processes will consequently be analysed against the backdrop of deliberation (deliberative democracy).

Civil society will be examined within this focus, to see if they are opening up new perspectives for participation within PES beyond what it currently is in state-run PES.

The comparison between PES design processes in Germany and Great Britain will make conclusions on the basic conditions for participation possible. At the same time it will explain background information which is necessary for understanding statements on the impact of participation on the success of the PES.

## 2. THE STATE OF RESEARCH TO DATE

Research on the topic of participation is diverse and vast in number. It also includes a huge variety of definitions and concepts of participation.

Participation seems to be a multifaceted term with widely separated ideas and concepts behind it. The understanding of participation ranges from the opinion that participation is about making information publicly accessible to the ideas of collective consensus decision-making. When speaking of participation one has to define what exactly is meant by the usage of the term.

From the current perspective there exists a plethora of publications on deliberation and deliberative democracy, which seemed to have securely established itself since the 90s. As an example one could name Jürgen Habermas (who is a famous exponent for the concept of deliberative democracy). Through his publication of “Drei normative Modelle von Demokratie”<sup>40</sup> (Three normative models of democracy) he made a strong impact on the debate on deliberative democracy in the United States. The term “deliberative democracy” was first used by Joseph Besette in 1980. However the ideas of deliberation could actually be traced back to the theories of public sphere by Hannah Arendt and John Dewey as well as the political theories of Rousseau or Aristotle.<sup>41</sup>

At present John Dryzek appears to be the most prominent exponent of the discourse on deliberative democracy.<sup>42</sup> He is also famous for representing the connection between deliberative democracy and green politics.<sup>43</sup>

Meanwhile a lot of publications have followed in this trend. This close link is especially important for the research and is therefore included in the theoretical analysis of the approaches of deliberative democracy. The need for this connection is based on the initial point where two complex systems interact with each other – namely the social system and various ecosystems. Both will be examined separately using different scientific disciplines. The connection of both systems should then be considered double complex. The increasing complexity will be accompanied by a growing number of perceptions on the problem. It is therefore proposed as a solution to confront the problem with collective discourse.<sup>44</sup>

Dryzek (just like Habermas) assigned procedural theories of democracy to his approach, placing the political decision-making process at the centre. In contrast contextual theory understands deliberation rather as a form of living than a procedure.

Another theoretic approach was given by Gutmann and Thompson, who found an alternative to other approaches by choosing something more participatory that looks at deliberation as the heart of democratic conflict resolution.<sup>45</sup>

Since the target is not a radical change in the formal institutional democracy, this theoretical approach could be an interesting theoretical framework for the research. Their approach could

---

<sup>40</sup> Jürgen Habermas (1996): Drei normative Modelle der Demokratie: Zum Begriff deliberativer Demokratie, in: Jürgen Habermas: Die Einbeziehung des Anderen. Frankfurt a.M. 1996, 277-292.

<sup>41</sup> See Lösch, Bettina (2005), 151.

<sup>42</sup> See *ibid.*

<sup>43</sup> See Smith, Graham (2003), 61.

<sup>44</sup> See Dryzek, John S. (1997), 8.

<sup>45</sup> See Lösch, Bettina (2005), 171ff.

help define the “highest level of participation” without contradiction between theory and reality resulting from the different institutional structures.

The interdependency between participation in PES design processes and the success of the PES scheme has not been examined in a study until now. At least similar work has not been found in both English and German literature.

There are articles in the semantic field of participation, but most of them refer to participation as enrolment in PES programmes. They mainly correspond to conditions and requirements under which ecosystem service providers sign PES contracts and hence participate in the programmes. Occasionally some studies would point out that the number of participants (signing the contract) could be increased with the participation of stakeholders in the decision-making processes.<sup>46</sup>

Within the wider scope of participation and collective shaping of the environment a much greater number of publications of different disciplines could be found. From an economic perspective participation is primarily linked to the failure of market and democracy.<sup>47</sup> Hence the book by Peter Feindt and Jens Newig (2005; *Participation, Public Participation and Sustainability*) for example actually represents a lot of articles, in which participation is seen as a political instrument for increasing the effectiveness and acceptance of political decisions.

