

OPERAs Project Meeting
Wednesday 16th to Friday 16th October 2013
Palma, Mallorca

Minutes and actions

NB All PowerPoint presentations and posters from this meeting will be placed on the internal section of the OPERAs website

Wednesday 16th October

1. Welcome (Mark Rounsevell)

Mark opened the meeting and welcomed everyone, including the many new members of the project. He stated that we are now 10 months into OPERAs and highlighted progress in a number of areas such as the project branding, collaboration with the OpenNESS project, the Resource Hub, the User Board, the meta-analysis, the exemplars and their clusters, and the Communities of Excellence. He stated that the aims of the meeting were to monitor WP progress, introduce new researchers to the project, focus on exemplar needs from instruments and knowledge and plan next steps. He then highlighted the up-coming deliverables for the project

2. Work Package Summaries

WP2 (Practice) – Achievements so far for WP2 include several milestones such as MS2.1 Review of ES/NC Assessment protocols, MS2.2 Draft Blueprint and MS2.3 Meta-analysis & knowledge gaps. Next steps include several milestones and D2.1 – the description of Exemplar Study Design (due end of February 2014). It was commented that the poster session taking place later would hopefully help to develop a matrix of connections between the exemplars, instruments and knowledge people.

WP3 (Knowledge) – This work package can be seen as a “mini OPERAs” with research at various levels of the knowledge-practice axis. There are 5 tasks in the WP and the WP has to be cross-cutting. Seeking to strengthen the link to the instruments WP. Will concentrate part of work in a joint exemplar. Scotland was considered as the most promising in this regard, its scale and data richness would be ideal to bring both larger and finer scale approaches together.

WP4 (Instruments) – Progress has been made in identifying tools and instruments that want to further use, fact sheets have been created, posters made, started team for joint tool/instrument development and links to exemplars made.

WP5 (Resource Hub) – This WP has change since the project was approved, due to the increasing collaboration with the OpenNES project on “one common platform” (rather than a Resource Hub and a Clearing House). A Scoping Document has been produced as well as a Review of Existing Hubs. Next steps include: updating the scoping document after this meeting (“living document”), business model in next few months and general design and functionality discussed.

3. Report back from WP Break Out Sessions

WP2 (Practice) – the 3 exemplar clusters will be presented tomorrow which involve all 11 exemplars. “Criteria” includes – spatial scale, drivers, trade-offs and stakeholders.

WP3 (Knowledge) – Purpose is how to integrate all the work in WP3.

Two ways to integrate

1. Horizontal/Cross WP integration (knowledge into instruments and tested in exemplars) - posters and create small groups
2. Integration between 5 knowledge tasks

Also spent time on inventory of method and tools in WP3

WP4 (Instruments) – 4 questions to consortium:

1. Scenario question – development “OPERAs” scenarios or individual for exemplars
2. Comprehensive overview of existing tools and gaps – selection of tools (criteria), how organise with WP3 and links to OpenNESS
3. Justification of final OPERAs tools (how many and why into RH – criteria)
4. Organisation of poster session

Need to think about what is missing from current list of instruments & need to know what OpenNESS is doing in relation to instruments.

WP5 (Resource Hub) – The Resource Hub is now a project with the OpenNESS project. Aim is “better ecosystem management”. What do people want from RH? – contacts of experts, ready to use tools, multiple access points for different users, easy to use/easy to access, language (English).

Thursday 17th October

4. Blueprint & Synthesis update (James Paterson & Genevieve Pautenaude)

Genevieve and James presented 5 options for electing what should be synthesised in the OPERAs project.

1. Document the operationalisation of ES (16)
2. Synthesis summarise exemplars research (3)
3. Focus on knowledge gaps (8)
4. Assess the scientific rigour in exemplar studies (6)
5. Test blueprint and compare to other ES frameworks (8)

After discussing each of these 5 options they asked the OPERAs consortium to vote on which one they wanted (the numbers in brackets give the number of people voting for each option).

5. Meta-analysis update (Sven Lautenbach)

Sven gave an overview of the WP2 Deliverable MS2.3 “Preliminary report on knowledge gaps and demand for instruments”. He highlighted the following issues: Lack of demand side studies; lack of use of scenarios; integrated models missing; lack

of validation and uncertainty analysis; instruments not been sufficiently investigated and specific recommendations missing.

6. WP2 Practice: 3 clusters (Meriwether Wilson, Ariane Walz & Kim Nicholas)

In this session each of the 3 Practice Co-leads described the exemplars which were in their cluster. They explained the reasons for having 3 thematic clusters: as a platform for connecting with other WPs, for collaboration and synergies between exemplars and to facilitate exemplar management.

