

This is the final draft of the contribution published as:

Ainscough, J., de Vries Lentsch, A., Metzger, M., Rounsevell, M., **Schröter, M.**, Delbaere, B., de Groot, R., Staes, J. (2019):
Navigating pluralism: Understanding perceptions of the ecosystem services concept
Ecosystem Services **36** , art. 100892

The publisher's version is available at:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2019.01.004>

Navigating pluralism: understanding perceptions of the ecosystem services concept

Authors: Jacob Ainscough^{1,2*}, jacob.ainscough@ed.ac.uk; Aster de Vries Lentsch¹, aster.devrieslentsch@ed.ac.uk; Marc Metzger¹, marc.metzger@ed.ac.uk; Mark Rounsevell^{1,3}, mark.rounsevell@kit.edu; Matthias Schröter^{4,5}, matthias.schroeter@ufz.de; Ben Delbaere⁶, info@delbaereconsulting.com; Rudolf de Groot⁷, dolf.degroot@wur.nl; Jan Staes⁸, jan.staes@uantwerpen.be

Affiliations:

¹ School of Geosciences, The University of Edinburgh, Drummond Street, EH8 9XP, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

² Laurence Mee Centre for Society and the Sea, Scottish Association of Marine Science (SAMS), Oban, PA37 1QA, United Kingdom

³ Institute of Meteorology and Climate Research, Atmospheric Environmental Research, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Kreuzeckbahnstraße 19, 82467 Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany

⁴ UFZ – Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research, Department of Ecosystem Services, Department of Computational Landscape Ecology, Permoserstr. 15, 04318 Leipzig, Germany

⁵ German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig, Deutscher Platz 5e, 04103 Leipzig, Germany

⁶ Delbaere Consulting, Udenhout, the Netherlands

⁷ Environmental Systems Analysis group, Wageningen University & Research, P.O. box 47, 6700 AA, Wageningen, the Netherlands

⁸ Ecosystem Management Research Group (ECOBIE), Department of Biology, University of Antwerp, Universiteitsplein 1, BE-2610 Wilrijk, Belgium

*Correspondence to:

61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120

26 Jacob Ainscough, Jacob.ainscough@ed.ac.uk. + 44 7702243523. Laurence Mee Centre for Society and the Sea,
27 Scottish Association of Marine Science (SAMS), Oban, PA37 1QA, United Kingdom
28
29 Keywords: ecosystem services, boundary object, guided pluralism, sustainability, science-
30 policy interface
31
32 Abstract word count: 200
33 Manuscript word count (excluding title page, tables, references): 8225
34

Abstract

Being open to multiple interpretations allows the ecosystem services concept to operate as a boundary object, facilitating communication and cooperation between different user groups. Yet there is a risk the resultant pluralism limits the capacity of ecosystem services assessments to directly inform decision and policy making, and that the concept could be used to support environmentally or socially harmful activities. Here, we report results from a large mixed methods survey conducted among academics, policymakers and practitioners working in the field of ecosystem services across Europe. We use these results to explore the trade-off that exists between the role of ecosystem services as a boundary object and the needs of policy and decision makers of more standardisation. We conclude this can be done by working towards the standardisation of ecosystem service assessments within specific jurisdictions, whilst maintaining forums for debate, collaboration, and critical reflection within the broader ecosystem services community. We also aim to deduce guiding principles to ensure the ecosystem services concept is not used to support detrimental activities. The consideration of shared and cultural values, the expansion of inter- and transdisciplinary work and the integration of the concept of sustainability are identified as valuable guiding principles to this end.

1. Introduction

1.1. A broadly operational concept despite a lack of unity

A number of wide scale assessments have taken place to assess the status and trends of the world's ecosystem services – including the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA, 2005), The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB, 2010), and the assessments of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES, 2018a, 2018b, 2018c, 2018d). Advances have been made towards operationalizing the concept in practice (Beaumont et al., 2017; Dick et al., 2018; Jax et al., 2018), and the concept is starting to be integrated into both national and international policy (Bezák et al., 2017; Bouwma et al., 2018; Matzdorf and Meyer, 2014). Dick et al. (2018, p. 563) declared that the ecosystem services concept is 'broadly operational', despite on-going debates within the ecosystem services community regarding conceptual frameworks, assessment and valuation methodologies, and even core terminology (Braat, 2018; Costanza et al., 2017; Díaz et al., 2018; Fanny et al., 2014). This lack of conceptual and methodological unity has previously been identified as a concern (Nahlik et al., 2012), although Dick et al. (2018) suggest the concept appears to be compatible in practice with a range of approaches founded in different philosophical traditions.

1.2. The acceptance of plurality within the field of ecosystem services

Accepting that the ecosystem services concept is open to multiple interpretations is seen by some as a strength, as it allows it to operate as a boundary object (Abson et al., 2014; Schröter et al., 2014; Schröter and van Oudenhoven, 2016). Boundary objects are concepts that are amorphous enough to be adapted to different contexts and worldviews, but are

robust enough to act as a channel of communication between these different positions (Star and Griesemer, 1989).

The idea of ecosystem services as a boundary object is well developed in the literature (Abson et al., 2014; Galler et al., 2016; Hermelingmeier and Nicholas, 2017; Jadhav et al., 2017; Kull et al., 2015; Schröter et al., 2014; Steger et al., 2018). Saarikoski et al. (2017) found the concept operated as a useful boundary object in some of the 22 European and Latin American case studies they assessed. From their case study in German environmental planning, Galler et al. (2016) conclude that ecosystem services can act as an effective boundary object in the early stages of collaboration, but that its usefulness decreases over time. This decrease in usefulness was largely due to conflicting interpretations of how the concept should be used in specific management or policy decisions. Saarela and Rinne (2016) develop the idea that artefacts (scenarios, simulation models, indicators etc.) produced using the ecosystem services concept, rather than the concept itself, may act as boundary objects. These artefacts are still open to multiple interpretations but are not neutral objects, as they are tied to the social and institutional context, with their embedded power relations, in which they are made (Saarela and Rinne, 2016). This can limit their capacity to operate as boundary objects, as they are only able to connect actors with pre-existing shared cultural values and preferences (Turnhout, 2009).

These discussions reveal a tension in the role of ecosystem services as a boundary object. On the one hand, it is most effective as a broad concept that can accommodate a large range of perspectives and worldviews. However, this function decreases in the context of specific policy and decision-making. Undertaking ecosystem services assessments for policy

requires the development of standardised classification systems, conceptual frameworks and related methodologies. This process may lead to certain worldviews being crowded out, and others foregrounded. If ecosystem service assessments are to become a mainstream approach for evidencing environmental policy and decisions, then such standardised practices will become institutionalised, potentially curtailing debate over the value laden choices taken to create them. This dynamic is referred to by Steger et al. (2018) as the creation of 'infrastructure'. Infrastructure are 'the tools, work practices, terms, and technologies that become embedded in and support a community of practice' (Steger et al., 2018, p. 144). The tension between ecosystem services as a broad, open boundary object and as an institutionalised concept with precise terminology and associated practices is a key theme of this paper.

There is evidence that the concept of ecosystem services is beginning to enter into national policy and legislation, but not yet in a manner that includes the explicit use of ecosystem services assessments and valuations (Bezák et al., 2017; Bouwma et al., 2018; Kistenkas and Bouwma, 2018; Leone et al., 2016; McKinley et al., 2018). Within the research community, continued disunity can be seen in ongoing debates over core frameworks and terminology since the introduction of the concept of 'Natures Contribution to People' (Baat, 2018; Díaz et al., 2018; Kenter, 2018; Maes et al., 2018; Pascual et al., 2017). Peterson et al. (2018) make the case here for an acceptance of pluralism to avoid a potentially harmful polarisation within the ecosystem services community. Hermelingmeier and Nicholas (2017) similarly embrace the range of perspectives that still exist around the ecosystem services concept, making the case for 'guided pluralism'.

130 The continued heterogeneity of interpretations and understandings of the ecosystem
 131 services concept requires an exploration of how far such a pluralistic outlook should be
 132 extended. Accepting pluralism does not mean that any work carried out either in research
 133 or policymaking using the language of ecosystem services is accepted as part of the overall
 134 canon, regardless of the theoretical basis, methodological approach or normative framing.
 135 The term 'guided pluralism' used by Hermelingmeier and Nicholas (2017) captures this idea.
 136 This term originates from the attempt of Baumgärtner et al. (2008) to develop a framework
 137 for coping with the heterogeneous practices within the field of ecological economics.
 138 However the idea has not been explicitly developed in the ecosystem services literature.
 139 Hermelingmeier and Nicholas (2017) only suggest the need for open dialogue over values
 140 and assumptions to establish common ground for research.
 141
 142 Baumgärtner et al. (2008) seek to harmonise the epistemological and methodological
 143 diversity of their field that interweaves descriptive and positive science with values and
 144 normative judgement. In applying the concept of guided pluralism to the field of ecosystem
 145 services, we carry forward this differentiation of epistemological and methodological
 146 diversity, and the view that this naturally arises from different philosophical and normative
 147 positions. We add the consideration of theoretical diversity, with theory being an
 148 intermediate stage, informed by particular epistemologies and informing methodologies.
 149 The second theme of this paper is an attempt to identify guiding principles with which to
 150 navigate this diversity, as to achieve a 'guided' pluralism within ecosystem services research
 151 and practice.

The two notions of boundary object and guided pluralism are complementary. Boundary objects accept pluralism, while the notion of guided pluralism allows space to discuss principles with which applications of the ecosystem services concept can be directed.

1.3. Aims

To analyse the work on ecosystem services as a boundary object, and the applicability of the notion of guided pluralism, it is important to understand different views within the ecosystem service community. This study hence aims to understand the way the ecosystem services concept is viewed by researchers, policymakers and practitioners. Firstly, we are interested in perceptions of strengths and weaknesses in the concept, and the different ways that people see the concept being used to inform decision-making. From here we ask if the ecosystem services concept can be seen as a boundary object, and what the limitations are to this in the context of policy and decision-making. Secondly, we seek to identify guiding principles for the ecosystem services concept, by synthesizing views from different user groups. Finally, this paper is also intended to underpin the Antwerp Declaration, which was developed during the conference hosted by the Ecosystem Services Partnership (ESP) in Antwerp in 2016. The declaration is an attempt to account for the critiques and concerns viewed by participants and reflect a need and desire to further develop the ecosystem services concept.

2. Methods

2.1. Survey design

175 We distributed a digital mixed methods survey among 350 early registrants to the European
176 Ecosystem Services Conference 2016¹ (EESC), which presented a good sampling pool for all
177 three target groups: academics, including junior researchers, who seek to gain knowledge
178 and understanding; policymakers, who develop and implement governance strategies and
179 instruments; and practitioners, who broadly spoken support policy development and/or
180 make environmental management decisions. The conference – which attracted 700
181 delegates – was organised by three large research projects (OPERAs², OpenNESS³,
182 ECOPLAN⁴), the University of Antwerp, and the Ecosystem Services Partnership⁵, one of the
183 largest international networks focused on ecosystem services, and so brought together a
184 wide range of people from across the field. We engaged with early registrants to be able to
185 present and discuss the outcomes at the conference. The survey was distributed through
186 the conference organisers' official e-mail list.

187
188 The survey was divided into four categories to capture different aspects of people's views of
189 the ecosystem services concept: its underlying purpose (P); visions (V) for its future
190 evolution (named goals in the survey); perceived myths (M) that misrepresent the concept;
191 and frustrations (F, named grumbles in the survey) to capture any irritations with the
192 ecosystem services concept not captured in the other categories.

193

¹ www.esconference2016.eu

² www.operas-project.eu

³ www.openness-project.eu

⁴ www.uantwerpen.be/en/research-groups/ecoplan/

⁵ www.es-partnership.org

Each category featured one closed question, and two or more open-ended questions, allowing participants to enter as little or as much text as they needed to express their ideas and opinions. Participants were asked to complete at least one category, and at the end of their first round of questions were given the opportunity to complete additional ones. Table 1 summarises the questions, which were phrased in generic terms to allow respondents the opportunity to give unrestricted open answers. The full questionnaire is included as Supplementary Material 1.

Table 1. Summary of the survey questions for the four survey categories: Purpose (P), Visions (V), Myths (M), Frustrations (F). One question on supposed differences of opinion (A1) was asked to all respondents at the end of the survey. The questions were either on a 5-point Likert scale (Likert), multiple-choice multiple answers (MCMA) or open-ended (open). MCMA statements are included in Figure 2. The full survey is available as Supplementary Material 1.

ID	Question	Type
P1	The ecosystem services concept provides a utilitarian framing of ecosystem functions as services to increase public interest in conservation.	Likert
P2	The concept of ecosystem services denotes a generic idea or metaphor to increase awareness of how human well-being in many ways depends on natural systems.	Likert
P3	Using an economic approach to environmental issues can help decision-makers to determine the best use of scarce ecological resources at all levels.	Likert
P4	Can you put down in your own words what you think is at the heart of the ecosystem services framework?	Open
P5	What would be the worst misuse of the ecosystem services framework?	Open
P6	Beyond basic research ethics and good practice, what values and principles or ideas should guide the practical applications of the ecosystem services framework?	Open
V1	In 20 years' time, what role should the ecosystem services framework have in society?	MCMA
V2	What are the main challenges for the widespread use of the ecosystem services framework?	Open
V3	What do you think are key steps to undertake in the future development of the ecosystem services framework?	Open
M1	Can you describe a common myth or misunderstanding you frequently encounter in your work?	Open
M2	Who holds these erroneous views?	Open
M3	What to your mind is the source of confusion that gave rise to these myths?	Open
M4	How would you debunk the myth?	Open
M5	Have you ever encountered one of the following claims regarding ecosystem services in your work?	MCMA

F1	What do you find most frustrating about working with the ecosystem services framework?	Open
F2	What would be the best way to resolve your frustration?	Open
F3	What to your mind is the biggest theoretical, moral or practical shortcoming of the ecosystem services framework?	Open
F4	How could that shortcoming be remedied?	Open
F5	Have you ever encountered one of the following frustrations?	MCMA
A1	In the field of ecosystem services, where do you think the biggest differences of opinion lie?	Open

2.2. Quantitative analysis

Attributes, i.e. characteristics of participants or cases (Bazeley and Jackson, 2013), were included in the survey design as open questions to prevent restricting participants in their answers. Based on the qualitative entries we constructed attribute labels for gender, discipline, and years of experience (Table 2). For 'Field of Study' we captured unclear answers with the 'Other discipline' category. Participants were also asked whether they were an academic researcher, junior researcher or student, practitioner, policymaker or 'other'.

