

A - Základní údaje

Návrh projektu do veřejné soutěže ve výzkumu, experimentálním vývoji a inovacích na podporu grantových projektů základního výzkumu pro Standardní projekty na rok 2017 (dále jen projekt)

Registrační číslo 17-03806S

Datum zahájení 1.1.2017

Doba řešení (v letech)
3

Název projektu česky

Odhalování temného koutu legislativního procesu: Příprava návrhů zákonů exekutivou

Název projektu anglicky

Exploring the Dark Corner of the Legislative Process: Preparation of Bills by the Executive

Hlavní panel

P408 - Právní vědy, politologie

Klíčová slova legislativní proces;návrhy zákonů;exekutiva;veřejná správa;koaliční vlády;kvalita legislativy

Klíčová slova anglicky legislative process;statutory bills;executive;public administration;coalition governments;quality of legislation

Navrhovatel a uchazeč

Jméno a příjmení doc. JUDr. PhDr. Robert Zbírál Ph.D.

E-mail robert.zbiral@law.muni.cz

Telefon 777020068

Organizace Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, Právnická fakulta

Sídlo Křížkovského 511/8, Olomouc

IČO 61989592

Část A - Abstrakt

Zařazení do číselníku CEP

AG - Právní vědy

AD - Politologie a politické vědy

Abstrakt Současný výzkum poukazuje na dominantní roli vlády v legislativním procesu a důležitost návrhu pro konečnou podobu zákona, přitom je ale procesu přípravy návrhů zákonů věnována výzkumníky i v mezinárodním měřítku minimální pozornost. Projekt zamýšlí tuto mezeru zaplnit a zjistit, kdo a jak ovlivňuje přípravu zákonů a jaké to má důsledky pro kvalitu výstupů přípravného procesu. Výzkum proběhne na případových studiích České republiky a Slovenska, dovolujících použití komparace nejbližších případů. S ohledem na téma bude aplikován multidisciplinární přístup kombinující právní a politologické metody, čemuž také odpovídá složení projektového týmu s odborníky z obou disciplín. Projekt je výrazně empiricky zaměřen a plánuje sběr a následnou analýzu rozsáhlých souborů unikátních dat. Poznatky budou prezentovány v řadě publikací, včetně článků v prestižních zahraničních impaktovaných časopisech.

Cíle Cílem projektu je poskytnout detailní a empiricky podloženou analýzu procesu přípravy vládních návrhů zákonů v projektu ČR a na Slovensku s důrazem na vysvětlení chování zúčastněných aktérů a jeho dopady na kvalitu výstupů z přípravného procesu.

Abstrakt Current research emphasizes the dominant role of the executive in the legislative process and importance of a bill anglicky for final version of any law, yet the process of preparing bills has been so far neglected by researchers even at the international level. This project seeks to close this knowledge-gap and explore who and how influences the bills' preparation and what consequences it has for the quality of outputs from the preparatory process. The inquiry will be pursued on the case studies of the Czech Republic and Slovakia, enabling the most similar cases comparison. Reflecting the topic, a multidisciplinary approach combining legal and political science methods is applied, to this end the project team consists of scholars from both disciplines. The project accentuates empirical aspects and plans to collect and analyse large samples of unique data. The findings will be presented in numerous publications, including articles in top impact factor journals.

Cíle This project aims to provide detailed and empirically grounded analysis of the process of preparing bills by the executive in the Czech Republic and Slovakia with the emphasis on explaining the behaviour or participating anglicky actors and its impact on the quality of outputs.

Část B - Finanční prostředky celkem

Částky jsou uváděny v Kč.

Celkové způsobilé náklady na řešení projektu ze všech zdrojů financování

	1.rok	2.rok	3.rok	Celkem
Celková dotace poskytovatele na projekt	1 293 tis	1 391 tis	1 227 tis	3 911 tis
Podpora z ostatních veřejných zdrojů (tuzemských i zahraničních)	0 tis	0 tis	0 tis	0 tis
Podpora z neveřejných zdrojů (vlastní prostředky, soukromé dotace)	0 tis	0 tis	0 tis	0 tis
Způsobilé náklady ze všech zdrojů financování	1 293 tis	1 391 tis	1 227 tis	3 911 tis
Míra podpory u poskytovatele	100 %			

Rozdělení uznaných nákladů na řešení projektu

	1.rok	2.rok	3.rok	Celkem
Ostatní provozní náklady	525 tis	623 tis	469 tis	1 617 tis
Osobní náklady	768 tis	768 tis	758 tis	2 294 tis
Celkem	1 293 tis	1 391 tis	1 227 tis	3 911 tis

Uchazeč - část B - celkové prostředky

Jméno a příjmení doc. JUDr. PhDr. Robert Zbírál Ph.D.
Organizace Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, Právnická fakulta
 Částky jsou uváděny v Kč.

Celkové způsobilé náklady na řešení projektu ze všech zdrojů financování

	1.rok	2.rok	3.rok	Celkem
Celková dotace poskytovatele na projekt	1 293 tis	1 391 tis	1 227 tis	3 911 tis
Podpora z ostatních veřejných zdrojů (tuzemských i zahraničních)	0 tis	0 tis	0 tis	0 tis
Podpora z neveřejných zdrojů (vlastní prostředky, soukromé dotace)	0 tis	0 tis	0 tis	0 tis
Způsobilé náklady ze všech zdrojů financování	1 293 tis	1 391 tis	1 227 tis	3 911 tis
Míra podpory u poskytovatele	100 %			

Rozdělení uznaných nákladů na řešení projektu

	1.rok	2.rok	3.rok	Celkem
Ostatní provozní náklady	525 tis	623 tis	469 tis	1 617 tis
Osobní náklady	768 tis	768 tis	758 tis	2 294 tis
Celkem	1 293 tis	1 391 tis	1 227 tis	3 911 tis

Uchazeč - část B - rozpis finančních položek

V této části návrhu se vyplňují celkové předpokládané způsobilé náklady projektu (tj. dotace + spolufinancování)

Ostatní provozní náklady

	1 .rok	2 .rok	3 .rok	Celkem
Materiální náklady	35 tis	25 tis	20 tis	80 tis
Cestovní náklady	187 tis	204 tis	136 tis	527 tis
Náklady na ostatní služby a nemateriální náklady	45 tis	117 tis	68 tis	230 tis
Doplňkové (režijní) náklady	258 tis	277 tis	245 tis	780 tis
Celkem	525 tis	623 tis	469 tis	1 617 tis

Osobní náklady (souhrn)

	1 .rok	2 .rok	3 .rok	Celkem
Mzdy odborných pracovníků	517 tis	517 tis	517 tis	1 551 tis
Mzdy dalších (tech.) pracovníků	20 tis	20 tis	20 tis	60 tis
Odměny z DPP/DPČ	40 tis	40 tis	30 tis	110 tis
Sociální a zdravotní pojištění a SF (FKSP)	191 tis	191 tis	191 tis	573 tis
Celkem	768 tis	768 tis	758 tis	2 294 tis