Cluster 1: Large Scale Dynamics (led by Ariane) involves the Global, pan-European and Circum-Mediterranean exemplars. They have the following in common: larger scale, scenario analysis, intense use of models, & stakeholder engagement.

Cluster 2: Aquatic Systems on the edge (led by Meriwether) involves the Barcelona, Danube, Baleric and Scotland exemplars. Areas to work include economic valuation, social valuation, governance and trade-offs.

Cluster 3: Local and Regional Transitions (led by Kim) involves the Dublin, Alps, Montado and Wine exemplars. Issues include land use change, cultural identify, valuation and trade-offs.

7. Exemplars & Instruments Session (Diana Tuomasjukka)

In this session Diana stated that the posters that had been produced & displayed at the session last night were all very useful and would help to further the matrix of exemplars and instruments. She then asked each of the exemplars which instruments they thought that they would like to explore. The result of this session will be an updated matrix of which instruments each exemplar might like to test.

8. Resource Hub update (Claire Brown & Eugenie Regan)

Claire & Eugenie gave an update on the Resource Hub and in particular the close working with the OpenNESS project. The two projects will now work together on a “Common Platform” and have produced a scoping document for this activity. The vision for this is that it should be more than just a website, a community of practice, have life beyond both projects, should be self-sustaining, should be useful, applicable and needed and should have a business plan.

9. User Board (Martin Watson)

Martin discussed the User Board and in particular who OPERAs should be engaging with. The first meeting of the User Board will take place on 28 & 29 November 2013 and will involve lots of participatory and interactive engagement.

10. Communities of Excellence: Experiences from the Scottish Exemplar (Marc Metzger and Meriwether Wilson)

Marc & Meriwether gave an overview of the Scottish multi-scalar exemplar and highlighted how there is a lot happening in both a research and policy context in Scotland at the moment with regard to ecosystem services. The creation of an Ecosystem Services Community Scotland (ESCom) was discussed, detailing its constituency, activities, launch event, and working groups. Then a description of different areas of Scotland in which work is taking place was given including the Inner Forth.

11. OpenNESS project (Heli Saarikoski)

Heli gave an introduction to the OpenNESS project via Skype. She highlighted that the project involved 35 partners and 26 case studies. She stated that the aims of the project were to “translate the concepts of ecosystem service and natural capital into operational frameworks that provide tested, practical and tailored solutions for integrating ecosystem services into management and decision making” and “to examine how the concepts can be embedded in existing practice, or used to transform current management and policy approaches”. She went on to describe how the 8 Work Packages functioned and the iterative approach of the project.

12. OPERAs & OpenNESS Collaboration (Mark Rounsevell)

Mark gave an overview of the common working areas between the two projects such as:

- Communication and dissemination strategies/plans
- Joint stakeholder engagement and monitoring plan
- Protocols and synthesis of exemplars/case studies
- Resource Hub and Clearinghouse common platform (perennity)
- Joint business plan for the common platform
- Compare the project policy briefs
- Lower Danube exemplar/case study
- Coordinate Summer School(s) and other training elements
- Joint Open Science Conference at the end of the projects
- Joint Special Issue linked to the final conference

13. Project Management (Jess Bryson)

Jess covered a number of project management issues such as the new project website, difficulties of file sharing, updating contact lists, teleconferencing, upcoming deliverables, sharing of milestones and possible dates and locations for the next full project meeting.

14. Dissemination Strategy & Website update (Marc Metzger)

Marc gave an update on the OPERAs Dissemination strategy which is a deliverable due at the end of November 2013. He stated that it had 4 objectives:

1. Identify and connect with target audiences
2. Promote OPERAs
3. Disseminate project results
4. Promote Resource Hub

The 4 target audiences are: Public/policy making/implementation, private sector, NGOs/civil society and academia. OPERAs will be promoted by: a new Website; a Social media strategy involving Twitter, LinkedIn group & Blogs; Flyer / cards; Engaging constituencies and the Exemplars and research output.

While the project results will be disseminated by: Papers; a special issue; Policy briefs; Blogs; Videos; Conferences and workshops; Summer schools and by the Resource Hub.

The new OPERAs website is up and running and we will shortly be updating the internal section of the website. Kate Morrison has been recruited as the project Digital

Communications Officer. Anyone in the project who would like to get involved with blogs, news, twitter etc should please contact her.

Friday 18th October

15. Instruments and Knowledge Session (Marcus Lindner and Peter Verburg)

This session involved a panel discussion on how best to link instruments and knowledge to create better instruments and put them into practice.

