TABLES SUMMARY WORKSHOP REPORT

October 11th Birmingham

**The following points emerged as key findings across the workshops and plenaries and will critically inform the development of our tools framework. We have used many of the bullets as presented with some adaptation to incorporate multiple viewpoints and provide explanations. We have also integrated as many of the post it notes and follow up email comments as possible.**

The tools reviews are all now conveniently located in the following web url <http://homepages.see.leeds.ac.uk/~lecmsr/TABLES/>. Please note this link is **not for sharing** as these reviews are still draft for feedback and finalisation across the teams (core, advisory and case study) involved in this project and are not in the public domain.

In addition the following presentations are available from the 11th October workshop. This will be added to so please book mark. <http://homepages.see.leeds.ac.uk/~lecmsr/TABLES/Presentations/>

The report is structured in the following way**:**

1. **Generic Issues**
2. **Specific tool issues and criteria**
3. **Draft assessment Criteria**
4. **Action plans and where next**

We hope you will help co-produce this work and to this end your comments and ongoing involvement will be really appreciated**.**

**Generic Issues for tool development.**

* **Ecosystem services framework is not a panacea**. The process enables people to look and frame an issue from different angles and find solutions. Need to show this alongside conventional policy approaches to show maximum benefit of adopting this.
* **Application of the ecosystems services requires some form of accreditation** and accountability. It does not need to be prescriptive but it needs to provide a solid framework which makes those who are participating in it feel that what they are doing is widely acceptable and meets an agreeable standard.
* **Tension between using existing tools versus developing new tools** with ‘piggybacking’ on to existing tools which work seen as the logical and pragmatic response for this project.
* **No one size fits all tool exists or can be developed** and imposed; people have different needs and predilections towards different tools.
* **Need to invest time and resources into skills development to help maximise the potential of existing tools and support correct use, interpretation and evaluation**. Changing policy agendas such as localism and ecosystem services rarely recognise this
* **Importance of developing a linked suite of tools to maximise effectiveness in decision making**. It is the cumulative effect that becomes important for better more joined up solutions; for example Green Infrastructure (GI) plus Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) = will deliver more when combined.
* **Need to ensure that tools being used and developed across other NEA Follow-on Workpackages are effectively harnessed** in this work; the valuation and futures tools are key here as there is a danger of linkages not being made.
* **Some tools are easy to see and understand but can be illusory with weak representations of reality**. Recognising limitations of tools is key to their effective use and interpretation.
* We are practiced, and getting better at, addressing selected ecosystem SERVICES on a discrete basis; **the priority now is to address SYSTEMS. We need to bring whole socio-ecological systems thinking into tools, not just tackling ecosystem services in isolated ways.** There is a tension between the ecosystem approach and ecosystem services as the framework.
* Public and/or stakeholder engagement can be a key focus of a tool to facilitate good decisions and their implementation; role of different and novel approaches. **Participation itself is not a tool; we need pragmatic tools to facilitate participation**.
* Need to ensure that **tools are developed which interface expert driven knowledge’s and applications with local knowledge and expertise**. It should not be either/or.
* Learning from the group present here; **importance of sharing practice and experience in an effective and managed learning environment** is vital in forums like this.

1. **Deliverability**

* Need to **move from abstract academic concepts to delivering/implementing actions on the ground.**
* **Key questions**: Who is going to use it? How is it going to improve their decision-making? Will they be grateful? Will they use it?
* **Important to identify what success (different ideas reflecting contested values) looks like** when using an ecosystem services framework; raises issue of how we evaluate or measure it through meaningful indicators.
* **Interdisciplinary, cross-sectoral approach really useful but needs to be delivery-focused**; input of business sector/landowners is crucial to overall deliverability.
* **Building a ‘Hub and Spoke model’ as a pragmatic response to reality of resource limitations**. Using central knowledge to apply to local context (and vice versa). This d removes the burden from the 'front line' of the project to a central hub.
* **Use concepts that help illuminate and integrate ecosystem benefits in a more explicit and cross sectoral manner. Eg Food**: explicit link to economic contribution and wider social gains (Grow with Wyre). Eg Health and Environmental/Climate Change Risk (9 Piece Jigsaw: Birmingham City Council).
* **Idea of using ‘oven ready chips’ (ready to use and apply data/tool) as tools rather than ‘potatoes in the ground’ (developing tool from scratch or needing significant data collection/evidence gathering).** There is a tension here as people may benefit more from digging their own potatoes. Danger that off the shelf tools become tick-box exercises rather than making a difference to existing thinking and practice.
* **The role of power relations is key to deliverability**; need to ensure approaches are able to be embraced and/or supported by existing gatekeepers and decision makers.
* **Important role that partnerships play as key delivery mechanisms** but can be hugely variable in terms of performance. Need to learn from successful ones.
* **Quantification drives models and such tools are often considered as necessary to convince politicians to take action or act differently in decision-making**. However, this has inherent risks, particularly around making approaches being expert-driven and also potentially excluding people and value systems for whom/which quantification is less appropriate.
* **Networking and cooperation from start is key to good deliverability for the long term**. Hook of duty to cooperate.
* Need to feed initiatives and projects into existing governance (statutory plans and processes) for things to work for the long term.
* **Importance of leadership and champions in making things happen on the ground**. At present this seems to happen in spite of the system rather than because of it? Key role of this project in using champions.