Rozpis mzdových nákladů a odměn z DPP/DPČ pro všechny roky řešení

Student	Jméno	Příjmení	Mzda/1.rok		Mzda/2.rok		Mzda/3.rok	
			Úvazek	Dotace	Úvazek	Dotace	Úvazek	Dotace
3.3.1(5)	Náplň práce / popis činnosti							
b	Robert	Zbíral	162 tis		162 tis		162 tis	
	vedení a koordinace projektu, výzkumník právní analýza / politologie		0,45	162 tis	0,45	162 tis	0,45	162 tis
b	Marian	Kokeš	94 tis		94 tis		94 tis	
	výzkumník právní analýza		0,30	94 tis	0,30	94 tis	0,30	94 tis
a	Milan	Hodás	78 tis		78 tis		78 tis	
	výzkumník právní analýza		0,25	78 tis	0,30	78 tis	0,30	78 tis
b	Jakub	Lysek	58 tis		58 tis		58 tis	
	sběr dat, výzkumník politologie		0,20	58 tis	0,25	58 tis	0,25	58 tis
a	Jaroslav	Bílek	78 tis		78 tis		78 tis	
	sběr a analýza dat, výzkumník politologie		0,25	78 tis	0,25	78 tis	0,25	78 tis
a	Michal	Škop	47 tis		47 tis		47 tis	
	sběr a analýza dat, výzkumník politologie		0,15	47 tis	0,15	47 tis	0,15	47 tis
b	Další spolupracovníci (technici)		20 tis		20 tis		20 tis	
	administrativa spojená s projektem		0,06	20 tis	0,06	20 tis	0,06	20 tis
dohoda	Jan	Kysela	25 tis		25 tis		25 tis	
	výzkumník právní analýza, konzultace a recenze		100,0	25 tis	100,0	25 tis	100,0	25 tis
dohoda	Jakub	Kánský	15 tis		15 tis		5 tis	
	sběr dat		100,0	15 tis	100,0	15 tis	33,0	5 tis

Uchazeč - část B - zdůvodnění finančních položek

Specifikace a zdůvodnění nákladů pro 1. rok řešení

Materiální náklady

Dominantní položkou v rámci materiálních nákladů bude v prvním roce nákup knih, a to jak těch týkajících se přímo daného tématu či legislativního procesu obecně, tak rovněž některé metodologické publikace. Požadovaná částka vychází z toho, že na jednu stranu má řadu monografií již projektový tým k dispozici, na stranu druhou jsou chybějící i případně nově vydané knihy povětšinou velmi drahé (hardbacks). Veškeré nakoupené publikace budou katalogizovány v knihovně PF UP v Olomouci. Mezi další materiální náklady patří nákup drobného kancelářského materiálu, zvláště jde o tonery do tiskáren a další podobný spotřební materiál.

V dalších letech budou materiální náklady klesat, u knih se v zásadě bude nakupovat jen nově vydaná literatura.

Cestovní náklady

Výdaje na cestovné se skládají z pokrytí aktivních účastí na mezinárodních a domácích konferencích. Všechny níže uvedené náklady byly přepočítány kurzem 1 EUR=27 Kč, 1 GBP=35 Kč, 1 USD=25 Kč.

Velkým problémem pro plánování konferencí je "nevzpytatelnost" jejich konání v oboru právo, na rozdíl od politologie neexistují pravidelné mezinárodní konference, většina je jich tematicky i místně vyhlašována ad-hoc. Z toho důvodu není v našich možnostech uvést přesné destinace a délky pobytu ve fakticky dvouletém předstihu. V prvním roce projektu se z těchto důvodů nikdo z právní části týmu zahraniční konference nezúčastní, dojde k tomu až v druhém roce projektu, kdy při psaní průběžné zprávy pro rok 2018 bude přeci jen z časového hlediska lepší možnost cesty podrobněji rozepsat.

V prvním roce projektu tak proběhnou celkem dvě zahraniční "politologické" konferenční cesty, vždy se na nich budou podílet dva členové týmu. Jakub Lysek a Michal Škop se zúčastní ECPR Joint Sessions of Workshops, který v roce 2017 proběhne v Nottinghamu (Spojené království). Oba vystoupí s příspěvkem souvisejícími s tématem, J. Lysek se zaměří na dopady přípravné fáze tvorby zákonů na lokální politiku a M. Škop na možnosti přístupu ke kvantitativnímu zpracování dat plánovaných v projektu. Délka pobytu je plánovaná na 6 dnů s následujícími náklady (na jednu osobu): letenka 8000 Kč, stravné 8000 Kč, ubytování 12000 Kč, místní doprava 1000 Kč.

Robert Zbírál a Kamil Gregor se pak zúčastní ECPR General Conference, která v roce 2017 proběhne v Oslu (Norsku). Oba vystoupí s příspěvkem souvisejícími s tématem, R. Zbírál představí východiska výzkumu v aplikaci na případové studie ČR a Slovenska, K. Gregor možnosti sběru dat z databází eKlep a Portálu právních předpisů a jejich využití. Délka pobytu je plánovaná na 5 dnů s následujícími náklady (na jednu osobu): letenka 6000 Kč, stravné 8000 Kč, ubytování 14000 Kč, místní doprava 2000 Kč.

Třem expertům ze sousedních zemí (Polsko, Rakousko, Německo) bude uhrazeno cestovné/letenka (10000 Kč/osoba) a ubytování na jednu noc (2300 Kč/osoba) při účasti na plánovaném mezinárodním workshopu, každý z nich představí základní prvky přípravy zákonů exekutivou v dané zemi.

Celkem (zaokrouhleně) za zahraniční cestovné v prvním roce projektu: 155 000 Kč

V prvním roce se členové týmu (M. Kokeš, R. Zbírál) zúčastní dvou jednodenních právnických konferencí v ČR, kompletní náklady (cestovné, stravné) jsou v tomto případě odhadnuty na 1000 Kč/účast. Uskuteční se jednodenní setkání celého projektového týmu v Olomouci, M. Škopovi, K. Gregorovi a J. Kyselovi bude proplaceno cestovné a stravné (1000 Kč/osoba). Všem členům týmu (5, mimo M. Hodáse a J. Kyselý) bude hrazena účast na plánovaném projektovém workshopu (3000 Kč/osoba= cestovné, stravné, ubytování na jednu noc). V neposlední řadě M. Hodásovi budou proplaceny dvě cesty z Bratislavy do ČR (setkání projektového týmu- 4000 Kč= cestovné, stravné, ubytování na jednu noc, projektový workshop- 4000 Kč=cestovné, stravné, ubytování na jednu noc). R. Zbírál absolvuje jednu dvoudenní cestu do Bratislavy (4000 Kč= cestovné, stravné, ubytování na jednu noc).

Celkem (zaokrouhleně) na vnitrostátní (včetně Slovenska) cestovné v prvním roce projektu: 32 000 Kč.

V druhém roce odpadne hrazení cestovného na workshop, ale dvou zahraničních konferencí se zúčastní i členové právní části týmu, u politologů rozpis 1 cesta/osoba zůstane shodná. V třetím roce projektu se pak zahraniční cesty oproti druhému roku opět zhruba o dvě poníží. Odhad výše uvedeného vnitrostátního cestovného se na další roky snižuje o náklady na na workshop, ve zbytku se nemění.

Náklady na ostatní služby a nemateriální náklady

Náklady na ostatní služby a nemateriální náklady se v prvním roce skládají především z konferenčních poplatků, konkrétně se jedná o účast na ECPR Joint Sessions of Workshops (3500 Kč/osoba) a ECPR General Conference (6000 Kč/osoba). Celkem tedy jde o 19000 Kč.

K získání uvedených (nižších) cen konferenčních poplatků je nutné institucionální členství v ECPR. To v minulosti hradila katedra politologie PF UP, nyní tak činí katedra politologie FF UP. Jelikož členové projektu budou využívat výhod členství, aniž by tak činili v rámci úvazků na druhé z kateder, je spravedlivé se na úhradě členství podílet. Výše příspěvku je navrhována na 10000 Kč (z celkových cca 30000 Kč/rok).

