Deliverable No: 2.2

WS1 evaluation of methodology, protocols and case studies, with stakeholder recommendations

Contents

Summary

The BESAFE project organized its first stakeholder meeting at INBO in Brussels on 23 and 24 May 2013. Committed stakeholder involvement is central to BESAFE's success, and the intention of this first workshop was to get initial feedback as well as to involve stakeholders in a brainstorm about the requirements for the practical use of, and access to, our future results.
Initial results and the chosen framework and case study setup were presented at the start of the workshop. Stakeholders were then asked about their own experiences with argumentation and their views on the possible formats and uses for BESAFE results.

The major recommendations were to concentrate our effort on people arguing for biodiversity to make sure to use the right 'tailored' approach and language for different user groups, and to advise the right *combination* of arguments for different situations. Stakeholders also emphasized not to forget that people relate to biodiversity in emotional as well as rational ways, and that the process of developing coalitions and collaborations needs time to run its course. The recommended tailored approach should especially take effect in the BESAFE web tool, in the development of which nearly all stakeholders are interested in taking part.

1. Introduction and reading guide

BESAFE investigates the effectiveness of different types of arguments in convincing policy and decision makers to take action for biodiversity protection. Apart from our scientific goal of disentangling the relationship between the effectiveness of different types of arguments and the context in which they are used, we are also committed to producing results which are practically usable and accessible through a web-based tool. This is a goal we can clearly only achieve through input and feedback from stakeholders. BESAFE is therefore set up as an interactive project in which we incorporate stakeholders at an early stage and, together with them, learn by doing.

About 16 months into the project, the initial literature review, methodology development and case study selection processes were completed. The first (of three) stakeholder workshops was therefore organised on 23rd and 24th May 2013 at the Research Institute for Nature and Forest (INBO) in Brussels. The workshop was attended by 12 stakeholders from DG Environment, RSPB (Royal Society for the Protection of Birds), ETC Biodiversity (European Topic Center Biodiversity), ECAF (European Conservation Agriculture Federation), BfN (Bundesamt für Naturschutz - German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation), Manchester University, UNEP, TripleEEE consultancy, the County Administrative Board of Örebro (Sweden) and the province of Zuid-Holland (the Netherlands).

Apart from this introduction, this deliverable consists of a short introduction to the aim of the workshop and the invitation policy (chapter 2), the actual report of the workshop (chapter 3) and an overview of how the project partners will take up the stakeholder recommendations (chapter 4) Please note that chapter 3 presents an overview of the workshop proceedings and therefore reports stakeholder opinions, questions and recommendations within the context of the discussions at the workshop. Nothing in this section must therefore be interpreted as BESAFE research results or as opinions of BESAFE partners, unless explicitly stated otherwise.

It should also be stressed that these 'centralised' workshops form only a part of the overall stakeholder integration work in BESAFE, and in particular that each of the 14 case studies involve their own stakeholder interaction processes.

2. Aim and invitation policy

The intention of this first workshop was to get initial feedback and to involve stakeholders in a brainstorm about the requirements for the practical use of and access to our future results.

In the first part of the project, BESAFE reviewed the use of arguments for biodiversity protection in written publications, devised a conceptual framework (BESAFE deliverable D1.1, *Report on the classification of arguments and the provisional framework*) and selected comparative studies and deep case studies (BESAFE deliverable D2.1, *Report on the selection of case studies*). In this first stakeholder workshop we wanted to present these to our stakeholders to get their feedback and suggestions for improvements, to ask stakeholders about their own experiences with arguing for biodiversity, to investigate their interests and needs, and to ensure their cooperation for further development of BESAFE outputs and tools. Accordingly, the stakeholders we invited for the workshop were the people actively involved in arguing for biodiversity themselves: biodiversity policy makers from all governance levels and NGO representatives.

A long-list of suitable stakeholders was compiled from the from the list of 'associates' compiled at the proposal stage of the project, supplemented by further people obtained through an inventory from BESAFE partners of their key of policy contacts and case study stakeholders. Around a hundred stakeholders from this list were then invited, both by general invitation mails and personal invitations.

