

Scotland's Rural College

Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats; a SWOT analysis of the ecosystem services framework

Bull, JW; Jobstvogt, N; Bohnke-Henrichs, A; Mascarenhas, A; Sitas, N; Baulcomb, C; Lambini, CK; Rawlins, M; Baral, H; Zahringer, J; Carter-Silk, E; Balzan, MV; Kenter, JO; Hayha, T; Petz, K; Koss, R

Published in:
Ecosystem Services

DOI:
[10.1016/j.ecoser.2015.11.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2015.11.012)

Print publication: 01/01/2016

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Bull, JW., Jobstvogt, N., Bohnke-Henrichs, A., Mascarenhas, A., Sitas, N., Baulcomb, C., Lambini, CK., Rawlins, M., Baral, H., Zahringer, J., Carter-Silk, E., Balzan, MV., Kenter, JO., Hayha, T., Petz, K., & Koss, R. (2016). Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats; a SWOT analysis of the ecosystem services framework. *Ecosystem Services*, 17, 99 - 111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2015.11.012>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats: a SWOT analysis of the ecosystem services framework

Highlights

- We completed a SWOT analysis of the ecosystem services (ES) framework
- The ES approach is a useful interdisciplinary communication tool
- Implementation is hampered by incomplete science and inconsistent application
- The ES approach could benefit from more alignment with existing policies and tools
- Threats include insufficient funding and a loss of political will
- We discuss strategies in light of the SWOT for furthering the approach

1
2
3
4 1 **Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats: a SWOT analysis**
5
6 2 **of the ecosystem services framework**
7
8 3

9
10 4 Bull, J.W. ^{a*}, Jobstvogt, N. ^b, Böhnke-Henrichs, A. ^c, Mascarenhas, A. ^d, Sitas, N. ^e, Baulcomb, C. ^f,
11 5 Lambini, C.K. ^g, Rawlins, M. ^h, Baral, H. ⁱ, Zähringer, J. ^j, Carter-Silk, E. ^k, Balzan, M.V. ^l, Kenter, J.O. ^m,
12 6 Häyhä, T. ⁿ, Petz, K. ^o, Koss, R. ^p
13
14 7

15
16 8 ^a *Department of Food and Resource Economics & Center for Macroecology, Evolution and Climate,*
17 9 *University of Copenhagen, Rolighedsvej 23, 1958 Copenhagen, Denmark (jwb@ifro.ku.dk)*

18
19 10 ^b *Independent researcher, Berlin, Germany*

20
21 11 ^c *Environmental Systems Analysis Group, Wageningen University, the Netherlands*

22 12 ^d *Center for Environmental and Sustainability Research, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal & Lab of*
23 13 *Landscape Ecology, Geography Institute, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany*

24 14 ^e *Natural Resources and the Environment, Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, Stellenbosch,*
25 15 *South Africa*

26
27 16 ^f *Land Economy, Environment & Society Research Group, Scotland's Rural College, Edinburgh, Scotland*

28
29 17 ^g *Bayreuth Center for Ecology and Environmental Research and Bayreuth Graduate School of*
30 18 *Mathematical and Natural Sciences, University of Bayreuth, Germany*

31
32 19 ^h *University of the West Indies, Port-of-Spain, Trinidad and Tobago*

33
34 20 ⁱ *School of Land and Environment, University of Melbourne, Australia*

35
36 21 ^j *Centre for Development and Environment (CDE), University of Bern, Switzerland*

37 22 ^k *Plymouth Marine Laboratory, Plymouth, U.K.*

38
39 23 ^l *Malta College of Arts, Science and Technology, Paola, Malta*

40 24 ^m *Laurence Mee Centre for Society and the Sea, The Scottish Association for Marine Science (SAMS),*
41 25 *Scotland*

42
43 26 ⁿ *Stockholm Resilience Centre, Sweden*

44
45 27 ^o *PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, The Hague, Netherlands*

46 28 ^p *Dalton Koss HQ, Melbourne, Australia*
47
48 29

49 30 *(* corresponding author)*
50
51 31

52 32 Article type: *Original Research Article*

53
54 33
55 34 Keywords: *Environmental policy; expert survey; Young Ecosystem Services Specialists*

56
57 35
58 36 Word count: *Abstract = 200; manuscript = 7,227. Number of figures = 6, number of tables = 5.*
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

37 **Abstract**

38 The ecosystem services concept (ES) is becoming a cornerstone of contemporary sustainability thought.
39 Challenges with this concept and its applications are well documented, but have not yet been
40 systematically assessed alongside strengths and external factors that influence uptake. Such an
41 assessment could form the basis for improving ES thinking, further embedding it into environmental
42 decisions and management.

43
44 The Young Ecosystem Services Specialists (YESS) completed a Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-
45 Threats (SWOT) analysis of ES through YESS member surveys. Strengths include the approach being
46 interdisciplinary, and a useful communication tool. Weaknesses include an incomplete scientific basis,
47 frameworks being inconsistently applied, and accounting for nature’s intrinsic value. Opportunities include
48 alignment with existing policies and established methodologies, and increasing environmental awareness.
49 Threats include resistance to change, and difficulty with interdisciplinary collaboration. Consideration of
50 SWOT themes suggested five strategic areas for developing and implementing ES.


51
52 The ES concept could improve decision-making related to natural resource use, and interpretation of the
53 complexities of human-nature interactions. It is contradictory – valued as a simple means of
54 communicating the importance of conservation, whilst also considered an oversimplification characterised
55 by ambiguous language. Nonetheless, given sufficient funding and political will, the ES framework could
56 facilitate interdisciplinary research, ensuring decision-making that supports sustainable development.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1. Introduction

The term 'ecosystem services' (ES) was first introduced in the 1980s as an advocacy tool for biodiversity conservation, and has since been subjected to a variety of definitions and classifications (Ehrlich & Ehrlich, 1981; Ehrlich & Mooney, 1983; Chan et al., 2007; Peterson et al., 2010). Since the 1990s, the continued evolution of ecosystem service definitions and classifications has been well documented (e.g. Costanza et al., 1997; Daily, 1997; MEA, 2005; Boyd & Banzhaf, 2007; Wallace, 2007; Chapman, 2008; Costanza, 2008; Fisher et al., 2009; TEEB, 2010; Böhnke-Henrichs et al., 2013). Whilst there is no one universal ecosystem services definition or framework, a recent and widely cited definition considers ES to be "the direct and indirect contributions of ecosystems to human well-being" (Braat & de Groot, 2012; TEEB, 2012; Fig. 1). Whilst critical voices have considered this a reflection of a utilitarian and anthropocentric view of nature, others emphasise that the concept of ES implies a worldview that humanity must be treated as part of nature rather than separate from it, and that we fundamentally rely upon functioning ecosystems – a view that has become increasingly recognised in recent decades (Mace, 2014). For the purposes of this paper, we define an ES framework to be "a framework by which ecosystem services are integrated into public and private decision making" (Ranganathan et al., 2008). Such an approach can include valuation of the goods and services provided by nature to society, thus enabling them to be incorporated into decisions regarding the governance of natural resources (Daily et al., 2000; Yousefpour et al., 2012). An ES framework is not restricted to economic valuation, and also allows the integration of multiple value domains (ecological, social, cultural and economic values), thus acknowledging the complexity of social-ecological systems in decision making (Martín-López et al., 2014) and the plurality of human values (Kenter et al., 2015).