Dále bude vynaloženo 10000 Kč na překlad draftů některých příspěvků na mezinárodní workshop a 6000 za proofreading těch, které budou psány rovnou v angličtině.

V dalších letech lze odhadovat setrvávající výši konferenčních poplatků (jen v druhém roce nárůst o zmíněné dvě cesty) i spoluúčasti na úhradě členských poplatků v ECPR, z důvodu vyšší četnosti publikačních výstupů se bude nicméně zvyšovat objem nákladů za překlady a proofreading, nadto ještě přibudou náklady na vydání monografií (20 tisíc/kus tuzemská monografie, 40 tisíc/zahraniční monografie).

Osobní náklady

Velikost úvazků odborných členů projektového týmu odpovídá jejich podílu na projektových aktivitách. Konkrétní rozpis úkolů každého člena a míra jejich podílu a odpovědnosti za publikační výstupy je podrobně rozepsána v části C projektové žádosti.

Měsíční mzda tvořící základ pro přepočítání dle úvazku reflektuje mzdy s ohledem na tabulkové zařazení pracovníků založené na pozici a senioritě. Konkrétně jde o 30000 Kč/měsíc (Zbíral), 26000 Kč/měsíc (Hodás, Kokeš, Gregor, Škop) a 24000 Kč/měsíc (Lysek), J. Kyselovi bude udělena DPP. Část projektového týmu (Zbíral, Lysek, Kokeš) v současnosti pracovněprávně působí u navrhovatele a na realizaci projektu se budou podílet dle 3.3.1. odst. 5 písm. b) zadávací dokumentace, zbytek (Hodás, Gregor, Škop, Kysela) bude u navrhovatele po dobu projektu zaměstnán dle 3.3.1. odst. 5 písm. a) zadávací dokumentace, a to při naplnění všech podmínek tam uvedených (doba určitá, nulový jiný úvazek u žadatele atd.).

Kromě odborných pracovníků projekt vyčleňuje malou částku i na minimální úvazek (dohromady 0,06) čtyř administrativních pracovníků (projektová podpora, účetnictví, mzdové záležitosti atd.), DPP bude poskytnuta studentovi Jakubu Kánskému za účelem pomoci s manuálním sběrem dat.

K příslušným hrubým mzdám je připočteno 34 % odvodů na zdravotní a sociální pojištění a 1,5 % do sociálního fondu, celkově tedy odvody činí 35,5 % z hrubých mezd.

Uchazeč - část D2 - bibliografie

Úplné bibliografické údaje o nejvýznamnějších výsledcích vědecké a výzkumné činnosti definovaných v aktuálně platné Metodice hodnocení výsledků výzkumu a vývoje

	Výsledek	Kód výsledku	Databaze	Citací	Impaktní faktor	ERIH
		Popis metodiky				
1	ZBÍRAL, Robert. A Legal revolution or negligible episode? Court of Justice decision proclaimed ultra vires (Czech Constitutional Court, judgment of 31 January 2012, Pl. ÚS 5/12). Common Market Law Review, 2012, roč. 49, č. 4, s. 1475-1492.	Jimp	WOS	9	3,000	
2	ZBÍRAL, Robert. Restoring tasks from the European Union to Member States: A bumpy road to an unclear destination?. Common Market Law Review, 2015, roč. 52, č. 1, s. 51-84.	Jimp	WOS	2	1,795	
3	ZBÍRAL, Robert. Přenos pravomocí členských států na Evropskou unii: cesta bez zpátečního lístku? Praha: Leges, 2013.	B	Jiná	14		
		Google Scholar/vlastní sběr				
4	ZBÍRAL, Robert. Teorie a praxe vyjednávání v Radě Evropské unie. Brno: IIPS, 2009.	B	Jiná	21		
		Google Scholar/vlastní sběr				
5	ZBÍRAL, Robert. Koncept národní identity jako nový prvek ve vztahu vnitrostátního a unijního práva: Poznátky z teorie a praxe. Právník, 2014, roč. 153, č. 2, s. 112-133.	Jrec	Jiná	11		
		Google Scholar/vlastní sběr				
6	ZBÍRAL, Robert. Changing Investiture Rules in the Czech Republic. IN: RASCH, Bjorn-Erik a kol. (eds). Parliaments and Government Formation: Unpacking Investiture Rules. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015, s. 182-196.	C	Jiná	1		
		Google Scholar/vlastní sběr				
7	ZBÍRAL, Robert. Institucionální struktura Evropské unie: právně-politologický pohled. Praha: Linde, 2007.	B	Jiná	16		
		Google Scholar/vlastní sběr				
8	ZBÍRAL, Robert. Comparing the Intensity of Scrutiny for 'Domestic' and Implementing Bills: Does Transposition of EU Law Reduce Political Contestation in National Parliaments? Journal of European Public Policy, 2016 (akceptováno k publikaci)	Jimp	WOS	0	1,817	

Celkové počty výsledků definovaných v aktuálně platné Metodice hodnocení výsledků výzkumu a vývoje za posledních 5 let (podle RIV)

J_{imp} - článek v odborném periodiku impaktovaném	2
J_{sc} - článek v odborném periodiku obsaženém v databázi Scopus	0
J_{neimp} - článek v odborném periodiku neimpaktovaném	1
J_{rec} - článek v českém odborném recenzovaném časopise	11
B - odborná kniha	2
C - kapitola v odborné knize	7
D - článek ve sborníku	0
P - patent	0
F - užitný nebo průmyslový vzor	0
Z - poloprovoz, ověřená technologie, odrůda, plemeno	0
G - prototyp, funkční vzorek	0
H - poskytovatelem realizovaný výsledek	0
L - specializovaná mapa	0
N - certifikovaná metodika a postup	0
R - software	0
V - výzkumná zpráva obsahující utajované informace podle zvláštního právního předpisu	0

Celkový počet citací včetně autocitací a H-index WOS

Počet citací včetně autocitací na všechny práce podle	Jiná	175
Metodika použitá pro počet citací dle "jiné metodiky"	Google Scholar/vlastní sběr- vyloučeny autocitace	
H-index podle Web of Science	2,00	

Uchazeč - část E - související projekty

Běžící projekty (uvádějí se i zahraniční projekty)

V současné době nejsou žádné projekty podporované.

Navrhované projekty (uvádějí se i zahraniční projekty)

V současné době nejsou žádné projekty navrhované.

Ukončené projekty

Poskytovatel	Kategorie CEP
GAČR	AG - Právní vědy
Název programu	Registrační číslo
Postdoktorský projekt	13-15422P
Role v projektu	Panel (pouze GA ČR a AZV)
Řešitel	P408
Celý název projektu	
Dopady unijního práva na vnitrostátní právní řády: komparace situace České a Slovenské republiky	
Dotace pro příjemce	Pracovní úvazek
487 tis	0,20
Počátek řešení	Ukončení řešení
1.2.2013	31.12.2015

Příjemce - název instituce

Univerzita Palackého, Právnická fakulta

Vztah k Projektu spolu rámcově souvisí tématicky svým zaměřením na legislativu. Konkrétně se ale nepřekrývají podávanémuvšobec, neboť u navrhovaného projektu je pozornost směřována na přípravnou fázi tvorby návrhů zákonů a návrhu roli aktérů v ní, u již ukončeného šlo o dopady práva EU na český právní řád a částečně roli Sněmovny. Určitá část kvantitativních dat o návrzích zákonů shromážděných v rámci postdoktorského projektu může být nicméně využita při analýze i v navrhovaném projektu.