Each category of the survey (Purpose, Visions, Myths, and Frustrations) had one multiple-choice section for which we compiled separate bar charts to help identify themes and support for the qualitative analysis of the open questions.

Table 2. Retrofitted attribute labels describing survey participants

Open-ended	Retrofitted Attribute labels
Gender	Female, Male
Years of experience	<5; 5-9; 10-19; >20
Discipline	Natural/Physical Sciences, Social Sciences, Economics, Science Policy Nexus, Inter/Transdisciplinary, Other discipline

2.3. Qualitative analysis

A general inductive approach (Thomas, 2006) to thematic content analysis was used to examine patterns in the responses to the open survey questions (Table 2) in a replicable and systematic manner (Bryman, 2016). The general inductive approach provides an easily used and systematic set of procedures for analysing qualitative data that can produce reliable and valid analysis of underlying structure in the raw data (Thomas, 2006). Rather than making prior assumptions about the survey responses in a predefined coding frame, an inductive approach was followed because we had no comprehensive predetermined expectations of the patterns, similar to Asah et al. (2014) and Maraja et al. (2016). The intended outcome of the inductive coding process was to create a small number of summary categories that in the evaluator's view capture key aspects of the themes identified in the raw data and are assessed to be the most important themes given the study's objectives (Thomas, 2006).

We followed the five stages of analysis described by Thomas (2006) using the Nvivo qualitative data analysis software (QSR International, 2016). The full set of responses was read carefully (1) and specific text segments were identified that related to the topic of the survey category (2). These segments were labelled to create a set of initial themes (3), which were refined to reduce overlap and redundancy (4) in an iterative process both within the categories and across the whole survey, allowing responses to be coded for multiple themes. Themes that were rarely mentioned were grouped as 'other'. The final stage consisted of creating a model that incorporates the most important themes into a limited set (5). Thomas (2006) explains that inductive coding that results in too many major themes

249 - he suggests more than eight - can be viewed as incomplete and encourages the evaluator
250 to make hard decisions about which themes are most important.

251
252 Given likely overlap in responses between the different survey categories we anticipated
253 that the final step would identify a number of cross-cutting themes. The choice of these
254 cross-cutting themes was supported by the results of the quantitative analysis and looked
255 for both consensus and divergence in views among the respondent categories. The cross-
256 cutting themes are illustrated with quotes and cross-references were made to the survey
257 questions that provided answers in support of the cross-cutting theme.

258

259 **2.4. Corroborating our findings and building towards a unified message**

260 Key findings from the analysis were presented at EESC 2016 to corroborate our findings
261 through discussions with conference attendees, and to collaboratively shape a charter
262 (named the Antwerp Declaration) that could capture and communicate a set of
263 recommendations based on our findings and discussions. An early findings document was
264 compiled and distributed among conference participants in the delegate packs. This formed
265 the basis for informed discussions and events during the conference where participants
266 could engage with the Antwerp Declaration process: a parallel session on the second day of
267 the conference presenting and discussing many of the themes relevant to the Declaration; a
268 Quote of the Day booth where participants could vote and share their opinion on proposed
269 bits of text for the Declaration; and a workshop held on the third day specifically addressing
270 different aspects of the Declaration. Input gathered through these events was then taken
271 forward by a writing team. At the end of the conference the final Declaration was presented
272 in plenary and a website was opened for signing the Declaration.

3. Results

3.1. Survey response and respondent attributes

The response rate was 34%, n=121, comprising academic researchers (50%); junior researchers (24%); practitioners (15%); policymakers (7%), and 4% who did not fit these categories. The gender balance was 41% male, 51% female, and 8% not stated, and most people reported their experience in the field of ecosystem services to be under or around 10 years.

Table 3. Definitions of each participant category.

Category	Definition
Academic researcher	Research staff at a University or research institute
Junior researcher	Researcher at an academic institution, either at PhD or post-doc stage
Practitioner	Individuals responsible for implementation or making environmental management decisions "on the ground". This can include support of the creation of public policy (civil service) or overseeing its implementation (government agencies or third sector)
Policymaker	Individuals working for national or supranational government with statutory responsibility for creating public policy
Other	Those that did not identify as any of these categories

Table 3 contains our interpretation of the participant categories. However, these definitions were not included in the original survey and we recognize that some individuals could fit in more than one category (e.g. a researcher in an NGO). This is especially true given the contemporary shift from 'government' to 'governance' and towards a post-normal science approach to research for policy making. We took responses to mean that respondents identified most with this group and saw this as their primary role. The category of 'practitioner' is also open to interpretation and this role may change depending on the way

CATEGORIES




Figure 1. Number of survey categories completed by participants and number of respondents per category.

3.2. Multiple choice responses

Figure 2 presents an overview of the Likert scale and multiple-choice responses for questions P1, P2, P3, V1, M5 and F5. There was strong agreement that the ecosystem services concept could increase societal interest in conservation (P1) and raise awareness of

307 human reliance on natural systems (P2), but opinion was divided as to whether an economic
308 approach could support better decision-making (P3). There was a shared vision that the
309 ecosystem services concept would achieve a paradigm shift in environmental protection
310 (V1C). Three myths frequently encountered were that the ecosystem services concept: does
311 not consider the intrinsic values of nature (M5B); is a capitalist paradigm about making
312 money (M5A); and implicitly accepts that human benefits are the only things that should be
313 protected (M5D). The most dominant frustrations with ecosystem services were: challenges
314 to communicating non-economic research due to misconceptions that economic valuation is
315 at the core of the concept (F5C); that it has become such a buzzword that the concept
316 becomes increasingly vague (F5E); and that the terminology is too complicated and
317 academic to use with non-expert audiences (F5A).

318


PURPOSE

N = 87




VISIONS

N = 57




MYTHS

N = 30



FRUSTRATIONS

N = 30



319

320 Figure 2. Responses to the closed questions in the survey.

3.3. Cross-cutting themes

Thematic content analysis helped structure the richness of the open question responses.

Supplementary Material 2 provides an overview of the identified themes per question.

Identical or highly related themes emerged for different questions and different survey categories. Results were therefore further synthesised to five cross-cutting themes, which are described below. The descriptions are based on the open-ended survey responses and identified themes, which are referenced, and illustrated by direct quotes.

3.3.1. Cross-cutting theme 1: Purpose of the concept

The core purpose of the ecosystem services concept was viewed by most respondents as an 'awareness raising' metaphor of the many ways human well-being depends on natural systems. This was evident in responses to P1 and P2 (Figure 2) and confirmed by the open-ended answers to P4. This can be exemplified by the below quote:

"The ecosystem service framework is useful to quantify the multifunctionality of ecosystems and to demonstrate how human health and wellbeing depend on the multiple functions and services of ecosystems. It is a concept that can be used to increase awareness among ecosystem users and to support conservation." – Academic Researcher response to P4.

Three primary themes emerged from responses to P4 regarding what respondents felt to be at the heart of the ecosystem services concept, 'awareness raising', 'scientific approach', and 'decision-making aid'. 'Awareness raising' was the most common theme, particularly amongst academics (see Table. 4). The 'decision-making aid' code captured answers that emphasised how the ecosystem services concept supports natural resource management and allocation, or explicitly referred to decision-making. Entries coded as 'scientific approach' highlighted the ecosystem services concept as a cognitive exercise, aimed at better understanding of socio-ecological systems. 'Decision-making aid' and 'scientific

approach' appeared a similar number of times. Four more codes for P4 were derived for responses that combined elements of the three main codes (see Table 4.).

Table 4. Summary of the responses under the 'Purpose' theme of the survey.

Theme	Summary of responses coded under theme	Academic Researcher	Student/Junior Researcher	Practitioner	Policy maker	Other	Total
Purpose (Values)							
P4 - Can you put down in your own words what you think is at the heart of the ecosystem services framework?							
Decision-making aid	ES as tool/support for decisionmaking & resource management	7	1	2	1	1	12
Scientific approach	ES as a scientific endeavour, expanding knowledge	4	2	3	1	0	10
Awareness raising	ES to demonstrate value of nature	22	11	4	0	1	38
Holistic approach	ES as an encompassing approach to complexity	3	3	0	1	1	8
Advocacy x Science	Responses combining science and awareness raising, focus on general public	8	4	1	2	0	15
Decision x Activism	Responses combining awareness raising and decision support, focus on policy	4	4	0	2	1	11
Science x Decision	Responses combining science and decision support, technocratic focus	2	0	4	1	0	7
Other		4	1	1	0	0	6

3.3.2. Cross-cutting theme 2: Concerns with the use of economic valuation

Although frequently mentioned and occasionally criticised (V2, V3), economic valuation was – overall – not perceived to be inherently problematic, but its potential misuse was a concern for many. Respondents disagreed whether an economic approach would help decision-making (Figure 2; P3). Participants were concerned that misuse of the ecosystem services concept could lead to poor decision-making, rushed and under-resourced assessments used to further a political agenda, and a bias towards industry interests (P5, V2). Several respondents warned against considering the ecosystem services concept as a panacea or cure-all for any environmental or resource management challenge regardless of the appropriate scale, methods and application of the framework (V2). There were also concerns about the framework potentially backfiring by providing a rationale for

environmental degradation rather than conservation (P5) as illustrated by the following quote:

“The misconception that it is all about utilitarian and monetary values. This is untrue, even to the contrary. However, this has been repeated so often, and some instances in fact do misuse the concept that way still. Kind of a self-fulfilled myth almost.” – Academic Researcher response to M1.

Thematic content analysis revealed that these frustrations stem from a polarised academic debate, and to a lesser extent from opposition with conservationists. This polarisation and confusion is potentially stirred up by media and high-profile publications that are feeding the debate on which dominant worldviews and ideologies are being served by the ecosystem services concept. Meanwhile, new ecosystem services terminology and underlying conceptual frameworks are continuously developed, with different ideas about the role of economic valuation (M3). There was considerable frustration about false perceptions that economic valuation is central to the ecosystem services concept, which was expressed exhaustively as a common misunderstanding (M1), but also as a frustration (F1) as illustrated by the following quote:

“That ecosystem services is all about 'valuing nature' - it's an approach that should be used very intelligently to frame environmental management challenges through a more socially relevant and integrated lens. Valuation is just one tool in the ecosystem services basket.” – Policymaker response to M1.

3.3.3. Cross-cutting theme 3: The importance of understanding social and cultural values in policy and decision-making

Although economic valuation was not seen as problematic – as explained above – many respondents were concerned about the lack of non-economic valuation methods (V2), and the more limited interest and ability to include non-economic valuation in decision-making (V2). This bias can lead to poor decision-making (P5), and the explicit incorporation of social

and cultural values into decision-making was expressed as an important step in the future development of the ecosystem services concept (V3). This would prevent misuse of the framework (P5) and help overcome a range of shortcomings currently identified (F3) – including a lack of social science compared to ecological and environmental sciences and economics. Embracing social and cultural values was seen as important communication pathway to both wider society and decision makers (V3, F2, F4), countering potential misunderstandings and inappropriate use of monetary definitions of value (M4), and a key requirement to realizing the transformative potential of the framework (V3, F4). The following quote is one of many emphasising the importance of social and cultural values:

“Incorporate the cultural (and spiritual) value of nature more which brings back the connection to nature and why we care about nature.” – Junior researcher or student in response to V3.

3.3.4. *Cross-cutting theme 4: The need to further expand inter- and transdisciplinary approaches to ecosystem services assessments*

Many respondents hope the ecosystem services concept would be considered a paradigm shift in environmental protection within the next 20 years (35% of responses; V1C Figure 2). Despite this apparent enthusiasm, a broad range of challenges impeding the widespread use of the ecosystem services concept were raised (V2) including: the lack of training and awareness of the concept among policymakers and practitioners; a lack of demonstrable policy impact and evidence of halting environmental degradation; institutional barriers and ‘silos’ in research and governmental bodies; and the technocratic and/or utilitarian terminology. These challenges were mirrored in frustrations about the bias and limitations in methods and decision-making processes (F3).

There was recognition that the ecosystem services concept has been a catalyst for promoting collaboration across disciplines (P4), but that expanding collaboration further is essential to stimulate dialogue and generate common understanding that is necessary to achieve societal impact (V3, F4). Framing the challenges around issue-based research will encourage transdisciplinary collaboration between disciplinary experts, business stakeholders and public body representatives (V3, F4). The involvement of knowledge brokers and the media is critical in supporting collaboration and in communicating outcomes (F4). The following quote is one of many calling for interdisciplinary research:

“Ultimately, it is critical for a more interdisciplinary approach to the scientific research agenda to enrich the research and facilitate better policy translation and a reduction in the emergence of perverse policies.” – Respondent from ‘other’ category in response to V2.