3. Workshop report

3.1   Stakeholder expectations at the beginning of the workshop

After introductions, we asked the stakeholders what expectations they had of the workshop, based on the information they received prior to it. The points mentioned (most important ones according to the stakeholders in bold):

- **To know more about the project.** The stakeholders were very conscious of the difficulty of arguing effectively for conservation in current policy contexts. They therefore support the aims of BESAFE and welcome the opportunity to discuss these issues and provide input to the project's development.
- **To learn what the strongest arguments are.** The stakeholders underlined that real, tangible advice is needed, both on *which* arguments to use, and *how* to get the message across most effectively. Stakeholder were conscious of the importance of multiple types of context in determining the answers to both these questions. For example, some stakeholders indicated that they would like to learn about different arguments relevant for rural versus urban environments.
- To learn about perspectives from different disciplines, sectors, and countries.
- To learn where, when and how the ecosystem services framework and arguments can contribute to justifying and/or helping conservation policy, decisions and actions.

These points initiated a discussion with the following main conclusions:
Just presenting the evidence that biodiversity is important does not seem to work, so we need to learn how to communicate the message better. Therefore we should not just address policy makers, but also NGO's and biodiversity people in general because they need to be convinced that they need to change their approach when it comes to "selling biodiversity". A number of stakeholders indicated that it sometimes is more effective to target the general public first. This requires a different type of argumentation, since the public tends to react more to moral/emotional arguments. They indicated that the reason for this approach is the decision-makers normally react if they see that the public reacts. However they also remarked that later on, if the policy-makers are already in the process of decision making for conservation, they want technical arguments.

3.2 The project structure and content

The general structure and content of BESAFE were presented in seven presentations. An overview of the comments and the discussions in between and afterwards is given below:

a) After Bruce Howard's presentation on the results of the review of types of arguments used in literature, the question was asked what the target groups of the project are.

It was remarked that different groups will need different types of arguments (continuation from the first discussion). However, policy makers will accept arguments that have backup from the public, because in a democracy public opinion is important, and an important role for policy and other actors is in communicating with, informing and influencing the views of the public. We were therefore advised to also look into what influences public opinion.

b) Another question was about our review search criteria and search period: why were we only searching for the term 'biodiversity' and not 'nature (conservation)', and why did we consider only recent literature (after 1992)?

The main reason is that 'nature' gives an unmanageable number of hits, and can have very different connotations in different languages; biodiversity is much more specific. It is however a relatively recent term, generally used from about 1992, though in any case effective use of resources precluded going back to earlier literature: the project is concerned with effectiveness of arguments in modern decision contexts, not the history of argumentation. 'Biodiversity' may be a difficult term, but by now everyone has a general understanding of what it means, and a general perception that it is 'a good thing'.

However, the stakeholders felt that it was a pity that the early literature on nature conservation (and therefore also biodiversity protection, when the term still needed to be coined) is not included in our review at the moment. They recommend including some crucial work such as The Silent Spring (Carson 1962), the arguments behind CBD, the Habitats Directive (HD) and Birds Directive (BD), the Bruntland report (WCED 1987). Suggestions included searching for other literature analysing the development of arguments in these processes and documents, and interviewing some of the people behind them. Karin Zaunberger provided a list of people we could ask about this. However, as noted above, the history of argumentation is not a

key focus of BESAFE and we have to consider how our limited resources can best be spent.

c) An important question some stakeholders had is why biodiversity loss has so little impact on (other) policies, in comparison with e.g. climate change. Why are published scientific facts often ignored?

A possible reason the stakeholders came up with themselves is: because biodiversity protection is (or is perceived as being) in conflict with the vested interests of the policy makers in question, or the community they are representing (e.g. agricultural industry)[1]. There was general agreement that telling people what they are doing is wrong, or telling them how they should behave, is not generally an effective way to convince them, as it may push them into denial. People often already know that biodiversity, and 'green' decisions more generally, have benefits: stakeholders suggested that using this positive energy to create shared dreams about nature / biodiversity can be much more productive than conflict.