79 **Figure 1:** Schematic representation of the conceptual thinking behind the ecosystem services framework
 80 (modified from: Braat & de Groot, 2012).



81

82 Although the academic literature continues to debate the definition of ES, decision makers have
 83 increasingly implemented ES as part of environmental and natural resource policies and management
 84 frameworks. However, the viability of the ES framework has been challenged both conceptually and
 85 practically (McCauley, 2006; Redford & Adams, 2009; Norgaard, 2010; Peterson et al., 2010; Barbier,
 86 2012; Beaudoin & Pendleton, 2012; Ressurreição et al., 2012; Sitas et al., 2013). A recent review by
 87 Schröter et al. (2014) highlights that the conceptual basis for ES may conflict with: biodiversity
 88 conservation; a fear of 'selling out' on nature; the commodification of nature; the vagueness of the
 89 concept; and, the power dynamics involved in ES research and management (see also Bowles, 2008;
 90 Naidoo et al., 2008; Bullock et al., 2011; Sommerville et al., 2011; Büscher, 2012; Luck et al., 2013).
 91 Knowledge gaps, specific to the connectivity between sustainability and human well-being, have also
 92 been highlighted as a challenge for the successful implementation of the ES concept (Nicholson et al.,
 93 2009; Chan et al., 2012), as have problems with existing tools, datasets and frameworks (Naidoo et al.,
 94 2008; Keeler et al., 2012).

95

96 In light of these concerns and challenges, significant research investment continues to seek the 'best'
 97 implementation pathways for the ES concept (Kremen & Ostfeld, 2005; Carpenter et al., 2009; Petz et al.,
 98 2012). As part of a collective endeavour to better understand how to operationalize the ES concept, an
 99 increasingly wide variety of implementation frameworks (Cowling et al., 2008; Nahlik et al., 2012; Petz &
 100 van Oudenhoven, 2012), payment structures (Gibbons et al., 2011; Sommerville et al., 2011; Bryan,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

101 2013), ES tools (Nelson & Daily, 2010), and datasets (Schulp et al., 2012; Baral et al., 2013) have been
102 developed and trialled globally.

103
104 Paralleling the proliferation of these disparate approaches, and despite concerns from some regarding
105 the extent to which the ES concept can realistically deliver upon its objectives (e.g. Norgaard, 2010), the
106 concept has begun to inform an increasingly wide range of national and international legislation and
107 agreements (Perrings et al., 2010). Examples include the ecosystem-based management on which the
108 European Marine Strategy Framework Directive is built (Long, 2011; Jobstvogt et al., 2014), the 14 Aichi
109 Targets developed by the Convention on Biological Diversity (Strategic Goal D; CBD, 2010) and
110 incorporation of ES in the CBD Ecosystem Approach, as well as the relatively new Intergovernmental
111 Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES; Larigauderie et al., 2010).

112
113 Given the landscape of conceptual and intellectual debates, practical concerns, and increasing legislative
114 consideration, it is important to continually and critically appraise the ES concept – searching for gaps,
115 suggesting how any gaps might be filled, and considering to what extent the approach remains fit for
116 purpose in a wider context. Here, we look critically at the ES concept through a Strengths-Weaknesses-
117 Opportunities-Threats (SWOT) type analysis. Existing reviews have explored challenges to the successful
118 implementation of the ES concept (Wallace, 2007; de Groot et al., 2010). Our SWOT assessment
119 presents these challenges in a broader context – by providing an integrated, structured analysis of
120 perceived strengths and weaknesses within the ES concept and its applications, as well as of the external
121 opportunities and threats that may benefit or impede further development. Additionally, we use such
122 analyses to begin developing strategies that might overcome existing or future challenges to the ES
123 concept.

124
125 For the purposes of this paper, the authors surveyed an interdisciplinary group of ES researchers and
126 practitioners – the Young Ecosystem Services Specialists (Böhnke-Henrichs et al., 2014) – eliciting their
127 perceptions on the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats of applying the ES concept for
128 natural resource policy, planning, governance and management. YESS members are diverse, working
129 across a wide range of ecosystems and disciplines, applying a variety of different methods and
130 approaches to study and implement the ES concept (Böhnke-Henrichs et al., 2014). The rationale for
131 relying upon early career ES researchers was to capture the perspectives of those who have a
132 substantial, up-to-date understanding of the topic, but joined the field of ES research and implementation
133 after its inception rather than being amongst those who first established it. Such researchers and
134 practitioners are likely to critically think about established concepts, have cutting-edge experience of
135 research on and implementation of the ES framework, and be actively engaged in innovation.

136

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

2. Material and Methods

A mixed methods research strategy (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2011) was employed, in the form of online surveys and face-to-face discussion groups, so as to elicit the perceptions from YESS members on the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats of the ES framework. Applying a mixed methods approach allowed researchers to better capture the richness and complexities of the phenomena under study than by using a singularly qualitative or quantitative approach.

2.1 Survey respondents

Young Ecosystem Services Specialists (YESS) is an international network of early career doctoral and postdoctoral researchers, lecturers, and practitioners working on a variety of ES topics at a range of research, environmental and nature conservation organisations. At the time of the SWOT analysis, there were 67 active members of YESS. As members represent a range of expertise in the ES field, they were considered sufficiently well informed to complete a SWOT analysis of the ES framework. Respondents' backgrounds span the natural sciences and environmental and ecological economics, but other social sciences were under-represented and there was no participation from arts or humanities scholars. As such, the sample is not representative of the whole early career ES research community.

2.2 SWOT analysis and development of strategies

SWOT analyses derive their name from the assessment of the Strengths (S), Weaknesses (W), Opportunities (O), and Threats (T) faced by an industry, sector, company or any organisation (Gao & Peng, 2011). The idea of a SWOT analysis has its roots in strategic management research conducted in the 1960s and 1970s (Arslan & Er, 2008; Sevkli et al., 2012), and arises from the perspective that the performance of a given (typically economic) agent with respect to a particular objective depends upon the way in which the management of that agent interacts with both the *internal* characteristics of the agent, and the broader *external* context in which the agent must act (but over which the agent has no direct control in the short term) (Houben et al., 1999).

