

Report on the National Workshop in Germany

Frankfurt, 23rd May 2017

Organised by Kerstin Hülemeyer, Christoph Mathias, Simone Sterly, Karlheinz Knickel

This report presents the outcomes of the discussions at the PEGASUS WP5 national workshop in Germany.

The list of attendees is presented in the Annex.

Lessons emerging from the project so far

The main points of the discussion with stakeholders covered:

ESBO terminology:

- Attendees of the workshop hinted on the fact, that our definition of ESBOs includes the whole ecosystem service cascade as developed by Haines-Young & Potschin (2010), de Groot et al. (2010), Müller et al. (2010) – suggested as further reference to build on when introducing the concept.
- It might be worth thinking of illustrating the ESBOs we focus on in a pyramid for visualisation purposes.

Case studies and action research:

- Results were appreciated by attendees and suggested to carry out equal approaches (especially scenario and strategy development) for other initiatives
- Indirect impacts of initiatives were discussed: e.g. initiatives like the Regionalwert AG have paved the way for organic farming through their media coverage and related perception by the broader public; in addition, members of those initiatives are most likely wealthier than average and have political/public influence, and are thus able to champion land use and initiatives that (help to) provide ESBOs
- Content related input see the next two paragraphs (messages for practice and policy)

Maps:

- The availability and suitability of input data were discussed:
 - o The attendees asked themselves on what basis the PEGASUS team created the “woody vegetation” layer used for landscape structure.
 - o Input data for agriculture were perceived as suitable
 - o Parts of input data for forestry were assessed as not suitable for the German context: In German forest management clear-cuts are not carried out anymore. The data based on Hansen will thus lead to misjudgement of windfall areas or areas of calamities. Important relevant data for the Land Hesse would be, for instance, the assigned core



areas (8% of state forest area which are taken out of forestry use and can be compared to national parks in terms of intensity of use). This makes one of the drawbacks of a European wide approach visible: It will always be important to take into account national/state specificities, in order to picture the reality, otherwise the lack of information will lead to a non-realistic picture of the actual situation.

- Maps on agriculture: In general, the maps mirror the current agricultural land use and its intensity. It was stressed by attendees, however, that in their point of view no new information is offered by the PEGASUS maps – as the land use patterns reflect the different natural areas, for which their agricultural potential and actual use is already known (and e.g. published in atlases). In general, attendees questioned if there is an additional benefit of the rather laborious approach of the PEGASUS team, e.g. in comparison to using the (more up-to-date) Corine Land Cover data. In addition, current intensive livestock farming may not be related to the use of land anymore, manure of these farms may be transported to other regions. These deviations in intensity are not captured by the current approach. A last point was, that attendees did not agree with summarizing information on pigs and poultry.
- Maps on forestry: By forest law, there is the obligation to carry out a multifunctional use of forests. It is therefore obvious, that this category has the largest share. In terms of assessing the provision of ecosystem services it would be more interesting to differentiate this category. One of the largest points of criticism was, that there is an obvious mixture of two approaches, hemeroby and naturalness: On the one hand areas are classified as intensively used, that show stands of equal age; in reality, these are mostly afforestations of the 1950s/1960s, in which there is not yet any form of timber extraction. The example shows that in this case, the focus is on naturalness and not on the intensity of use. In contrast, in southern Hesse the maps classify a larger amount of stands as low intensive: These are degraded alluvial forests, which means they were close-to-nature but have been destroyed due to river regulation and draining and are therefore not intensively used – but do not have a high value in terms of naturalness. The indicator/layer “Ruggedness” is thus only of limited use to draw conclusions on intensity of use. In addition, the layer tree species was questioned: how was it used, did the PEGASUS team consider the potential natural vegetation? In general, it was criticised that in spite of the number of slides provided the approach remains black box, which hampered the discussion. The attendees would have wished for a better disclosure.
- If the PEGASUS results on provision of ecosystem services for forests are available, HessenForst (the state forestry service) would be willing to carry out a plausibility check based on their classification of forest functions.
- In general, it was suggested to avoid an equal number of classes.
- The attendees were surprised to see that obviously current mapping endeavours like e.g. MAES seem not to have been used or considered for the PEGASUS mapping approach. If the PEGASUS team was interested the German material which has been produced in this context (by the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation) can be provided.
- Summarizing, the attendees considered the mapping exercise as rather complicated for presenting the status quo, but see a potential in using it for considering scenarios or the change in societal values over time. Having said that, the attendees agreed that the reality



has been mirrored in the maps to a very limited extent only and the additional value of the maps was limited.

- The German PEGASUS team was not able to present the example of “Farm management intensity impact on provision of wildlife” because of the previous length of discussion on the maps.

Messages for policy and practice

The main points of the discussion with stakeholders covered:

- There was a general agreement that local initiatives are not sufficiently supported in their efforts; and that support needed is not primarily in the thematic area, but more in the field of organisational capacities.
- Due to the complex administrative structures – particularly in a federal state – there is often confusion or a lack of information of who to contact in the administration for particular matters.
- There was seen a large need to be able to spontaneously support initiatives in crisis

All recommendations were discussed based on the emerging findings.

