



TITRE DU WORKSHOP: 15- Ecosystem services

CHAIRPERSON: Cécile Barnaud cecile.barnaud@inra.fr

Date: April 2017 6th

Number of participants: 19

Format of the workshop: share of experiences and perception, world café

INTRODUCTION

The objective of the workshop is to rethink the concept of ecosystem services for BRs.

- 1/ To share experience, ideas on ecosystem services.
- 2/ Discuss the potential and the limits of the concept for biosphere reserves.

The concept emerged in the 1960's (see power point). 1990's: the concept was born. 2000's: media coverage and large success of the concept, classification. 2010's: the concept comes concretely into politics, focusing on the economic values of nature. Pavan Sukhdev: "we use nature because it's valuable; we lose nature because it's free". National assessments of ecosystems: the contribution of nature to the national economy. The success of the concept is increasing in political and scientific arenas. As a consequence, the concept is more and more granted. But there are still controversies and debates. Bruno Latour: "we have the readymade science (stable knowledge, consensus...) and science in the making (controversies, debates...)."

With Martine Antona, we tried to map the controversies and identified 5 levels of uncertainties:

- 1/ Processes. Complex relationships between effects and causes of the services.
- 2/ Should we use the concept? Pros say that it reconnects society with ecosystems, as our society depends on ecosystems. Cons say that Nature exists independently, it doesn't reconnect, it is much more complex than only utilitarian. Who use it don't always agree on the definition: the potential functions or the concrete benefits? And on who is providing: ecosystems or people?
- 3/ Economic valuation. Pros say nature is free so economic valuation is necessary. Cons say it's not ethically acceptable to put a price on nature. Some think that other values could be taken into account.
- 4/ Complexity of the social context. When you start to manage ecosystem services, you have providers and beneficiaries. There are trade-offs, winners and losers.
- 5/ Political tools: the main one is payment for ecosystem services. Forest owners, farmers get paid for the ecosystem services they provide. Pros say it's a win-win solution. Cons say that it's a marketing issue, not acceptable ethically.

In BRs, there are studies going on: inventories, mapping, to help decision makers, managers to arbitrate, to justify the need of ecosystem services. It is used also like a metaphor to make people aware of the dependences to ecosystems. We also use the ecosystem services to highlight the complexity of the socio-ecological dependences and social dependences between people to foster a concerted collective management of ecosystems.

In France, we have a research project called Secoco in Cévennes (Fr) and Montseny (Sp) BRs, to highlight the interdependence between providers, beneficiaries, ecosystems through the concept of ecosystem services. We try to map these social interdependences to understand the link between people so that they are more inclined for collective action.

In France, another research project has been carried out in 3 BRs, with the objective to understand if the concept is more useful or interesting for BRs than the ones that we have already and how. We tried to understand from the stakeholder's point of view. We worked through questionnaires and

inquiries, with people using landscape (agriculture, forest, wetlands...) to understand their perception of the utility of ecosystems for them. As a result, we saw that people are describing the services in the services the way they live their territory, and it has nothing to see with the classical international categories. It appears that people mix and link the different ecosystem services and if we try to classify the ecosystem they are talking about, we lose these links which are the interesting outputs of the concept. We are trying to study the effect of the use of the concept on people and territory, but it's too early to see it.

Question: can we talk about the services which nature supply to nature?

Some think that it is included in support services. This is part of the black box of the concept of ecosystem services that we have to open. This is described by CICES as "intermediate services".

Comment: There are many classifications and services are interdependent two, they cannot be split. This approach is complementary to the others, not instead of. There are many definitions and approaches and methodologies. It's all about the same object, but at the same time, many approaches could lead to something very general.

Comment: It is important to know why we want to use the concept. The different ways of using it correspond to different aims. If the stakeholder vision doesn't fit in the theoretical classification, it doesn't mean that one of these uses of the concept is wrong. The two uses and objectives have nothing to see. Who want to use the concept has to wonder with what aim.

Comment: According to whether you are talking to students in ecology or politicians, about ecosystem services, you don't say the same; it is not the same context.

World café

- 1/ Ecosystem services: what do you keep, what do you leave. Potential and limits of the concept for BRs?
- 2/ If anything was possible, what would be a useful project?
- 3/ Need to do/need to have to make it real

CONCLUSION

Is the concept will stay 10 years and disappear? Probably, another name will be invented for the same issue.