Additionally Peter Feindt’s publication “Regierung durch Diskussion“ (Governing through Discourse) should be stated exemplarily at this point. The book presents participation against the backdrop of deliberation while at the same time providing a classification of deliberative participation methods. Further publications in the German language discuss different approaches of participation in environmental decision-making and with that contribute essentially to the debate<sup>48</sup>. There are a far greater number of publications in English on the topic. John Dryzek was already given as an example of one of the most important exponents.

Within the preliminary investigation one publication was mentioned rather frequently. It was a book edited by Bill Cooke and Uma Kothari titled: ‘Participation. The New Tyranny?’. The reason for this assumingly is the small number of literature that looks critically at participation. In this case it should be kept in mind that this publication was aimed at participatory projects in “developing countries” and should not be taken out of this context. The distribution of power in this case is not only a question of a single nation system but a question of distribution between states. However it presents critical reflections and approaches that should be taken into account.

Research gaps with regards to participation in environmental decision-making could be recognised in the following fields:

Within the topic of research on volunteering Eckard Priller pointed out that research on impacts and conditions of impact of volunteering is needed. He furthermore had endorsed examinations on the meso level within different topics to enrich research on volunteering. The environmental field was also mentioned here.

---

<sup>46</sup> See e.g. Kosoy, Nicolas, Corbera, Esteve; Brown, Kate (2008), 2081.

<sup>47</sup> See Kohout, Franz (2002), 78.

<sup>48</sup> Following are adduces exemplary: Franz, Kohout (2002): *Vom Wert der Partizipation. Eine Analyse partizipativ angelegter Entscheidungsfindung in der Umweltpolitik*, Münster, Hamburg, London: LIT.; Feindt, Peter H./ Newig Jens (Hgs.): *Partizipation, Öffentlichkeitsbeteiligung, Nachhaltigkeit. Perspektiven der politischen Ökonomie*, Marburg: Metropolis. und Walk, Heike (2008): *Partizipative Governance. Beteiligungsformen und Beteiligungsrechte im Mehrebenensystem der Klimapolitik*, Wiesbaden: VS.

In order to develop the state of the research he proposed improving theoretical foundations as well as methodical instruments and installing long-term investigations and research networks.<sup>49</sup>

Within the research field of participation, the following research needs were pointed out in the literature:

(1) Analysis of participation should also reflect participation in its democratic, deliberative sense<sup>50</sup>

(2) There are requirements on empirical studies regarding actual impacts on participatory processes<sup>51</sup> and

(3) The challenge is to focus on the problem areas of participation and with that answer the questions of who initiates participation, who should and who is allowed to participate and which methods are used within the processes. The appreciation of sustainability within society could be deepened with these answers.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> See Priller, Eckhard (2002), 51f.

<sup>50</sup> See Feindt, Peter H./ Newig, Jens (2005), 34.

<sup>51</sup> See *ibid.*

<sup>52</sup> See Baranek, Elke/ Walk, Heike (2005), 82/ 83.

### 3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The following research questions were developed with the acquirement of the problem area and the state of research.

What are the possibilities and limitations of participation in the PES design processes?

Further research questions aimed at the details beneath this question are:

What does participation mean within the context of deliberation in environmental decision-making?

Which approaches are used to design PES in a participatory manner?

What motives lead to the decision of designing PES with a participatory approach?

What impacts does participation have on the success of PES?

How do participatory PES design processes differ between Germany and Great Britain? (Why are they different?)

What role do civil society organisations play within the PES design process in Germany and in Great Britain?

### 4. RESEARCH GOAL

*“If public goods like pure air, clean water and an intact landscape are not provided in a sufficient amount – and this is the tragedy of the commons – the solution consists of authoritarian political sanctions. To stress again political enforcement – regardless of its form – is inevitable.” (W. Ophulus, 1992)*

Against the backdrop of identified research gaps which demonstrated above all the deficit in the impact research for participatory processes and its understanding in a deliberative way, the dissertation aims to close this gap by analysing motives for, methods and impacts of participation and its impact on the success of PES-instruments.

Contrary to the future scenario W. Ophulus created in the above quotation, the research is looking for alternatives in environmental conservation.

This possibility is seen in the deliberative design of approaches and instruments in environmental protection and nature conservation. This offers the chance to design approaches and instruments to overcome political constraints and have corrective influences on power asymmetries.

With the particular rise in environmental problems, the research here will attempt to identify solutions that do not rely on political enforcement.