3.3 An example of argumentation for protection: the Bialowieza forest

To let the stakeholders experience the complexity of and pitfalls in the analysis of written argumentation, we presented them with an exercise, using a text on the protection of Bialowieza forest (see annex), one of the deep case studies. This exercise was carried out in three separate groups, which also gave us the opportunity to check whether relatively unprepared persons would come up with more or less the same results or not.

The three groups interpreted the instructions in different ways and did come up with very different points and remarks about their understanding of the situation, showing that texts can be interpreted very differently by different groups of people. Two of the groups did not so much concentrate on the text, but also on the arguments that could have / should have been used in addition to the text provided. However, after discussion, the reasons and values each group thought were implicitly or explicitly addressed in the argumentation turned out to be fairly the

---

[1] BESAFE comment: Institutional structures and responsibilities also play a role, with the problems of 'silo thinking' and the need to 'mainstream' biodiversity widely recognised, including in the Aichi target Strategic Goal A, "Address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society." But different ways of arguing and communicating biodiversity could be more effective in overcoming vested interests and in contributing to mainstreaming than others: this is where BESAFE and other research in this area has an important role to play.

same and overall rather complete. The general conclusion was that it is very difficult to leave out subjective interpretation of the text/arguments, but that, to be able to compare results, the interpretation needs to be as objective as possible. A general remark was that the framing of arguments (i.e. how they are formulated and presented) is very important. In this example of the text on Bialowieza the framing was sometimes negative (economic gain from logging spoils unique biodiversity as well as goodwill), where it easily could have been positive (unique biodiversity brings economic gain and goodwill through i.e. tourism), and thus might have worked better.

3.4 Inventory of stakeholder experiences with argumentation

For the next session we asked the stakeholders to discuss their own experiences with arguing for biodiversity protection. Again three separate groups were formed and a lot of valuable information came forward from these group discussions. Their contributions are summarised below under a number of common headings:

Sensitivity to audience

Stakeholders highlighted that the effectiveness of different arguments depends heavily on who you are talking to. It makes a huge difference if you talk to a landowner or to the ministry. In a case with a variety of stakeholders, a mix of arguments is therefore expected to be most effective (though care can be required to avoid loss of trust, if seen as giving contradictory messages to different groups). A combination of arguments also makes it possible to show more benefits. But to use the right arguments requires good preparation and analysis, and awareness of contextual factors and audiences.

Ecosystem Services (ES) and economic value

A lot of the examples the stakeholders came up with concerned the use of the economic value of ES. These can be powerful arguments, especially when the economic validity of alternatives / sustainable solutions can be shown. Cost – benefit analysis is therefore a powerful instrument, if correctly used in a sustainable and social benefits context.

What's in it for me?

Stakeholders suggested that demonstrating the value or added value for the people directly involved can be highly effective. People are often not aware of alternatives

that are biodiversity friendly, and even think these alternatives are expensive. Vested interests may encourage these conceptions. The particular case of demonstrating biodiversity conservation benefits for farmers was stressed. Demonstration of alternatives (e.g. farms ran profitably in an alternative way) and show their economic effect in (sustainable and social) cost – benefit analysis can be very persuasive.

Health

Stakeholders stressed that the relationships between biodiversity conservation and human health improvements are powerful arguments, with individuals and in political discourse.

Positive framing

Biodiversity arguments often end with the conclusion that something should be stopped, or should not be done, and/or by blaming some individual or group for a particular negative outcome. Stakeholders felt that, in many cases, the argumentation could also be phrased in a positive way, highlighting the opportunities. For instance, avoiding the argument 'this is wrong' and instead focusing on 'this alternative is better, more profitable, more sustainable.'.

Counterarguments

Participants highlighted that many arguments against (parts of) biodiversity or particular species are related to assumed costs or fear. It is often easy to show they are wrong, or to counter them by positive arguments.