3.3.5. Cross-cutting theme 5: Ecosystem services in policy and decision-making

As identified above the ecosystem services concept can assume different roles in decision or policy making contexts. It may be used directly as a ‘decision-making aid’ through the instrumental mode of knowledge use (Mckenzie et al., 2014; Weiss, 1979) or as an ‘awareness raising’ tool akin to the conceptual mode of knowledge use (Dunlop, 2014; Weiss, 1979). Although less directly related to policy and decision-making, using the ecosystem services concept in the context of a purely ‘scientific approach’ may also influence decisions again through the conceptual mode by contributing to societies wider understanding of the dependence of humans on natural systems.

A number of ways to increase the uptake of ecosystem services in policy and decision making were identified that span both instrumental and conceptual knowledge use. A clear need for practical learning emerged (V2, F1, F3, F4), and case study research was identified

as a way to progress the implementation of the framework to support land management decision-making (V3, F4). To this end, several steps for further development of the ecosystem services concept were identified (V3, F4): develop and share targeted information, packaged and communicated appropriately to selected audiences; engage stakeholders and the public; and include more socio-cultural values and closer work with social scientists.

There were many frustrations related to the user-friendliness of the ecosystem services concept (F1, F2) as a decision-making aid. Irritations about the academic nature or the terminology (F5A, Figure 2), has already been mentioned, but the content analysis revealed frustration around the lack of standardisation (F2), insufficient suitable and accessible methods (F3), and a lack of data (V2, F3). Those identifying primarily as practitioners also signalled being overwhelmed by the variety of categorisations and tools available, and the background information required for their appropriate application (F3); suggesting these may have been policy practitioners. The following quotes illustrate the frustration with the user-friendliness of the ecosystem services framework:

“The language – and therefore the concept – suffers from its technocratic, utilitarian image.” – Academic researcher in response to V2.

“It is frustrating how many parties seem obsessed with re-classifying ecosystem services on a continual basis - this is often unnecessary and unhelpful when seeking to implement a joined-up approach across different interest groups.” – Policymaker response to F1.

3.4. The Antwerp Declaration

The ‘early findings’ document, included in the EESC delegate pack (see Supplementary Material 3), formed the basis for the participatory exercises during the conference, which

received input from approximately 100 individuals. These participatory events largely confirmed the cross-cutting themes summarised in section 3.3, although greater emphasis was placed on the importance to focus the ecosystem services concept on the principles of sustainability. The discussion also provided guidance about how to translate the findings to a short Declaration that forms a call for action that was signed (on a voluntary basis) by the conference delegates. The resulting Declaration (Figure 3) was presented at the closing plenary and has been signed by 331 people on the website www.antwerpdeclaration.com following the conference (last count 17 August 2018).

The Antwerp Declaration



Following a decade of ever more research activity the ecosystem services framework has major political and scientific momentum. We must now deliver societal impact.

In this declaration we – the signatories – call for action to realise the transformative potential of the ecosystem services framework. We need to refocus on principles of sustainability, reclaim the notion of value and expand collaborations.

Refocus on principles of sustainability

Ecosystem services gained prominence as a framework that acknowledges nature's fundamental role in supporting human wellbeing. There has been considerable progress in quantifying, valuing, and mapping ecosystem services. Yet, there is a risk that these methods are applied without consideration of equality and social justice. To ensure the fair distribution of nature's benefits we need to refocus the ecosystem services framework on the principles of sustainability. By explicitly including sustainability principles in ecosystem services assessments we can bring into focus trade-offs between conflicting interests, guide just decisions and avoid misuse of the concept.

Reclaim the notion of value

How we understand our relationship with nature sits at the heart of the ecosystem services framework. To do justice to all the ways nature matters to us as humans we need to include diverse values into our assessments. By embracing a multitude of perspectives, voices and values we can move away from understanding nature's importance in a purely monetary way. Finding innovative approaches that include multiple values is challenging, but enables us to make better decisions. Collaborative projects with many different stakeholders should therefore be the starting point of any ecosystem assessment.

Expand collaborations

The ecosystem services framework has been a catalyst for promoting collaboration across disciplinary boundaries. Expanding collaboration is essential to stimulate dialogue and generate common understanding that is necessary to achieve societal impact. Framing the challenges around issue-based research will encourage collaboration between disciplinary experts, business stakeholders and local government representatives. The involvement of knowledge brokers and the media is critical in supporting collaboration and in communicating outcomes.

For Impact we need to

- make the most of the large amount of knowledge and learning that is generated by case study research
- develop and share targeted information, packaged and communicated appropriately to selected audiences
- increase the user-friendliness of frameworks and tools to support their application beyond current users
- bring business and researchers together to encourage innovation and creation of new flexible business models that integrate ecosystem services
- strengthen the integration of ecosystem services into all policy sectors in dialogue with researchers and practitioners

Sign the Declaration today:
www.antwerpdeclaration.com



Figure 3. The Antwerp Declaration – www.antwerpdeclaration.com

4. Discussion

The EESC represented a rare opportunity to collect the views of a varied group of researchers, practitioners and policymakers engaged with the ecosystem services concept.

We recognise our result reflects a primarily Eurocentric perspective. However, the survey received many responses and the events held at the conference were well attended, allowing us to collect insights from a diverse group.

4.1. The role of the ecosystem services concept in the science-policy interface

Responses to our survey demonstrate the tension between the different roles that the ecosystem services concept can play at the science-policy interface. Many participants expressed the view that the concept was a useful awareness raising tool and could be used to integrate different perspectives and approaches in environmental management (Cross-cutting theme 1). That is, to function as a boundary object. Many academics in our study did not identify scientific inquiry as the primary role of the ecosystem services concept, instead emphasising the awareness raising role that it plays. This could indicate a perception among academics of ecosystem services as a way to communicate research findings to a broader audience, rather than as a tool for scientific inquiry (Barnaud and Antona, 2014; Crouzat et al., 2017).

There were also concerns around the lack of standardisation and the user-friendliness of the concept for decision makers (Cross-cutting theme 5). Indeed, many practitioners and policymakers did not see the core purpose of the ecosystem services concept as contributing directly to decision-making at present (Table 4). This is consistent with recent literature suggesting that, despite a number of projects and toolkits aimed at integrating ecosystem services into decision-making, assessments rarely play an instrumental role in influencing decisions (Dick et al., 2018; Martinez-Harms et al., 2015; Ruckelshaus et al., 2013; Saarikoski et al., 2018).

Standardisation was the most frequently cited remediation for the issue of user-friendliness, amongst all groups (F2). Efforts are being made to standardise the categorisation of ecosystem services (primarily through the Common International Classification of Ecosystem Services (CICES⁶)), and several calls and attempts to standardise conceptual frameworks and assessment/valuation approaches have appeared in the literature (Boerema et al., 2017; Boyd and Banzhaf, 2007; Seppelt et al., 2012, 2011). However, standardisation involves the curtailment of some of the conceptual and methodological diversity that exists within the ecosystem services community. This could potentially hamper inter- and transdisciplinary dialogue and communication supported by our respondents (Cross-cutting theme 4). Standardisation correlates to the creation of 'infrastructure', and we follow Steger et al. (2018) in suggesting that such a move would limit the capacity of ecosystem services to function as boundary objects. This supports the conclusion of Galler et al. (2016) that ecosystem services may function most effectively as a boundary object prior to the point where it is used to inform specific policy or management decisions.

This does not imply that the concept plays no role in policymaking; others have identified conceptual learning, consistent with the boundary role of ecosystem services, as a promising impact pathway of ecosystem services assessments and research (Beaumont et al., 2017; Carmen et al., 2018; Dick et al., 2018; Ruckelshaus et al., 2013).

⁶ www.cices.eu

There is then a potential conflict between those who see ecosystem services as a tool for raising awareness and discussion, and those who wish to see it standardised and used in decision-making. We argue that this can be reconciled by accepting that the concept is capable of playing both roles at once. Whilst the creation of standardised infrastructure should be supported, it is also necessary to maintain a more pluralistic notion of the concept within academic and policy debates (Figure 4).

The creation of infrastructure will reflect and embody the norms of the context in which it is developed (Saarela and Rinne, 2016; Turnhout, 2009). This can be a necessary trade-off to improve usability and uptake of the concept directly in decision and policymaking. However, it can become problematic for two reasons: 1) if the knowledge, views or values of a particular group or groups within this context are excluded, for instance, the development of accounting schemes for ecosystem services might focus on instrumental values (Hein et al., 2015), and could be problematic for the inclusion of relational values that people might hold with respect to nature (Pascual et al., 2017). Or 2) if such infrastructure is transplanted to a cultural context that is significantly different from where it was created (as may be the case in transnational environmental governance settings). This problem was recently pointed out by Díaz et al. (2018), emphasising the need for context-specific perspectives when assessing the relations between humans and nature. Polasky et al. (2015) similarly make the point that ecosystem service assessment standards should be tailored to specific use contexts.

Experimentation with the ecosystem services concept in different policy contexts is increasing, and it is possible that we will see a continued construction of infrastructure

1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1720
1721

552 within different administrative jurisdictions (at a sub-national, national, and international
553 scale) (Bezák et al., 2017; Bouwma et al., 2018; Mauerhofer, 2018; Mauerhofer and Laza,
554 2018; McKinley et al., 2018). As this happens, retaining a highly pluralistic notion of the
555 concept that exists above any contextually specific infrastructure has two distinct
556 advantages over full standardisation. Firstly, it maintains space for worldviews that are
557 excluded through the construction of infrastructure, allowing ecosystem services to still
558 function as a boundary object that enhance debate and awareness raising over the
559 relationship between nature and human well-being. Secondly, it allows space for more
560 critical, dissenting voices and academic disciplines to highlight constantly the way that the
561 creation of infrastructure can obfuscate and normalise political choices made during its
562 creation. Critical geographers, for instance, are well positioned to offer such critique, as
563 their discipline is well versed in exploring the power relations around the social construction
564 and mobilisation of emerging and ‘taken for granted’ concepts and practices (Kull et al.,
565 2015; Turnhout et al., 2016).




Figure 4. Trade-offs between the function of ecosystem services as a boundary object and as set infrastructure capable of informing policy and decision-making, in terms of usability and plurality.

4.2. Valuation of ecosystem services: integrating cultural and social values as a guiding principle

Values, and valuation, are useful vehicles to explore the dynamic between ecosystem services in the broad, pluralistic sense (where it is most effective as a boundary object), and ecosystem services as set infrastructure. Our results show a clear desire for social and cultural values to be better captured in ecosystem services assessments (Cross-cutting theme 3). This was reaffirmed through input to the Antwerp Declaration, where the need to 'reclaim' the notion of value was raised. This desire resulted from the dual perception that

1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1840
1841

579 1) integrating a plurality of values is essential to ensure that ecosystem services
580 assessments lead to inclusive decision-making, and 2) a perception exists that only a limited
581 definition of value is captured within the ecosystem services concept.
582
583 The concept of ecosystem services has stimulated much debate about the notion of value,
584 and how best to measure it; bringing together scholars from a wide range of disciplines
585 (Chan et al., 2016, 2012; Edwards et al., 2016; Fanny et al., 2014; Fish et al., 2016; Jacobs et
586 al., 2018, 2016; Jax et al., 2013; Kenter et al., 2016b, 2015; Ranger et al., 2016; Sagoff,
587 2011). Here we see ecosystem services work as an effective boundary object, and many
588 methodologies now exist for integrating different types of values into ecosystem service
589 assessments (Iniasta-Arandia et al., 2014; Jacobs et al., 2016; Kenter, 2016; Kenter et al.,
590 2016b, 2016a; Ranger et al., 2016). Such methodologies are now established as a part of the
591 plethora of existing ecosystem services approaches and practices. Operationalizing these
592 methods in real world decision-making was a core priority that emerged from our survey
593 (Cross-cutting theme 3).
594
595 However, no method is capable of capturing all types of value (Jacobs et al., 2018), and it is
596 not necessarily the case that the use of a variety of methods will become standard practice
597 within policy and decision-making. In the UK for example, the importance of shared and
598 cultural values was recognised in the UK National Ecosystem Assessment (UK NEA, 2014).
599 However, the Treasury ‘Green Book’ which dictates valuation methods for public body
600 decision-making in the UK relies exclusively on methods derived from neoclassical
601 economics (Treasury, 2011). The centrality of marginal utility value theory in neoclassical
602 economics makes it difficult to meaningfully account for shared and cultural values. As the

ecosystem services concept becomes embedded in set infrastructure there is a risk that evaluation methods will foreground incumbent individualist notions of value at the expense of methods accommodating of social and cultural values.

Narrow economic valuation of ecosystem services was criticised by some respondents to our survey but was largely not seen as inherently problematic (Cross-cutting theme 2); matching findings from previous studies (Fisher and Brown, 2015; Hermelingmeier and Nicholas, 2017). Concerns were raised however regarding the potential for ecosystem services studies to be misused to further specific political agendas or support environmentally destructive activities. This may be the case if infrastructure is created in the context of highly extraction-driven, capitalistic norms. Maintaining a pluralistic notion of the ecosystem services concept will ensure that space remains for critical reflection on assessment and valuation approaches within different institutional settings. Within this context, the desire to ensure that social and cultural values are captured offers a potential guiding principle for the ecosystem services community.

4.3. Expanding inter- and transdisciplinary approaches

Increased collaboration, both between academic disciplines and between academia and wider society, was identified as a key area for the development of ecosystem services research and practice. The expansion of inter- and transdisciplinary work was a clear desire of the respondents (Cross-cutting theme 4) and matches aspirations in the literature (Carmen et al., 2018; Jacobs et al., 2015). The inclusion of more social scientists within ecosystem services assessments was particularly stressed as a necessary step to increase the integration of social and cultural values (Cross-cutting theme 5).