It is furthermore the goal of the research, to analyse the instruments of PES and to contribute to the development of the instruments. This is transferred by analysing PES against the backdrop of a theoretical framework of deliberation which ought to give answers to what chances participation offers to countering power asymmetries.

## 5. METHODS

The research draws primarily upon qualitative methods, while comparison is chosen as the methodological access to every procedural step. In order to answer questions on the motives for, methods and impacts of participation in the PES design processes, the analysis of case studies (namely the PES design processes) will be necessary.

### **The filtering of organisations that organise PES design processes as a participatory process**

Databases on civil society organisations in the field of environment from Germany and Great Britain will first be examined. The German database was developed by the Maecenata Institute; the Great Britain database comes from the British charity commission. An overview of the civil society organisations active in the environmental field in both countries will be generated through the examination of the databases. Environmental organisations that could be potential users of PES-schemes and their participatory designs are extracted from the databases based on their indicated goals or their fixed targets. Such cases are additionally exposed through the snowball principle.

### **Patterns in the connection between participation and the success of PES –theses formation**

An online survey will be sent to the filtered organisations. The goal is to identify organisations in both countries that use participatory approaches for designing Payments for Ecosystem Services. In this way the participatory methods used and a valuation of the success of the PES will be surveyed.

Indicators which define this success will be generated within the working process. The evaluation of the online survey will be conducted with the Qualitative Comparative Method (QCA). This method was designed by Charles Ragin to enable the making of statements regarding a middle-sized number of cases (10-50 cases).

QCA works with variables and attempts to filter patterns from prevailing circumstances. Therefore new hypotheses can be generated or already posed theses revised.<sup>53</sup>

The Qualitative Comparative Analysis will serve as a method for revealing the patterns of the impact participation has on the success of PES. It is these patterns that would define the cultural and country-specific differences which will also allow conclusions on the basic conditions for participation to be drawn.

### **Patterns of contrasting participation processes**

Contrasting cases will be selected from the resulting cases of the online survey and examined in a case study. Data will come from existing documents of the design processes and will be collected through qualitative interviews of participants of the design process. The generated data will be evaluated using qualitative content analysis<sup>54</sup>. The aim of the analysis is to find, recognise and evaluate patterns behind such processes. Examples of such evaluating participatory processes can be found in publications<sup>55</sup>. They can be taken as the fundament and aid for the evaluation.

---

<sup>53</sup> Information on QCA was taken from a workshop held at the Leibniz-Centre for Agricultural Landscape Research by Lasse Cronqvist in 2009.

<sup>54</sup> According to Philipp Mayring (2000).

<sup>55</sup> See e.g. Lindner, Wolf/ Vatter, Adrian (1996), 182ff; Feidt, Peter H. (2001), 336 ff. and Geißel, Brigitte (2008), 29-48.

## 6. PROCEDURE

The work is subdivided into six chapters and the contents differentiated into three sections. The first combines theoretical reflections of deliberation and deliberative democracy with environmental decision-making processes. The second produces a comparative perspective between Great Britain and Germany and searches for the conditions of deliberative democracy in both countries. The third deals with the PES instruments and the case studies related to participatory PES design processes.

After an **introduction** (Chapter 1) on the topic of participation and PES, the **second chapter** will focus on the theoretical perception of deliberative democracy and its various concepts and exponents. The connection between deliberation and environmental decision-making will be discussed in a subchapter. Following that, points of criticism of deliberative democracy will be scrutinised. With the help of the acquired knowledge, a classification of participation methods (concerning the deliberative democracy concept) will be created.

**Chapter three** is devoted to the frame conditions for deliberation in both the investigation areas Germany and Great Britain. These conditions should be examined with the main elements for deliberation, which are the public sphere (in the historical development), the democratic structures and political participation in environmental decision-making. **Chapter four** then analyses the PES instrument, its origin, its main principle and its actual uses. It will also search for participation possibilities and try to reveal the limitations of participation within the PES-scheme. Furthermore this chapter should illustrate the connections between the impact of participation on the success of the PES and the patterns and theses produced with QCA. **Chapter five** is devoted exclusively to the analysis of the case studies, concentrating on the participation process and its structure. The insights from that will be used to explain the possibilities and limitations of participation within the PES, to enable a **conclusion** to be drawn and to provide an **outlook on the research**.