Emerging finding 1 The provision of economic, social and environmental benefits often can be delivered more effectively when the approach and mechanisms involved arise as a collective effort from well-grounded and operational relationships between key actors operating in a region or along a supply chain.

Recommendation	Targeted at
<i>Strengthen the intermediary level/ institutions in their networking capacity.</i>	<i>states</i>
<i>Foster the development more structures at the local level: e.g. landscape conservation associations.</i>	<i>States</i>
<i>Foster inter-state cooperation in supporting initiatives</i>	<i>States, federal level</i>

Emerging finding 2 Collective initiatives or actions frequently generate greater engagement by land managers to deliver environmental goods and services. Social capital, trust, good communication and cooperation are critical for enabling collective action to emerge and for the success of initiatives on the ground.

<i>Develop tools and support the transfer of knowledge to the younger generation /successes.</i>	<i>States, organisations</i>
<i>Coaching programmes for initiatives, organisational development support.</i>	<i>Federal and state level</i>
<i>Foster a new definition of volunteering.</i>	<i>all</i>
<i>Provide opportunities for corporate volunteering</i>	<i>businesses</i>
<i>Make more use of new media.</i>	<i>initiatives</i>
<i>Install and maintain a “Hobby with a meaning” platform</i>	<i>State, e.g. the Hessen-Agentur</i>



Emerging finding 3 The interplay between public and private actors (individuals or commercial entities) is critical in many initiatives and there is scope for strengthening it further in a wide range of schemes

<i>Install ONE contact point for various specific topics for the support to non-governmental activities working on ESBO related themes.</i>	<i>Administration</i>
<i>Focus on synergistic benefits</i>	<i>All</i>
<i>Use different approaches in parallel</i>	<i>all</i>

Emerging finding 4 Governance and institutional aspects are critical in securing the durability and success of collective initiatives, especially where market signals are weaker. Having the right institutional settings is important not only to enable the emergence of collective action but also to maintain and cultivate a culture of trust between local stakeholders, including government and commercial actor

<i>Foster more action-oriented research to support initiatives.</i>	<i>States and federal level commissioning research funding.</i>
<i>Make budgets available for un-bureaucratic short-term activities to support initiatives.</i>	<i>states</i>

Emerging finding 5: Increasing the public's appreciation of, and transforming this into demand for environmental and social goods and services from agriculture and forestry systems would help to increase their provision.

<i>Increase the awareness for the ESBOs among the society.</i>	<i>All levels, all actors</i>
<i>Identify suitable terms for a broad communication of the beneficial outcomes</i>	<i>Researchers, policy makers</i>
<i>Support education and training institutions to include the topic in curricula and to establish working groups on the topic</i>	<i>states</i>
<i>Approach "best agers" as a new target group to get involved in initiatives.</i>	<i>agencies</i>
<i>Create placements for the federal volunteering programme and the voluntary ecological year (BuFDIs and FÖJ) programmes</i>	<i>agencies</i>

Emerging finding 6 It can be difficult to establish causal linkages between management actions on agricultural or forestry systems and the related environmental and social outcomes they deliver, particularly over a short timescale. Establishing such linkages requires robust, spatially explicit and accessible data to be available and this is currently not the case for all types of outcomes at EU level. A mixed approach, focussed both on measurable environmental results and the promotion of preferred practices, could be pursued when designing policies where causal links cannot be established or monitored.

<i>Better to talk about "using effects" than to "control effects"</i>	<i>PEGASUS team</i>
<i>Involving the public in assessing the uses, e.g. through citizen science apps.</i>	<i>Researchers</i>
<i>Pay administration and research to assess the benefits</i>	<i>state</i>

Attendees to the PEGASUS WP5 national workshop in Germany		
Name	Organisation	Type of stakeholder
Jan Freese	DVS, German Networking Agency for Rural Areas	Public (network agency)
Katharina Dietrich	BfN (Federal Agency for Nature Conservation), I.2.1 Legal and economic issues of nature conservation	Public administration (federal agency)
Claudia Sattler	ZALF (Leibniz Centre for Agricultural Landscape Research), Institute of Socio-Economics, Coordinator of ERA-net project Civil-Public-Private-Partnerships (cp ³): collaborative governance approaches for policy innovation to enhance biodiversity and ecosystem services delivery in agricultural landscapes	Research
Beate Reichhold-Appel	State agriculture service, horticulture consultancy, responsible for orchard meadows	Public administration (state service)
Dr. Manuel Weis	State forestry service of Hesse, Head of unit GIS analysis	Public administration (state service)
Thomas Zebunke	Hessian Ministry of the Environment, Climate Protection, Agriculture and Consumer Protection, Dpt. VII.9 Organic Farming, Agrobiodiversity	Public administration (ministry)
Claudia Bieling	University of Hohenheim, Director of Unit „Societal Transition and Agriculture “	Research
Simone Sterly	IfLS – Head of Department „Sustainable development, global change, multifunctionality of rural areas“	PEGASUS team
Kerstin Hülemeyer	IfLS – Researcher	PEGASUS team
Christoph Mathias	IfLS – Researcher	PEGASUS team
Karlheinz Knickel	IfLS – Research associate	PEGASUS team