1902
1903
1904 627
1905
1906
1907 628 The ecosystem services concept arose at the interface of ecological and economic science,
1908
1909 629 however is now engaged with by, and functions as a boundary object between, a large
1910
1911 630 range of disciplines (Chaudhary et al., 2015). Yet physical, economic and social geographers
1912
1913 631 are just a few groups to have been identified as having useful, but underutilised insights
1914
1915 632 (Barnaud and Antona, 2014; Dempsey and Robertson, 2012; Potschin and Haines-Young,
1916
1917 633 2011). Even large scale efforts at interdisciplinary working, such as the Intergovernmental
1918
1919 634 Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), are to some degree
1920
1921 635 dominated by natural scientists (Timpote et al., 2018) and within IPBES the need for a
1922
1923 636 stronger engagement of social science and humanities was particularly emphasised (Díaz et
1924
1925 637 al., 2018).
1926
1927
1928 638
1929
1930
1931 639 Our result suggest the lack of engagement from some disciplines may be due to the way the
1932
1933 640 concept is perceived. Although respondents to our survey did not see economic valuation as
1934
1935 641 central to the ecosystem services concept (P4), the perception that the two are closely
1936
1937 642 interlinked was commonly encountered by participants. This view was encountered
1938
1939 643 primarily from other scientists and, to a lesser extent, conservationists (Cross-cutting theme
1940
1941 644 2). One respondent suggested that many groups and scientists simply refuse to engage with
1942
1943 645 ecosystem services (P2) due to its image as a technocratic and utilitarian approach. This
1944
1945 646 finding matches others who have noted the tendency to conflate 'ecosystem services' with
1946
1947 647 'payments for ecosystem services' (PES) schemes, and the potential for such confusion to
1948
1949 648 deter some from engaging with the concept (Schröter et al., 2014; Schröter and van
1950
1951 649 Oudenhoven, 2016).
1952
1953
1954 650
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961

1962
1963
1964
1965 651 The perception that the concept of ecosystem services is equivalent to putting a price on
1966
1967 652 nature limits its capacity to function as a boundary object. Increasing integration of other
1968
1969 653 disciplines into ecosystem services research may be assisted by improving communication
1970
1971 654 to overcome myths about the concept (see section 5.1.3: Economic valuation), and by
1972
1973 655 demonstrating the contributions that different disciplines can make through the expansion
1974
1975 656 and publication of case study research.
1976
1977 657
1978
1979
1980 658 As infrastructure is created to embed ecosystem services assessments in specific
1981
1982 659 governance institutions, it will be impossible and potentially unnecessary to maintain the
1983
1984 660 disciplinary heterogeneity that exists within the wider community. However, ecosystem
1985
1986 661 service assessments still require skilled interdisciplinary teams, particularly if they are to
1987
1988 662 capture social and cultural values as well as the biophysical elements of ecosystem services.
1989
1990 663 Assessment approaches also legitimise some knowledge claims at the expense of others. In
1991
1992 664 the context of transdisciplinary assessments it is therefore important to co-develop the
1993
1994 665 design of the research between knowledge holders and to be open about methodological
1995
1996 666 and data-related choices. This consideration requires the deployment of trained social
1997
1998 667 scientists to develop suitable processes for knowledge co-production (see, e.g. (Hauck et al.,
1999
2000 668 2015). Equipping public bodies with the necessary skills requires significant investment as
2001
2002 669 environmental impact assessments and policy appraisals are currently not necessarily
2003
2004 670 conducted by teams of researchers with interdisciplinary skills (Rozas-Vásquez et al., 2018;
2005
2006 671 Turnpenny et al., 2014; Wawrzyczek et al., 2018). It is in this context that it becomes crucial
2007
2008 672 to retain a diverse, reflexive community of practice outside of any specific attempt to
2009
2010 673 institutionalise the concept; as discussed above.
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016 674
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021

2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081

675 The importance of inter- and transdisciplinary research and assessment approaches
676 identified in our survey also gains strong support within the ecosystem services literature
677 (Ainscough et al., 2018; Albert et al., 2017; Carmen et al., 2018; Costanza et al., 2017; Steger
678 et al., 2018). This acts as a guiding principle in the broad sense that it rejects narrow
679 disciplinary approaches to ecosystem service assessment and valuation, supporting the
680 norm of collaborative working and respect for different knowledge types.

4.4. Integrating sustainability and ecosystem services

683 A need to focus on the principles of sustainability was emphasised during events at the
684 conference and became a core element of the Antwerp Declaration. Sustainability is usually
685 understood as equitably meeting the needs of current generations without reducing the
686 capacity of future generations to meet their needs (WCED, 1987). As sustainability is not
687 necessarily implied by the ecosystem services concept, many authors have sought to
688 synthesize the two concepts to ensure that the ecosystem services concept is applied in a
689 manner consistent with the principles of sustainability (e.g. Bennett et al., 2015; Ekins et al.,
690 2003; Jacobs et al., 2013; Schröter et al., 2017). Key points made in this literature are, first,
691 that the biophysical processes underpinning ecosystem services (and inherent limits in
692 their ability to survive under different levels of stressors) should not be lost behind the
693 'stock' metaphor of ecosystem services. Second, stakeholder preferences and values should
694 form part of ecosystem service assessments, to ensure people's needs are equitably
695 accounted for.

696
697 Jacobs et al. (2013) stress the need to refocus ecosystem services research around a 'strong'
698 notion of sustainability. These authors suggest the majority of ecosystem services research

2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
2100
2101
2102
2103
2104
2105
2106
2107
2108
2109
2110
2111
2112
2113
2114
2115
2116
2117
2118
2119
2120
2121
2122
2123
2124
2125
2126
2127
2128
2129
2130
2131
2132
2133
2134
2135
2136
2137
2138
2139
2140
2141

699 focuses on the efficient use of ecosystem services, but not the inherent limits and
700 boundaries of the reproductive capacities of underlying natural capital. Jacobs et al. (2013)
701 also emphasise the centrality of fairness and equity to the sustainability concept and
702 suggest that distributional effects should be central to any ecosystem services analysis.
703
704 Schröter et al. (2017) discuss ecosystem services as a descriptive and normative scientific
705 concept, whose application may conflict with the principles of sustainability. They claim that
706 'if the ecosystem service concept is understood as contributing to sustainability, ecosystem
707 services need to be conceptualised through sustainability strategies rather than assessing all
708 forms of natural resource use in aggregated, snap-shot assessments' (Schröter et al., 2017,
709 p. 41). Cavender-Bares et al. (2015) seek to synthesise economic, ecological and systems
710 theory to integrate ecosystem services and sustainability. Principally, they suggest
711 accounting for the ecological mechanisms underpinning services in the way assessments are
712 carried out, particularly the inherent biophysical limits of these processes. By integrating
713 preferences and values of different stakeholders, coupled with a systems dynamics
714 approach, ecosystem services assessments could consider how the whole system might
715 develop over time (Cavender-Bares et al., 2015). Similarly, Bennett and Chaplin-Kramer
716 (2016) point to the development of a socio-ecological systems perspective as a step forward
717 in integrating sustainable use to the ecosystem services research agenda (although it is not
718 clear that this is an 'advancement' as much as a return to the roots of ecosystem services
719 science, given its origins in systems ecology (Costanza et al., 2017; Odum, 1971)). Despite all
720 these calls, sustainability issues of ecological thresholds and fairness are still often ignored
721 in ecosystem services research and practice (Dendoncker et al., 2018).

722

2142
2143
2144 723 Focusing on principles of sustainability, coupled with consideration of social and cultural
2145
2146 724 values of ecosystem services, was seen as key to ensuring the concept was not misused or
2147
2148
2149 725 used to justify environmentally degrading activities (Cross-cutting theme 2). Here we
2150
2151 726 reiterate, with the support of respondents who contributed to the development of the
2152
2153 727 Antwerp Declaration, the call to adopt the normative and analytic content of the concept of
2154
2155 728 sustainability in discussion and application of the ecosystem services concept. We add that
2156
2157
2158 729 as the ecosystem services concept is embedded as infrastructure in planning and decision-
2159
2160 730 making in different contexts, the need for this to be coupled with the principles of
2161
2162 731 sustainability becomes greater.
2163
2164
2165 732
2166
2167 733 In terms of the main types of pluralism we have discussed, the notion of sustainability
2168
2169 734 provides limits to the epistemological and methodological approaches within ecosystem
2170
2171 735 services research, whilst also placing it within a broader normative framing. It is therefore a
2172
2173
2174 736 useful concept to guide the discussion and practice around the ecosystem services concept.
2175
2176 737 This has ramifications for the types of epistemological, theoretical and methodological
2177
2178 738 approaches to ecosystem services research and practice compatible with sustainability.
2179
2180 739
2181
2182 740 A heavy focus on human values, or biophysical processes, whilst not precluded by a
2183
2184
2185 741 commitment to sustainability, should also be treated with caution. Methodologies that seek
2186
2187 742 purely to understand how humans value their environment will not capture ecological
2188
2189 743 dynamics and limits. Similarly, approaches focused purely on the biophysical underpinning
2190
2191 744 of ecosystem services may miss the important distributional impacts of changes between
2192
2193
2194 745 different user groups. At the broad level of research and policy-science innovations, this is
2195
2196 746 not problematic as studies may seek to answer certain questions or develop new methods.
2197
2198
2199
2200
2201

However, as infrastructure is created, it is important that neither values, nor biophysical dynamics are neglected. This reinforces the need to ensure that inter- and transdisciplinary practices are carried forward as the concept is institutionalised.

The three guiding principles that emerged from this survey are mutually reinforcing; a consideration of social and cultural values, inter- and transdisciplinary approaches and a commitment to the principles of sustainability. Such principles can accommodate a broad range of theoretical, epistemological and methodological approaches, whilst guarding against an 'anything goes' approach to the application of the ecosystem services framework.

4.5. Limitations and future research

User group identifications in our survey broad and not defined during the data collection; leading to potentially different interpretations between participants. Participants were also not able to identify as multiple user groups, which may not reflect the way that these roles can overlap. We also received fewer responses from those identifying as policy makers or practitioners than those identifying as academics. We were therefore not able to explore in detail the variety of different roles connected to varying uses of the ecosystem services concept outlined above. In order to gain a more nuanced understanding of how the ecosystem services concept is perceived by different user groups, further research will be needed with a more targeted sampling approach.

Future work may also build upon the distinction between set infrastructure and a broad, pluralistic ecosystem services community. These two strands are undoubtedly already in existence and we do not suggest that critical debate is waning within the ecosystem services

community. Yet the ecosystem services concept is likely to become increasingly embedded in policy and decision-making institutions moving forward. As this happens, there may be a need for a more substantive elaboration of the necessary structures to ensure that the critical, pluralistic perspective on ecosystem services is maintained and crucially kept in dialogue with the construction of contextually specific infrastructure.

Part of this process may be cross jurisdictions reviews of the way that ecosystem services is being embedded at sub-national, national, and international level. Studies of individual jurisdictions and some comparisons are beginning to emerge, but not yet in a systematised way (Bezák et al., 2017; Leone et al., 2016; Mauerhofer and Laza, 2018; McKinley et al., 2018). We suggest that such studies would benefit from considering the guiding principles laid out in this paper. These principles formed the basis of the collaboratively developed Antwerp Declaration and are supported by other literature as outlined above. We suggest that these may constitute potentially useful frames to reflexively assess the institutionalisation of the ecosystem service concept.

5. Concluding remarks

There are advantages and disadvantages to the ecosystem services concept being a boundary objects or set infrastructure, and likely these roles represent poles on a spectrum rather than a binary split. We find these two notions useful lenses for understanding the role of the ecosystem services concept at the science-policy interface, and for framing the views of different user groups. As the concept is further institutionalised in governance institutions, it is important to remain cognizant of the trade-off that exists between these

two roles and to not lose sight of the political choices necessary for the creation of set infrastructure.

The structured pre-conference survey and the participatory process of developing the Antwerp declaration have helped to identify different major purposes of the ecosystem service concept, including its function as awareness raising tool, scientific approach, and decision-making aid. The integration of the principles of sustainability and the inclusion of social and cultural values were seen as major research frontiers.

Although our findings are based on large number of responses of relevant stakeholders (n= 121), they are biased towards the European research community, and the segmentation of policy and practitioner stakeholders could not be clearly defined. Nevertheless, they emphasised research needs that have been identified and discussed in the literature for some time thus affirming and supporting existing arguments, whilst providing and guidance to support application of the ecosystem services concept. We suggest that surveys of the wider community to understand the ecosystem services concept provide a valuable approach to encourage nuanced discussion and reflexivity and prevent polarisation of the debate.

Acknowledgements

We thank our three anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback which helped to greatly strengthen the manuscript.