Personal and emotional aspects

Stakeholders stressed that while argumentation is often perceived as a matter of formulating logical and rational arguments, real people and processes are not always rational or logical. People often do not act only on rational, 'common sense' arguments but also, and sometimes primarily, on emotions. People often identify with a species (or nature's) fate, value 'fairness' and feel responsibility for conservation.

The groups felt that shared, bottom up arguments can be very strong and powerful. It therefore helps to make people feel directly involved in arguments and processes. This can for instance be achieved by pointing out they can help to prevent bee starvation by providing habitat in their gardens, or to show them that their gardens

can help to decrease fragmentation. Other examples are the 'adoption' of species by villages ('this is your mouse'), school gardens or forest schools, or promoting identification by e.g. 'name the wolf'. Another rationale which was given for convincing the general public with emotional arguments first is that policy makers often act on public opinion.

Personal and inter-personal aspects are also very important, like the relationship and (dis)trust between parties/interests. *Who* makes an argument can be as important as its logical content. Historical and contextual factors play important roles in shaping the arguments that are used and how they are received.

Another personal factor noted was the frequent dependence of successful argumentation and conservation action on the personal commitment and efforts of specific individuals. It makes all the difference to have someone who is energetically committed to a particular case.

Increase people's nature experience
Stakeholders argued that many people are not familiar with nature in the way that previous generations were, and therefore have trouble to identify with it. This can be directly addressed by outreach programmes, helping to create a societal context in which people are more responsive to conservation arguments.

Branding
Biodiversity can be often "branded" under other concepts, for example concept of conservation in agriculture in several countries, "agri-environment" in UK or "soil health" in the Netherlands.

3.5 The project's data collection framework and the web tool
Rob Tinch presented the data collection framework we will use to collect data in our twelve 'deep' case studies.

The only concrete remark about the framework for the case study data collection was that we should not only include 'specific species', but also 'specific habitats' and 'specific ecosystems'.

The remarks and recommendations for the web tool that were made after the presentation came forward from a plenary discussion as well as from the last brainstorm session in groups. The remarks and recommendations are summarized under several separate headings below.

Who should we aim at?

It was suggested that the tool needs a focus, thus we should choose a target audience - in first instance policy makers/policy implementers (often the same people). If there is time and resources then we could develop it further with other target groups in mind.

What should the tool offer?

- Stakeholder would like to see what information there is on the various arguments so that they can build the arguments for their own situations/contexts.
- The tool also needs to help the user to prioritize. Which arguments are the most important ones for the situation?
- The tool could just present which arguments have been successful in different contexts, but it would be much more useful if it could offer guidance on choosing the most effective arguments for the different situations of the users and their intended audiences.   For example, the website could seek to offer analysis of 'typical' argument strategies in situations comparable to that of the user in question, and assessment of which arguments are then likely to be the most effective. This would require the user to describe the problem in a standard format, which could then be matched with a comparable context in our data: the practicalities of this approach need to be explored as part of our research.
- The tool could also provide links to websites of comparable cases / examples to get more of the information behind the arguments used there.
- This option led to a discussion about the role of the stakeholders in co-production of the tool.   BESAFE could provide the more formal analysis of the effectiveness of arguments depending on context, backed up with a set of argumentation examples based on the experiences of individual stakeholders in particular situations. Again the technical and resource aspects of this need to be considered.
- The tool is not a lobby instrument and will not do the task of convincing, so it is a means to an end and not an end in itself. It should only be used to give

information on different options: it should not seek to provide 'black box' solution or to replace the need for reflection and analysis on the part of the users.

What about the format?

- The website should allow users to find arguments for their specific situation. So start with: who are you, who do you want to convince. Details of the contexts and aspirations of the target audiences (receiver(s) of the arguments) and the sender(s) of the arguments (generally the tool users are central, and users should be advised to inform themselves very well regarding that.

- Given that arguments are messy and cut across categories the tool needs to be flexible and allow for this. This will lead to complexity and many possible permutations, that must be managed in order to make the tool practicable.

- The tool may also need to be simpler for some uses / users, so a 'nested' approach may be appropriate.