When applied to ES and its associated research fields, Strengths can be considered to be those features of the ES concept that underpin the ability of the concept and the field to achieve the implicit goals of:

- a) increasing awareness of the extent to which human societies interact with and are dependent upon the environment;
- b) better integrating the natural and social sciences and engaging and acknowledging stakeholder knowledge;
- c) greater understanding of the impacts of environmental change and environmental policy on human wellbeing; and,
- d) contributing towards achievement of sustainable relationships between human society and ecosystems.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

174 By way of contrast, Weaknesses are attributes that can undermine the achievement of the goals (a-d)
175 unless they are specifically addressed and improved. Here, Strengths and Weaknesses can be
176 considered features of the ES concept itself, or 'internal' features. Conversely, Opportunities include the
177 economic, technical, social, political, legal, and environmental features representing the context within
178 which the ES concept is implemented, and that may facilitate or encourage the achievement of these
179 goals. We thus consider Opportunities to be 'external' features. Threats are, similarly, external features
180 that may prevent the accomplishment of the above goals (a-d).


182 The value of a SWOT analysis stems not only from its ability to highlight ways in which an agent's internal
183 and external environments interact to affect its success (Houben et al., 1999), but also from its ability to
184 be used in the development and implementation of long-term strategies to achieve particular objectives
185 (Houben et al., 1999; Yuksel & Dagdeviren 2007; Arslan & Er, 2008; Gao & Peng, 2011; Mainali et al.,
186 2011; Sevkli et al., 2012). There are various classes of strategies that can follow from a SWOT analysis:
187 e.g. those that link Strengths and Opportunities ('SO Strategies'), those that link Weaknesses and
188 Opportunities ('WO Strategies'), those that jointly focus on the Strengths and Threats ('ST strategies'),
189 and those that arise from the joint assessment of Weaknesses and Threats ('WT Strategies'). For
190 example, SO strategies utilise the fact that Strengths may help to capitalise upon external Opportunities,
191 whereas WO strategies focus upon the pursuit of external Opportunities to lessen the severity of
192 Weaknesses. Similarly, ST strategies focus on the potential for existing internal Strengths to mitigate the
193 impact of external Threats, while WT strategies consist of actions intended to reduce both internal
194 Weaknesses and external Threats simultaneously (Sevkli et al., 2012).

196 2.3 *Analytical procedure*


197 In conducting a SWOT analysis of the ES framework, an iterative approach was used. The first step of
198 the process involved an online pilot survey (Survey 1) of 20 YESS network members, who were simply
199 asked to share their perceptions about the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT)
200 of applying the ES framework in their work, as an open question. The pilot study was followed by two
201 main surveys (i.e. Survey 2 and 3), where the framing of survey questions was refined based on pilot
202 survey findings. The surveys took place in 2013: the pilot survey from January to March, Survey 2 from
203 August to September, and Survey 3 from November to December.

205 A central research coordinator compiled the responses from the pilot survey, and attempted to identify
206 themes for each SWOT characteristic, including the frequency with which the theme emerged.

208 **Figure 2: The development and delivery of the ES SWOT research process**



211 **Figure 3: The analytical process performed upon responses to Surveys 1 & 2, to develop SWOT themes**



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

214 The results of the pilot survey generated varied responses and fragmented agreement for each SWOT
215 category – thus, the outcomes were sent back to YESS members, who were asked to refine their
216 responses based on the following, more structured questions (Survey 2), and considering the goals (a-d)
217 outlined in section 2.2:

- 218 a) What are the Strengths of the ES framework to achieve a more sustainable relationship between
219 human society and nature?
- 220 b) What are the Weaknesses of the ES framework to achieve a more sustainable relationship
221 between human society and nature?
- 222 c) What Opportunities exist within the larger world that might support application of the ES
223 framework to help achieve a more sustainable relationship between human society and nature?
- 224 d) What are the Threats within the larger world that might undermine the application of the ES
225 framework to help achieve a more sustainable relationship between human society and nature?

226 A thematic analysis was carried out on the results of Survey 2 by two independent YESS researchers
227 (Fig. 3). 'Themes' were considered to arise if similar suggestions were made by more than one
228 respondent (e.g. 'the ES framework is interdisciplinary', as a Strength). The researchers identified
229 between 10-13 themes per SWOT category with the requirement that both researchers had to reach
230 consensus on the existence and wording of each theme. The results of that stage were presented,
231 discussed and refined at the Ecosystem Services Partnership (ESP) conference in Bali in 2013¹, during a
232 facilitated YESS workshop. Themes in all four SWOT categories were presented and explored in open
233 discussion. Note that themes were not removed or added at this stage, as the goal was not to change the
234 outcomes of the original survey; rather, their meaning was clarified as far as possible for a wider
235 audience.

236
237 Following this refinement, a third online survey (Survey 3, Appendix) was developed and a link sent to all
238 YESS members. Survey 3 required respondents to share their level of agreement on a 9-point scale from
239 -4 ("strongly disagree") to +4 ("strongly agree") for each theme identified in the previous stage by the
240 research coordinators, and refined at the Bali conference. 'Level of agreement' was then measured
241 between 0% and 100%, corresponding to the percentage of respondents that agreed with the theme (i.e.
242 rating on the agreement scale between +1 to +4) or disagreed with the theme (i.e. rating between -4 to -
243 1).

244
245 Respondents then ranked the themes' respective perceived importance by selecting the three most
246 important themes within each of the four SWOT categories. We used a weighted sum procedure for this

¹ http://previous.espconference.org/previous_editions/81764/5/0/60

part of the analysis (i.e. scores per respondent: 3 = most important; 2 = second most important; 1= third most important) and presented the group result as the 'total importance score'. The maximum total importance score would have been 60, if all respondents chose the same theme as most important.

3. Results

3.1 Final survey respondent demographics

Following Surveys 1 (pilot) and 2, 20 YESS members participated in the final SWOT Survey 3 (~30% response rate). The average participant was 33 years old (min. 26 years, max. 45 years) with men and women equally represented. The sample covered researchers from 16 different countries. Participating YESS members were predominantly PhD students or postdoctoral researchers with an average of three years of ecosystem services research experience (min. one year and max. 9 years). The majority of participants stated that they had a background in environmental/conservation sciences (75%) or environmental/ecological economics (40%) (Table 1).