1. **Language**

* **Moving from negative associations with environment to more positive perceptions via the use of ‘benefits’**. Consistent with a move from conventional policy themes towards benefits. Changes the language and mindset of planning and development.
* E**cosystem services provides ONE tangible expression of sustainable development which can be used in tools** that can arguably help people to better understand it. People are at the centre of the environment agenda set within the wider Ecosystem Approach.
* **Find a common language that unites rather than divides**. Eg Local Nature Partnerships and Local Enterprise Partnerships talking different languages at the moment; need joined up discussions now to reduce conflict later.
* **How to communicate ecosystem services in a language to generate buy-in and understanding to publics and decision makers outside the “environmental family”.** Focus on what is currently on ‘people’s radar to capture their interest) rather than force our (alien) definitions and concepts onto others (may also provide longer lasting hook and help deeper understanding). **The ‘hook’ is key to engagement and needs to be tailored to the audience. Ecosystem Services framework is not going to work if this language is used.** The current government pro-growth agendademands that we also must engage with this more explicitly. The hook is there but we are currently not exploiting it as the environment is still seen as an enemy of enterprise.
  + Hooks discussed included green infrastructure for planners and developers
  + NPPF paragraph 109 recognising value of ecosystem services.
  + Viability
  + Duty to Cooperate
  + Risk
  + SEA
  + Asset checks
* **The potential for private enterprise involvement is important**. We should also think about ISO 14000 (+ EMAS), Corporate Ecosystem Valuation (CEV).
* Improved engagement with key decision and policy makers, land managers and communities needs to go beyond consultation and information. Deliberation is important.
* **Ecosystem services is not the only show in town**. This needs to be realised when people are trying to see old wine in new bottles

1. **Priorities**

* All landscapes matter” (European Landscape Convention); how do Ecosystem Services provide a way forward for this set within spatial and place making work/agendas? Should we favour the highly protected areas (designations) or degraded areas? Addressing the artificial polarity in the above point, **should we take a more ‘Lawton Review’ approach and consider connections of services across wider landscapes whether designated, impoverished, potential linking corridors or other?** Do we favour the outstanding rural landscape or pay attention to where the majority of people live where more benefits can accrue. Or, conversely, **do we consider the connections between these ‘landscapes’ through which services flow, including dependencies on international supply chains?**
* “Exposure to viewpoints of others and exposing decision-makers to all aspects of landscape; how do we empower all stakeholders to have a voice in decision-making?
* Danger of sole focus on quantifiable outcomes rather than wider holistic aspects. The intangibles can easily get lost. **Ecosystem Services currently subsumes the ecosystem approach which is the wrong way round**.
* **Who benefits and who loses out from delivery of Ecosystem Services? Furthermore, what Ecosystem Services are in the foreground and which get neglected/ignored**.

1. **Role of behaviour change**

* Regulation is not the best answer for behaviour change required by the Ecosystem approach when delivered in isolation and is unlikely to secure long term behaviour change without cumulative impact of other nudge and support tools.
* **Examples of good practice and where culture change has happened. (How, Why, What;** e.g. Wolverhampton approach changing the way that planning is done; a systems view).
* **Role of learning and skills development in instigating behaviour change**. A focus on champions is important here particularly in getting buy in from non-environmental sector participants. So do Harvey Nicholls (over the road) know what we are doing? Should they?
* **Need to understand psychology and drivers of particular groups before designing tools and policy interventions** (eg payments for Ecosystem services). For example farmers may not respond to incentives when in their mind it challenges the ethos of what good farming is given that they are in the continual gaze of their neighbours.
* **To boldly go… The act of doing things differently and taking risks and learning lessons is needed yet many decision makers in public policy are risk averse** and where mistakes and failure leads to calls for resignations. This is a barrier.
* **Focus more on top-down interventions or bottom-up initiatives?** Where/when do each perform best and is there an interface which is more desirable which can lead to substantive changes?

1. **Scale**

* **Think about connecting across multiple scales rather than any one scale dominating tool development.** Danger of community or national approaches being developed in isolation.Important opportunity spaces at local and landscape scales. However danger of using ‘local’ and ‘landscape’ results in different interpretations of the scale being meant.
* **Dangers of different self developed geographies which many agencies operate under.** Need common scale or agreement – but in reality, landscape / environmental change does not respect this. **Ecosystem services do not respect political or administrative or sectoral boundaries**, so are our tools aligned to natural flows and dependencies or current work silos? **Who has strategic overview of the bigger picture**.
* **Is the loss of a regional scale a handicap to delivering ecosystem services** particularly with regard to planning policy and its operation.

