

**Prospects of academic writing and publishing within TRANSPAREA project framework  
(in order of appearance and merely priority)**

1. Policy paper(s): one or two, addressing renaturalisation by means of passive protection („doing nothing”). Factor of altitude should be taken into account in case of Fulufjellet, which potentially makes the case more complicated as compared to Białowieża. Cost dimension (foregone profits) could also be incorporated, taking into account the clear division between the two cases in terms of forestry management: whilst in NO and SE forest are mostly private-owned, in both PL and BY the public bodies are in charge of forestry management. Prices themselves could be used as a proxy of costs. Political soundness of Białowieża forest should be underlined and used for paper promotion. The phenomenon of negative WTP could have required explanation if the paper is reviewed by the economist. Natural sciences expert should be invited in order to compose the ecological chapter and professor Per Angelstam seems to be natural candidate. Possibly, data from NEWFOREX could be used. Targeted journals – interdisciplinary ones with the conservation emphasis: Conservation biology, Restoration ecology (US).
2. Are transboundary nature protected areas international public goods? The core economic paper dedicated to testing of the main research hypothesis and its explanation by means of hybrid modelling. Possible options: one pooled dataset, two case-specific datasets/models or four country-specific models. Targeted journals – ERE, JEEM.
3. Why WTP for protection of the neighbouring part is negative (Białowieża case, possibly with references to the Scandinavian one as a baseline). Latent class modelling approach aiming to explain the probability of falling into particular class with the set of sociodemographic and attitudinal/behavioural variables. Targeted journal – EE.
4. Free-riding. Does believing in unilateral conservational action from the side of neighbouring country influence the decision not enter the market (systematic picking SQ in all sixteen CT or frequency of picking SQ out of the set of CT – since the respondent take the decision to either enter the market or not every time she faces the CT). Highly problematic – there could have also been other possible explanations, for instance fear of bark-beetle invasion from the neighbours’ side. Besides, it has not been tested yet if such a correlation is the case. My idea – my efforts.
5. Geographical pattern of protected areas establishment, inspired by the recent publication in ERE.
6. Influence of the geographical proximity of the respondents’ place of residence on use value (possibly we should frame it into the paper #2).
7. Mixed qualitative/quantitative study of nuances of understanding of the scenario and questionnaire by the respondents (based on the records of Scandinavian focus groups).
8. Do respondents perceive the survey as politically consequential (based on difference of design modifications in terms of their incentive compatibility)?