Table 1: Stated group affiliations of YESS survey participants (Survey 3)

Research/practice field	Frequency*
Environmental/conservation sciences	15
Environmental/ecological economics	8
Agriculture/forestry	5
Ecology/ecosystem sciences	5
Geography	4
Biological sciences	4
Environmental policy/governance studies	4
Sustainability studies	4
Others	5

* Multiple selections and open responses were possible. The number of participants was 20

3.2 Breakdown of outcomes by SWOT category

3.2.1 Strengths

Amongst the key themes identified across all four SWOT categories (Fig. 4), the interdisciplinary approach was highlighted as the most important Strength of the ES framework (in this case a total importance score of 28 as a weighted sum). This was followed closely by the chance to improve accounting for nature (score=24) and taking a holistic approach (score=16). Raising societal awareness of ES benefits (score=9), the ability of the ES framework to reconnect people to nature (score=7) and the


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

270 conceptual simplicity of the ES framework (*score=5*) were noted as key strengths, but were ranked lower
271 in importance in comparison to the founding purpose of the ES concept (i.e. as a communication and
272 advocacy tool; *score=13*). These findings indicate that survey respondents believe that fundamental
273 Strengths of the ES framework lie in its interdisciplinary potential and in its ability to support improved
274 decision-making. The respondent's agreement with the themes presented to them as Strengths ranged
275 from 80%-100% (**Table**).

276

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure 4: SWOT themes ranked according to their total importance score. The score is expressed as weighted sums (scores per respondent: 3 = most important; 2 = second most important; 1 = third most important; 60 = maximum group score). Symbols (○ □ ▸ +*) and shading indicate the 5 different strategy topics that emerged from the SWOT themes. For details see section 3.3



282
283
284

285 **Table 2:** Strengths of the ES framework identified. 'Importance score' and 'agreement with theme'
 286 measured during survey 3, as specified in the Material and Methods section.

Survey themes	Total importance score	Agreement with theme (%)
Interdisciplinary approach: The diversity of disciplines involved in ES research strengthens the framework. The ES framework is methodologically flexible; it invites methods stemming from different disciplines to be applied and new methods to be developed.	28	95
Improved accounting for nature: Ecosystem services valuation might improve environmental decision making by accounting for the freely available and often intangible services provided by nature.	24	100
Holistic approach: The ES framework takes a holistic perspective that brings social, ecological and economic values together and highlights trade-offs between and within the three dimensions.	16	100
Advocacy and communication tool: The ES framework provides a tool to advocate and communicate nature conservation, by adding social and economic reasoning to ethical arguments.	13	100
Increased societal engagement: The simplicity and anthropocentric perspective of ecosystem services facilitates its uptake by a wide range of actors and sectors e.g. policy makers, media, businesses and the general public. This might lead to larger engagement of these groups in nature conservation processes.	9	85
Equity in natural resource allocation: The ES framework could lead to more equity in natural resource allocation through improved accounting for ES and more equitable distribution of natural resources amongst stakeholders.	9	80
Reconnecting people to nature: The link between the biophysical and human dimensions of ecosystems is made explicit by the ES concept. The ES framework makes nature conservation about what matters to people.	7	80
Conceptual simplicity: The ES framework outlines the multifaceted way in which society benefits from ES and addresses the cause-effect relationship between environmental impacts and human well-being in an easy understandable manner.	5	90
Knowledge base: The ES framework enables us to categorize and organise our knowledge about the interconnectedness of humans and nature. This is an important pre-requisite to improving our understanding of the complexity of these connections.	5	95
Works on different scales: The ES framework enables the use of different geographical and temporal scales to account for ES. It can account for ES that are provided to distant areas or future generations and allows cross-comparison of local and global impacts.	3	90

287

288

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

289 3.2.2 Weaknesses

290 Survey respondents agreed that the two main Weaknesses in the ES framework are an incomplete
291 scientific basis (*score*=20) and inconsistencies in the application of a divergent range of available ES
292 frameworks (*score*=16) (Table 3). Questionable measures of the intrinsic value of nature (*score*=14), the
293 ambiguous language of the ES framework (*score*=13), and an overemphasis on monetary values
294 (*score*=11), were also considered key weaknesses by survey respondents. The need for better tools
295 (*score*=3) and the scale-dependence of outcomes (*score*=4) were the lowest ranked weaknesses of the
296 ES framework. Overall, survey respondents highlighted the need for: greater methodological and
297 terminological consistency; an overarching ES framework in the short term; further research; better
298 understanding of ES supply; better understanding of the relationship of ES supply to maintaining or
299 enhancing biodiversity in the long-term; and enhancing the influence of non-monetary methods to assess
300 ES.

301
302 The respondents' agreement across themes ranged from 65% to 80%, i.e. lower than for the strengths
303 (Table 3).
304

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

305 **Table 3:** Weaknesses of the ES framework identified. 'Importance score' and 'agreement with theme'
306 measured during survey 3, as specified in the Material and Methods section.

Survey themes	Total importance score	Agreement with theme (%)
Scientific basis incomplete: Our current understanding of the links between, biodiversity, ecosystem functioning and ecosystem services provision is poor.	20	70
Framework inconsistently applied: There are a range of ES frameworks in circulation, which do not entirely overlap. This might increase difficulties around data sharing and comparability of research results.	16	80
Disregarding intrinsic value of nature: The anthropocentric view of the ES framework and its application in decision making might cause an imbalance between biodiversity conservation targets and social and economic objectives, with dominance of the latter two.	14	70
Ambiguous language: The terminology used in the ES framework is open to interpretation.	13	70
Overemphasis on monetary values: An overemphasis of the monetary values of ecosystem services within ecosystem assessments might be contrary to the original objective of making ecosystems count.	11	80
Some ecosystem services poorly represented: The cultural, regulating and supporting services tend to be less well represented in ES research and assessments than provisioning services.	9	65
Large resources needed to apply framework: Implementing the ES framework in practice requires considerable resources (e.g. data, finance, expertise).	8	75
Inaccessible to non-specialists: Those who do not work in the ecosystem services field, or are not scientists, might find the ES framework terminology and methodology hard to understand.	6	65
Benefits poorly understood: It is non-trivial to aggregate, analyse and present the benefits received from ES. Many people might not necessarily acknowledge benefits of the ES identified by researchers.	6	75
Oversimplification: The ES framework is sometimes used in a way that oversimplifies ES to the extent that they are poorly represented and assessed. This might lead to misguided environmental decision making.	5	70
Difficult to apply: The ES framework is difficult to implement in practice. It is currently considered to be methodologically challenging to combine the large number of ES in one assessment.	5	75
Scale-dependence of outcomes: The ES framework is applied in different ways across different scales (local, regional, national etc.), with a range of possible outcomes at each scale.	4	70
Need for better tools: The ES assessment tools currently available to practitioners and researchers are inadequate and need to be improved.	3	75

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

308 3.2.3 Opportunities

309 A list of 11 themes within the Opportunities category reflects the positive outlook of survey respondents
310 for future potential development in the ES framework. Alignment with policies and strategies (*score=24*)
311 and existing tools and methods (*score=18*) were ranked as the top two opportunity themes. These were
312 followed closely by increasing environmental awareness (*score=17*), and opportunity for better realising
313 sustainability (*n=16*) (**Table**). Other themes within this quadrant have the potential to complement the top
314 opportunities: for example, more funding (*score=7*) could align with policies and strategies, technological
315 advancements (*score=4*) can advance existing tools and methods, and demand for ecosystem
316 management (*score=14*) can align with increasing environmental awareness.