Hodnocení

dosud nehodnoceno

Část C2 - odhad předpokládaných výsledků

Odhad předpokládaných výsledků projektu

Část C2 – s ohledem na požadavky IS VaVal - CEP se uvádí odhad počtu a druhu předpokládaných výsledků respektující zvyklosti daného oboru, kterých bude dosaženo v rámci řešení projektu, v členění podle druhů výsledků definovaných v aktuálně platné Metodice hodnocení výsledků výzkumných organizací a hodnocení výsledků ukončených programů; údaje jsou požadovány na základě požadavků evidence IS VaVal - CEP a jsou tam předávány.

J_{imp} - článek v odborném periodiku impaktovaném	4
J_{sc} - článek v odborném periodiku obsaženém v databázi Scopus	1
J_{neimp} - článek v odborném periodiku neimpaktovaném	2
J_{rec} - článek v českém odborném recenzovaném časopise	4
B - odborná kniha	3
C - kapitola v odborné knize	0
D - článek ve sborníku	0

Přílohy

Návrh projektu má připojeny všechny povinné přílohy.

Životopisy (část D1)

Uchazeč	Jméno souboru	Velikost
Uchazeč	CV_Zbiral_short_March_2016.pdf	132kB
Uchazeč	CV_Zbiral_short_March_2016.pdf	132kB
Uchazeč	CV_Zbiral_short_March_2016.pdf	132kB
Uchazeč	CV_Zbiral_short_March_2016.pdf	132kB
Uchazeč	CV_Zbiral_short_March_2016.pdf	132kB
Uchazeč	CV_Zbiral_short_March_2016.pdf	132kB

Ostatní přiložené přílohy

Typ přílohy	Jméno souboru	Velikost
část C	Dark_Corner_Project_Description_Final_Rev.pdf	286kB

Robert Zbiral

Affiliation: Palacky University, Law Faculty, Department of Political Science
Position: Senior lecturer
Address: tř. 17. listopadu, 771 11, Olomouc, Czech Republic
Phone no.: +420 777 02 00 68
E-mail: robert.zbiral@upol.cz

Date of birth: 6th September 1980
Citizenship: Czech Republic

MAIN AREAS OF INTERESTS

use of empirical methods in law, constitutional law (namely legislative and parliamentary issues), implementation of EU law, division of competences between the EU and Member States, EU institutional framework

WORK EXPERIENCE (only main employer)

2004-onwards Palacky University in Olomouc, Law Faculty
Senior lecturer

2009-2014 Palacky University in Olomouc, Law Faculty
Head of the Department of Social Studies and Political Science (resignation on the position)

2010-2013 Palacky University in Olomouc, Faculty of Science
external lecturer

2005-2006 Palacky University in Olomouc, Philosophical Faculty (Department of Political Science and European Studies)
external lecturer

EDUCATION

2012 Palacky University in Olomouc, Law Faculty
Ph.D. in Law; Thesis title: *Return of Competences from the European Union to the Member States*

2005 Palacky University in Olomouc, Law Faculty
M.A. in Law

2004 Palacky University in Olomouc, Philosophical Faculty
M.A. in European studies and political science; summa cum laude

2001 College of Charleston (USA)
exchange stay

GRANTS (selected grants with the exclusion of internal grants from the main employer)

Fulbright Commission
2013-2013: Research Fellowship at the University of Michigan Law School

Czech Grant Agency
2013-2015: Post-doc project "Influence of EU law on national legal orders: Comparison of situation in the Czech Republic and Slovakia"

European Commission (EACEA)
2012: Jean Monnet Learning at School, project "Decide on Europe"

European Commission (EACEA)
2010: Jean Monnet Module, project "European Union Meets Faculty of Science"

European Commission (EACEA)
2010: Jean Monnet Module, project "External Relations Law of the EU" (co-applicant)

Office of the Government of the Czech Republic
2009: Establishment of Internet database covering academic sources related to EU institutions

Czech Ministry of Education

2006-2011: Long-term research grant "Czech National Interests in the European Union" (member of the research team)

Czech Ministry of Education

2005-2011: Long-term research grant "Reform of Public Administration in the Czech Republic" (member of the research team)

OTHER ACTIVITIES

- 2016-onwards Member of the working group (for EU law) of the Legislative Council of the Czech Government
- 2005- onwards Participation at numerous conferences, giving visiting lectures both in the Czech Republic and abroad (Germany, Poland, United Kingdom, France, Turkey, Slovakia, Slovenia, Iceland, Mexico, Italy, Austria, Ireland, Hungary, United States)
- 2007- onwards Referee for the following academic journals: Journal of Contemporary European Studies, Perspectives, Mezinárodní vztahy, Politologický časopis, Politics in Central Europe, Acta Iuridica Olomucensis, Jurisprudence, Časopis pro právní vědu a praxi
- 2008-onwards Long-term research stays (more than one month long) at the University of Michigan Law School, Humboldt Universität, Central European University, European University Institute
- 2015-onwards Evaluator of scientific projects for various subjects (Czech Grant Agency, Slovak Grant Agency, OP VVV)
- 2012- 2014 Member of the Scientific Board of Law Faculty (Palacky University)- resigned on membership
- 2010- 2014 Member of the Academic Senate of Law Faculty (Palacky University)- resigned on membership
- 2010- onwards Member of the Ethical Commission of Palacky University

MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANISATIONS

ECPR (European Consortium for Political Research): coordinator for the Palacky University

UACES (University Association for Contemporary European Studies)

Česká společnost pro politické vědy (Czech Association for Political Sciences): former Member of the Managing Board

Česká společnost pro evropské a srovnávací právo (Czech Association for European and Comparative Law): Member of the Managing Board

SUMMARY OF PUBLICATION RECORD

Selected publications in English

ZBÍRAL, Robert. A Legal revolution or negligible episode? Court of Justice decision proclaimed ultra vires (Czech Constitutional Court, judgment of 31 January 2012, Pl. ÚS 5/12). *Common Market Law Review*, 2012, vol. 49, no. 4, p. 1475-1492.

ZBÍRAL, Robert. Restoring tasks from the European Union to Member States: A bumpy road to an unclear destination?. *Common Market Law Review*, 2015, vol. 52, no. 1, p. 51-84.

ZBÍRAL, Robert. Changing Investiture Rules in the Czech Republic. IN: RASCH, Bjorn-Erik a kol. (eds). *Parliaments and Government Formation: Unpacking Investiture Rules*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015, p. 182-196.

ZBÍRAL, Robert. Comparing the Intensity of Scrutiny for 'Domestic' and Implementing Bills: Does Transposition of EU Law Reduce Political Contestation in National Parliaments? *Journal of European Public Policy*, 2016 (accepted for publication)

Total number of scientific publications: 54 (including five monographs)

Total number of known citations (without autocitations): 175

PROJECT PROPOSAL

Project: Exploring the Dark Corner of the Legislative Process: The Process of Preparing Bills by the Executive

1 State of the art: review of literature

Research in political and legal science has always dedicated the utmost attention to legislation and the legislative process.¹ That is hardly surprising as the topics essentially encircle the whole agenda of both disciplines: legal science is in the end about law(s) and the formulation of any policy is dominantly pursued by legislation. On the other hand, methods and priorities on analysing the subject matter in a narrow sense differ between both groups of researchers. Legal scholars generally prefer to use descriptive (doctrinal) methods and concentrate on the constitutional foundations of the legislative process (including the formal powers of the involved subjects) and technical features of law-making (drafting). Political scientists on average rather explore the factual behaviour of participating actors, including those largely ignored by formal rules (e.g. political parties), and support their analysis by empirical data. While the interdependency is obvious and asks for a multidisciplinary approach, the two camps often work in parallel rather than together (for a review see Kokeš 2016).