2382
2383
2384 817 We also thank our survey participants as well as all collaborators on the Antwerp
2385
2386 818 Declaration at the EESC 2016. We thank Sander Jacobs and Alexander van Oudenhoven for
2387
2388
2389 819 their feedback and contributions to the Declaration process. We thank Vanessa Burton for
2390
2391 820 proofreading and logistical support to the writing team. This study was funded by the
2392
2393 821 European Commission Seventh Framework Programme under Grant Agreements No. FP7-
2394
2395 822 ENV-2012-308393-2 (OPERAs) and 308428 (OpenNESS) and supported by the Ecosystem
2396
2397 823 Services Partnership, the University of Antwerp, and ECOPLAN – Planning for Ecosystem
2398
2399
2400 824 Services (Research Foundation Flanders Grant No. 120014).
2401
2402 825
2403
2404 826 Jacob Ainscough was supported by a NERC doctoral training partnership grant
2405
2406 827 (NE/L002558/1).
2407 828
2408
2409 829 **Conflicts of interest**
2410
2411 830 None
2412
2413 831
2414
2415
2416 832 **References**
2417
2418 833 Abson, D.J., Wehrden, H. Von, Baumgärtner, S., Fischer, J., Hanspach, J., Härdtle, W.,
2419
2420 834 Heinrichs, H., Klein, A.M., Lang, D.J., Martens, P., Walmsley, D., 2014. Ecosystem
2421
2422 835 services as a boundary object for sustainability. *Ecol. Econ.* 103, 29–37.
2423
2424
2425 836 Ainscough, J., Wilson, M., Kenter, J.O., 2018. Ecosystem services as a post-normal field of
2426
2427 837 science. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 31, 93–101.
2428
2429 838 Albert, C., Neßhöver, C., Schröter, M., Wittmer, H., Bonn, A., Burkhard, B., Dauber, J.,
2430
2431 839 Döring, R., Fürst, C., Grunewald, K., Haase, D., Hansjürgens, B., Hauck, J., Hinzmann, M.,
2432
2433 840 Koellner, T., Plieninger, T., Rabe, S.-E., Ring, I., Spangenberg, J.H., Stachow, U.,
2434
2435 841 Wüstemann, H., Görg, C., 2017. Towards a National Ecosystem Assessment in
2436
2437
2438
2439
2440
2441

2442
2443
2444 842 Germany: A plea for a comprehensive approach. *GAIA - Ecol. Perspect. Sci. Soc.* 26, 27–
2445 843 33.
2446
2447
2448
2449 844 Asah, S.T., Guerry, A.D., Blahna, D.J., Lawler, J.J., 2014. Perception, acquisition and use of
2450
2451 845 ecosystem services: Human behavior, and ecosystem management and policy
2452
2453 846 implications. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 10, 180–186.
2454
2455
2456 847 Barnaud, C., Antona, M., 2014. Deconstructing ecosystem services: Uncertainties and
2457
2458 848 controversies around a socially constructed concept. *Geoforum* 56, 113–123.
2459
2460 849 Baumgärtner, S., Becker, C., Frank, K., Müller, B., Quaas, M., 2008. Relating the philosophy
2461
2462 850 and practice of ecological economics: The role of concepts, models, and case studies in
2463
2464 851 inter- and transdisciplinary sustainability research. *Ecol. Econ.* 67, 384–393.
2465
2466
2467 852 Bazeley, P., Jackson, K., 2013. *Qualitative Data Analysis with Nvivo*, Second Edi. ed. SAGE.
2468
2469 853 Beaumont, N.J., Mongruel, R., Hooper, T., 2017. Practical application of the Ecosystem
2470
2471 854 Service Approach (ESA): lessons learned and recommendations for the future. *Int. J.*
2472
2473 855 *Biodivers. Sci. Ecosyst. Serv. Manag.* 13, 68–78.
2474
2475
2476 856 Bennett, E.M., Chaplin-Kramer, R., 2016. Science for the sustainable use of ecosystem
2477
2478 857 services. *F1000Research* 5, 1–13.
2479
2480 858 Bennett, E.M., Cramer, W., Begossi, A., Egoh, B.N., Cundill, G., Di, S., Geijzendorffer, I.R.,
2481
2482 859 Krug, C.B., Lavorel, S., Lazos, E., Lebel, L., Marti, B., Meyfroidt, P., Mooney, H.A., Nel,
2483
2484 860 J.L., Pascual, U., Payet, K., Roebeling, P., Seppelt, R., Solan, M., Tschakert, P.,
2485
2486 861 Tscharnkte, T., Ii, B.L.T., Verburg, P.H., Viglizzo, E.F., White, P.C.L., 2015. Linking
2487
2488 862 biodiversity, ecosystem services, and human well-being: three challenges for designing
2489
2490 863 research for sustainability. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* 14, 76–85.
2491
2492
2493 864 Bezák, P., Mederly, P., Izakovičová, Z., Špulerová, J., Schleyer, C., 2017. Divergence and
2494
2495 865 conflicts in landscape planning across spatial scales in slovakia: An opportunity for an
2496
2497
2498
2499
2500
2501

2502
2503
2504 866 ecosystem services-based approach? *Int. J. Biodivers. Sci. Ecosyst. Serv. Manag.* 13,
2505
2506 867 119–135.
2507
2508
2509 868 Boerema, A., Rebelo, A.J., Bodi, M.B., Esler, K.J., Meire, P., 2017. Are ecosystem services
2510
2511 869 adequately quantified? *J. Appl. Ecol.* 54, 358–370.
2512
2513 870 Bouwma, I., Schleyer, C., Primmer, E., Winkler, K.J., Berry, P., Young, J., Carmen, E.,
2514
2515 871 ŠpulEROVÁ, J., Bezák, P., Preda, E., Vadineanu, A., 2018. Adoption of the ecosystem
2516
2517 872 services concept in EU policies. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 29, 213–222.
2518
2519
2520 873 Boyd, J., Banzhaf, S., 2007. What are ecosystem services? The need for standardized
2521
2522 874 environmental accounting units. *Ecol. Econ.* 63, 616–626.
2523
2524
2525 875 Braat, L.C., 2018. Five reasons why the Science publication “Assessing nature’s contributions
2526
2527 876 to people” (Diaz et al. 2018) would not have been accepted in Ecosystem Services.
2528
2529 877 *Ecosyst. Serv.* 30, A1–A2.
2530
2531 878 Bryman, A., 2016. *Social Research Methods*, 5th Editio. ed. Oxford University Press.
2532
2533 879 Carmen, E., Watt, A., Carvalho, L., Dick, J., Fazey, I., Garcia-Blanco, G., Grizzetti, B., Hauck, J.,
2534
2535 880 Izakovicova, Z., Kopperoinen, L., Liqueste, C., Odee, D., Steingröver, E., Young, J., 2018.
2536
2537 881 Knowledge needs for the operationalisation of the concept of ecosystem services.
2538
2539 882 *Ecosyst. Serv.* 29, 441–451.
2540
2541
2542 883 Cavender-Bares, J., Polasky, S., King, E., Balvanera, P., 2015. A sustainability framework for
2543
2544 884 assessing trade-offs in ecosystem services. *Ecol. Soc.* 20.
2545
2546
2547 885 Chan, K.M.A., Balvanera, P., Benessaiah, K., Chapman, M., Díaz, S., Gómez-Baggethun, E.,
2548
2549 886 Gould, R., Hannahs, N., Jax, K., Klain, S., Luck, G.W., Martín-López, B., Muraca, B.,
2550
2551 887 Norton, B., Ott, K., Pascual, U., Satterfield, T., Tadaki, M., Taggart, J., Turner, N., 2016.
2552
2553 888 Opinion: Why protect nature? Rethinking values and the environment. *Proc. Natl.*
2554
2555 889 *Acad. Sci.* 113, 1462–1465.
2556
2557
2558
2559
2560
2561

2562
2563
2564 890 Chan, K.M.A., Satterfield, T., Goldstein, J., 2012. Rethinking ecosystem services to better
2565
2566 891 address and navigate cultural values. *Ecol. Econ.* 74, 8–18.
2567
2568
2569 892 Chaudhary, S., McGregor, A., Houston, D., Chettri, N., 2015. The evolution of ecosystem
2570
2571 893 services: A time series and discourse-centered analysis. *Environ. Sci. Policy* 54, 25–34.
2572
2573 894 Costanza, R., de Groot, R., Braat, L., Kubiszewski, I., Fioramonti, L., Sutton, P., Farber, S.,
2574
2575 895 Grasso, M., 2017. Twenty years of ecosystem services: How far have we come and how
2576
2577 896 far do we still need to go? *Ecosyst. Serv.* 28, 1–16.
2578
2579
2580 897 Crouzat, E., Arpin, I., Brunet, L., Colloff, M.J., Turkelboom, F., Lavorel, S., 2017. Researchers
2581
2582 898 must be aware of their roles at the interface of ecosystem services science and policy.
2583
2584 899 *Ambio* 47, 97–105.
2585
2586
2587 900 Dempsey, J., Robertson, M.M., 2012. Ecosystem services: Tensions, impurities, and points of
2588
2589 901 engagement within neoliberalism. *Prog. Hum. Geogr.* 36, 758–779.
2590
2591 902 Dendoncker, N., Turkelboom, F., Boeraeve, F., Boerema, A., Broekx, S., Fontaine, C.,
2592
2593 903 Demeyer, R., De Vreese, R., Devillet, G., Keune, H., Janssens, L., Liekens, I., Lord-Tarte,
2594
2595 904 E., Popa, F., Simoens, I., Smeets, N., Ulenaers, P., Van Herzele, A., Van Tichelen, K.,
2596
2597 905 Jacobs, S., 2018. Integrating Ecosystem Services values for sustainability? Evidence
2598
2599 906 from the Belgium Ecosystem Services community of practice. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 31, 68–76.
2600
2601
2602 907 Díaz, S., Pascual, U., Stenseke, M., Martín-López, B., Watson, R.T., Molnár, Z., Hill, R., Chan,
2603
2604 908 K.M.A., Baste, I.A., Brauman, K.A., Polasky, S., Church, A., Lonsdale, M., Larigauderie,
2605
2606 909 A., Leadley, P.W., van Oudenhoven, A.P.E., van der Plaat, F., Schröter, M., Lavorel, S.,
2607
2608 910 Aumeeruddy-Thomas, Y., Bukvareva, E., Davies, K., Demissew, S., Erpul, G., Failler, P.,
2609
2610 911 Guerra, C.A., Hewitt, C.L., Keune, H., Lindley, S., Shirayama, Y., 2018. Assessing nature's
2611
2612 912 contributions to people. *Science* (80-.). 359, 270–272.
2613
2614
2615 913 Dick, J., Turkelboom, F., Woods, H., Iniesta-Arandia, I., Primmer, E., Saarela, S.R., Bezák, P.,
2616
2617
2618
2619
2620
2621

2622
2623
2624 914 Mederly, P., Leone, M., Verheyden, W., Kelemen, E., Hauck, J., Andrews, C., Antunes,
2625
2626 P., Aszalós, R., Baró, F., Barton, D.N., Berry, P., Bugter, R., Carvalho, L., Czúcz, B.,
2627 915
2628 Dunford, R., Garcia Blanco, G., Geamănă, N., Giucă, R., Grizzetti, B., Izakovičová, Z.,
2629 916
2630 Kertész, M., Kopperoinen, L., Langemeyer, J., Montenegro Lapola, D., Liqueste, C.,
2631 917
2632 Luque, S., Martínez Pastur, G., Martin-Lopez, B., Mukhopadhyay, R., Niemela, J., Odee,
2633 918
2634 D., Peri, P.L., Pinho, P., Patrício-Roberto, G.B., Preda, E., Priess, J., Röckmann, C.,
2635 919
2636 Santos, R., Silaghi, D., Smith, R., Vădineanu, A., van der Wal, J.T., Arany, I., Badea, O.,
2637 920
2638 Bela, G., Boros, E., Bucur, M., Blumentrath, S., Calvache, M., Carmen, E., Clemente, P.,
2639 921
2640 Fernandes, J., Ferraz, D., Fongar, C., García-Llorente, M., Gómez-Baggethun, E.,
2641 922
2642 Gundersen, V., Haavardsholm, O., Kalóczkai, Á., Khalalwe, T., Kiss, G., Köhler, B.,
2643 923
2644 Lazányi, O., Lellei-Kovács, E., Lichungu, R., Lindhjem, H., Magare, C., Mustajoki, J.,
2645 924
2646 Ndege, C., Nowell, M., Nuss Girona, S., Ochieng, J., Often, A., Palomo, I., Pataki, G.,
2647 925
2648 Reinvang, R., Rusch, G., Saarikoski, H., Smith, A., Soy Massoni, E., Stange, E., Vågnes
2649 926
2650 Traaholt, N., Vári, Á., Verweij, P., Vikström, S., Yli-Pelkonen, V., Zulian, G., 2018.
2651 927
2652 Stakeholders' perspectives on the operationalisation of the ecosystem service concept:
2653 928
2654 Results from 27 case studies. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 29, 552–565.
2655 929
2656 Dunlop, C.A., 2014. The possible experts: How epistemic communities negotiate barriers to
2657 930
2658 knowledge use in ecosystem services policy. *Environ. Plan. C Gov. Policy* 32, 208–228.
2659 931
2660 Edwards, D.M., Collins, T.M., Goto, R., 2016. An arts-led dialogue to elicit shared, plural and
2661 932
2662 cultural values of ecosystems. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 21, 319–328.
2663 933
2664 Ekins, P., Simon, S., Deutsch, L., Folke, C., De Groot, R., 2003. A framework for the practical
2665 934
2666 application of the concepts of critical natural capital and strong sustainability. *Ecol.*
2667 935
2668 *Econ.* 44, 165–185.
2669 936
2670 Fanny, B., Nicolas, D., Sander, J., Erik, G.B., Marc, D., 2014. How (not) to perform ecosystem
2671 937
2672
2673
2674
2675
2676
2677
2678
2679
2680
2681

