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Research methods

• Network analysis
• Qualitative data analysis
  • Interviews
  • Participant observation
  • Archival document analysis
Findings
Networks before the Carpathian Convention
Key Carpathian networks in the 1990s

• ACANAP: Association of the Carpathian Protected Areas (1991-CNPA)
• CERI: Carpathian Ecoregion Initiative (1999-dormant)
• Carpathian Euroregion (1993-)
• ANPED: Northern Alliance for Sustainability (1991-2014)
• Eastern Carpathian Biosphere Reserve (1992-)
Role of Carpathian networks before the Convention

- Connections between people and organizations spanning
  - National borders
  - Types of organizations (authorities, local governments, NGOs, research institutions, protected area administrations etc.)
  - Sectors

- Umbrella organizations
  - Consultation and cooperation bodies (science, management practices, reports)
  - Channel Carpathian interests to fora outside of the Carpathians
Role of Carpathian networks before the Convention

• Paving the way for the Carpathian Convention
  • Familiarity among actors
  • Shared understanding
  • Shared (and diverging) motivations
Findings
Network of the Carpathian Convention
Network of Actors
Structure

47 meetings
346 organizations

Certain network-weaving events
Diverse network
Single connected component
NGOs
UN bodies
Academic & research bodies
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Inter-governmental org.
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Meeting

COP2 to COP3
Core-periphery network structure

COP3 to COP4
Larger number of WG meetings
Group of organizations that have attended a larger number of meetings together and thus are likely to have gotten to know each other

COP4 to COP5
Two communities among the organizations that tend to attend different types of meetings together
Network of Actors
Structure
Network of Actors
Structure

Core-periphery network structure
• 19 organizations in core
Network of Actors
Structure

Implications
Beneficial for
• Social cohesion, trust
• Consensual, shared knowledge generation
Harmful for
• Accessing new knowledge
• Diversity and inclusivity
Findings
Thematic Networks
Thematic networks

- Carpathian Network of Protected Areas (CNPA) 2006-
- Carpathian Wetland Initiative (CWI) 2006-
- Science for the Carpathians (S4C) 2008-
Network of Actors
Structure

CWI
CNPA

S4C
Characteristics of thematic networks

- Formalized tie to Carpathian Convention
  - Active participation at Convention meetings
  - Participating to and initiating projects
- Connecting to international fora and organizations
- Bridging all Carpathian countries
- Facilitating network development
- Enabling information exchange
- Personal commitment of individuals
- Low level of legal formalization
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Aims

• Input to research

• Identifying *lessons learnt* from existing networks
  • Identify good practices to carry forward
  • Identify problems
  • Suggest options to avoid problems in ESD network

• NOT a strategy development workshop
Role of focus groups

• Researcher will prepare internal report and recommendations
  • Anonymous input
  • For internal use only, not shared publicly
    • Carpathian Convention actors and project donor will get access

• Feed into ESD network establishment process
Agenda

The solutions
• Individual work (2-3 minutes)

The problems
• Individual work (2-3 minutes)
• Group discussion (2x15 minutes)

The solutions
• Group discussion (15 minutes)

• Report back (voluntary)
Attitudes for focus group

• Participation is voluntary
• All contributions are highly valuable and appreciated
• No right and wrong answers

• Embrace diversity
• Openness to others
• Active and constructive contribution
• Equal participation
• Anonymity, confidentiality (“what is said in the group, stays in the group”)

Link to online document for online participants

https://tinyurl.com/CarpathianESD
Task 1 / individual exercise

Identify areas that work well in existing networks.

• List at least 4-5 concrete examples of things that work/worked well in the existing networks.
• Think of the time spectrum starting at the founding of the networks until today.
• Be as concrete and specific as possible.
Task 2 / Group discussion

Identify the top 5 problem areas for the Carpathian networks.

• You may use the cards if you find them helpful.
• Identify first which is the biggest problem, and work backwards from here.
• If something is missing from the cards, add a new card.
• If something is not relevant from the cards, put the card aside.
Task 3 / Group discussion

Contextualize and explain how you experience the top problem areas in the Carpathian networks.

• Start with the biggest problem area, and note down its relevance to the Carpathian networks.
• Be as concrete as possible.
• Try not to get stuck on one problem area.
Task 4 / Group discussion

Develop possible ways forward to avoid (overcome or mitigate) problems when establishing the ESD network.

- For each problem area develop concrete suggestions to avoid the problem occurring.
- Think at the meta level.
- Stay realistic.
Report back

Any points you would like to share from your group?

• Eye-opening solutions.
• Innovative suggestions.
• Consider confidentiality when sharing from your group.
Problem areas

• Financial issues
• Administration problems
• Low involvement and motivation of actors
• Inappropriate diversity of actors
• Inadequate quality and quantity of outputs delivered by the network
• Communication problems between network actors

• Issues with communication outside of the network
• Network closed to new participants
• Instability of the network
• Lack of identity of the network
• Lack of interaction with other networks
• Unevenly shared responsibilities