



Webinar | Networking for the landscape: The potential of collaborative governance in addressing institutional misfit in the provision of ecosystem services

Monday, April 16, 2018, 01.00 p.m. CET

Questions and Answers Report

Claudia Sattler, Leibniz Centre for Agricultural Landscape Research, Germany (csattler@zalf.de)

Gregor Giersch, Organisation for International Dialogue and Conflict Management, Austria

Lenny von Bussel, Wageningen University, Netherlands

ZoiKonstantinou, Faculty of Science, University of Porto, Portugal (zkonstantinou@ciimar.up.pt)



Introduction

An important challenge in environmental governance is to reach so-called 'institutional fit'. This means to ensure that the established governance structures are spatially and temporally well-aligned to the ecosystems and ecosystem services they are meant to govern. The cp³ project analyzed the potential of collaborative governance approaches to mitigate institutional misfit in landscape management, an issue with growing importance in ecosystem services governance. Thereby, we define collaborative governance as partnerships between multiple actors from the public, private, and civil society sphere of society. During the webinar, successful initiatives for collaborative governance from 3 European protection areas were introduced:

- the Biosphere reserve Spreewald, Germany,
- the Nature park Jauerling-Wachau, Austria and
- the Berg en Dal region as part of the National Landscape Gelderse Poort, Netherlands.

The initiatives include both formal and informal partnerships that were initiated either bottom-up or top-down with the aim to reach a better fit in landscape management. These approaches were analyzed in view of the types of involved actors, their roles, motives, influence and benefits, as well as the way that these actors interact with each other to generate knowledge, leveraging funding, spur trust and mitigate conflicts.

This webinar aimed to provide insights regarding the specific features through which the collaborative governance approaches could successfully address and mitigate issues of institutional misfit in landscape management. Additionally it aims to introduce aspects of the importance of Science-Policy-Society interface regarding biodiversity and ecosystems services.

Inputs to the webinar provided by:

Claudia Sattler (Leibniz Centre for Agricultural Landscape Research, Germany), Anglea Meyer and Gregor Giersch (Organisation for International Dialogue and Conflict Management, Austria) and Lenny von Bussel (Wageningen University, Netherlands) will present and discuss results from the BiodivERSA/ FACCE-JPI project cp³: 'Civil-public-private-partnerships: collaborative governance approaches for policy innovation to enhance biodiversity and ecosystem services delivery in agricultural landscapes' [www.cp3-project.eu]

ZoiKonstantinou (Faculty of Science, University of Porto) will present and discuss the EKLIPSE mechanism for Science-Policy-Society interface regarding biodiversity and ecosystems services in the EU

[www.eklipse-mechanism.eu]

Questions and Answers

1. What can be done if influential/decision making stakeholders do not engage?

Cp3 project had one example (water management board) where one powerful public actor was reluctant to be part of the discussion that was about allowing for broader participation in mutual decision making. In this case the other actors articulated concern and finally convinced the actor to be involved. So social pressure and actively trying to convince someone that decisions that are based on the input of all concerned actors are better decisions is one possible solution.

2. In terms of private funding what is attractive for the private sector ? What incentives do they have to put funding into this ? Especially if a feasibility study has been done for the private sector. It would be interesting to know the figures: ROR and ROI.

When analysing the motives of private actors we always found a mix of different motives. This included other-regarding interests (e.g. doing something for nature, the community) along with self-regarding interests. So reasons to offer funding could be because of both motives. In terms of self-regarding interests, private actors could for instance improve their 'image' or could benefit economically. The later is relevant, when a more diverse and biodiversity rich landscape is also important for income generation of a private actor, such as tourism agencies. We do not know of any feasibility studies including figures on 'rate of return - ROR' or 'return on investment - ROI'. In the interviews 'risk' and 'uncertainty' came up in conversations that were about trying new/innovative things. A way of handling both is by starting small, as in the example of the pilot, so if the idea fails, the loss is still manageable.

3. How were ecosystem services calculated (e.g. using proxies based on land use/land cover)?

We have used the so-called matrix method as proposed by Burkhard *et al.* (2009) and refined by Burkhard *et al.* (2012; 2014). This matrix method consists of a relatively simple matrix with the ecosystem services as columns and geospatial units such as ecosystem, land use or land cover type, as rows. On each intersection a number from 0-5 is given, indicating the capacity of the geospatial unit to provide a certain ecosystem service, with 0 implying no relevant supply and 5 very high supply.