317

318 **Table 4: Opportunities identified for the ES framework. 'Importance score' and 'agreement with theme'**
 319 **measured during survey 3, as specified in the Material and Methods section.**

Survey themes	Total importance score	Agreement with theme (%)
Alignment with policies & strategies: Existing environmental policies and strategies already in place or currently under development are well suited to fit the ecosystem services concept, such as the CBD Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and the EU Biodiversity Strategy among others.	24	75
Alignment with existing tools & methods: ES framework can be easily integrated into existing tools and methods of environmental policy, such as environmental impact assessment and cost-benefit analysis.	18	95
Increasing environmental awareness: The ES framework fits into the growing global awareness of environmental issues, including climate change and its potential long-term impacts.	17	85
Operationalization of sustainability: There is a need to operationalize the term of 'sustainability' and reduce its vagueness. The ES framework with ecosystem services indicators and assessments could provide the framework to make sustainability more assessable and traceable.	16	95
Demand for ecosystem management: The demand to improve ecosystem based management, as well as the necessity to increase its acceptance might support the use of the ES framework.	14	85
Interest of societal actors: ES framework has received recognition and support from a wide range of actors within society, including public media, researchers, the business sector and stakeholders involved or affected by environmental management.	9	80
Policy awareness: Governments are aware of the ES framework as a result of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity initiative. Current demand for national assessments of natural resources is high.	8	75
More funding: Funding bodies are interested to support research with societal impact and interdisciplinary projects. There is also the opportunity to get more funding by highlighting the benefits that nature provides to humans.	7	85
Technological advancements: Fast increasing computing power allows us to use more complex system models to analyse data. Technological advancements also allow new ways of interacting with audiences through online media, video, games, and presentations.	4	85
Institutionalisation of nature's value: Establishment of legal requirements to protect the environment and the ES it provides. Incorporating the regulation of ES into laws and constitutions. Example set by Ecuador.	2	85
People's utility: People tend to value their self-regarding benefits higher than other-regarding values (including non-humans). The ES framework might benefit from this kind of thinking.	1	60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

321 3.2.4 Threats

322 Resistance to change in environmental practices (*score=32*), difficulty of interdisciplinary work (*score=19*)
323 and insufficient funding (*score=14*) were the top three Threats as selected by survey respondents.
324 Interdisciplinarity of the ES framework (*score=19*) was highlighted as a potential Threat due to different
325 technical terminology and applications. The lack of institutional capability (*score=13*) and loss of political
326 interest (*score=13*) were equally perceived as Threats for the ES framework.

327
328 An overall assessment of SWOT themes across all categories revealed that at least half of survey
329 respondents were in agreement for most SWOT themes (Fig. 5). Only the Threat theme ‘diversion from
330 sustainability goals’ received less than 50% agreement from survey respondents. There was greater
331 agreement across survey respondents within the Strengths quadrant (92%) as compared to Opportunities
332 (82%), Weaknesses (72%) and Threats (69%) quadrants (Fig. 5). Broad agreement with themes was
333 expected since they were derived from survey respondents’ contributions in Survey 2.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65


334 **Table 5: Threats identified for the ES framework. ‘Importance score’ and ‘agreement with theme’**
 335 *measured during survey 3, as specified in the Material and Methods section.*

Survey themes	Total importance score	Agreement with theme (%)
Resistance to change environmental practices: Even if understanding of human impacts and nature conservation benefits is considerably improved, changing environmental practices might not follow automatically.	32	85
Difficulty of interdisciplinary work: ES framework requires inter-disciplinary collaborations, which are hard to truly achieve in practice.	19	75
Insufficient funding: Funding for research might suffer severe cuts.	14	75
Loss of political interest: In the mid- to long-term future, policymakers might lose interest in promoting or implementing ES framework, if expectations for practical solutions of environmental management cannot be met by the ES framework.	13	80
Lack of institutional capability: Insufficient institutional capacity and expertise to implement treaties, agreements, conventions etc.	13	55
Competing approaches: Different approaches to biodiversity conservation and sustainable resource management divert interest away from ES research and assessments.	8	55
Loss of interest from researchers: Due to pressure of working at the cutting-edge of science and publishing novel approaches, scientists might lose interest in researching ES framework and move on to new approaches.	7	60
Misuse of environmental tools: Environmental tools can be incompletely or incorrectly applied, and therefore become ineffective or worsen the situation.	6	70
Lack of awareness across general public: Overall low understanding of ecosystems among general public including stakeholders and policy makers. These groups might be disengaged, if their interests are not sufficiently taken into account by the ES framework, or if low ecological understanding prevents buy-in to the ES framework.	5	85
Environmental ethics viewpoint: Approaches such as the ES framework, which put human values before nature’s intrinsic value, might face opposition by some factions within the nature conservation field and the general public.	2	80
Diversion from sustainability goals: Society at large may lose interest in nature conservation and sustainability goals, thus removing the demand for the ES framework.	0	35

336
337

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure 5: Overall agreement with the themes developed for each SWOT category. Agree = rating between +1 and +4; neutral = rating 0; disagree = rating between -1 and -4.




3.3 Strategy development based upon the SWOT

Following on from the SWOT, the authors grouped themes into 5 different strategic areas (Fig. 4):

- 1. ES concept characteristics ○
- 2. Application of the ES concept □
- 3. Effects of ES concept application ◐
- 4. Demands of ES concept application +
- 5. User interface of the ES concept *

Certain SWOT themes belong under more than one strategy. When counting the items per topic, it became clear that these are distributed irregularly in the different quadrants of the SWOT diagram (Fig 6). While, for instance, Strategy 1 themes are concentrated within quadrants S, W and T, Strategy 5 themes have been identified only in quadrants O and T – perhaps unsurprisingly, given that the ‘user interface’ strategy might only be expected to be represented in the ‘external’ quadrants.

Figure 6: Conceptual representation of strategy development and distribution of SWOT themes for each strategy topic. Far left: reminder of the four quadrants constituting the SWOT assessment. Dashed lines highlight the quadrants considered for each strategy 1 – 5. The number of SWOT themes identified within each quadrant is given for each strategy.



This distribution of themes across the SWOT quadrants was used as a starting point for identifying topic related strategies. These were considered useful under the assumption that a single overarching strategy may not be suited to capture the complexity of the problem and may also not be sufficiently tailored for those working in their respective context within the ES framework. Further, depending upon their expertise, survey respondents may have been interested in certain topics only – thus, topic-specific strategies would likely be more easily adopted.

