

Evamab closing workshop

Wrap-up

Luc Janssens de Bisthoven, Anne-Julie Rochette, Erik Verheyen, Jean Hugé

Bahir Dar, Ethiopia

13-17 May 2019

First ideas about the manual

plenary discussion, Wednesday 15 May

- Define well the **target group**, because language should be adapted;
- Co-stewardship and **positive wordings**, the economic valuation is important but should be contextualised and is only one aspect;
- Different approaches for **different ecosystems**;
- Make it **attractive** for governments, catchy title, challenges and opportunities, but also communication;
- Be aware about **concerns and skills** of target group;

plenary discussion, Wednesday 15 May (2)

- A **manual** or **technical guideline** format, but also a policy brief about the manual for policy;
- Promote close link of MAB with local **universities**;
- Case studies Evamab, but manual should be helpful to **other MABS** and **non- MAB** protected areas;
- Valuate ES, but also **protect** ES!
- **Which tool** to select is one aspect through decision system

World cafés

Wednesday, 15 May

World café 1

on rapid assessment tools

1.1. Anne-Julie Rochette: Why would you (not) use a rapid ecosystem services assessment tool?

Why?

- **User friendly step by step** approaches and well documented tools
- **Stakeholders engagement:** Gives a change to all to contribute – strengthens the link between stakeholders
- Clear picture on quantity and quality of ES
- **Community** involvement: raises awareness
- **Customizable** to a specific situation
- Gives **legitimacy** to the results

Will only be used if

- **communication, accompaniment and training about it**
- **clearly inked to the objectives and management of the area**

Why not?

- **Unknown**
- Another new concept – tool – we have enough (**too much info**)
- **Lack of time** –Managers are too busy
- Lack of **capacities/skills** to apply the tools
- Might have bad **consequences** eg on non priority ES
- **Too general-** not applicable as such to a specific site
- Economic valuation: Risks of **under/over evaluation**

World café 1

on rapid assessment tools

1.2. Erik Verheyen: What would you do with the results when you have applied such a rapid ecosystem services assessment tool? What are possible entry points to feed the results into MAB Reserve management?

- 1. Look at the results from the point of view that they are important for the future of the young and future generations and that you seek to **support the population from the MAB area**
- 2. **Communicate** the obtained results to the stakeholders
- 3. Interpret the strengths and weaknesses of the current situation, as revealed by the results, with the stakeholders
- 4. Solicit opinions on the solutions to address the problems revealed via the obtained results and validate them via the **stakeholders**

- 5. Select **different communication tools depending on the target audience** to communicate the results and proposed actions for outreach purposes (local tv and radio, pamphlets at churches, workshops, ... >< internet, website ...)
- 6. Assure **full participation of stakeholders** at all levels to assure acceptance of results (create sense of ownership)
- 7. Develop a **co-designed action plan**: i.e. based on proposals of initiatives from local stakeholders
- 8. Actively seek out **stakeholders from outside MAB** (e.g. NGO's) already involved in regional development actions, hence with expertise to execute this type of actions in the transition zone
- 9. Seek **support from higher authority** levels, while maintaining "red lines" to safeguard local priorities/ objectives (define clear responsibilities and roles of various stakeholders)
- 10. Collaborate with higher authority levels to eventually adapt, or accommodate initiatives to pre-existing development plans
- 11. **Adapt**, when necessary the **boundaries of the MAB** and its buffer zone to enable the effectiveness of the proposed initiatives
- 12. Mainstreaming the results/ actions in local by-laws, to be communicated regionally via adapted communication strategies

World Café 1.3: Approaches besides/beyond ES tools?

- Three clusters of ideas emerged:
- ***A. Co-production of knowledge***
- ***B. Communicating the values/the importance of ecosystem services***
- ***C. Building on/re-interpreting traditional knowledge***

World Café 1.3: Approaches besides/beyond ES tools?

Cluster A: Co-production of knowledge

- Use serious games
- Use scenarios using rich pictures
- Use citizen science and community-based monitoring
- Create working groups bringing together champions of change
- Create opportunities for skill transfer
- Link science with indigenous knowledge

World Café 1.3: Approaches besides/beyond ES tools?

Cluster B: Communication

- Local media
- Celebrations
- Goodwill ambassadors
- Competitions & awards
- Field visits for locals, it's their Biosphere Reserve!
- Support local champions (change makers)
- Develop local 'brands'
- Use traditional events as anchoring points
- Use drama, dance and music to communicate about ecosystem services

World Café 1.3: Approaches besides/beyond ES tools?

- ***Cluster C: Traditional knowledge***
- Sacred sites are/have been effective – complementary approach
- Importance of religious/traditional leaders as influential resource persons → change in perceptions and behavior.
- Re-interpret some traditions which use eg animals

World café 2

(SWOT of economic valuation)

- **2.1. Steven Van Passel: Strengths of ES**

- Money is well known
- Helps to design **payment for ecosystem services** and reward mechanisms
- **Politicians** (and policy makers) speak in monetary terms
- Monetary values look simple, it is **1 unit** and hence it is comparable
- Can **attract investment** and result in **job creation**
- Helps decision making between **competing users** and different land use types.
- Supports appreciation and awareness of ES/ can help to raise **knowledge**, embrace conservation
- Can motivate local communities and help to create **markets** (e.g. carbon markets)
- Can facilitate law **enforcement**
- **Can show the need to intervene**, e.g. in the case of a decline of ES
- Can connect people and stimulate discussion, **multidisciplinarity**
- Can help to **diversify between economic activities**
- Valuation of ecosystem services can help to **improve national accounting systems**
- Valuation can help with **conflicts** between wild life and local people (e.g. design of compensation schemes)