2682
2683
2684 938 service valuations: pricing gorillas in the mist. *Biodivers. Conserv.* 24, 187–197.
2685
2686
2687 939 Fish, R., Church, A., Willis, C., Winter, M., Tratalos, J.A., Haines-Young, R., Potschin, M.,
2688
2689 940 2016. Making space for cultural ecosystem services: Insights from a study of the UK
2690
2691 941 nature improvement initiative. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 21, 329–343.
2692
2693 942 Fisher, J.A., Brown, K., 2015. Ecosystem services concepts and approaches in conservation:
2694
2695 943 Just a rhetorical tool? *Ecol. Econ.* 117, 261–269.
2696
2697 944 Galler, C., Albert, C., von Haaren, C., 2016. From regional environmental planning to
2698
2699 945 implementation: Paths and challenges of integrating ecosystem services. *Ecosyst. Serv.*
2700
2701 946 18, 118–129.
2702
2703 947 Hauck, J., Stein, C., Schiffer, E., Vandewalle, M., 2015. Seeing the forest and the trees:
2704
2705 948 Facilitating participatory network planning in environmental governance. *Glob.*
2706
2707 949 *Environ. Chang.* 35, 400–410.
2708
2709 950 Hein, L., Obst, C., Edens, B., Remme, R.P., 2015. Progress and challenges in the development
2710
2711 951 of ecosystem accounting as a tool to analyse ecosystem capital. *Curr. Opin. Environ.*
2712
2713 952 *Sustain.* 14, 86–92.
2714
2715 953 Hermelingmeier, V., Nicholas, K.A., 2017. Identifying five different perspectives on the
2716
2717 954 ecosystem services concept using Q Methodology. *Ecol. Econ.* 136, 255–265.
2718
2719 955 Iniesta-Arandia, I., García-Llorente, M., Aguilera, P.A., Montes, C., Martín-López, B., 2014.
2720
2721 956 Socio-cultural valuation of ecosystem services: uncovering the links between values,
2722
2723 957 drivers of change, and human well-being. *Ecol. Econ.* 108, 36–48.
2724
2725 958 Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, 2018a.
2726
2727 959 The regional assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services for the
2728
2729 960 Americas. IPBES Secretariat, Bonn, Germany.
2730
2731 961 Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, 2018b.
2732
2733
2734
2735
2736
2737
2738
2739
2740
2741

2742
2743
2744 962 The regional assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services for Asia and the
2745
2746 Pacific. IPBES Secretariat, Bonn, Germany.
2747 963
2748
2749 964 Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, 2018c.
2750
2751 965 The regional assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services for Europe and
2752
2753 Central Asia. IPBES Secretariat, Bonn, Germany.
2754 966
2755
2756 967 Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, 2018d.
2757
2758 968 The regional assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services for Africa. IPBES
2759
2760 Secretariat, Bonn, Germany.
2761 969
2762 970 Jacobs, S., Dendoncker, N., Martín-López, B., Barton, D.N., Gomez-Baggethun, E., Boeraeve,
2763
2764 F., McGrath, F.L., Vierikko, K., Geneletti, D., Sevecke, K.J., Pipart, N., Primmer, E.,
2765 971
2766 Mederly, P., Schmidt, S., Aragão, A., Baral, H., Bark, R.H., Briceno, T., Brogna, D., Cabral,
2767 972
2768 P., De Vreese, R., Liqueste, C., Mueller, H., Peh, K.S.H., Phelan, A., Rincón, A.R., Rogers,
2769 973
2770 S.H., Turkelboom, F., Van Reeth, W., van Zanten, B.T., Wam, H.K., Washbourn, C.L.,
2771 974
2772 2016. A new valuation school: Integrating diverse values of nature in resource and land
2773
2774 975 use decisions. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 1, 213–220.
2775
2776 976
2777
2778 977 Jacobs, S., Martín-López, B., Barton, D.N., Dunford, R., Harrison, P.A., Kelemen, E.,
2779
2780 978 Saarikoski, H., Termansen, M., García-Llorente, M., Gómez-Baggethun, E., Kopperoinen,
2781
2782 L., Luque, S., Palomo, I., Priess, J.A., Rusch, G.M., Tenerelli, P., Turkelboom, F.,
2783 979
2784 Demeyer, R., Hauck, J., Keune, H., Smith, R., 2018. The means determine the end –
2785 980
2786 Pursuing integrated valuation in practice. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 29, 515–528.
2787 981
2788
2789 982 Jacobs, S., Nicolas, D., Keune, H., 2013. No root, no fruit- sustainability and ecosystem
2790
2791 services, in: Jacobs, S., Nicolas, D., Keune, H. (Eds.), *Ecosystem Services - Global Issues,*
2792 983
2793 *Local Practices.* Elsevier Inc., London, pp. 19–28.
2794 984
2795
2796 985 Jacobs, S., Spanhove, T., De Smet, L., Van Daele, T., Van Reeth, W., Van Gossum, P., Stevens,
2797
2798
2799
2800
2801

2802
2803
2804 986 M., Schneiders, A., Panis, J., Demolder, H., Michels, H., Thoonen, M., Simoens, I.,
2805
2806
2807 987 Peymen, J., 2015. The ecosystem service assessment challenge: Reflections from
2808
2809 988 Flanders-REA. *Ecol. Indic.* 61, 715–727.
2810
2811 989 Jadhav, A., Anderson, S., Dyer, M.J.B., Sutton, P.C., 2017. Revisiting ecosystem services:
2812
2813 990 Assessment and valuation as starting points for environmental politics. *Sustain.* 9.
2814
2815 991 Jax, K., Barton, D.N., Chan, K.M.A., de Groot, R., Doyle, U., Eser, U., Görg, C., Gómez-
2816
2817 Baggethun, E., Griewald, Y., Haber, W., Haines-Young, R., Heink, U., Jahn, T., Joosten,
2818 992
2819 H., Kerschbaumer, L., Korn, H., Luck, G.W., Matzdorf, B., Muraca, B., Neßhöver, C.,
2820 993
2821
2822 994 Norton, B., Ott, K., Potschin, M., Rauschmayer, F., von Haaren, C., Wichmann, S., 2013.
2823
2824 Ecosystem services and ethics. *Ecol. Econ.* 93, 260–268.
2825 995
2826
2827 996 Jax, K., Furman, E., Saarikoski, H., Barton, D.N., Delbaere, B., Dick, J., Duke, G., Görg, C.,
2828
2829 997 Gómez-Baggethun, E., Harrison, P.A., Maes, J., Pérez-Soba, M., Saarela, S.-R.,
2830
2831 998 Turkelboom, F., van Dijk, J., Watt, A.D., 2018. Handling a messy world: Lessons learned
2832
2833 when trying to make the ecosystem services concept operational. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 29,
2834 999
2835 415–427.
2836 1000
2837
2838 1001 Kenter, J.O., 2018. IPBES: don't throw out the baby whilst keeping the bathwater; Put
2839
2840 1002 people's values central, not nature's contributions. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 33, 40–43.
2841
2842
2843 1003 Kenter, J.O., 2016. Editorial: Shared, plural and cultural values. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 21, 175–183.
2844
2845 1004 Kenter, J.O., Jobstvogt, N., Watson, V., Irvine, K.N., Christie, M., Bryce, R., 2016a. The impact
2846
2847 1005 of information, value-deliberation and group-based decision-making on values for
2848
2849 1006 ecosystem services: Integrating deliberative monetary valuation and storytelling.
2850
2851 Ecosyst. Serv. 21, 270–290.
2852 1007
2853
2854 1008 Kenter, J.O., O'Brien, L., Hockley, N., Ravenscroft, N., Fazey, I.R., Irvine, K.N., Reed, M.,
2855
2856 1009 Christie, M., Brady, E., Bryce, R., Church, A., Cooper, N., Davies, A., Evely, A., Everard,
2857
2858
2859
2860
2861

2862
2863
2864 1010 M., Fish, R., Fisher, J.A., Jobstvogt, N., Molloy, C., Orchard-Webb, J., Ranger, S., Ryan,
2865
2866 M., Watson, V., Williams, S., 2015. What are shared and social values of ecosystems?
2867 1011
2868 Ecol. Econ. 111, 86–99.
2869 1012
2870
2871 1013 Kenter, J.O., Reed, M.S., Irvine, K.N., O'Brien, E., Bryce, R., Christie, M., Cooper, N., Hockley,
2872
2873 N., Fazey, I.R., Orchard-Webb, J., Ravenscroft, N., Raymond, C., Tett, P., Watson, V.,
2874 1014
2875 2016b. Shared values and deliberative valuation: Future directions. Ecosyst. Serv. 21,
2876 1015
2877 358–371.
2878 1016
2879
2880 1017 Kistenkas, F.H., Bouwma, I.M., 2018. Barriers for the ecosystem services concept in
2881
2882 European water and nature conservation law. Ecosyst. Serv. 29, 223–227.
2883 1018
2884
2885 1019 Kull, C.A., Arnould de Sartre, X., Castro-Larranaga, M., 2015. The political ecology of
2886
2887 ecosystem services. Geoforum 61, 122–134.
2888 1020
2889 1021 Leone, M., Grizzetti, B., Liqueste, C., Antunes, P., Carvalho, L., Geam, N., 2016. Ecosystem
2890
2891 services for water policy: Insights across Europe. Environ. Sci. Policy 66, 179–190.
2892 1022
2893
2894 1023 MA, 2005. Ecosystem and human well-being: Synthesis report. Island Press, Washington,
2895
2896 D.C.
2897 1024
2898 1025 Maes, J., Burkhard, B., Geneletti, D., 2018. Ecosystem services are inclusive and deliver
2899
2900 multiple values. A comment on the concept of nature's contributions to people. One
2901 1026
2902 Ecosyst. 3, e24720.
2903 1027
2904
2905 1028 Maraja, R., Barkmann, J., Tscharntke, T., 2016. Perceptions of cultural ecosystem services
2906
2907 from urban green. Ecosyst. Serv. 17, 33–39.
2908 1029
2909 1030 Martinez-Harms, M.J., Bryan, B.A., Balvanera, P., Law, E.A., Rhodes, J.R., Possingham, H.P.,
2910
2911 Wilson, K.A., 2015. Making decisions for managing ecosystem services. Biol. Conserv.
2912 1031
2913 184, 229–238.
2914 1032
2915
2916 1033 Matzdorf, B., Meyer, C., 2014. The relevance of the ecosystem services framework for
2917
2918
2919
2920
2921

2922
2923
2924 1034 developed countries' environmental policies: A comparative case study of the US and
2925
2926 EU. Land use policy 38, 509–521.
2927 1035
2928
2929 1036 Mauerhofer, V., 2018. The law, ecosystem services and ecosystem functions: An in-depth
2930
2931 1037 overview of coverage and interrelation. Ecosyst. Serv. 29, 190–198.
2932
2933 1038 Mauerhofer, V., Laza, I., 2018. How do ecosystem services perform in enforceable law?
2934
2935 Potentials and pitfalls within regional and national integration. Ecosyst. Serv. 29, 260–
2936 1039
2937 270.
2938 1040
2939
2940 1041 Mckenzie, E., Posner, S., Tillmann, P., Bernhardt, J., Howard, K., Rosenthal, A., 2014.
2941
2942 1042 Understanding the use of ecosystem service knowledge in decision making: Lessons
2943
2944 from international experiences of spatial planning. Environ. Plan. C Gov. Policy 32, 320–
2945 1043
2946 340.
2947 1044
2948
2949 1045 McKinley, E., Ballinger, R.C., Beaumont, N.J., 2018. Saltmarshes, ecosystem services, and an
2950
2951 1046 evolving policy landscape: A case study of Wales, UK. Mar. Policy 91, 1–10.
2952
2953 1047 Nahlik, A.M., Kentula, M.E., Fennessy, M.S., Landers, D.H., 2012. Where is the consensus? A
2954
2955 proposed foundation for moving ecosystem service concepts into practice. Ecol. Econ.
2956 1048
2957 77, 27–35.
2958 1049
2959
2960 1050 Odum, H.T., 1971. Environment, Power and Society. Wiley-Blackwell, New Jersey, US.
2961
2962 1051 Pascual, U., Balvanera, P., Díaz, S., Pataki, G., Roth, E., Stenseke, M., Watson, R.T., Başak
2963
2964 Dessane, E., Islar, M., Kelemen, E., Maris, V., Quaas, M., Subramanian, S.M., Wittmer,
2965 1052
2966 H., Adlan, A., Ahn, S.E., Al-Hafedh, Y.S., Amankwah, E., Asah, S.T., Berry, P., Bilgin, A.,
2967 1053
2968 Breslow, S.J., Bullock, C., Cáceres, D., Daly-Hassen, H., Figueroa, E., Golden, C.D.,
2969 1054
2970 Gómez-Baggethun, E., González-Jiménez, D., Houdet, J., Keune, H., Kumar, R., Ma, K.,
2971 1055
2972 May, P.H., Mead, A., O'Farrell, P., Pandit, R., Pengue, W., Pichis-Madruga, R., Popa, F.,
2973 1056
2974 Preston, S., Pacheco-Balanza, D., Saarikoski, H., Strassburg, B.B., van den Belt, M.,
2975 1057
2976
2977
2978
2979
2980
2981