- We could look for examples of sites / tools that do the same thing for other fields and learn from them (this is already work in progress).

- In order to capture more information on arguments that have been used we could link to a Wiki. Perhaps we then need to create separate parts of the tool, one more formal part which has been critically analysed within the BESAFE project, and another one which carries a "health warning" but allows users to upload their own argumentation examples.

- Linking: stakeholders suggested that we look for sites which already have a lot of information and link directly to parts of these. Use for instance specific information fromwww.biodiversity.nl, www.biodiversity.fr to link BESAFE arguments to, and use their forum/existence to fill gaps in information and examples.

General remarks

The stakeholders made several general remarks and suggestions regarding the development and use of the web tool. These are listed below. It should be noted that there may be trade-offs between some of the desired features: for example making it useful, avoiding over-complexity and tailoring to the needs of specific users may have some areas of conflict. BESAFE will work with the stakeholders and resources available to seek the best solutions.

- Selling the web tool is very important, otherwise nobody will use it. When one or two individuals from one institution are positively supportive, there will be a snowball effect and more persons will start using it. So an 'advertising' process among policy makers, DG-Env etc. should be included which implies iteratively seeking feedback in the developing stage. People can then see the progress they want and recognize the usefulness.

- The tool must take the overwhelming amount of information we all already get nowadays into account: so be precise, concise and to the point.

- User friendly: it is very important that the web-tool is built in such way that the information is delivered quickly. Otherwise people lose interest.

- Language, communication style and tools need to fit the user and situation: they need to be adapted to governance scale and target group. Arguments must be based on the drivers of the target group. Language and communication style need to fit to this.

- Keep it accurate. Quality control is important, and this is especially the case if there is a wiki or message board element where stakeholders can contribute with their own examples.

- BESAFE should use expertise on marketing and communication. But the tool should not become a lobbying instrument. Rather, it should help direct users to what they want to know, linking to experts or projects that have already done particular things and learning from them.

- One idea was to use an online questionnaire to get the opinion of more stakeholder groups.

- We need to be aware that if we want the web tool to be functional after the project ends, we need to start looking for interested parties (suggested: biodiversity platforms) to take it over. Otherwise the web tool may be static once the project is finished and due to the time dependency of arguments it may then be outdated soon.

At the end of the workshop, we asked the stakeholders if they would be interested in joining a panel that will help us to develop the web tool. All stakeholders but one agreed.

3.6   References

Carson, Rachel 1962. *Silent Spring.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

WCED 1987. Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future. United Nations.

4. Recommendations and actions

In this section we summarise the results of the workshop into a number of recommendations. All the recommendations are within the line of the normal project work and therefore do not require any change of our formal plans. They are however very useful in helping us to find the right approaches and emphasis. In this section we therefore indicate how we will take the recommendations up in the further course of the project.

1. Make sure to use the right ('tailored') approach and language

One of the points consistently emphasized by the stakeholders is that there are different 'target groups' to convince which need different tactics and arguments to reach them. Finding the arguments with the best 'fit' for a specific group and situation was defined as the foundation of effective biodiversity argumentation. Moreover, each different group also needs to be approached using the right vocabulary. A linked issue is that a positive framing of arguments may often be more effective than a negative one. Our stakeholders believe that Ecosystem Services therefore are very useful, making good use of the benefits of nature to promote protection. A very practical recommendation is to use flagship cases like the Costs Rican biodiversity strategy as appealing and high-profile examples.

Action
Taking context factors that influence the effectiveness of argumentation into account is already part of the backbone of BESAFE. We will however pay extra attention to this point, and to the use of specific vocabulary in the case studies. We will make the addressing of different user groups one of the main points in the design of the web tool by taking them up in the specification. We will also make flagship cases an integral part of it.