3.3.1 Strategy 1 – ES framework characteristics

In Strategy 1 we consider a **strength-weakness (SW)** combination, and how to use identified Strengths to overcome Weaknesses. By contrasting the four highest scoring strengths with the five highest scoring weaknesses (Fig. 6), this strategy would focus upon the characteristics that form the ES framework via:

- extending the interdisciplinarity of ES research, with an emphasis on further strengthening links with the social sciences and increasing involvement from the arts and humanities;
- creating holistic frameworks that contain clear and concise language so the approach can be consistently applied as communication and advocacy tools; and,
- increasing the representation and analysis of ES beyond utilitarian values to highlight broader shared and social values, and the intrinsic value of nature, including by highlighting synergies between intrinsic value and supporting and regulating services, and shared values and cultural services.

It is important to highlight that both the difficulty of interdisciplinary work and the variety of competing approaches within the Threat quadrant (Fig. 6) may not be reduced under the proposed **SW** strategy. Thus, a **strength-threat** strategy could be applied to reduce these threats. Pursuit of such a strategy should improve the ability of ES analyses to make progress on improving the sustainability of human-environment interactions.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

3.3.2 Strategy 2 – Application of the ES framework

The second Strategy would concern the use of external Opportunities to overcome internal Weaknesses, with themes residing in the **weakness-opportunities (WO)** quadrants. Two of the highest scoring Opportunities acknowledge the potential alignment of the ES framework with existing agreements (e.g. the CBD Aichi targets, the UN Sustainable Development goals), and with existing tools (e.g. spatial conservation planning, environmental impact assessment, remote sensing). However, the Weaknesses suggest that this approach is inaccessible to non-specialists and difficult to apply. A **WO** strategy could focus on using the identified opportunities in two ways:

- Enhanced communication to elucidate how ES can be linked and add value to key performance indicators, and other measures that determine policy implementation success (e.g. measures of sustainable economic development). This broader picture could facilitate a better understanding of ES; and,
- ES specialists assisting and working with non-technical audiences in identifying and applying the most relevant and effective ES methods and tools for the required application. The result could be greater uptake and ownership of the ES framework.

3.3.3 Strategy 3 – Effects of an ES framework application

Thirdly, we consider the potential use of the ES framework to overcome Threats, given a combination of **strengths, opportunities and threats (SOT)**. Blending the existing Strengths of the ES framework (which includes improved accounting for nature, increased societal engagement, equity in natural resource allocation and reconnecting people with nature) with Opportunities (specifically an increase in environmental awareness and operationalization and institutionalisation of the ES framework) could offer scope for increasing environmental awareness and understanding (countering the identified threat of low awareness).

Equally, drawing upon these Strengths could ensure that implementation of the ES framework becomes or remains a political imperative (at the same time seeking to address any threat of a loss of political or researcher interest), and that the institutional application of the ES framework adds value.

A strategy containing these elements could also consider seeking to showcase the ES framework itself as a way of measuring the effects of resistance to change environmental practices (a third Threat theme).

3.3.4 Strategy 4 – Demands of an ES framework application

The fourth Strategy concerns dealing directly with barriers to the application of the ES, with a focus upon **weaknesses, threats** and some **opportunities (WTO)**. Overcoming Weaknesses and Threats is considered likely to be challenging. The strategic direction is heavily influenced by 8 Weaknesses, ranging from an incomplete scientific basis, to the fact that large resources are needed to apply frameworks, to the need for better tools. Insufficient funding is highlighted as a Threat, however, funding

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

426 is also an identified Opportunity – so understanding exactly where the funding gap lies, and what causes
427 it, would be a key challenge to deal with under this strategy.

428
429 Many of the identified Weaknesses – disregard for intrinsic value, oversimplification, ambiguous
430 language, inaccessibility – are perhaps at the root problems of conceptual convergence and
431 communication. These Weaknesses are compounded by Threats such as loss of interest and lack of
432 awareness. A strategy for resolving these challenges must involve collaboration between those
433 researching and implementing the ES framework, as well as a focus on communication to non-specialists.

434
435 Although the Opportunity for technological advances through applying the ES framework was highlighted,
436 it is endangered by the Threat of a lack of institutional capacity. The approach requires extensive support
437 in terms of human and financial resources, to develop capacity, if it is to realise the opportunities it
438 presents.

439 3.3.5 Strategy 5 – Wider interface with the ES framework

440 Finally, a strategy that focuses upon external issues, i.e. **opportunity-threat (OT)** quadrants, is
441 necessary. This would concern the public face of the ES framework – specifically, how users (such as
442 policy makers, researchers and the general public) engage with the approach.

443
444
445 Identified Opportunities highlight interest in and awareness of the ES framework on the part of a range of
446 stakeholders. These are in contrast with a number of identified Threats such as: resistance to change in
447 environmental practices, loss of political interest, lack of awareness across the general public and loss of
448 interest by researchers. Building upon the topic of communication mentioned in Strategy 4, careful
449 communication and dissemination measures would need to be designed that build upon existing interest
450 and awareness – and, if the approach does prove successful in practice, ensuring that success is
451 evaluated and publicised so as to avoid losing interest on the part of both researchers and policymakers.
452 In turn, this latter requirement suggests the need for monitoring and detailed ex-post evaluation of the
453 implementation of the ES framework.

454
455 A key Opportunity, as mentioned in Strategy 2, is alignment with existing policies. By seeking to support
456 existing agreements and policies, and providing useful mechanisms for policy implementation rather than
457 replacing them, it could perhaps be ensured that the ES framework circumvents the threat of resistance
458 to change. The same reasoning could apply to the Threat of competing environmental approaches.

460 **4. Discussion**

461 The YESS group carried out a three-stage survey constituting a SWOT analysis of the ES framework.
462 The aim of the assessment was to seek agreement on the perceived utility of an ES-based approach from

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

463 a set of early career researchers and practitioners, and to offer the beginnings of some potential
464 strategies for taking the framework forward based upon findings. In this way, we have extended the
465 existing literature on the ES framework, which, whilst highlighting challenges to the use of ES concepts, is
466 usually not structured around a SWOT analysis, and contains limited discussion around such strategies.
467 While strategies to address challenges related with the application of the ES concept have been
468 discussed elsewhere (see de Groot et al., 2010; Baker et al., 2013; Schröter et al., 2014), the strategies
469 we identify emerge from a systematic approach to address perceived weaknesses and threats of ES-
470 based approaches. The identified strategies should not be seen as exclusive, rather, they arise from
471 focusing upon different combinations of the SWOT quadrants, and therefore can be complementary.