2982
2983
2984 1058 Verma, M., Wickson, F., Yagi, N., 2017. Valuing nature's contributions to people: the
2985
2986 IPBES approach. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* 26–27, 7–16.
2987 1059
2988
2989 1060 Peterson, G.D., Harmáčková, Z. V., Meacham, M., Queiroz, C., Jiménez-Aceituno, A., Kuiper,
2990
2991 1061 J.J., Malmborg, K., Sitas, N., Bennett, E.M., 2018. Welcoming different perspectives in
2992
2993 1062 IPBES: "Nature's contributions to people" and "Ecosystem services." *Ecol. Soc.* 23, 39.
2994
2995 1063 Polasky, S., Tallis, H., Reyers, B., 2015. Setting the bar: Standards for ecosystem services.
2996
2997 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 112, 7356–7361.
2998 1064
2999
3000 1065 Potschin, M.B., Haines-Young, R.H., 2011. Ecosystem services: Exploring a geographical
3001
3002 1066 perspective. *Prog. Phys. Geogr.* 35, 575–594.
3003
3004 1067 QSR International, 2016. Nvivo. Melbourne, Australia.
3005
3006 1068 Ranger, S., Bryce, R., Richardson, P., Kenter, J.O., 2016. Forming shared values in marine
3007
3008 conservation management: a deliberative multi-criteria approach to include
3009 1069
3010 community voices. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 21, 344–357.
3011 1070
3012
3013 1071 Rozas-Vásquez, D., Fürst, C., Geneletti, D., Almendra, O., 2018. Integration of ecosystem
3014
3015 services in strategic environmental assessment across spatial planning scales. *Land use*
3016 1072
3017 policy 71, 303–310.
3018 1073
3019
3020 1074 Ruckelshaus, M., McKenzie, E., Tallis, H., Guerry, A., Daily, G.C., Kareiva, P., Polasky, S.,
3021
3022 Ricketts, T., Bhagabati, N., Wood, S.A., Bernhardt, J., 2013. Notes from the field:
3023 1075
3024 Lessons learned from using ecosystem service approaches to inform real-world
3025 1076
3026 decisions. *Ecol. Econ.* 115, 11–21.
3027 1077
3028
3029 1078 Saarela, S.R., Rinne, J., 2016. Knowledge brokering and boundary work for ecosystem
3030
3031 service indicators. An urban case study in Finland. *Ecol. Indic.* 61, 49–62.
3032 1079
3033
3034 1080 Saarikoski, H., Primmer, E., Saarela, S.R., Antunes, P., Aszalós, R., Baró, F., Berry, P., Blanco,
3035
3036 1081 G.G., Gómez-Baggethun, E., Carvalho, L., Dick, J., Dunford, R., Hanzu, M., Harrison, P.A.,
3037
3038
3039
3040
3041

3042
3043
3044 1082 Izakovicova, Z., Kertész, M., Kopperoinen, L., Köhler, B., Langemeyer, J., Lapola, D.,
3045
3046
3047 1083 Liqueste, C., Luque, S., Mederly, P., Niemelä, J., Palomo, I., Pastur, G.M., Peri, P.L.,
3048
3049 1084 Preda, E., Priess, J.A., Santos, R., Schleyer, C., Turkelboom, F., Vadineanu, A.,
3050
3051 1085 Verheyden, W., Vikström, S., Young, J., 2018. Institutional challenges in putting
3052
3053 1086 ecosystem service knowledge in practice. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 29, 579–598.
3054
3055
3056 1087 Sagoff, M., 2011. The quantification and valuation of ecosystem services. *Ecol. Econ.* 70,
3057
3058 1088 497–502.
3059
3060 1089 Schröter, M., Stumpf, K.H., Loos, J., van Oudenhoven, A.P.E., Böhnke-Henrichs, A., Abson,
3061
3062 1090 D.J., 2017. Refocusing ecosystem services towards sustainability. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 25, 35–
3063
3064 1091 43.
3065
3066
3067 1092 Schröter, M., van der Zanden, E.H., van Oudenhoven, A.P.E., Remme, R.P., Serna-Chavez,
3068
3069 1093 H.M., de Groot, R., Opdam, P., 2014. Ecosystem services as a contested concept: A
3070
3071 1094 synthesis of critique and counter-arguments. *Conserv. Lett.* 7, 514–523.
3072
3073
3074 1095 Schröter, M., van Oudenhoven, A.P.E., 2016. Ecosystem services go beyond money and
3075
3076 1096 markets: Reply to Silvertown. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 31, 333–334.
3077
3078 1097 Seppelt, R., Dormann, C.F., Eppink, F. V., Lautenbach, S., Schmidt, S., 2011. A quantitative
3079
3080 1098 review of ecosystem service studies: Approaches, shortcomings and the road ahead. *J.*
3081
3082 1099 *Appl. Ecol.* 48, 630–636.
3083
3084
3085 1100 Seppelt, R., Fath, B., Burkhard, B., Fisher, J.L., Grêt-Regamey, A., Lautenbach, S., Pert, P.,
3086
3087 1101 Hotes, S., Spangenberg, J., Verburg, P.H., Van Oudenhoven, A.P.E., 2012. Form follows
3088
3089 1102 function? Proposing a blueprint for ecosystem service assessments based on reviews
3090
3091 1103 and case studies. *Ecol. Indic.* 21, 145–154.
3092
3093
3094 1104 Star, S.L., Griesemer, J.R., 1989. Institutional ecology, “translations” and boundary objects:
3095
3096 1105 Amateurs and professionals in Berkley’s Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907–39. *Soc.*
3097
3098
3099
3100
3101

3102
3103
3104
3105 1106 Stud. Sci. 19, 387–420.
3106
3107 1107 Steger, C., Hirsch, S., Evers, C., Branoff, B., Petrova, M., Nielsen-Pincus, M., Wardropper, C.,
3108
3109 1108 van Riper, C.J., 2018. Ecosystem Services as Boundary Objects for Transdisciplinary
3110
3111 1109 Collaboration. Ecol. Econ. 143, 153–160.
3112
3113 1110 TEEB, 2010. The economics of ecosystems and biodiversity: Mainstreaming the economics
3114
3115 of nature: A synthesis of the approach, conclusions and recommendations of TEEB,
3116 1111
3117 Environment.
3118 1112
3119
3120 1113 Thomas, D.R., 2006. A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data.
3121
3122 1114 Am. J. Eval. 27, 237–246.
3123
3124
3125 1115 Timpte, M., Montana, J., Reuter, K., Borie, M., Apkes, J., 2018. Engaging diverse experts in a
3126
3127 1116 global environmental assessment: participation in the first work programme of IPBES
3128
3129 1117 and opportunities for improvement. Innovation 31, S15–S37.
3130
3131 1118 Treasury, H.M., 2011. The Green Book: Appraisal and evaluation in central Government.
3132
3133
3134 1119 Turnhout, E., 2009. The effectiveness of boundary objects: The case of ecological indicators.
3135
3136 1120 Sci. Public Policy 36, 403–412.
3137
3138 1121 Turnhout, E., Dewulf, A., Hulme, M., 2016. What does policy-relevant global environmental
3139
3140 1122 knowledge do? The cases of climate and biodiversity. Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain. 18,
3141
3142 65–72.
3143 1123
3144
3145 1124 Turnpenny, J., Russel, D., Jordan, A., 2014. The challenge of embedding an ecosystem
3146
3147 1125 services approach: Patterns of knowledge utilisation in public policy appraisal. Environ.
3148
3149 1126 Plan. C Gov. Policy 32, 247–262.
3150
3151
3152 1127 UK National Ecosystem Assessment, 2014. UK National Ecosystem Assessment Follow-on
3153
3154 1128 Work Package 4 – Coastal/marine ecosystem services : Principles and Practice
3155
3156 1129 Summary.
3157
3158
3159
3160
3161

3162		
3163		
3164	1130	Wawrzyczek, J., Lindsay, R., Metzger, M.J., Quétier, F., 2018. The ecosystem approach in
3165		
3166		
3167	1131	ecological impact assessment: Lessons learned from windfarm developments on
3168		
3169	1132	peatlands in Scotland. Environ. Impact Assess. Rev. 72, 157–165.
3170		
3171	1133	Weiss, C., 1979. The many meanings of research utilization. Public Adm. Rev. 39, 426–431.
3172		
3173	1134	World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987. Our Common Future. Oxford
3174		
3175		
3176	1135	University Press, Oxford.
3177		
3178	1136	
3179		
3180	1137	
3181		
3182		
3183	1138	
3184		
3185	1139	Supplementary Material
3186		
3187	1140	SM1 – Full questionnaire
3188		
3189	1141	SM2 – Coding Matrix
3190		
3191	1142	SM3 – Early findings documents
3192		
3193		
3194	1143	
3195		
3196	1144	
3197		
3198	1145	
3199		
3200		
3201	1146	
3202		
3203	1147	
3204		
3205	1148	
3206		
3207	1149	
3208		
3209		
3210	1150	
3211		
3212	1151	
3213		
3214	1152	
3215		
3216		
3217		
3218		
3219		
3220		
3221		

Supplementary Material 1

Full survey circulated among 350 early registrants to the European Ecosystem Services Conference 2016.

Q1. What would you like to talk about? (<i>Multiple-choice, single choice, mandatory</i>)
A) Values
B) Goals
C) Myths
D) Grumbles
Purpose (Values in the original survey)
What do you think is at the heart of the Ecosystem services framework? [...] Please indicate how closely each of the following statements resembles your own thinking:
P1) The ecosystem services concept provides a utilitarian framing of ecosystem functions as services in order to increase public interest in conservation. (<i>5-point Likert scale</i>)
P2) The concept of ecosystem services denotes a generic idea or metaphor to increase awareness of how human well-being in many ways depends on natural systems. (<i>5-point Likert scale</i>)
P3) Using an economic approach to environmental issues can help decision-makers to determine the best use of scarce ecological resources at all levels. (<i>5-point Likert scale</i>)
P4) Now that you've gone through the literature statements, can you put down in your own words what you think is at the heart of the ecosystem services framework? (<i>Open-ended</i>)
P5) What, to your mind, would be the worst misuse of the ecosystem services framework? (<i>Open-ended</i>)
P6) Beyond basic research ethics and good practice, what values and principles or ideas should guide the practical applications of the ecosystem services framework? (<i>Open-ended</i>)
Visions (Goals in the original survey)
V1) In 20 years time, what role should the ecosystem services framework have in society? (<i>Multiple-choice, tick all that apply</i>)
A) All policy is centred on the ecosystem services framework, from local to international agreements
B) It is a household term, something everyone is familiar with and needs little explanation
C) It is considered the paradigm shift that turned environmental protection into a core priority
D) It's around but remains quite a technical term, confined to academia and high-level policy
E) Everyone has finally come to their senses and moved on to a more useful framework
F) Other (please describe below)
V2) What are the main challenges for the widespread use of the ecosystem services framework (<i>Open-ended</i>)
V3) What do you think are key steps to undertake in the future development of the ecosystem services framework? (<i>Open-ended</i>)
Myths
M1) Can you describe a common myth or misunderstanding you frequently encounter in your work? (<i>Open-ended</i>)
M2) Who holds these erroneous views? (<i>Open-ended</i>)
M3) And what to your mind is the source of confusion that gave rise to these myths? (<i>Open-ended</i>)
M4) How would you debunk the myth? (<i>Open-ended</i>)
M5) Have you ever encountered one of the following claims regarding ecosystem services in your work? (<i>Multiple-choice, tick all that apply</i>)
A) The ecosystem services framework is based on economic terminology and therefore a capitalist concept, it's just an extension of the capitalist paradigm and all about making money
B) The ecosystem services framework undermines the widely held moral-aesthetic value arguments for environmental protection and does not consider the intrinsic value of nature.

C) The ecosystem services framework implicitly accepts that happiness and wellbeing can be quantified.
D) Ecosystem services are purely human-centric, the framework implicitly accepts that human benefit is the only good and that we should solely protect services if they benefit humans.
E) The traditional, ethical arguments for conservation have failed, so the ecosystem services framework embodies an appeal to self-interest instead.
F) The ecosystem services framework cannot support decision-making nor can it create a solution that pleases everyone and therefore has no use in informing environmental policy.
G) Other (please describe below)
Frustrations (Grumbles in the original survey)
F1) What do you find most frustrating about working with the ecosystem services framework? (<i>Open-ended</i>)
F2) What would be the best way to resolve your grumble? (<i>Open-ended</i>) What to your mind is the biggest theoretical, moral or practical shortcoming of the ecosystem services framework? (<i>Open-ended</i>)
F3) How could that shortcoming be remedied? (<i>Open-ended</i>)
F4) Have you ever encountered one of the following frustrations? (<i>Multiple-choice, tick all that apply</i>)
A) The terminology of ecosystem services is too complicated and academic, impossible to use with non-expert audiences.
B) The ecosystem services framework is so contentious, the use of the term is best avoided when applying the framework in practice, to avoid shouting matches and people disengaging on principle.
C) In people's perceptions the ecosystem services framework is equalled with monetary valuation and selling off nature, making it a hard sell even if the study at hand doesn't look at economic aspects at all.
D) Policy makers have adopted the ecosystem services framework for their own purposes, without really paying attention to its theoretical underpinnings.
E) Ecosystem services is such a hyped buzzword, it is becoming increasingly vague and opaque, everybody uses it without much regard for what it actually entails.
F) The phrase 'ecosystem services' is used to cover a growing variety of quite distinct concepts and approaches.
G) Other
Background
A1) In the field of ecosystem services, where do you think the biggest differences of opinion lie? (<i>Open-ended</i>)
A2) What do you do? (<i>Multiple-choice, single option</i>)
A) Student/Junior Researcher
B) Academic Researcher
C) Policy maker
D) Practitioner
E) Other
A3) What is your main field of study? (<i>Open-ended</i>)
A4) How long have you been working with the ecosystem services approach? (<i>Open-ended</i>)
A5) What gender do you identify with? (<i>Open-ended</i>)
A6) Schedule permitting, would you be interested in attending a follow-up workshop at the conference, to discuss some of the topics raised here in more detail? (<i>Yes/No</i>)
That was all, thank you so much for taking part and we're looking forward to meeting you in September. Would you like to do another theme? (<i>Yes/No</i>)
[If yes, redirects to Q1]

Supplementary Material 2

Coding matrix of the inductive thematic content analysis. Counts refer to the number of times each theme was mentioned by each user group. Any empty responses to open questions were removed from the analysis prior to coding.