2. Advise users to use a combination of arguments

Another clear suggestion is that individual arguments in isolation do not mean much. This is both because different stakeholders react differently to different arguments, and because any individual may need a number of arguments, or repetitions of arguments, in order to be convinced of anything that goes against their initial preconceptions Argumentation will often therefore be most effective when it is relevant for many actors, used timeously, repeatedly, along with other arguments, and in fitting with the contextualsituation. From the previous recommendation it

then follows that different arguments and / or different framings will be required. According to some of the stakeholders this is probably the reason that economic and ecosystem services arguments are so important: they are on the same level, address the same values and are convincing for a wide range of stakeholders. However, argumentation should also be concise and to the point and therefore BESAFE could also offer help with determining which arguments should get priority.

Action

We will give the combination of arguments special attention in our analysis of effectiveness of argumentation in the case studies. The points of tailoring the combination of arguments for the combination of stakeholders involved and prioritization of arguments will be taken up in the web tool specification.

3. Do not forget that biodiversity is also emotion

Argumentation can be thought of as a rational, logical process, and it could be thought that this is the most effective way to convince policy makers. However, workshop participants stressed that biodiversity is also about emotion. People often identify with species, habitat, landscapes and other aspects of biodiversity, and arguments that successfully make an appeal to the emotions can be powerful. Even stakeholders with a clear economic interest like farmers are to a certain extent sensitive to this type of argument, especially with back up from 'what is in it for me' arguments.

Action

'Appeal to emotion' is already one of the key 'framings' reflected in the BESAFE argument framework. Several of the argument types also resonate strongly with emotional framings (for example benefits associated with moral obligations to protect) though in essence most of the arguments can be used in an emotional framework. Emotional arguments need not necessarily seek to replace or challenge more rational, technical arguments but can be complementary to them. Even for example arguments related to biodiversity supporting basic service provision can be presented emotionally or rationally (e.g. the same biodiversity-benefit link can be portrayed via a photograph of a hungry child eating or via statistics on food derived from forest land: often, the two are used together). BESAFE needs to ensure in its data collection and analysis methods, database and webtool that these different framings are fully represented.

4. Concentrate on stakeholders arguing for biodiversity as the main target group

The stakeholders recognized that policy makers in fields other than biodiversity protection are a major target group for research (establishing the type of arguments they are sensitive to), but that all people or groups arguing for biodiversity are the main users of our results. They emphasized that in involving these users, we also need to target NGOs and biodiversity actors outside the more narrowly defined biodiversity policy community, because they too need to see that they could argue in different ways.   Another benefit here is that, while policy makers (or their supervisors) regularly move on to new fields, key actors at the biodiversity decision-implementing level tend to remain in the field for much longer, and indeed become key sources of information for policy makers. Reaching out to these people therefore helps directly, and indirectly through the influence they exert on policy makers.

Action
The prominent role of people arguing for biodiversity as our primary communication and dissemination target is already quite clearly expressed in the project's Description of Work, but we will give the involvement of 'users' outside the biodiversity policy community extra attention.

5. Realize that the process takes time, that things need to run their course

Coalitions and collaborations are important, and these things take time to form. Things therefore need the time to run their course. For example some stakeholders in the UK who were first against Natura 2000 (examples given included salmon fishermen and whisky producers) turned around later when they realized the benefits conservation had for them.

Action
The realization that we are dealing with a process is central to the whole design of the BESAFE case studies and database ,which construct timelines of arguments within the cases, and seek to evaluate long-term effectiveness, including in such characteristics as the persistence, wider uptake and 'scale crossing' properties of arguments, as well as the dynamics of stakeholder participation and interaction. We will emphasize the importance of continuity and the development and change of

coalitions, collaborations and argumentations within the cases study research and analysis.

6. The web tool must offer a tailored approach for different user groups

The BESAFE web tool is considered to be important. It should avoid lobbying, instead seeking to provide information on different arguments and their effectiveness, rather than seeking to be a biodiversity marketing tool. Success will depend on applicability, user friendliness and on how well it is known and supported. It therefore needs to be precise, concise and to the point and requires a 'marketing-trajectory'. The tool should at first focus on policy makers / implementers, and especially on those among them who last longer than just an election cycle. The tool should nevertheless offer a tailored approach for the different governance scales and user groups within that initial target group.