Legislation encompasses several forms of legal acts, but the most important ones are laws (statutes).² If we look at the process of their adoption, we find out that in almost any democratic country in the world, the formal framework is extremely similar: the primary responsibility of preparing bills is entrusted to the executive, which then submits them to the parliament where the bills are discussed, amended and eventually adopted. Of course, a deeper look will reveal that there is a myriad of distinct features in each state that make any generalizations difficult. With hundreds of papers published every year on the topic, this should not pose a problem as there is hardly a lack of knowledge. Still, some aspects of the legislative process are preferred to others by researchers. The cursory review of several volumes of *The Journal of Legislative Studies* confirms that the majority of attention is dedicated either to various issues related to the workings of parliaments or executive-legislative relations (see also the recent “Bible” on legislative studies by Martin et al. 2014). The later topic is immensely diversified, but the general consensus stands that recently the executive has a much stronger influence on the outcomes of the legislative process than parliaments (Obler 1981, 127: “...legislators do not legislate. Executive legislate...”; Blondel 1990, 241: “...governments can see to it that laws are passed in the shape which they wish these to have...”; Tsebelis 2002, 93: “...government is able to impose its will on parliament...”).

The supremacy of the executive in the process is achieved through two important instruments: its agenda setting powers by introducing bills and its (usual) majoritarian control of the parliament. The situation is epitomized by a famous “90 percent rule”: the executive proposes at least 90 percent of the bills and at least 90 percent of what it proposes is adopted (e.g. Schwarz and Shaw 1976, 199). These values obviously vary based on the features of the concrete political system (see Saiegh 2009), but the conclusion is clear: maybe the most important factor shaping the legislative process is the bill submitted to the parliament. The prominence of agenda-setter is expected by almost all theoretical models based on rational choice (neo-institutionalism) theory that nowadays dominate political science (see review in Shepsle 2008) and has been also confirmed empirically by numerous research projects (for the U.S. see Cox and McCubbins 2005, for European states see contributions in Rasch and Tsebelis 2011).

¹ Due to limited space, “obvious” references to seminal sources are not cited. Concrete pages are cited only for direct quotes.

² All other forms of legal acts were left outside the scope of the project and any further references to legislation or legislative process relate only to statutory law. That does not mean that the relevant findings contained in a literature dealing with executive delegated legislation (e.g. von Bogdandy 2000, Kysela 2006) will not be used throughout the project (see also below).

If the agenda setting power and the bill that sets the agenda are so important *ex post*, one should also inquire how and by whom the bills are prepared, or, to paraphrase Obler above, how the executive legislates. Suddenly we will find that despite the plethora of research on legislation, “the question is rarely asked about how legislation comes to be written” (Page 2003, 652). The cited “Bible” on legislative studies touches on the topic (cursorily) in only three chapters out of 33. The proposed project seeks to address this knowledge-gap.

It is fair to admit that we do not enter a completely uncharted territory.³ The starting point is provided by legal scientists that explore the rules (process) that govern the executive phase of preparing bills, these sources are however very descriptive, completely atheoretical and country specific (e.g. for common law jurisdictions Miers and Page 1990, Zander 2015; for Germany Schneider 2002; for the CR Gerloch et al. 2008, Bohadlo et al. 2011; for Slovakia Svák et al. 2012). Descriptive mode also prevails in exploring the roles of institutions important in the preparatory phase such as the Legislative Council in the CR (Filip 2007) If concerned with outputs, legal science concentrates primarily on the legislative drafting and technique (see Šin 2003, Xanthaki 2014). Selected papers choose to delve into “law in practice” approach and often end up with a highly critical view of the preparatory process, yet the argumentation is based on anecdotal, biased or very limited (case-specific) evidence (selected contributions in Gerloch and Kysela 2007, Bartošek 2014). The only exception is probably a systematic analysis of RIAs (Regulatory Impact Assessment), the results however are rather self-contained without further repercussions for the whole preparatory phase (Staronova 2010).

As already noted, political science scholars usually use “facts” from the preparatory phase as independent variables, the most prominent being an impact of the unity of government. Any coalition government faces the following dilemma: at the one hand, it shall pursue compromises on the agreed common goals in order to be seen as a competent cabinet, on the other, parties in coalition still compete for voters and thus have a tendency to pursue their own goals even against their coalition partners. When preparing legislation in the given sector, ministers hold at least an information advantage, which they may exploit to achieve objectives incompatible with the other parties. The higher ideological distance between parties, the higher is the threat of ministerial drift (Strom et al. 2010). Partners of course try to counter the drift and gain information (monitoring) or change the ministerial outputs (correcting). Various instruments are used, for example the coalition councils (Andeweg and Timmermans 2008) or shadowing of ministers from one party by junior ministers from other parties (Caroll and Cox 2012). However while the theory is well tested, the dependent variables are almost always recorded at the parliamentary stage of the legislation process (Martin and Vanberg 2011, André et al. 2016). Even when (few) researchers decided to analyse the executive phase of preparing bills in more detail and presented the data from it, they had to manage with crude input (e.g. coalition agreements) and output (bills) variables (e.g. very helpful research on Poland in Goetz and Zubek 2007, Zubek and Klüver 2015).

Another systematically researched aspect relevant to our project is the relationship between politicians and bureaucrats. Positioned between political science and public administration and based mainly on the principal-agent theory, scholars have asked which from the two mentioned groups has more influence on the outputs. Numerous hypothesis are tested, recently the empirical results have largely answered the question in favour of politicians (for a review see Page 2012). The problem is that the projects exercised so far preferred to focus on delegated legislation or the position of (independent) agencies, while the role of administration in preparing bills is neglected (for an exception see Page 2003).

³ We prefer to list sources covering the Czech Republic (CR) and Slovakia as these states represent our case studies.

2 Description of the project

2.1 Project's objectives and logic⁴

The primary objective of the project is to close the abovementioned knowledge-gap and provide a detailed and empirically supported analysis of the process of preparing bills in the CR and Slovakia, to a lesser extent also in other states (for a selection of cases see below). Our approach will be inherently multidisciplinary and will combine both legal and political science methods. There are three distinct but at the same time interdependent streams and subsequent objectives that might be distinguished in the project:

a) Descriptive and exploratory stream

Section 1 revealed there is a certain amount of existing theoretical and empirical knowledge on the topic in question, but due to its rather haphazard fashion, it would make little sense to use it out of hand. We first need to systemize what is really relevant to our cases and second to apply the inductive approach and explore the cases even more in order to formulate viable and testable hypotheses and ascertain appropriate variables for data collection. The stream would thus concentrate on gaining deep insight of the process of preparing bills, including the role of involved institutions (actors) and rules. Emphasis will be put on the practical functioning of the process, although still on a limited sample of cases.

b) Explanatory (causal) stream

Building on the outcomes from the previous stream, the project aims to unearth internal causal mechanisms in the bills' preparation process. To this end, two large samples of empirical data (see below) will be systematically collected and coded and then analysed through quantitative methods. The main objective is to find out how the actors behave (descriptive statistics) and test for various variables that may be driving such behaviour (inferential statistics). In order to increase the explanatory value, it might also be useful to perform a qualitative investigation based on a limited sample of cases.

c) Normative stream

One shall not forget that one of the primary goals of the legislative process is to produce laws (bills) of good quality. Based on the (admittedly still contentious) criteria and benchmarks developed by legal science (e.g. Kellerman et al. 1998, Mader et al. 2010) or judicial practice (for the CR Kokeš 2015), the team will try to assess how the findings from explanatory stream affect the quality of process' outputs, namely the final bills.