## 7. TEMPORARY OUTLINE

As a result of the procedure of this thesis with regards to the actual stages of the research, the following outline is proposed for the monograph: (headlines of chapters are regarded as working titles)

1. INTRODUCTION
2. DELIBERATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL DECISION-MAKING
  - Deliberative democracy (concepts and exponents)
  - Deliberation and environmental decision-making
  - Limits and critiques on deliberative democracy
  - Classification of participation methods against the backdrop of deliberative democracy
  - Research findings
3. GENERAL CONDITIONS FOR DELIBERATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL DECISION-MAKING IN GERMANY AND GREAT BRITAIN
  - Systematic frameworks in both countries assessed through the public sphere, the democratic structures and the possibilities to participate in environmental decision-making
  - Historical development and actual situation of the general conditions in both countries
  - Relationship between state and environmental civil society organisations in Great Britain and Germany
  - Research findings
4. PARTICIPATION IN PES INSTRUMENTS. FIRST APPROACH TO A NEW INSTRUMENT IN ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION
  - PES instruments in environmental conservation (origin of the idea, principles and actual usage)
  - Possibilities and limits of participation within PES instruments
  - Estimation by organisations regarding the success of PES
  - Patterns of successful participatory designed PES (results from the QCA)
  - Findings and hypotheses derived with QCA
5. PARTICIPATION IN PES DESIGN PROCESSES. FINDINGS FROM THE COMPARISON OF CASE STUDIES
  - Methodology (selection and case comparison)
  - Case studies and general conditions
  - Patterns of successful participatory designed PES (results from the qualitative content analysis of documents and interviews)
  - Possibilities and limitations of participation in PES- design processes
6. RESEARCH FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

## 8. SCHEDULE

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
<b>Theoretical studies</b>					
Definition of Participation					
Deliberation (concepts and exponents)					
Deliberative democracy and environmental decision-making					
Public sphere in GB & D					
Democratic structures in GB & D					
Political Participation in environmental decision-making in GB & D					
PES – origin, principle, actual usage and possibilities for participation					
PES – success; indicators for success					
<b>Data Collection and Evaluation</b>					
Construction and analysis of databases of environmental organisations in GB & D					
Online survey: Identification and survey of relevant organisations					
Evaluation of the online survey (QCA)					
Selection of contrasting cases					
Data collection for the case studies (documents & interviews)					
Evaluation of cases with qualitative content analysis					
<b>Thesis Writing</b>					
Introduction					
Chapter 2 – Deliberation and environmental decision-making					
Chapter 3 – General conditions in GB und D					
Chapter 4 – Participation in PES instruments					
Chapter 5 – Participation in PES design processes					
Chapter 6 – Research findings, conclusion and outlook					
Revision / corrections					
<b>Miscellaneous</b>					
Planned: Research stay at Cardiff, Wales, with Peter H. Feindt					
Planned: additional publication in a scientific journal					

Formatiert: Englisch  
(Großbritannien)

Formatiert: Englisch  
(Großbritannien)

