

# Identification of relevant stakeholders and network creation in EU member states

**Leena Kopperoinen**

**Head of Land Use and Urbanisation Unit, Senior Researcher  
Biodiversity Centre, Finnish Environment Institute SYKE**



EU Horizon 2020 Coordination and support action



- **Develop and facilitate stakeholder process**
- **Create a functional European collaboration network**
- **Take stock of EU member states’ needs and challenges in ES mapping and assessment**
- **Provide continuous support to responsible authorities in EU member states**
- **Ensure continuation of support beyond the project**

- ★ **Task 2.1: Identifying stakeholders and initial analysis of ES mapping and assessment**, as well as related research and **policy activities** in member states
- ★ **Task 2.2: In-depth evaluation of stakeholder needs: creating case study and member state profiles**, compiling development needs, **clustering of member states**
- ★ **Task 2.3: Developing a new co-operation network** in mapping and assessment implementation
- ★ **Task 2.4: Identifying solutions** for overcoming problems in ES mapping and assessment and **creating support mechanisms**

- **Every partner institute of ES MERALDA was expected to**
  - **Be the contact point for identifying the stakeholders (= the key national authorities and other relevant people for MAES work) in one's own country**
  - **Get in contact with them**
  - **Integrate / Encourage them into the ES mapping and assessment work**

- **Supporting stakeholder groups were established in each EU member state**
  - **A regularly updated contact list**
    - **The General Data Protection Regulation rules as of 25 May 2018 do not allow use of the contact list anymore without further consent from the people**
  - **Stakeholders were integrated into the ESMERALDA work through online surveys and workshops**
- **Next: to the creation of active national networks of MAES activities**

- ★ **Stakeholder survey method ready for implementation (MS 7, 2015)**
- ★ **EU member state profiles (MS 8, 2015)**
- ★ **Fact sheets per member state / case study (MS 9, 2015)**
- ★ **Engagement plan for collaboration, networking and synergies (MS 10, 2015)**
- ★ **Establishment of supporting stakeholder groups in each member state (MS 13, 2015)**
- ★ **Business Plan to sustain Network beyond ESMERALDA (D 2.5, 2018)**

# EU member states' challenges and solutions for MAES implementation

Leena Kopperoinen



EU Horizon 2020 Coordination and support action



- ✓ **Survey 1** to evaluate ES mapping and assessment activities and related research and policy activities in EU member states
  - ✓ Identification of
    - ✓ specific hurdles to carry out ES mapping
    - ✓ options to develop the activity
    - ✓ key implementers needing support
- ✓ **Stakeholder workshop in Riga** to analyse the gaps in ES mapping and assessment activities and identifying solutions to overcome them
- ✓ Stakeholder engagement in other ES MERALDA workshops through **dedicated break-out sessions** and **panel discussions**
- ✓ **Survey 2** to make the final stocktaking of EU MS needs after a couple of years of project support activities



- ★ **Draft stocktaking of EU member state needs (MS 11, 2015)**
- ★ **Analysing the gaps in ES mapping and assessment activities and identifying solutions to overcome them with stakeholders from EU countries – The first project workshop in Riga, Latvia (MS 12, 2015)**
- ★ **Clustering of all 28 EU member states according to their prerequisites and needs to perform ES mapping and assessment (D 2.1, 2015)**
- ★ **Overview of gaps and recommendations to overcome them (D 2.2, 2016)**
- ★ **Final stocktaking of EU member state needs (D 2.3, 2018)**
- ★ **On-line database and support mechanisms for EU member state authorities established and operating (D 2.4, 2018)**

- ★ Final stocktaking of EU member state needs for the final year of ESMERALDA and beyond the project (D2.3) – material derived from:
  - ★ **On-line survey** was open until 16 October 2017, one final response was received via email in November
    - ★ Sent to ESMERALDA's support groups in each EU member state (and some associated countries)
    - ★ 314 recipients, 19 respondents by the first deadline – finally 38 respondents by mid-November
  - ★ **Break-out group discussions** in the ESMERALDA WS in Plovdiv, October/2017
  - ★ **Facilitated stakeholder panel discussion** in Plovdiv
- ★ The previously identified recommendations and solutions (D2.2) were revisited based on the results
  - ★ Whether stakeholders were **aware** of the support measures and activities of ESMERALDA
  - ★ What they saw as **the most important** measures provided
  - ★ Solutions **still missing** and needing development

- ★ Perceived benefits of **inviting an ESMERALDA expert to promote MAES**

- 1. **Approaching policy-makers, authorities and government in order to**

- ★ Convince them of linkages of ES and other themes such as Natural Capital, climate change
    - ★ Facilitate dialogue about the challenges and obstacles of MAES for policy uptake
    - ★ Show the value of using the most appropriate methods for national assessment
    - ★ Increase the policy relevance of MAES
    - ★ Get more local authorities and people involved in mapping

## 2. Improving awareness of MAES

- ★ To especially those who perform MAES at the national level
- ★ To different stakeholders apart from MAES experts
- ★ To raise the prestige of national MAES projects and revitalize already started projects