Legislative research generally concentrates either on legislative capacity (e.g. institutions, inputs), on legislative operation (e.g. interactions among actors) or on legislative performance (e.g. outputs). Further on the key thematic agendas of the project along that division are listed:

a) Legislative capacity

- Sources of legislation: Where do the initial impulses to prepare bills come from? Are they primarily (passive) reactions to external pressure from the EU or other actors, or are the changes promoted by long-term planning in the hands of administrators, or maybe active implementation of policy priorities of the government (e.g. Moury 2012)? Obviously it is a combination of drivers and determining causal links among them will be difficult, but we can track for consequences of different impulses.
- Special consultative institutions: There are special expert bodies (Legislative Council) in both the CR and Slovakia that should check the quality of the preparatory process and its outputs. What is their composition, role, impact?
- Regulatory Impact Assessments: RIAs were recently introduced to infuse the preparatory phase with concrete data on the impact of planned legislation. Results are so far mixed. How the RIAs affect other aspects of preparing bills and their quality?

⁴ Publication outputs and deliverables are presented in section 4.

b) Legislative operation

- Internal consultations: Each bill is firstly discussed within the ministry that is responsible for its preparation. How are these consultations handled, who is involved and how does it affect the subsequent fate of the bill?
- Inter-institutional consultations: All the bills (or even before the initial outline of a bill) are sent for commenting to other subjects, namely ministries. This part of the process is of utmost importance because it provides an opportunity to constrain the leading ministry. The latter must either accept or negotiate on the comments (amendments), if needed, intervention of the whole government is called for. Consultations offer a unique chance to track the interests and influence of all actors.
- Public consultations: It has become more common to involve the public or other non-official entities in the preparatory process. Who and when intervenes? What impact the public has?

c) Legislative performance

- Ex-post evaluations: Numerous bills are just amending or replacing previous laws. Do the former follow a proper evaluation of the latter's functioning and efficiency (see Van Aeken 2011)? Are special legislative instruments such as sunset or review clauses used in practice?
- Recommendations of the consultative institutions: It is possible to trace the impact of recommendations of those bodies on final versions of the bills adopted by governments. When and why they are (not) followed?
- Quantity and quality of final bills: What determines the quantity of the bills submitted by the government? How do the bills look like? How do they reflect variabilities in the preparatory phase?

It has to be noted that while the project focuses on the phase that ends with the submission of a bill to the parliament and we do not plan to test any hypotheses with parliamentary data, it would be wrong to completely omit the ensuing phases of the legislative process. Scholars and insiders alike suggest that the disputes from the preparatory phase are commonly transferred to the later stages, for example unsuccessful coalition parties or administrators are trying to pursue their rejected proposals through amendments to the bill in the parliament (for the CR e.g. Linek and Mansfeldová 2008). In order to capture the whole picture of bill preparation and full explanation, we also have to cover these possibilities.

2.2 Research design and methodology

We face several difficulties when drafting this section. The main problem was already noted: because the underexplored terrain of our research, we prefer to use the inductive approach and first collect enough information to delineate concrete research design and hypotheses for research goals set above. We could have of course opted for the deductive logic and formulate the hypothesis from the existing theoretical propositions, but such an approach will be premature and methodologically controversial because those propositions are closer to hunches than firmly grounded paradigms.⁵

In line with the project's logic and objectives delineated above, our research will revolve around the following research questions:

a) How much the bureaucrats and experts influence bills' preparatory process?

The indispensable role of administration in the process could hardly be disputed, the question stands who is the principal and agent in its relationship with the political actors. To what extent do the bureaucrats only implement political decisions, what control measures are applied to reduce the administration's drift? As noted, the prevailing consensus (tested in other situations) tends to give the upper hand to politicians, but such findings from well-established democracies are hardly given in more volatile political and administrative environment of post-transformative states.

⁵ Or, to use more scientific terminology, they resemble "ordinary knowledge" as opposed to "usable knowledge" (Lindblom and Cohen 1979).

b) How centralized is bills' preparatory process from the government's viewpoint?

Diverging interests within the coalition governments certainly influence the preparatory process. What devices do the partners use to reduce the ministerial drift and how successful is the government in its efforts to centralize the whole procedure? We tentatively expect that ministers in post-communist countries have higher autonomy and the efficiency of constraining instruments is lower than in Western democracies (see also Dimitrov et al. 2006).

c) How does the political practice affect quantity and quality of outputs in the bill's preparatory process?

The process and its outputs are intrinsically linked. One can expect that combination of more competition in the process, more autonomous actors and less effective coordinating mechanisms leads to decreasing quality of final bills (Richter 2007). The effect might be also recorded quantitatively, less coordination shall increase the number of submitted bills (Goetz and Zubek 2007).

The CR and Slovakia were selected as main case studies for the project. The choice is firstly justified on a subjective ground: these are the systems we know best, but even objectively there is a promise of the easiest access to data (language, knowledge of insiders). Secondly the selection is reasonable theoretically as well, we want to explore the under researched cases and check a fit of propositions predominantly tested for Western democracies in post-transitional states. The small number of cases is intentional. As written above, in general the legislative process have similar sequencing and goals in all democratic countries, on the other hand the numerous distinct features make comparisons difficult (see e.g. Voermans et al. 2012). The researchers face a width vs depth dilemma, the more cases they include, the more schematic the analysis becomes. We chose the first option to avoid (paraphrasing Sartori) treating stones and rabbits as equal. But to quote again the giant of political science, "he who knows one country only knows none" (Sartori 1994, 16), thus we decided not to perform a one case study. Comparison of the CR and Slovakia then makes a lot of sense, because the procedures of preparing bills are almost identical in both countries. By applying the most similar case design, we can minimize the many variables, small N problem. Still, the cases provide variations on some crucial independent variables, e.g. the character and homogeneity of governments or the independence of the administration. The exploratory (descriptive) part of the project will also extract knowledge and experience from other states, namely the neighbouring Austria, Poland and Germany (see also Zalasinski 2008, Morlok et al. 2016). They will however not be engaged in the full analysis as the data collection is too demanding and will compromise the most similar case design.

The number of objectives and subtopics involved, together with the multidisciplinary nature of the project, require application of methodological pluralism. Legally oriented members of the team will rely mostly on traditional doctrinal methods which would be however heavily infused with "law in practice" approach. Those with background in political science will dominantly apply quantitative methods. We will use the existing datasets (mainly for independent variables such as homogeneity of governments), but primarily we want to create two original datasets that will serve as a basis for analysis (dependent variables):

- a) Inter-ministerial consultations: We will collect information on subjects and content of comments on all draft bills in the inter-ministerial consultations, together with the impact of comments. Databases eKlep (CR) and Portál právnych predpisov (Slovakia) will serve as the source of data and both automatic and manual coding will be used. The planned timeframe covers 2006-2016 period (governments in the CR: Topolánek I+II, Fischer, Nečas, Rusnok, Sobotka; Slovakia: Fico I, Radičová, Fico II).
- b) Changes throughout the bills' drafting: We will collect information on how the bills are changed from the initial proposals to the final versions by using quantitative parameters (percentage of change) and content analysis. The sample will cover the same cases (observations) as the previous one.

Other additional empirical data could be collected if the need arises. Textual sources are preferred for extracting data as they are more reliable. While interviews often form a cornerstone of research on

the functioning of the executives or administrations, the method faces numerous obstacles (e.g. Lodge 2013) and we will use it only complementarily. The datasets will be tested with descriptive and inferential statistics suitable to meet the project's objectives. As in some cases qualitative scrutiny of only a few selected cases (observations) might be more fruitful, we do not exclude the use of process tracing.