## 9. REFERENCES

- Bahr, Hans-Eckehard (1970): Öffentlichkeit und Partizipation, in: *Offene Welt*, Nr. 101, (Partizipation. Aspekte politischer Kultur), Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, pp. 92-102
- Baranek, Elke/ Walk, Heike (2005): Partizipation und Nachhaltigkeit. Zwei Seiten ein und derselben Medaille, in: Feindt, Peter H./ Newig Jens (Hgs.): Partizipation, Öffentlichkeitsbeteiligung, Nachhaltigkeit. Perspektiven der politischen Ökonomie, Marburg: Metropolis, pp. 65-86
- Cooke, Bill/ Kothari, Uma (2001) (Hg.): *Participation: The New Tyranny?*, London: Zed Books
- Dryzek, John S. (1997): *The Politics of the Earth. Environmental Discourses.*Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dryzek, John S./ Downes, David/ Hunold, Christian/ Schlosberg, David/ Hernes, Hans-Kristian (2003): *Green States and Social Movements – Environmentalism in the United States, United Kingdom, Germany, and Norway*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Eckert, Roland (1970): Politische Partizipation und Bürgerinitiative, in: *Offene Welt*, Nr. 101 (Partizipation. Aspekte politischer Kultur), Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, pp. 30-47
- Enquete-Kommission „Zukunft des Bürgerschaftlichen Engagements“, Deutscher Bundestag (2002): *Bürgerschaftliches Engagement: auf dem Weg in eine zukunftsfähige Bürgergesellschaft*, online available at: <http://dip21.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/14/089/1408900.pdf>, date:1/2/2010
- Feindt, Peter H. (2001): *Regierung durch Diskussion. Diskurs- und Verhandlungsverfahren im Kontext von Demokratietheorie und Steuerungsdiskussion*, Frankfurt a.M., Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien: Peter Lang
- Feindt, Peter H./ Newig Jens (2005a): Politische Ökonomie von Partizipation und Öffentlichkeitsbeteiligung im Nachhaltigkeitskontext, Probleme und Forschungsperspektiven, in: Feindt, Peter/ Newig Jens: Partizipation, Öffentlichkeitsbeteiligung, Nachhaltigkeit. Perspektiven der politischen Ökonomie, Marburg: Metropolis, pp.. 9-40
- Geißel, Brigitte (2008): *Wozu Demokratisierung der Demokratie? Kriterien zur Bewertung partizipativer Arrangements*, in: Vetter, Angelika (Hrsg.): *Erfolgsbedingungen lokaler Bürgerbeteiligungen*, Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften
- Habermas, Jürgen (1969): Über den Begriff der politischen Beteiligung. In: Ders./ Friedeburg, Ludwig von/ Oehler Christoph und Weltz, Friedrich: *Student und Politik*, 3.Auflage, Soziologische Texte, Band 18, Neuwied am Rhein, Berlin: Luchterhand
- Jürgen Habermas (1996): *Drei normative Modelle der Demokratie: Zum Begriff deliberativer Demokratie*, in: Jürgen Habermas: *Die Einbeziehung des Anderen*. Frankfurt a.M. 1996, pp. 277-292
- Hagedorn, Konrad (2001): *Regionalisierung von Agrar-Umweltprogrammen: Gründe, Konsequenzen, Modelle*, in: WWF-Deutschland/ Deutscher Jagdschutz-Verband e.V. (Hg.): *Die Agrar-Umweltprogramme. Naturschutz in ländlichen Räumen*, Tagungsband zur Podiumsdiskussion, online available at: [URL:http://www.jagd-online.de/downloads/bericht310501.pdf](http://www.jagd-online.de/downloads/bericht310501.pdf), date: 2/8/2010
- Kohout, Franz (2002): *Vom Wert der Partizipation. Eine Analyse partizipativ angelegter Entscheidungsfindung in der Umweltpolitik*, Münster, Hamburg, London: LIT, Reihe: Politik und Partizipation, Band 1
- Kosoy, Nicolas/ Corbera, Esteve/ Brown, Kate (2008): *Participation in payments for ecosystem services: Case studies from Lacadon rainforest, Mexico*, in: *Geoforum*, 39(6), pp. 2073-2083
- Kosoy, Nicolás/ Corbera, Esteve (2009): *Payments for ecosystem services as commodity fetishism*, in: *Ecological Economics*, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2009.11.002
- Kumar, Pushpam (2005): *Market for Ecosystem Services*, iisd, online available at: [http://www.unep.org/dec/economics\\_market\\_for\\_ecosystem\\_services.pdf](http://www.unep.org/dec/economics_market_for_ecosystem_services.pdf), date: 2/4/2010
- Lindner, Wolf/ Vatter, Adrian (1996): *Kriterien zur Evaluation von Partizipationsverfahren*, in: Selle, Klaus (Hg.): *Planung und Kommunikation*, Wiesbaden und Berlin: Bauverlag, pp. 181-188