People involved in the panel were:

- Info: Eugenie
- Decision support systems: Adrienne, Bernhard
- Implementation: Marianne
- Biodiversity: Sandra
- Social-cultural valuation: Craig
- Monetary evaluation: Patrick
- Governance: Lennart

Instruments	Knowledge needs:
<p>Adrienne: Backcasting instrument: you have a vision, and want to analyze/model how to get there, work with maps – But how do we get synergies and trade-offs</p>	<p>Sandra: approach of multiple properties and relationships of ES; could provide mechanistic + statistical relationships to put into decision support tool Kim: historical development of ES (Elena Bennett) Sven: offers his optimisation systems for trade-off curves Lennart: important to govern ES functions instead of ES (otherwise ES is undermined);ie map of functions is needed</p>
<p>Adrienne: Are there indicators from Knowledge to understand the powerplay (governance systems) in study regions/exemplars (Switzerland)? governance needed to drive function</p>	<p>Lennart: have Switzerland join EU ... Patrick: who are the mayor winners/looser – then you have the power relations. At higher level: developing a decision tree to describe power functions. It can be described, but there is no power tool that can be handed out Christian: policy network approach done for CH. Together with local partners this can be done for Grenoble</p>
<p>Marcus: Trade-off assessment –how can ES be valued (for stakeholders) SIA + MCA + CBA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Idea about ES important (knowledge needed from WP3). - Valuation: Often combination of social evaluation plus SIA – get hold of priorities and values, conflicts, 	<p>Sandra: Almut has models on evaluation of GHG emissions and C sequestration tradeoffs Deirdre+Craig: social and cultural valuation (qualitative) combined with ecological values. E.g. via scenario change (incl. thresholds and uncertainties). Various methods</p>

<p>ecol. And societal tradeoffs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This info is important plus underlying uncertainty. (Bernhard) - Sequence of users of tools: SIA -> MCA -> CBA? 	<p>available. Quantification would be interesting</p> <p>Sandra: valuation of ES exists, trade-offs between them would be interesting.</p> <p>Patrick: restoration costs, MCDA, other approaches between now and scenarios available; but uncertainties between those are crucial and content-relevant.</p> <p>Ariane: social valuation on same areas -> gives demographic backgrounds and contributions which gives</p>
<p>Astrid: Playing devil’s advocate: Now there is a lot of discussion about improving models even further – but linking back to the example from Africa and power play – often practitioners and policy makers become suspicious on too detailed models. How can we make sure that they get used in practice?</p>	<p>Adrienne: Tom’s visualisation tool will be developed for different users, but from Meta-analysis etc. we need to know where the gaps in process are and what the needed form would be. Needs to be explicit.</p> <p>Lennart: number of actors have increased from government to governance. We need to investigate the more subtle power games such as social movements (example Istanbul – park – freedom – other values – different channels other than official channels)</p> <p>Marcus: underlying conditions and cultural background important also at national level in order to select suitable tool/form, that also gets used in that context.</p> <p>Boyan: in final decision don’t argue with environmental arguments. It has to be in social-economic structure without talking about environment too much to get message/decisions through</p>
<p>Sven: workshop on experience sharing on topic of how to reach and influence decision makers – maybe extra meeting needed.</p>	
<p>Marianne: implementation instruments are rather wide (PES. Offsetting, green business, finance, ...): all knowledge needs defined are relevant to us as well:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tradeoffs 2. functions of ES such as biodiversity – where do we get info for that 	
<p>Marianne: Trade-offs; what info will we get of biodiversity; which exemplar includes biodiversity in addition to ESS?</p>	<p>Iris Seagrass Mallorca have data on indicators</p> <p>Astrid Indicators on biodiversity and offsets on European level</p>