3 Justification of the project's submission

The project is in our view worthy of support for two main reasons. First one is its research value. A comparatively quite neglected multidisciplinary topic is addressed, a mix of both legal and political science methods and theory and practice will be exploited, empirical quantitative data so far unused anywhere in the world will be collected and analysed. In light of the foregoing, the research should have a competitive edge also at the international level with the promise of having the resulting publications accepted in top journals.

Secondly, the findings might have considerable relevance in practice. While mainly legal scientists often lament about the deficiencies in the initial stages of the legislative process, there is little reaction from policy makers to rectify the situation. Exposure of practice through empirical data could more persuasively back the abstract propositions and possibly increase the pressure on responsible actors, also because the bills' preparatory process has recently attracted more and more attention from the media, civic society and NGOs. We would actively engage with these wider societal repercussions of our outputs, even if they are not (in a narrow sense) part of the project.

4 Expected outputs (publication strategy)

International workshop: We will organize a workshop (either in Prague, Brno or Olomouc) with invited experts from the academic field and practice from the CR, Slovakia, Germany, Austria and Poland. The main objective is to discuss the topic, gain background knowledge and experience from other states (exploratory phase).

4 Jimp articles: Two Jimp articles will exploit the two datasets and quantitatively analyse the comparison of the CR and Slovakia in inter-ministerial consultations and changes in the bills versions (will be offered to top journals such as *Journal of European Public Policy*, *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, *Law and Policy*). Two other articles will focus on the interaction of the administration with politicians and combine descriptive statistics with qualitative analysis (it will be offered to top public administration or law journals such as *Public Administration or Governance*).

3 monographs: The first monograph will contain the written contributions from the international workshop (preparation of bills in the CR and neighbouring countries), we plan to offer it to an international publishing house (e.g. Oxford University Press, Springer, Routledge). The second monograph will concentrate on the role of the executive in preparing bills in Slovakia and will be published by a Slovak publishing house (e.g. Eurokodex, C.H. Beck). The last monograph will deal with the normative issues of legislative quality and will be published by a Czech publishing house (e.g. C.H. Beck, Leges).

- We do not promise any book chapters even if at least the first monograph will obviously consist of many chapters written by different authors.

4 Jrec articles: First article will delineate the research topic on the case study of the CR. Second article will explore the role of the Legislative Councils and the force of their opinions. Third article will inquire into the problem of the "art of legal drafting". Fourth article will position the political science outcomes of the project against the legal practice (all articles published in Czech legal journals, e.g. in *Právník*, *Právní rozhledy*, *Správní právo- Legislativní příloha*).

1 Jsc article: One article summarizing results of the research will be offered to *The Journal of Legislative Studies*.

2 international peer-reviewed articles: Two legally oriented articles will deal with the participation of the public in the preparatory process and legislative optimism and the role of administration (published

in foreign legal journals that are peer-reviewed but at the moment outside any official indexing databases, e.g. *Právny obzor* or *Central and Eastern European Legal Studies*).

Members of the team will additionally participate at relevant national and international conferences (namely ECPR Joint Sessions or General Conferences, ECPR Standing Groups on Parliaments, IPSA Congress).

5 Expected timeframe⁶

Activity/output	Year	2017				2018				2019			
	Quarter	I.	II.	III.	IV.	I.	II.	III.	IV.	I.	II.	III.	IV.
Inductive systemization of knowledge/ delineation of research design													
Collection of data													
Analysis of data													
International workshop													
Monograph 1- five states comparison													
Participation at domestic and int. conf.													
Monograph 2- Slovakia													
Monograph 3- legis. quality													
Jrec articles													
Jimp articles													
Int. peer-reviewed articles													
Jsc article													
Final report													

In the case of outputs the presented deadlines represent submissions of the publications into the review process as the length of the latter varies widely and we can hardly influence it. Our strategy in the case of IF journals would be firstly to submit to the top journals and then go to the lower tier journals in the case we are rejected.

We preferred to present conservative estimates of outputs, yet we hope than namely the datasets will be exploited in a number of additional publications even during the project's timespan.

6 Cooperation with foreign institutions

We do not plan to establish any official partnership with foreign institutions (it is excluded by the project conditions anyway). Obviously the link to Slovakia must be strong but this is solved by incorporating Milan Hodás into the project team. He will be responsible for any cooperation with the pertinent Slovak political and research institutions. We will additionally contact experts and scholars from Germany, Austria and Poland who will participate in the workshop planned for the first year of the project and consequently remain involved in the project as referees or consultants. We expect that all members of the team will exploit their current relevant contacts in the international academic community and build new ones at the conferences or workshops they attend.

7 Background of the applying institution

The Law Faculty of Palacký University is an institution with a long tradition of research, including investigation of numerous GAČR grants. Its library is well equipped with Czech and to a lesser extent also foreign legal and political science sources and the faculty (university) provides access to a wide spectrum of electronic information databases that contains full-texts of almost any international scientific journal.

The members of the project team have at their disposal all the personal equipment necessary to finish the assigned tasks objectives, including the specialized software for quantitative computations.

⁶ For closer description of outputs see section 4, for other activities see section 2.

8 Members of the project team and their roles

The only criterion applied in assembling the team was the suitability of candidates in light of the project goals and their academic and professional background. Because of that the participants vary extensively in terms of age or affiliation of the main employer, yet they are united in the interest in the topic.

Robert Zbíral (principal investigator, coordinator): Senior lecturer at the Law Faculty of Palacký University in Olomouc. Author of five monographs and dozens of articles (including in the 1st quartile IF journals), he combines legal and political science methods with emphasis on the empirical approach. One of his interests has been the involvement of executive and parliamentary actors in implementing EU law in the CR and Slovakia, to which end he collected and analysed large amounts of data. He has recently become a member of the Czech Legislative Council working group (for EU law).

- R. Zbíral will coordinate the whole project and be responsible for achieving its overall goals and outputs. He will edit the book and co-author three IF and one Jsc article.

Legal section of the team

Milan Hodás: Researcher at the Law Faculty of Comenius University in Bratislava. Author of two monographs and numerous peer-reviewed articles namely on legislative issues and the transposition of EU law. He also has considerable practical experience with the legislative process as he has worked for many years in the legislative departments of the National Council, Ministry of Education and the Office for Public Procurement (current position).

- M. Hodas will operate as the project's expert on Slovakia and apart from his own analysis, he will consult and review the comparative outputs as well. He will author two journal articles and one monograph.

Marian Kokeš: Senior lecturer at the Law Faculty of Palacký University in Olomouc. Author of almost 20 publications, most of them dealing with the legislative process, a topic he also covered in his recent PhD thesis. Additionally he works as a long-time clerk at the Constitutional Court.

- M. Kokeš will be responsible for covering the normative dimension of the preparatory process, including the quality of drafting and final bills. He will also author one monograph, one IF and two Jrec articles.

Jan Kysela: Associate professor at the Law Faculty of Charles University in Prague. Author of five monographs and numerous articles in peer-reviewed journals. He is probably the biggest Czech expert on the legislative process, in which he is also heavily involved in practice as a long-time secretary of the Senate's constitutional commission and member of the Czech Legislative Council working group (for public law).

- J. Kysela will serve as a consultant for other members in order to match the research findings against his insiders' knowledge (reality check). He will also author two Jrec articles.