472
473 Numerous YESS members including 20 participants in the final survey (Survey 3), plus attendees at an
474 ESP conference in Bali, gave input at the various stages of the SWOT analysis. There was very strong
475 agreement by participants in relation to the most highly ranked Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities
476 and Threats. The outcomes suggest that key Strengths include that the ES framework is interdisciplinary,
477 provides a means for improved accounting for nature, is holistic, and is a useful advocacy and
478 communication tool. Current Weaknesses include that the scientific basis for the approach is incomplete,
479 ES frameworks are inconsistently applied and do not necessarily account for nature's 'intrinsic' value, and
480 that the language of ES can be ambiguous. External Opportunities for the ES framework include
481 alignment with different existing and emerging policies and strategies, the implementation of the approach
482 through existing tools and methods, and the possibility that environmental awareness is increasing more
483 generally. Finally, identified external Threats include general inertia regarding change in environmental
484 practices, the broader difficulties with successful interdisciplinary collaboration, and insufficient funding to
485 fully realize the potential of the ES framework.

486
487 Subsequent consideration of the themes coming out of the SWOT suggested five key strategic areas for
488 furthering the ES framework: (1) approach characteristics; (2) application of the framework; (3) effects of
489 application; (4) demands of application; and, (5) interface with the framework. Whilst the development of
490 full strategies for improving and (if appropriate) embedding the ES framework into practice is beyond the
491 scope of this article, we make some suggestions based on SWOT outcomes, and our findings here could
492 influence the development of strategies.

494 4.1 *Strategies*

495 Strategy 1 is based around how existing Strengths with the approach might be used to overcome
496 Weaknesses. Options include using the interdisciplinary nature of the ES framework, and the associated
497 broad network of researchers working in the space, to further develop the currently incomplete scientific
498 basis (see Bennett et al., 2015). Equally, since the approach has the Strength that it requires practitioners
499 and policymakers to take a holistic view, it should readily be able to incorporate additional considerations

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

500 that it currently lacks (e.g. inclusion of broader shared and social values; Kenter et al., 2015). Given the
501 approach's potential Strength as an advocacy tool (Costanza et al., 2014), a focus upon this strength
502 could result in the approach being used to leverage input from many more stakeholders than it currently
503 does, to help ensure more equitable use of ES. However, there are also challenges: not least that
504 interdisciplinary science is not easy, or that some stakeholders may remain unwilling to engage with the
505 ES framework if they consider it to violate notions of intrinsic value of nature (Lang et al., 2012). The
506 notion that the ES framework should go beyond utilitarianism to include broader values is now broadly
507 recognised (Kenter et al., 2015), as reflected in explicit in the inclusion of shared or social values in major
508 assessments (e.g. TEEB, 2010; UK National Ecosystem Assessment, 2011; 2014). The degree to which
509 the ES framework is or may be able to incorporate non-anthropocentric values is more contentious. There
510 has been debate around whether the concept of services to human-wellbeing is by definition
511 anthropocentric, and not amenable to notions of intrinsic values (Gómez-Baggethun & Ruiz-Pérez, 2011;
512 Braat and de Groot, 2012; Jax et al. 2013; Costanza et al., 2014; Schröter et al., 2014), and our survey
513 suggests that most participants recognise the disregard of nature's intrinsic value as a weakness of the
514 ES framework (Table 3). Nonetheless, notions such as habitat services (TEEB, 2010), and
515 conceptualisations of cultural ecosystem services (e.g. Chan et al. 2012; Daniel et al., 2012) can provide
516 a hook for bringing in biocentric values that go beyond the economic notion of existence value. Others
517 have suggested a new ethical approach altogether that aims to transcend the intrinsic-instrumental,
518 biocentrism-anthropocentrism divide (O'Neill et al., 2008). Although delving into this debate is beyond the
519 scope of this article, it is useful to point out that survey participants also associated this issue with
520 application of the ES framework in decision making, and thus broader institutional concerns around how
521 the ES framework is applied. This runs parallel with two aspects of ES that, according to Gómez-
522 Baggethun and Ruiz-Pérez (2011), are often neglected: (i) the role of the particular institutional setup in
523 which environmental policy and governance is currently embedded; and (ii) the broader economic and
524 socio-political processes that have governed the expansion of pricing into previously non-marketed areas
525 of the environment.

526
527 Strategy 2 addresses the use of external Opportunities to overcome internal Weaknesses. Two key
528 Opportunities involved the potential alignment of the ES framework with policies and strategies, and with
529 existing tools and methods (e.g. spatial conservation planning, remote sensing, environmental and
530 economic impact assessment). Meanwhile, one potential Weakness was that the approach can be
531 inaccessible to non-specialists, and difficult to apply. Finding ways to align the ES framework more
532 closely with existing policies, strategies and methods could facilitate a better understanding of ES for
533 those not working directly in the field. This is a strategy that can be considered already in progress (e.g.
534 incorporating ES into landscape planning; Albert et al., 2014), but it is nevertheless worth emphasizing
535 that doing so is likely to be productive, developing guidelines and providing examples of applied research
536 on how this can be done, highlighting the ongoing need to communicate the basic ideas behind the ES

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

537 framework (according to the Strengths identified, those ideas are essentially rather straightforward; Fig.
538 4), and developing knowledge exchange networks that bring together policy makers, research and
539 practitioners (e.g. the UK Ecosystems Knowledge Network²). Focused efforts for ES specialists to work
540 with non-technical audiences in identifying and applying the most relevant and effective ES methods and
541 tools, for a given application, should result in greater uptake and ownership of the ES framework. Here
542 transdisciplinary approaches, involving the co-production of knowledge offer much promise (Liu et al.,
543 2010; Jahn et al., 2012; Reyers et al., 2015) Encouraging the use of existing familiar tools and
544 methodologies to implement the ES framework could equally support uptake, and help address the
545 ongoing challenges around how best to operationalize the approach.

546
547 Strategy 3 targets the effects of applying the ES framework given a combination of the relevant Strengths,
548 Opportunities and Threats. Blending the existing Strengths of the ES framework (e.g. conceptual
549 simplicity, increased societal engagement, reconnecting people to nature) with Opportunities could well
550 support an expanding general awareness of and willingness to engage with environmental issues (e.g.
551 within industry; Bull et al., 2015), increasingly politicising the value of implementing the ES framework.
552 Yet it must be considered that a 'loss of political interest' was identified as one of the major Threats to the
553 ES framework. So long as the ES research community builds firmly upon the Strengths and Opportunities
554 identified here, and given recent developments in ES policy – such as the potential incorporation of
555 mandatory ES assessment into European environmental impact assessment requirements, and the
556 recent establishment of IPBES – it would seem unlikely that political interest for the framework will fade in
557 the short term. However, it cannot be taken for granted that this will perpetuate in the longer term, and so
558 any strategic approach must contain measures to keep ES on the political agenda, and importantly
559 ensure that ecosystem management activities are implemented on the ground in order to bridge
560 research-policy-implementation gaps. Another Threat to the ES framework is resistance to changing
561 environmental practices – one can understand the potential for fatigue on the part of policymakers and
562 the public, given how substantially concepts within conservation (and consequently policy development)
563 have changed over recent decades (e.g. Mace, 2014). Arguments based on key Strengths with the ES
564 framework, such as being characterised by conceptual simplicity and working on multiple scales, as well
565 as explicit recognition and management of Weaknesses (e.g. perceived focus on monetary values) will
566 continue to be required in order to overcome this overarching Threat. The fact that the ES framework
567 provides a potentially strong advocacy and communication tool may be a useful asset in arguing for its
568 wider implementation, especially with regards to engaging with the business sector (Reyers et al., 2015).
569 Here working with bridging agents can be powerful (Braat & de Groot, 2012; Ruckelshaus et al., 2013).
570 However, ultimately the ES framework is only a means to diffuse ends, and it is conceivable that at some

² <http://ecosystemsknowledge.net>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

571 point the ES framework is superseded by other conceptualisations of sustainability and human-nature
572 relations that prove more useful, persuasive or effective in terms of being embedded into practice.

