

WINS Workshop: - Discussion Moss & Paavola

Problems of fit, interplay, scale

Multi-level / polycentric governance

=> *Managing large resource systems / SETS!*

Ines Dombrowsky

July 16, 2014

Moss: Reflections on problems of fit, interplay & scale



- 3 themes as analytically distinct , but interdependent in practice
=> yes, and indeed highly relevant for problem analysis e.g. in water, e.g. Horleman/Dombrowsky 2012
 - Illusive quest for optimal fit/interplay, pay less attention to structure of a RBO and more to horizontal and vertical interactions
=> yes, but RBOs can be highly ineffective & allocation of diverse functions across scales matters, e.g. Dombrowsky et al. 2014, see also Paavola no. 2!
 - Also consider politics of scale & multiple resource geographies
=> yes, also closely related to multiple benefit and cost streams, see Paavola no. 4 or Dombrowsky 2010
=> also consider interaction sector reforms and broader decentralization processes, Houdret/Dombrowsky/Horlemann 2013
 - Target boundary organizations
=> Who are they and how are they legitimized?
- ⇒ Yes, no panaceas, but can't we say more? Hagedorn (2014)??

Paavola: Towards economics of multi-level and polycentric governance



4 economic arguments for MLEG:

- No. 1: Representation may reduce collective action problems of large groups/ Olson (bottom up nested)
=> yes, but not necessarily...
- No. 3: Path dependency, increasing returns and economies of scope speak for existing (mostly type I) jurisdictions (top down, mostly nested)
=> yes, but not necessarily nested...
- No. 2: Implementing various governance functions in managing large-scale SETS at different scales may reduce governance costs (polycentric)
=> intuitively yes, but is this necessarily so?
- No. 4: Multi-functionality in ecosystem service provision leads to various benefit and costs streams across scales/actors speaking for MLEG/ polycentricity
=> yes, multi-level provision (e.g. through PES) can be more efficient and equitable, but total value maximization needed as you rightly say...

⇒ Yes, economic next to political and other factors to be considered in explaining MLEG, but efficient arrangements no automatism!

⇒ Yes, complementary arguments, but can this be further systematized??



- Dombrowsky, Ines, Annabelle Houdret and Lena Horlemann (2014): Evolving River Basin Management in Mongolia? In Huitema, Dave and Sanders Meijerink (eds): The politics of River Basin Organization, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham (to be published in August 2014)
- Houdret, Annabelle, Ines Dombrowsky and Lena Horlemann (2013). The institutionalization of River Basin Management as politics of scale – Insights from Mongolia, *Journal of Hydrology*, Available online 4 December 2013, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2013.11.037>
- Horlemann, Lena, Dombrowsky, Ines (2012): Institutionalising IWRM in developing and transition countries: the case of Mongolia, *Environmental Earth Sciences*, 65(5): 1547–1559, IWAS special issue, DOI 10.1007/s12665-011-1213-7
- Dombrowsky, Ines (2010): The Role of Intra-water Sector Issue Linkage in the Resolution of Transboundary Water Conflicts, *Water International* 35(2): 132-149

Thank you for your attention!

German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE)

Tulpenfeld 6

D-53113 Bonn

Telephone: +49 (0)228-949 27-0

E-Mail: DIE@die-gdi.de

www.die-gdi.de

www.facebook.com/DIE.Bonn

www.youtube.com/DIEnewsflash