World café 2

(SWOT of economic valuation)

- **2.2. Bruno Verbist on the risks of ES**
- 1. Difference between economic potential and what can/will be realized risks to **reduce motivation of stakeholders**
- 2. EV will increase the gap between suppliers – beneficiaries as they don't always speak the same (economic) language
- 3. **Valuation needs to be informed by knowledge about ES** (e.g. accounting for all forms of biodiversity, ...)
- 4. **Some ES are easier to value** and valorise than others (e.g. carbon vs. biodiversity). What about the ES that are more difficult to value and valorise
- 5. Economic valuation might not always assess properly the difference in quality of ES for beneficiaries closer or further away from the resource.
- 6. Huge importance of **transparency**

- 7. Competing interests & unequal power balance between beneficiaries e.g. commercial vs. traditional fishermen
- 8. How can stakeholders be grouped/represented correctly **without overlooking e.g. minorities ?**
- 9. **Different evaluation methods will lead to different results** and might – if the discrepancy is too big – lead to different/wrong policy decisions
- 10. There is **no “universal value”** for different ES
- 11. There is a lack of “scaling rules” in EV
- 12. EV is not forward looking
- **13.** Difference in value of 1 USD in different countries e.g. Etjiopia vs Morocco can drive e.g; C-payments to the cheapest country rather than lead to an increase in ES (in casu tree planting) in all countries
- 14. Current MAB boundaries do not always coincide with the boundaries of ES service provision

- 15. Tipping points in ES delivery will likely not match with tipping point regarding WTPay or tipping points in livelihoods of communities
- 16. EV tends to **underestimate ES**; it can be a very large underestimation
- 17. Are the data for EV good enough?
- 18. **Volatility in prices** for ES might be very high, which might lead to ES providers to consider other LU options that provide less ES, but more private income
- 19. EV can push people from an intrinsic reason to conserve to an often weaker external reason (money) to protect/preserve ES
- 20. **Risk of corruption**
- 21. EV could lead to a PES scheme that is so successful, that it might become a victim of its success by creating a pool of attraction for many people living further away than the neighbouring communities
- 22. Some groups have the power to **abuse EV methods** (eg. Public investments in infrastructure rather than a rehabilitation of the uplands)
- 23. Difference in power between suppliers – buyers; Is the “ES-market” a buyers’ or suppliers’ market?
- 24. The power of the market to control a reduction in ES might be much lower than the rule of law. Need for a change in paradigm

World café 2

(SWOT of economic valuation)

2.3. Koen Vanderhagen on examples of best practices

- Plenty of examples of situations of value attached to ES as part of decision process or working of PES.
- **Eg Simanjiro area in Tanzania: wild animals accessed community land and were compensated by tour operators.**
- Ghana: local people are rewarded by capacity building , training on alterative lievlihoods etc.
- Rwanda: electricity in Kigali provided by wetlands, converted to agriculture, rehabilitation!
- Uganda: ecotrust, Kibale NP, TZ red+ projects.
- L. Manyara: tourist visits. Ecuador: scheme goats and sheep destroyed vegetation, change to alpaca in Paramo. Challenge of conditionality in reward systems.

World café 3

(Tools to trigger change, how, stakeholders, examples)

3.1. Luc Janssens de Bisthoven: How can rapid ecosystem services assessment tools be used to trigger change

1. Travail qui doit se faire doit être précédé par identification des attentes des communautés.
2. **Trust building** important part of the tool
3. Use techniques of **mobile phoning** in rural areas; ;
4. Every stakeholder at all levels should know when talking about problem or benefit
5. Understandable to everybody. Absorption of information , ownership building of information
6. Transfer doc to people in face to face way
7. Kids at school, eg China reforestation of mangroves, typhoons, replanting by kids. Now community protect the mangroves because feel emotionally responsible.
8. **Reach the influential people** | the communities. !!

9. Incorporating the media within the tool, starting processing info to make it transparent to community.
10. Media: local FM station. Part of programmes responsibility.
11. Ass tools in context of research assigning values, challenge comm findings to community.
12. Research need to budget to outreach to come back to communities to show results.
13. Missing link between researchers and outreach organisations, lack of incentives!
14. Other way: demonstration sites of scientists working with farmers or experimenting directly with communities. Incentive is disappearance of ES like medicinal plants is a incentives, walking to the different sites with the communities. Discussion by walking, very powerful.
15. Seeing convinces.

16. Communities surveying affected diseased trees, because they are affected directly.
17. Address localized problems, they realize bringing solutions within themselves. Vo-management!!
18. Funding policies addressing local problems?

World café 3

(Tools to trigger change, how, stakeholders)

3.2. Meine: most impactful stakeholders, how to be reached?

- List local, national and global stakeholders
- → who might have a stake in the area?
- → what approach may work best to engage them.
- Threats
 - Lot of value at risk
 - Conflict can get out of control
- Opportunity
 - Reconciling conservation and local traditions
 - Job opportunities and new investments (focus on youth and women)
 - SDGs
 - Clarity on the rules of the game for attracting investments
- Short vs long term (short in support of the change needed for the longer term)
 - Immediate issues: journalists and politicians
 - Long: education, trust building, respect, recognition and partnerships

World Café 3.3: Impactful research

Conditions for succesful uptake of research findings by decision-makers?

- Demonstrate socio-economic impact
- Research questions must be co-identified
- Co-production of knowledge
- Transparency
- Avoid saturation of communities
- Pilot & demo sites
- Adapt methods & communication strategy to key target audience
- Work with inter-disciplinary teams



Thank you!

Lake Victoria, biodiversity hotspot for e.g. Cichlidae, basin of 35 Million people and 5 countries, Photo@L. Janssens de Bisthoven