## 3. For learning and sharing knowledge

- ★ From front-runner countries to countries at earlier stages
- ★ On how to conduct ES mapping in conditions where resources are lacking
- ★ In order to have more precise methodologies and knowing which data and methods to choose

## 4. Bringing legitimacy from the outside

- ★ Outside experts promoting a European agenda might seem more convincing to national authorities

- ★ Support for **communication** especially with policy sectors and knowledge sharing among everyone
  
- ★ **Activating the support groups**
  - ★ Create pressure to make things happen
  - ★ Raise attention at higher levels of government
  - ★ Strengthen capacity for carrying out MAES activities on both local and national levels
  - ★ Create linkages between different entities and experts on both national and international levels
  - ★ Strengthen the communication of MAES to authorities
  - ★ Getting support for other projects related to MAES
  
- ★ **Clear real life examples and case studies** including success stories

- ★ **ESMERALDA acting as an intermediary between stakeholders and other institutions, especially internationally**

- ★ Acting as an **intermediary between the EC and member states**  
(yes 53%, no 47%)
  - ★ **Why yes:**
    - ★ Making the need for more detailed (remote sensing) data known to EU policy levels
    - ★ For initiating urgent activities in MS
    - ★ Improving bilateral conversation and knowledge sharing with MS and the EC
    - ★ Harmonizing the different systems of mapping across EU MS
    - ★ Facilitating and improve the organisation of meetings between MS and the EC
  - ★ **Why no:**
    - ★ Direct communication is better because additional actors might lead to misunderstandings
    - ★ MAES working groups already have good communication with the EC

- ★ **Clarification of ES concept** to policy makers would be useful
- ★ **Clear communication plans** should be put in place similar to Natura 2000 process
- ★ Creating **meaningful linkages** to other projects and networks
- ★ **KNOWLEDGE SHARING APPRECIATED AS THE GREATEST BENEFIT OF ESMEALDA:** when and how to use different methods for data collection and mapping



- ★ As solutions for communication for **which ESMERALDA currently does not provide support** the following were mentioned:
  - ★ EU wide media campaigns
  - ★ Announcing and advertising promptly the publications of ESMERALDA guideline materials
  - ★ Policy briefs and relaying the latest news and updates regarding ecosystem services for easy access of policy-makers
  - ★ Materials in more understandable language, not MAES jargon
  - ★ Showing where ecosystem service assessments have influenced existing policies

- ★ As to the other *solutions that already are available* but **need to be better used and communicated** the following responses came up in the open question:
  - ★ Showing the charts of progress of other countries (creates pressure for countries who are behind)
  - ★ Clear guidance materials for MAES implementation
  - ★ Case studies and practical uses and examples

- ★ 97% of respondents saw “**Mapping ecosystem services**” open access handbook as relevant or helpful for capacity building

- ★ **Training material and open online courses** preferred most
  - ★ Material and courses on mapping and assessment methods on national and local levels
  - ★ Online courses for GIS and data processing (with examples)
  - ★ Ecosystem services related tools and their use
  - ★ Materials with detailed method descriptions, decision keys and without inconsistencies
  - ★ Regional ESP conferences
  - ★ GIS data available at the EU level
  - ★ Open access models that can be run at the national scale
  - ★ **Development of an on-line support system / Using existing systems for the more permanent on-line support**

- ★ Curriculum development not seen relevant by the majority (65% of respondents answered no)
- ★ **Identified challenge:** ES mapping started in countries before actual monitoring or guidelines were set up, thus making the development of the processes happen simultaneously to the actual activities

- ★ 88% respondents said that making **information, data and maps available via open-source platforms** would be helpful and relevant:
  - ★ Model codes, maps at regional and European scales
  - ★ **One harmonized platform or database with all the necessary information and a network of people doing mapping**
  - ★ Ready-to-use time series datasets of large numbers of variables
  - ★ Spatially referenced socio-economical information
  - ★ Data for ES indicators
  - ★ High resolution remote sensing data and geoinformation

- ★ **Users of existing platforms:** EU BISE 53%, ESP-VT 18% and OPPLA 44% of the respondents
  - ★ Maintaining **OPPLA and the Q&A section** was found useful for supporting teams in charge of mapping
- ★ **Guidelines and guidance**
  - ★ Scaling (e.g. downscaling)
  - ★ Selection of ES, indicators and methodology
  - ★ ES in different areas (urban, forests, protected habitats) and their capacity
  - ★ Cross walk tables to EUNIS categorization and ES
  - ★ QGIS plugin with guided access to all different sources of maps
  - ★ Stakeholder engagement guidelines
  - ★ Practical workshop

- ★ **Communicate better already existing solutions and recommendations!** Keep thinking solutions for new problems
  - ★ In regard to all guidance materials, communicate also **when** to expect them to come out, **what** they contain, **why** they are important and **in what** they can help!
- ★ Make clear **to whom** certain tools and guidelines are for, **how** they can be used, **for what** purpose and **where** to get information
- ★ Create a **list of existing support options and support people in each country** → Create **dissemination material** about this
- ★ Learn from **success stories in cities**
  
- ★ **Keep up enthusiasm by bringing people together also post-project – have fun!**





**Thank you for listening!**