Theme	Summary of responses coded under theme	Academic Researcher	Student/Junior Researcher	Practitioner	Policy maker	Other	Total
Purpose (Values)							
P4 - Can you put down in your own words what you think is at the heart of the ecosystem services framework?							
Decision-making aid	ES as tool/support for decisionmaking & resource management	7	1	2	1	1	12
Scientific approach	ES as a scientific endeavour, expanding knowledge	4	2	3	1	0	10
Awareness raising	ES to demonstrate value of nature	22	11	4	0	1	38
Holistic approach	ES as an encompassing approach to complexity	3	3	0	1	1	8
Advocacy x Science	Responses combining science and awareness raising, focus on general public	8	4	1	2	0	15
Decision x Activism	Responses combining awareness raising and decision support, focus on policy	4	4	0	2	1	11
Science x Decision	Responses combining science and decision support, technocratic focus	2	0	4	1	0	7
Other		4	1	1	0	0	6
P5 – What would be the worst misuse of the ecosystem services framework?							
Backfiring	ES used to demonstrate that environmental degradation is affordable	3	0	0	0	2	5
Monetary valuation	ES solely used to put a price on nature	28	8	4	2	1	43
Panacea	ES used a cure-all applied without concern for context or applicability	3	0	0	2	0	5
Poor decision making	ES used in flawed decision-making processes	7	2	1	1	1	12
Selling off nature	ES used to commodify nature	8	4	3	1	1	17
Other		6	4	4	0	0	14
Visions (Goals)							
V2 - What are the main challenges for the widespread use of the ecosystem services framework?							
Education & awareness	Addressing lack of knowledge of ES framework and theoretical underpinnings	6	2	2	2	1	13
Impact	Lack of tangible impact (i.e. Halting of environmental degradation)	0	1	0	0	2	3
Institutional barriers	Historic and organisational challenges in academia and governance	3	4	1	0	1	9
Methods, date & tools	Methodological improvements needed and concerns around data gaps/quality	11	4	5	2	1	23
Policy & decision making	Lack of political will and vested interests in decision making	4	2	2	0	2	10
Terminology	Overly technical ES terminology acting as a barrier to widespread use	9	3	0	0	0	12
Un-niching	Need to move ES beyond a scientific margin into policy and public mainstream	3	0	0	0	1	4
Other		1	0	0	1	0	2
V3 - What do you think are key steps to undertake in the future development of the ecosystem services framework?							
Better communication- General	Responses citing better communication	2	2	1	1	0	6
Better communication- Holistic emphasis	Responses citing communication to promote holistic nature of ES framework	0	1	0	1	0	2
Better communication- Stakeholder & public engagement	Responses citing better communication with non-expert audiences	1	1	3	0	0	5
Better decision-making	Improving the decision-making process	1	0	0	0	0	1
Better science- General	Responses citing the need for better science in general (tools, methods, data, theory)	9	2	3	3	0	17
Better science- Accounting	Responses specifically citing need for better accounting for ES	1	0	0	0	0	1
Better science- Include cultural values	Responses focusing on improving inclusion cultural values in ES research/valuations	3	2	0	1	0	6
Better science- Interdisciplinarity	Responses citing need for working more interdisciplinarily in ES	3	0	1	1	0	5
Science-policy	Improvements to the science-policy interface and evidence based decisions	15	5	1	1	0	22

3402
3403
3404 1163
3405
3406
3407
3408
3409
3410
3411
3412
3413
3414
3415
3416
3417
3418
3419
3420
3421
3422
3423
3424
3425
3426
3427
3428
3429
3430
3431
3432
3433
3434
3435
3436
3437
3438
3439
3440
3441
3442
3443
3444
3445
3446
3447
3448
3449
3450
3451
3452
3453
3454
3455
3456 1164
3457 1165
3458
3459
3460
3461

Theme		Academic Researcher	Student/Junior Researcher	Practitioner	Policy maker	Other	Total
Myths							
M1 - Describe a common misunderstanding or myth around ecosystem services you frequently encounter in your work?							
All about the money	ES revolves around monetary valuation of nature	10	2	3	1	0	16
Other		5	1	3	0	0	9
M2 - Who holds these erroneous views?							
Conservationist	Responses citing conservationists and/or environmentalists as myth believers	4	1	0	1	0	6
Lay people	Responses citing lay people as myth believers	6	1	0	0	0	7
Scientists	Responses citing other disciplines and scientists as myth believers	8	3	1	0	0	12
Policymakers & practitioners	Responses citing policymaker and/or practitioners as myth believers	2	0	2	1	0	5
Other		2	0	2	0	0	4
M3 - What to your mind is the source of confusion that gave rise to the myth you've just described?							
Media & publications	Responses citing certain ES publications or media in general as source of myths	2	1	2	0	0	5
Terminology & concept	Confusion seen as inherent to the language and concept of ES	3	0	1	0	0	4
Worldview & ideology	Responses citing ideological bias and vested worldviews as source of myths	4	1	2	0	0	7
Other		5	1	1	1	0	8
M4 - How would you debunk the myth?							
Communication	Improving communication around ES	8	3	4	0	0	15
Expanding disciplinary	Working across disciplines and audiences	3	0	1	0	0	4
Refine concept	Improve ES framework conceptually	1	1	0	0	0	2
Other		3	0	1	0	0	4
Frustrations (Grumbles)							
F1 - What do you find most frustrating about working with the ecosystem services framework?							
External skepticism	Responses citing negative attitudes to ES framework	3	0	0	0	1	4
Misuses	ES framework being misapplied	2	0	0	0	0	2
User friendliness	Difficulties with terminology and high expertise needed to use ES & tools	7	2	4	2	0	15
Practical implementation	Difficulties with applying ES framework in practice	4	0	1	2	0	7
Science shortcomings	Scientific issues raised - lack of data, accounting methods, conceptual flaws	5	4	2	1	0	12
Silos-Niche	Lack of mainstreaming and inter/cross disciplinary work within ES	4	1	0	0	0	5
F2 - What would be the best way to resolve your grumble?							
Best practice	Spreading best practice guidance and knowledge sharing	0	0	0	1	0	1
Educate	Improving education around ES framework	2	1	0	0	0	3
Interdisciplinarity	Working across disciplines and audiences	3	0	0	1	0	4
More research	Issues can be addressed by further research into challenges	1	1	0	0	0	2
Pick & roll	Picking one ES framework methodology and sticking with it across all ES research	0	0	1	0	0	1
Standardisation	Standardising existing frameworks and methodologies (plural)	3	2	3	1	0	9
Tailor & complement	Tailoring ES framework to local contexts and use in conjunction with other tools	1	0	0	0	1	2
F3 - What to your mind is the biggest theoretical, moral or practical shortcoming of the ecosystem services framework?							
Bias	Problems relating to perceived ideological biases in ES framework	0	1	0	0	0	1
Concept & method deficit	Problems cited relating to the theory, concept and method of ES framework	5	4	2	1	1	13
Decision-making deficit	Issues with use of ES framework in (flawed) decision-making processes	1	0	0	1	0	2
Practical implementation deficit	Lack of practical applications of ES framework	1	0	1	0	0	2
Social science deficit	Lack of inclusion of social sciences in ES research	4	1	1	0	0	6
F4 - How could that shortcoming be remedied?							
Communication	Improved communication can address challenges	3	0	0	1	0	4
Inter/ transdisciplinarity	Improving and increasing work across disciplines and audiences	5	0	1	0	0	6
More research	Additional studies needed	1	1	1	0	1	4
Public/ stakeholder engagement	Better inclusion and outreach to general public and stakeholders	1	1	0	2	0	4
Standardisation	Standardising existing frameworks and methods	2	3	1	0	0	6

Supplementary Material 3

Early findings documents circulated in the delegate pack to the all participants in the European Ecosystem Services Conference 2016.

The Antwerp Declaration



The Antwerp Declaration will outline a clear message from the conference participants about ecosystem services that is relevant to the wider world. It provides a means of communicating high-level views to a range of potential audiences including decision makers, academics and practitioners. The Declaration embodies a legacy for the conference and a statement of intent from the scientific community.

Survey

To inform the discussions on the conference we sent out an online survey in July to 350 early registrants. The questionnaire gathered views from the participants on the Values, Goals, Myths and Grumbles they encounter in their work with ecosystem services. A big Thank You goes out to the **121 participants** who contributed!

Values

The Values theme asked what participants considered the core of the ecosystem services framework.



Ecosystems services are a wide window through which we have to realise that our survival is dependent on the planet's ecology and that we have to start to work hand in hand with it.

At its heart, the ecosystem services framework is still viewed by most as a metaphor that **raises awareness** of the many ways human wellbeing depends on natural systems. Although frequently mentioned and occasionally criticised, economic valuation was on the whole not perceived to be inherently problematic. Its potential misuse on the other hand was a concern for many and resonated strongly with responses in the Myths theme as well.


It's an approach that should be used very intelligently to frame environmental management challenges through a more socially relevant and integrated lens. Valuation is just one tool in the ES basket.

However, most of our respondents come from an academic background, which begs the question from policy makers, applied researchers and practitioners:

Q — What are the practical benefits of using the ecosystem services framework on the ground? Does it indeed enable awareness raising and a more socially relevant approach to environmental management?

Goals

The ecosystem services community certainly does not lack ambition: in the Goals section the majority of re-



spondents expressed a hope that in 20 years time the ecosystem services framework will have catalysed a **paradigm shift** that turned environmental protection into a core priority. However, despite this widespread enthusiasm and high-held hopes for the concept, a broad range of challenges was raised.

The language - and therefore the concept - suffers from its technocratic, utilitarian image. It has been used in this way so long that it is impossible to broaden it to embrace real-world problems (and their less tangible but essential values) fully. This is demonstrated by the still awkward and clumsy state of the cultural services debate, and the blunt refusal of many movements - and scientists - to work with it as a central concept. The time has come to face the fact that there are frontiers, and confine this concept to its safe operating space.

We also asked what key steps are necessary for the future development of ecosystem services, and the answers were surprisingly homogenous: better communication, emphasising the holistic nature of the approach, more inclusion of socio-cultural values (and by extension social scientists), improve stakeholder engagement and strengthen the science policy nexus.

Q — Is concentrating on incorporating cultural values through transdisciplinary work and participative projects with many different stakeholders the most transformative frontier of the ecosystem services framework

Myths

We asked what myths people most frequently encountered in working with ecosystem services, and there was a very clear answer: it's all about the money. Economic valuation and commodification of nature was the most frequently raised point in this section. Interestingly enough, the reported sources of these myths and their audiences (who subscribe to the reported myths) show that it is mostly **a quarrel between scientists**. 'Other scientists' was the most cited audience to misunderstand ecosystem services, followed by conservationists, lay people, and finally policymakers & practitioners.

The remedies offered resonate with those mentioned in other themes: better communication and working more interdisciplinarily. However the direction of communication suggests an engagement gap between scientists and policymakers & practitioners, those who would arguably be one of the most important target audiences to reach. One respondent raised an interesting point in terms of the potential impact of applying the ecosystem services framework and the limits of scientific evidence:

“ *[It is a myth] that describing a range of (natural) ecosystem services could counterbalance the conflicting interests of industry (and politics).*

Many respondents, especially from the policy and practitioners side called for best practice examples and effective case studies to demonstrate how ecosystem services are used in decision-making processes on the ground and to promote best practice.

Q — How can we encourage case study research of successful applications of ecosystem services that are actually being used in the decision making process?

Grumbles

A lot of the frustrations voiced in the Grumbles section had to do with **user friendliness** in various forms. On the scientific side there were complaints around the lack of standardization in the framework as well as insufficient methods, and a lack of data. Practitioners on the other hand signaled being overwhelmed by the variety of categorisations and tools available, and the background information required for their appropriate application.

Q — Instead of further adaption and refinement of ecosystem services frameworks, efforts should be focused on ensuring the existing frameworks and tools are understood by and accessible to practitioners and policymakers.

Events during the conference

Monday - Introduction

Opening address by Ben Delbaere.

Quote of the Day

From Tuesday to Thursday a statement will be up in a central location for you to discuss, leave comments and vote on. Stickers for voting have been provided: a different colour for each day and white for comments.

Tuesday - G4 Session

11:00-12:30

There will be an opportunity to discuss themes related to the Declaration in the G4 session *"Reflections on the last decade of ecosystem services research: Rights, Wrongs and the Way Forward"*. This session is organised by Alexander van Oudenhoven, Matthias Schröter and Sander Jacobs, and will take place in room K.201.

Wednesday – AD16 Workshop

12:30-16:30 (at the latest)

The main AD16 discussion event will be an interactive workshop style session, taking place over lunch and into the afternoon on Wednesday. We will ply you with food and drink, and set your brilliant minds to work over some of the puzzles thrown up by the survey results and previous discussions. Location TBC.

NOTE: This event runs parallel to the field excursions, and has limited spaces. If you would like to attend please e-mail: aster.devrieslentsch@ed.ac.uk.

Thursday – Drop-In Session

09:00-12:30

We will run a drop-in session in the morning. Pop in to discuss the Declaration progress, share your thoughts on the Quotes or take a seat and to be our armchair critic!

Friday – Official launch

Social Media - #AD16 (Twitter)

CONTACT

If you have any questions about the Antwerp Declaration, please get in touch with Aster via e-mail: aster.devrieslentsch@ed.ac.uk.

All quotes used were taken directly from the survey as illustrative examples of points raised.