Political science section of the team

Kamil Gregor: Researcher at the NGO kohovolit.eu with PhD. in political science. Author of several chapters in books and numerous articles (including IF journals). He specializes in advanced data collection and analysis, inquiring into topics such as voting in parliaments or the transparency of administration.

- K. Gregor will participate in developing the datasets and perform the data analysis, including the selection of the proper statistical methods. He will co-author two IF articles.

Jakub Lysek: Junior lecturer and PhD student at the Philosophical Faculty of Palacký University in Olomouc. Author of several papers, including one in top IF journal *Electoral Studies*. He specializes in local and regional politics and in quantitative methods in general.

- J. Lysek will participate in developing the datasets (including supervising student coder) and help with the creation of research designs. He will author one IF and one Jsc article.

Michal Škop: Co-director of the NGO kohovolit.eu with PhD. in demography. Author of several publications dealing namely with roll-call analysis in parliaments. He has vast experience with the collection of data, advanced statistical techniques and data analysis and visualizations.

- M. Škop will participate in developing the datasets (including writing the scripts for automatic data collections) and perform the data analysis and visualizations.

9 References

- ANDEWEG, R., TIMMERMANS, A. (2008). Conflict Management in Coalition Government. IN: STROM, K. et al. (eds). *Cabinets and Coalition Bargaining: The Democratic Life Cycle in Western Europe*. Oxford: OUP.
- ANDREÉ, A. et al. (2016). "Trust Is Good, Control Is Better" Multiparty Government and Legislative Organization. *Political Research Quarterly*, no. 1, p. 108-120.
- BARTOŠEK, J. (2014). Byrokraticko-exekutivní fáze zákonodárného procesu. IN: *Dny práva 2014*. Brno: MUNI.
- BLONDEL, J. (1990). *Comparative Government: An Introduction*. New York: Philip Allan.
- BOHADLO, D. et al. (eds) (2011). *Legislativní proces (teorie a praxe)*. Praha: Ministerstvo vnitra.
- CAROLL, R., COX, G. (2012). Shadowing Ministers: Monitoring Partners in Coalition Governments. *Comparative Political Studies*, no. 2, p. 220-236.
- COX, G., MCCUBBINS, M. (2005). *Setting the Agenda. Responsible Party Government in the U.S. House of Representatives*. Cambridge: CUP.
- DIMITROV, V. et al. (2006). *Governing after Communism: Institutions and Policymaking*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- FILIP, J. (2007). K postavení Legislativní rady vlády České republiky. *Časopis pro právní vědu a praxi*, no. 3, p. 203-210.
- GERLOCH, A. et al. (2008). *Teorie a praxe tvorby práva*. Praha: ASPI.
- GERLOCH, A., KYSELA, J. (eds) (2007). *Tvorba práva v České republice po vstupu do Evropské unie*. Praha: ASPI.
- GOETZ, K., ZUBEK, R. (2007). Government, Parliament and Law-making in Poland. *The Journal of Legislative Studies*, no. 4, p. 517-538.
- KELLERMAN, A. (ed) (1998). *Improving the Quality of Legislation in Europe*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff.
- KOKEŠ, M. (2016). Teorie zákonodárství aneb pokus čelit nezájmu právní teorie a politologie o legislativní tvorbu práva v ČR. *Správní právo*, 2016, no. 1, p. 1-39.
- KOKEŠ, M. (2015). *Vybrané nedostatky zákonodárného procesu z pohledu teorie zákonodárství a judikatury Ústavního soudu ČR*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Brno: Law Faculty.
- KYSELA, J. (2006). *Zákonodárství bez parlamentů. Delegace a substituce zákonodárné pravomoci*. Praha: PF UK.
- LINDBLOM, C., COHEN, D. (1979). *Usable Knowledge- Social Science and Social Problem Solving*. Yale: Yale University Press.
- LINEK, L., MANSFELDOVÁ, Z. (2008). Legislativní proces a činnost parlamentu. In: LINEK, L., MANSFELDOVÁ, Z. (eds), *Český parlament ve druhé dekádě demokratického vývoje*. Praha: Sociologický ústav
- LODGE, M. (2013). Semistructured Interviews and Informal Institutions: Getting Inside Executive Government. IN: BRUTER, M., LODGE, M. (eds). *Political Science Research Methods in Action*. Houndmills: Palgrave.
- MADER, L. et al. (eds) (2010). *Quality of Legislation- Principles and Instruments*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- MARTIN, L., VANBERG, G. (2011). *Parliaments and Coalitions*. Oxford: OUP.
- MARTIN, S. et al. (eds) (2014). *The Oxford Handbook of Legislative Studies*. Oxford: OUP.
- MIERS, D., PAGE, A. (1990). *Legislation*. London: Sweet and Maxwell.
- MORLOK, K. et al. (eds) (2016). *Parlamentsrecht: Handbuch*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

- OBLER, R. (1981). Legislatures and the Survival of Political Systems: A Review Article. *Political Science Quarterly*, no. 1, p. 127-139.
- PAGE, E. (2012) *Policy Without Politicians: Bureaucratic Influence in Comparative Perspective*. Oxford: OUP.
- PAGE, E. (2003) The Civil Servant as Legislator: Law Making in British Administration. *Public Administration*, no. 4, p. 651-679.
- RASCH, B.-E., TSEBELIS, G. (eds) (2011). *The role of Governments in Legislative Agenda Setting*. London: Routledge.
- RICHTER, T. (2007). Jak (ne)pomoci legislativnímu procesu. *Právní rozhledy*, no. 3, p. 105-109.
- SARTORI, G. (1994). Compare Why and How. Comparing, Miscomparing and the Comparative Method. IN: DOGAN, M., KAZANCIGIL, A. (eds). *Comparing Nations: Concepts, Strategies, Substance*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- SALEIGH, S. (2009). Political Prowess or "Lady Luck"? Evaluating Chief Executives' Legislative Success Rates. *The Journal of Politics*, no. 4, p. 1342-1356.
- SCHNEIDER, H. (2002). *Gesetzgebung: ein Lehr- und Handbuch*. Heidelberg: C.F: Müller.
- SCHWARZ, J., SHAW, E. (1976). *The United States Congress in Comparative Perspective*. Hinsdille: Dryden Press.
- SHEPSLE, K. (2008). Rational Choice Institutionalism. IN: BINDER, S. et al. (eds), *The Oxford Handbooks of Political Institutions*. Oxford: OUP.
- ŠÍN, Z. (2003). *Tvorba práva: Pravidla, metodika, technika*. Praha: C.H. Beck.
- STARONOVA, K. (2010). Regulatory Impact Assessment: Formal Institutionalization and Practice. *Journal of Public Policy*, no. 1, p. 117-136.
- SVÁK, J. et al. (2012). *Teória a prax legislativy*. Bratislava: Eurokodex.
- TSEBELIS, G. (2002). *Veto Players. How Political Institutions Work*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- VAN AEKEN, K (2011). From Vision to Reality: Ex Post Evaluation of Legislation. *Legisprudence*, no. 1, p. 41-68.
- VOERMANS, W. et al. (eds) (2012). *Legislative Process in Transition*. Leiden: Leiden University.
- VON BOGDANDY, A. (2000). *Gubernative Rechtsetzung*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- XANTHAKI, H. (2014). *Drafting Legislation*. Oxford: Hart.
- ZALASINSKI, T. (2008). *Zasada prawislovej legislacji w pogladach Trybunalu Konstytucyjnego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe.
- ZANDER, M. (2015). *The Law-Making Process*. Oxford: Hart.
- ZUBEK, R., KLÜVER, H (2015). Legislative pledges and coalition government. *Party Politics*, no. 4, p. 603-614.