- Burkhard B, Kandziora M, Hou Y, Müller F. 2014. Ecosystem Service Potentials, Flows and Demands – Concepts for Spatial Localisation, Indication and Quantification. *Landscape online* 34: 1-32.
- Burkhard B, Kroll F, Müller F, Windhorst W. 2009. Landscapes' Capacity to Provide Ecosystem Services - a Concept for Land-Cover Based Assessments. *Landscape online* 15: 1-22.
- Burkhard B, Kroll F, Nedkov S, Müller F. 2012. Mapping ecosystem service supply, demand and budgets. *Ecological Indicators* 21: 17-29.

4. The water ditches are important for drainage, why did the farmers agree to the measures to make the ditches more natural?

The farmers agreed to make the ditches more natural because they get compensated for this. I don't think that the drainage function is being lost by making the ditches more natural. In addition, farmers obtain benefits from more natural ditch edges in terms of ecosystem services, such as pollination or disease and pest control through beneficial organisms, although I am not sure if farmers are aware of this.

5. It will be interesting from a CC for further research to research the baseline GHGs before and after the activities, and if adaptation and mitigation activities are harmonious or contradictory.

In the cp³ project we did not directly focus on climate change issues, but there are examples in the literature (see below). Also, for instance, the IPCC is often considered as an international 'collaborative' governance approach.

Some literature on the topic:

- Brink E, Wamsler C (2018): Collaborative governance for climate change adaptation: Mapping citizen–municipality interactions. *Environmental Policy and Governance* 28: 82-97.
- Barton JR, Krellenberg K, Harris JM (2014) Collaborative governance and the challenges of participatory climate change adaptation planning in Santiago de Chile. *Climate and Development*, 7: 175-184.
- Emerson, K, Murchie P (2010): Collaborative governance and climate change: Opportunities for public administration (Available via www.researchgate.net).

6. Was there any initiative to make the intensification more sustainable, e.g. through ecological Christmas trees?

There have been (and still are) attempts to mitigate the impact of Christmas tree production on Biodiversity, e.g. through ecological production techniques (avoidance of pesticides). However so far they have not been successful. To our understanding this is due to: (a) lacking awareness and demand on the side of the consumers and (b) still lacking cooperation on the side of the local producers to gain the critical mass e.g. for a sustainability label or other marketing instrument, that could help compensate higher production cost through market premium.

7. Are there studies which discuss the role of niche markets for regions/landscapes like this?

There are some studies and related papers discussing the role of niche markets for regional/landscape maintenance and development in similar agro-environmental systems including in Austria. From these studies and the issues related to the quite specific market for Christmas trees, it appears necessary to caution with regard to any generalisation.

- Bender, O. (2010): Cultural landscape, traditional food and tourism. Rural development in the “Franconian Switzerland” (Bavaria, Germany) and the Wachau (Lower Austria). in: Borsdorf, A. et al. (2010): Challenges for Mountain Regions—Tackling Complexity, Vienna: 120-127
- Schmitzberger, I.; Wrbka, Th. (2005): How farming styles influence biodiversity maintenance in Austrian agricultural landscapes. In: Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 108:3: 274-290

8. Why and how did the public actors get involved in a citizen foundation?

Mainly, because they also care for the landscape and have an interest that the traditional landscape associated with high biodiversity is maintained in the long-run. The public actors include the biosphere reserve administration which logically is interested in landscape conservation. Public actors also include the three counties in which the biosphere reserve is located and the larger cities. Amongst others, they have an interest because tourism is important for the region (they have nearly 5 mio. visitors per year) and landscape aesthetics contribute to the attractiveness of the region. Public actors are/were involved as founders contributing to the endowment of the foundation and as donors contributing annually to the funding of different projects.

9. Related to the upscaling issue but rather different: what general scientific insights can one get out of these 3 empirical examples, which are always very context-dependent?

Naturally, from just three case studies it is difficult to make generalizations. But if you include examples already presented in the literature some generalisations are possible. Since our focus was primarily on social network analysis and looking into the structural characteristics of the different approaches, we can make some general observations in this regard: e.g. that actors assume distinct roles and pull their strengths for the collaboration and by doing so develop ‘collaborative leadership’ with shared responsibilities. But, we would also like to emphasize that we see ‘context-dependency’ as one main advantage of collaborative approaches, supporting governance solutions that really fit to the specific context situation.

10. At the beginning, it has been mentioned some work done with GIS and Participatory GIS. Could I know more? Where can I find more information about it?

In the cp³ project, we developed a web-based survey tool called ‘MapScape’ (<https://mapscape.org>), which can also be used to collect GIS information (points, lines and polygons). We are currently working on a user manual and hope it will be available online soon. If you like to know more or like to use the tool you are welcome to get in touch with us (e-mail contact: csattler@zalf.de).