- Lösch, Bettina (2005): *Deliberative Politik. Moderne Konzeptionen von Öffentlichkeit, Demokratie und politischer Partizipation*, Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot
- Matzdorf, Bettina (2004): Ergebnis- und maßnahmenorientierte Honorierung ökologischer Leistungen der Landwirtschaft – Eine interdisziplinäre Analyse eines agrarumweltökonomischen Instrumentes, in: *Agrarwirtschaft*, Sonderheft Nr. 179, Bergen/Dumme: Agrimedia.
- Mayring, Philipp (2000): Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse, in: *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung*, Volume 1, No. 2, Art. 20, Juni 2000, online available at : <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/viewArticle/1089/2383>, date: 2/4/2010
- Millenium Ecosystem Assessment (2005): *Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Biodiversity Synthesis*. Washington D.C.: World Resource Institute.
- Muradian, R. et al. (2009): Reconciling theory and practice: An alternative conceptual framework for understanding payments for environmental services, in: *Ecological Economics* (2009), doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2009.11.006
- Müller, Birgit (2009): *Agrar-Umwelt-Maßnahmen – ihre Evaluierung und ein Weg zum institutionellen Wandel – Dargestellt am Beispiel Deutschlands*, Göttingen: Mathematisch-Naturwissenschaftliche Fakultäten der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen, online available at: [http://webdoc.sub.gwdg.de/diss/2009/mueller\\_birgit/mueller\\_birgit.pdf](http://webdoc.sub.gwdg.de/diss/2009/mueller_birgit/mueller_birgit.pdf), date: 12/7/2010
- Perrot-Maître, D. (2006): The Vittel payments for ecosystem services: a “perfect” PES case? International Institute for Environment and Development, London, UK, online available at: <http://www.katoombagroup.org/documents/tools/TheVittelpaymentsforecosystemservices2.pdf>, date: 1/2/2010
- Priller, Eckhard (2002): Zum Stand empirischer Befunde und sozialwissenschaftlicher Theorie zur Zivilgesellschaft und zur Notwendigkeit ihrer Weiterentwicklung, in: Enquete-Kommission „Zukunft des Bürgerschaftlichen Engagements“ Deutscher Bundestag (Hg.): *Bürgerschaftliches Engagement und Zivilgesellschaft*, Band 1, Opladen: Leske + Budrich, pp. 39-54
- Querschnittsarbeitsgruppe Partizipation (Hrsg.) (2005): *Partizipation und Nachhaltigkeit. Reflektionen über Zusammenhänge und Vereinbarkeiten*, Diskussionspapier Sozial-ökologische Forschung, online available at: [http://www.sozial-oekologische-forschung.org/\\_media/O-AG\\_Partizipation-Diskussionspapier3\\_05%281%29.pdf](http://www.sozial-oekologische-forschung.org/_media/O-AG_Partizipation-Diskussionspapier3_05%281%29.pdf), date: 12/3/2010
- Scholl, Bruno (2006): *Europas symbolische Verfassung. Nationale Verfassungen und die Konstitutionalisierung der EU*, Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Studien zur Europäischen Union, Band 5
- Smith, Graham (2003): *Deliberative Democracy and the Environment*, London und New York: Routledge
- Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1698/2005 Des Rates vom 20.September 2005 über die Förderung der Entwicklung des ländlichen Raums durch den Europäischen Landwirtschaftsfond für die Entwicklung des ländlichen Raums (ELER)
- Wunder, Sven (2005): Payments for environmental services: Some nuts and bolts, CIFOR Occasional Paper Nr. 42; online available at: [http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/publications/pdf\\_files/OccPapers/OP-42.pdf](http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/publications/pdf_files/OccPapers/OP-42.pdf), date: 12/7/2009

## 10. ANNEX / APPENDIX

Example of a private organised PES scheme <sup>56</sup>:

The **Ecosystem Service**, in this case is water with high quality (without pesticides, without nitrites, and with only a low amount of nitrate [4.5 mg/l]).

**Service-Buyer** of the Ecosystem Service is a water bottling company in France.

**Service Providers** of the Ecosystem Service are farmers in the catchment area of the spring, where the company takes the water from.

The water bottling company has to secure a high level of water quality as it sells the water as 'natural mineral water' (high water quality in this case is defined as to be seen in the box describing the Ecosystem Service).

The water is taken from an aquifer, which reaches earth's surface in this region for geological reasons.

Upstream areas are used for agriculture. With the modification of farming types the input of chemical elements has increased. For that reason the company had to find alternative solutions to secure water quality.

Therefore they took different alternatives into account:

- to dislocate the catchment to a place closer to the spring,
- to own the land in the catchment area,
- start legal proceedings that force farmers to change the land use types into more ecofriendly types or
- introduce financial incentives which encourage farmers to change farming types.

After checking financial and legal possibilities for the implementation of the alternatives, the company decides to implement financial incentives. These incentives led to fact that all farmers in the region where changing their land use types and with that the company was able to secure the water quality.

Among other things incentives were:

- long-time contract durations (of contracts that remunerate the conversion of the land use type and therefore the securing of the Ecosystem Service)
- financial adjustments for new farming equipment and for advisory professionals
- involvement in new professional networks

---

<sup>56</sup> See Perrot-Maître, D. (2006) : S. 9ff.