	<p>Meriwether Coastal march trade-offs</p> <p>Claire WCMC provides biodiversity indicators</p> <p>Sven trade-offs between indicators</p> <p>Extra: Marianne – ToSIA has indicators as well (aesthetical + quantitative)</p>
<p>Marianne Gov: on which scale do you implement your tools/instruments?</p>	<p>Christian: scale where ES-relevant policies are allocated assessed in gov.task.</p> <p>Boyan: all our work is related to investment proposal and thus always local and site-specific</p>
<p>Eugenie Cultural ES are difficult to get knowledge, values and mapped; How can you map sth that doesn't have monetary values (eg spiritual)</p>	<p>Craig: cult-soc. Values such as recreation and tourism is existing for economist. Regulating ES more difficult (see ppt)</p> <p>Patrick: education and scientific knowledge more difficult to get but travel value functions exist (such as value of protected site measures via visits).</p> <p>Deidre: Dublin Exemplar tries to do that. Underlying hotspots of value (eg. Spiritual)</p> <p>Samantha: participatory mapping without monetary valuation (what do you find important as ES and where)</p> <p>Meriwether: importance of rituals and relation to bio-physical relations (eg fasting, etc). And traditional knowledge links place and spiritual values. Knowledge from pacific case study, but translation can be investigated</p> <p>Boyan: cultural-social values depend on social classes which may be contradictory. Mapping is practically impossible.</p> <p>Adrienne: tool interlinkages may help eg visualisation.</p>
<p>Are there knowledge that are not yet picked up in tools/instruments?</p>	<p>Lennart: values to whom? Opinions and values are important: multiple level maps are needed dependent on values of perceptance.</p> <p>Kim: are there any direct links between knowledge methodologies that gets implemented in instruments?</p>
<p>Boyan: comparing existing ES (maybe degraded) and future new values – do we have knowledge on predicting values for after restoration to put into decision making</p>	<p>Anita: in global Ex. Eg for reforestation as scenarios</p> <p>Rob: outputs of regenerate project REMEDY tool (needs info input) – suggestion to include Meriwether's</p>

	<p>cultural knowledge into REMEDY tool to make predictions</p> <p>Lennart: if you have mechanistic values – yes. If you only have statistical values – more difficult</p> <p>Xxx: future values have are of importance</p>
<p>Jose: crowd-sourcing as data input on biodiversity and wider aspects. Can we get instrument to get this knowledge and survey it?</p>	<p>Eugenie: we have subtask on crowd-sourcing, eg through userboard, and develop tools that are needed. Eg CANVAS tools</p>

Actions identified

- ➔ Small workshop on our experience in how we can bring knowledge and tools to practice better – as we have expertise from Lennart, Christian etc. (proposed by Peter, not inventoried if there is an interest to take this up. Action item?).
- ➔ Biodiversity – Ecosystem services trade offs – WCMC, CONNECT, bring together knowledge and data on this. (action Item Marianne, IEEP). Sandra: biodiversity –ecosystem services overlaps point / antagonistic
- ➔ Socio-cultural valuation task link to the information needs and tools out there to bring to a common environment. Perhaps a workshop on this aspect. **Action item WP3.2 leads (UCD)**

16. Wrap Up

The project now has 12 exemplars – with a new Swiss one being coordinated by Adrienne Gret-Regamey. WP2 has a deliverable due in February 2014 – D2.1 “Description of Study Design: Exemplars, stakeholder needs and tested tools/instruments”.

The first deliverable for WP3 is due at the end of May 2014: D3.1 “Transferable geo-referenced metrics, and GIC based quantification and valuation functions”.

The first deliverable for WP4 is due at the end of March 2014: D4.1 “Report and policy brief on existing and emerging policy needs and opportunities”.

It was noted that the deliverables for WP5 will need to be modified due to the collaboration with OpenNESS on the “Common platform”.

A “Dissemination Strategy and Plan” (D6.1) will be completed soon by WP6.

17. Next Meeting

The next meeting will take place in May/June next year and a doodle will be sent out to organise a date.

Summary of Actions

	Action
1	Power points from this meeting on internal section of OPERAs website (Jess Bryson & Kate Morrison)
2	Mini information document to be produced for each of the instruments (WP4 leaders to coordinate)
3	Posters to be placed on internal section of the OPERAs website (Kate Morrison)
4	Information to be gathered on OpenNESS instruments (Mark Rounsevell)
5	Milestones to be placed on internal section of OPERAs website (Kate Morrison)
6	Database on meta-analysis to become available (Sven)
7	Exemplars to update their posters and send to Jess & Kate (Exemplar leads)
8	Extended narration about exemplars and tools
9	Tool factsheets to be sent to Jess
10	Resource Hub Scoping Document to be placed on internal section of OPERAs website (Claire to send to Kate)
11	Both the Alps exemplar and the Danube exemplar need to collaborate with their counterparts in the OpenNESS project (Mark Rounsevell to follow up)
12	WCMC to send their stock of ecosystem photos to Jess for general project use
13	Update OPERAs contact list and send to all (Jess & Kate)
14	New 12 th “Swiss” exemplar led by Adrienne Gret-Regamey to be added to project information (to be sent to Kate Morrison to be put on website)
15	Update project timeline from RIP with new milestones (Jess)
16	Doodle for next full project meeting in May 2014 (Jess)
17	Deliverables for WP5 need to be rethought due to collaboration with OpenNESS on the “Common Platform” (WP5 & Coordination team)
18	Flash presentations as a format for next meeting
19	WCMC to contact SME’s in OPERAs to get an idea of their “user needs”