1. **Connectivity**

* The issue of administrative boundaries as a barrier. Ecosystem services does not respect this. **Tools need therefore to operate across scales; problems for tools embedded in one scale eg Community Infrastructure Levy, neighbourhood plan..**
* **Community Development isn’t just about consulting people** – it’s local private enterprise and their local suppliers and customers identifying our economic future (complex supply chains).
* **Need to move away from silos towards more wholesale connectivity of landscapes between people and places**. Need to improve relationships and connections of, and between the myriad of different plans and policies. **Partnerships are key here but are usually bolt ons to existing patterns of governance requiring additional work burdens**. Cross sector and scalar thinking is increasingly important but rarely planned for in work/agency restructuring. Such moves can help improve delivery.
* How to scale up local successful initiatives? Danger of treading on local sensitivities and context.
* Nature Improvement Areas as new models for delivery of ecosystem services.

1. **Time**

* Temporal component in tools important; intergenerational equity often forgotten. If the future and future generations matter, ensure they are considered in timeline of tools implementation and decision making.
* Issue of scenarios and futures thinking to help think about where we want to go. Backcasting a useful tool here; also simulations, games, Problem solving initiatives.

1. **Evidence**

* **Evidence is socially constructed** and therefore is not objective. Need to assess level of trust that people have in data or evidence. Eg Badger cull shows messy issue of values in evidence!
* **Slow and sophisticated *vs* quick and dirty; is there is a third way?**
* **Learn lessons from examples of good and bad practice**. Too much focus on the spin of good rather than learning from the mistakes which are generally hidden.
* **Poor sources of data** – how and who can improve? Consistency and availability of data, consistency and use of evaluation including development of effective indicators for ecosystem services.
* **Expert evidence is costly (time and £) and experts are busy people.** Pragmatic response is to develop the hub and spoke model. Best practice guides needed to help others learn.
* **People can ‘get hooked’ on objectivity of data and evidence**, e.g. maps, rather than thinking more holistically and using field observation. Ie the virtual evidence becomes objective reality.
* **Data can over-drive a decision-making process at a local level**; to what end and value?
* **Role of adaptive management and innovation as ways of helping to deal with/plug data gaps.**
* **Role of community evidence and local expertise and its intersection with top down expert knowledge**. Responses include using more open source approaches and/or develop hubs of information and
* **Good quality data does not always equal good decisions**. The ‘politics’ and power factors can loom large here.

**Draft Assessment Criteria for tools**

This is a suggested and much reduced list following a small group meeting after the workshop. From the original 50+ points we have slimmed it down to a set of criteria that are sufficient and workable for assessment by yourselves as we move forward. .

We intend to use the tools listed in the tool review with important additions from **future tools** and **valuation tools.**

Your role is to read the relevant tool reviews that you are most interested and experienced in and then score them as tools suitable for this project on a likert scale where 1=poor 5= excellent. N/A is where on that criterion you are unable to make a judgement.

**It is important that you do not score tools you do not fully use or understand.**

1. Suitability for incorporating an ecosystem services framework
2. High impact in current policy and decision making processes
3. Transparent
4. Robust (data gaps and uncertainty)
5. Consistency in use, application and assessment across users
6. Compatible across scales and sectors
7. Deliverable
8. Currently used and valued
9. Be based on widely available and accessible data
10. Has mechanisms for meaningful engagement and participation of stakeholders

Tool Assessment

This is the format we intend to use with a matrix and then an ability for you to score those tools you are familiar and/or experienced in.

You will be asked to rate across the criteria above where 1 = poor and 5 = excellent. In this way we will have a scoring system that will allow the top scoring tools to be selected.

However we do have parameters. We agreed that we need to select at least one tool from within the typology: (1) Regulatory (2) Incentive (3) Decision Support (4) Participatory (5) Valuation and (6) Futures

**Example scoring sheet across 10 criteria above.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tools | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | total |
| (1) Tool A | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 37 |
| (2) Tool B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (3) Tool C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (4) Tool D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (5) Tool E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (6) Tool F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Action Plan**

**All**

1. **Read through the report adding any comments on points of omission.** A facilitator led report will be posted on the web for each workshop in due course.
2. **Critically review the proposed assessment criteria for the tools assessment** and feedback comments (Deadline 9th November)
3. **Read through tool reviews and add critical feedback** (16th November)
4. Fill in matrix and score tools on agreed finalised criteria (20-29 November)
5. Attend (if possible) workshop 17th December to develop and enhance framework and principles for selected tools.
6. Identify suitable real life testing opportunities for selected tools between February to June 2013

**Research Team**

1. Add reviews of valuation and futures tools to tool reviews
2. Revise assessment criteria in line with feedback and send out for scoring.
3. Revise tool reviews in light of critical feedback received.
4. Assess scoring responses to tools
5. In preparation for December 17th meeting undertake selected literature reviews using expertise across all teams where appropriate.
   1. Tool development and practice using ecosystem services frameworks.
   2. Decision support tools
   3. Regulatory tools
   4. Valuation tools, including economic and social and environmental
   5. Incentive/nudge tools
   6. Community engagement tools
6. Develop draft framework and principles for work on 17th December.
7. Write up workplan for WP10 the testing of tools.