11. How do you ensure cooperation of knowledge holders?

We can not ensure knowledge holders cooperation, we can only invite it, by making our aims as visible as possible and by ensuring that our processes are open to all and as transparent as possible. To achieve that we follow different paths, which allow us to disseminate our work and our actions in an audience as wide as possible. EKLIPSE had developed and constantly expanding a network of knowledge holders which we invite to provide with information relevant to each request. All our calls and activities are accessible through EKLIPSE website (<http://www.eclipse-mechanism.eu/>) and the [KNOCK forum](#), which we publisize through different Social Media. During the Scoping Phase of each request, we identify potential knowledge holders for each subject and contact them separately. Finally, we ask our requesters, the organisations or consortiums which have put the request forward, to point us to potential knowledgeableholders which may be interested in participating in the process. We choose to believe that as EKLIPSE will gain visibility, more knowledge holders will engage our process.

12. Is there any meta-analysis done, on how much the collected information is used by decision makers?

It is not up to EKLIPSE to ensure the implementation of its outputs. Among other reasons because that would indefiere with the impartial role of EKLIPSE in the Science-Policy-Society interface process, as well with the transparency of our processes. Nevertheless, there is a need for meta-analysis on if and how these outputs are being used. Since at the moment EKLIPSE has only concluded only one request cicle, this regarding [NBS solutions](#), it is early to begin this analysis, which will take place when more outputs are available, after the end of 2018. It is positive to say though that the outputs of the NBS request, have been used in policy context.

13. "join the EKLIPSE expert network" link on EKLIPS web page is not working

Please follow the [link](#), to join the EKLIPSE network. We are sorry for any temporary problems. Should you have any other problems, do not hesitate to contact Zoi Konstantinou directly (zkonstantinou@ciimar.up.pt)

14. Can collaborative governance be a cover or 'greenwash', for structural relations of power and money, e.g. landowners, CAP subsidies which reward large landowners, forest extraction rights etc?

Since actors' motives are versatile and also included economic interests and image improvements, greenwashing could be a motivation, in principle. But for the examples we analysed, we found in most cases this mix of motives, including both, self- and other-regarding interests. Thereby the Net-Map tool can be used to reveal 'hidden' interests, since different actors are also asked about their perceptions on the motives of the other actors. If you would use ego-networks only asking the actors themselves about their motives, you would have a higher risk that actors state 'fake' motives, or motives they think are more socially accepted. In Net-Map you can compare what

actors tell you about themselves and what other tell you about them. In addition, the interest-influence matrix is a further tool to reveal power relations in a network.

15. As these collaborative actor-interaction systems are often vulnerable and short term, how can we promote learning, innovation, and a collective intelligence for strategic thinking ?

From the interviews we did in cp³ one topic that came up quite often was that the different actors contributed different types of knowledge, skills and resources and only by pooling them they could create a space to innovate and develop solutions while also learning from each other. However, we did not do a process analysis, looking at different points in time and asking about learning effects directly. This would be an interesting approach for future research, though. Analysing different points in time in view of how the network changes, how actors join the network or drop out and what kind of effects that has, e.g. on learning.

16. I am working on a file on the natural value of floodplains and their management in a complex policy setting. Did you have case studies addressing floodplains and could you point me to information on the web or in publications?

In two of the case studies, the German and the Dutch one, water and flood management was very important. But in both cases, interests were not only on this particular issue, because of the multiple, and partly competing, interests of actors. For instance, in the German case, farmers were in favor of lowering water tables earlier in the year (so they can access their land to produce 'provisioning' ecosystem services), while the nature protection agencies were in favor of keeping the water tables higher for a longer period (for conservation purposes and to provide more 'supporting' and 'regulating' ecosystem services). So for us the focus was more on how they reached a compromise on the management aiming to reconcile different interests. But when we did our literature search we found quite a number of studies on collaborative water management.

Here we list some examples:

- de Boer C, Vinkede Kruijf J, Özerol G, Bressers H. (2016): Collaborative Water Resource Management: What makes up a supportive governance system? *Environmental Policy and Governance* 26: 229-241.
- Runhaar HAC, Melman TCP, Boonstra FG, Erisman JW, Horlings LG, de Snoo GR, Termeer CJAM, Wassen MJ, Westerink J, Arts BJM (2016): Promoting nature conservation by Dutch farmers: a governance perspective. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability* 15: 264-281.
- Anandaa J, Proctorb W (2013): Collaborative approaches to water management and planning: An institutional perspective. *Ecological Economics* 86: 97-106.