Contact the national biodiversity platforms and other biodiversity panels and ask them to become stakeholders. Also ask them to suggest other interested parties (to let the tool live on after the project).

Action
Biodiversity platforms will be approached and all the points mentioned will be taken on board while drafting the specifications for the web tool.

7. Find out what the original motivation for CBD, HD and BD etc. was

Several stakeholders at the workshop expressed the view that we should investigate the original motivation and arguments for the development of biodiversity protection strategies like the CBD and the habitat and bird directives, while all major contributors are still around.

Action
Taking this on board is a good idea, but is a major task and will require at least a shift in resources. For the moment, we need to limit ourselves to exploring the options.

5. Annex 1: List of participants

Surname	First name	Institution
Zaunberger	Karin	European Commission ENV
Böttcher	Marita	BfN
Basch	Gottlieb	ECAF
Costello	Brendan	RSPB
Evans	Doug	Biodiversity Topic Centre, Paris
Wiersema	Menko	Province of Zuid-Holland, NL
Schoumacher	Cindy	UNEP
Tonneijck	Fred	Triple-E, NL
Heistek	Jolanda	Triple-E, NL
Göthlin	Erik	Örebro County Administration
Sandström	Ulf	County Administrative Board Örebro
Watt	Allan	CEH
O'Neill	John	BIOMOT
Partners		
Blicharska	Gosia	SLU
Tinch	Rob	EFTEC
Berry	Pam	ECI
Carmen	Ester	CEH
Bugter	Rob	Alterra
van Dijk	Jiska	NINA
Primmer	Eeva	SYKE
Van Herzele	Ann	INBO
Turkelboom	Francis	INBO
Grudova	Margarita	Pensoft Publishers Ltd
Mortelmans	Dieter	INBO
Tack	Jurgen	INBO

6. Annex 2: Programme

From 12.00: arrival and registration, lunch

13.00 Welcome and opening (Rob Bugter, Jurgen Tack)

13.15 Introductions and expectations

13.45 - 15.00 A closer look at arguments for biodiversity protection

> *13.45 Introduction: Rob Bugter (BESAFE coordinator)*
>
> *14.00 Different types of arguments in literature. (Bruce Howard, recorded presentation)*
>
> *14.20 How does the context influence the arguments and their effectiveness (Rob Tinch)*
>
> *14.40 How do arguments generate effects? (Eeva Primmer)*

15.00 Tea break

15.30 A real world example

> *A closer look at argumentation for the protection of Bialowieza forest. In small groups, with a short plenary comparison of results at the end.*

16.10 How do arguments differ at different governance levels? (Ann van Herzele).

16.35 Ecosystem services as arguments (Pam Berry).

17.00 – 17.30 Round table discussion.

> *First impressions, questions. How and where could BESAFE results be the most useful?*

19.30 Dinner at 'Bij den Boer'

Friday 24 May

9.00 Overview of the BESAFE case studies (Malgorzata (Gosia) Blicharska)

9.30 Brainstorm session in small groups.

> *What experiences with biodiversity protection argumentation do you have? Are these translatable into requirements for information on the effectiveness of arguments? Are there commonly shared requirements that can be combined into useful recommendations for BESAFE?*

10.00 Reporting back and short plenary discussion

10.30 – 11.00 Coffee break

11.00 – 11.30 A web tool to access information on the effectiveness of arguments: first ideas (Rob Tinch).

11.30 – 12.15 Brainstorm session in small groups on the tool with 5 minute plenary at the end

D2.2 WS1 evaluation of methodology, protocols and case studies, with stakeholder recommendations 20

12.15 Final plenary and round table discussion on the main subjects of the day:
- *Requirements for information on the effectiveness of arguments: which recommendations can be made to BESAFE?*
- *What is the best way to unlock this information for stakeholders?*
- *Establishing a stakeholder panel for the web tool.*

12.30 Closure and lunch

D2.2 WS1 evaluation of methodology, protocols and case studies, with stakeholder recommendations