573
574 Strategy 4 brings a focus upon Weaknesses, Threats and Opportunities. Research needs for the ES
575 framework have been identified in the literature (e.g. Braat & de Groot, 2012; Bennett et al., 2015).
576 Clearly, input of additional funding and resources to develop the ES framework would begin to address
577 some of these challenges – and indeed insufficient funding has been highlighted as a Threat. But this
578 does not constitute a strategy in itself, as the ES framework competes with many other fields for research
579 funding. The strategy would be to use the identified Strengths and Opportunities to make the case for
580 increased funding to develop and implement the ES framework: such as, e.g. on-going alignment with
581 existing governmental or international policies and strategies. Equally, reducing the costs and efforts
582 required for applying the ES framework will be important. Opportunities for reducing costs and efforts can
583 include uptake of recent technological developments, utilizing synergies between research projects and
584 strengthening the networking and exchange of involved scientists rather than ‘re-inventing the wheel’, and
585 striking a balance between application of existing knowledge and methods based on agreed frameworks
586 and protocols and ongoing debate and innovation. The Opportunity provided by technological
587 advancements in terms of applying the ES framework (e.g. ES models and algorithms, hardware for
588 monitoring components of ES), must be considered in the context of a lack of institutional capacity (as a
589 Threat) in some cases. This might perhaps be mitigated through the open exchange of tools and
590 knowledge, as well as key datasets. Further Opportunities could include the development and testing of
591 less data-heavy tools and methods, for instance, by using proxies and existing datasets (e.g. Helfenstein
592 & Kienast, 2014; Jacobs et al., 2015).

593
594 Themes informing Strategy 5 are within the Opportunities and Threats quadrants. This strategy relates to
595 the ‘public face’ of the ES framework – specifically, how to encourage users (such as policy makers,
596 societal actors, researchers and the general public) to engage with the approach. The Opportunities
597 highlight interest and awareness of the ES framework on the part of a range of stakeholders. This can be
598 used to promote the approach, but must be balanced with recognition of the difficulty in maintaining a
599 consistent conceptual framing (Lamarque et al., 2011). Equally, public acceptance of the ES framework
600 must overcome any future potential loss of political interest, resistance to change in environmental
601 processes, lack of awareness across the general public and loss of interest by researchers. The ES
602 framework and concepts behind it require clear communication across a range of audiences if the
603 approach is to be successfully implemented, and the concept of ecosystem services should be
604 mainstreamed across sectors, outlining the potential benefits of doing so (Cowling et al., 2008; Sitas et
605 al., 2014). Note, finally, that a potential Threat that was raised in the pilot survey was the chance of
606 societal diversion from sustainability goals more generally. This was not retained as a Threat to the ES
607 framework by the last survey, perhaps as the respondents trust society will continue to pursue

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

608 sustainability goals in some capacity (despite changing contextual conditions, e.g. austerity measures
609 and economic crisis).

610

611 4.2 *Study limitations and further work*

612 The survey sample size (20 researchers in Survey 3) was small in absolute terms and thus cannot be
613 assumed to represent the view of early career ES researchers generally. Nonetheless, there was a good
614 degree of variety in the age, sex, nationality and experience with ES of those participating, which may
615 have minimised potential biases in responses. As further research, it would be interesting to extend the
616 survey more widely to other respondents and examine the extent to which the findings are in agreement
617 with the broader ES community, especially of the opinions and perceptions of more long-established
618 researchers in the field of ES.

619

620 The respondents to the survey were biased towards the natural sciences and environmental and
621 ecological economics. Therefore, the outcomes may be different if the same survey approach was carried
622 out using a more diverse academic sample (e.g. including more respondents with humanities and broader
623 social science backgrounds), or decision makers. Similar future exercises could be undertaken to draw
624 insights among and between different groups of ES users, stakeholders, researchers or practitioners. The
625 strategies we have outlined should be seen as suggestive, rather than concrete guidelines for action. We
626 offer them as a means for combining the findings of our surveys in a way that is practical and useful to
627 future directions in the theory and practice of the ES framework.

628

629 Beyond potential biases associated with participants in the study, there are important linguistic
630 uncertainties to consider. For a start, we consider a valuable component of the survey to be the variety in
631 nationalities represented by respondents, but this same factor means that there is likely to be uncertainty
632 introduced to the identification of themes resulting from subtleties in translation between different native
633 languages. Such uncertainty extends to vaguely defined technical terms, and indeed, the definition of
634 'ecosystem services' itself. Here, we have used the TEEB definition, but others exist e.g. "the benefits
635 people obtain from ecosystems" (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005); "the benefits provided by
636 ecosystems that contribute to making human life both possible and worth living" (UK National Ecosystem
637 Assessment, 2011), which are clearly rather different. ES can also be defined in more ecological terms,
638 and in too many other ways to list here (Fisher et al., 2009). It is possible that the survey results would
639 have been rather different with a different starting definition of ES – and therefore it should be considered
640 that the very choice of definition encapsulates a certain perspective into the findings here.

641

642 Although SWOT analysis stands out for its simplicity and value in focusing attention on key issues, it
643 entails limitations – for example unclear classification of items as strengths, weaknesses, opportunities or
644 threats, or over-subjectivity in the generation of themes due to compiler bias (Pickton & Wright, 1998).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

645 Nevertheless, the results of the SWOT analysis we conducted here allow assessing the relative
646 importance of different themes under the four SWOT categories, from the perspective of a group of ES
647 early career researchers and practitioners. The key utility in the research presented here is thus to review
648 and capture, in a structured way, a variety of considerations relevant to the strategic development of the
649 ES framework that are otherwise not collated within the literature. Another important aspect of conducting
650 such a SWOT analysis is the process itself (Pickton & Wright, 1998). In this research, it provided a
651 platform to exchange ideas and find agreement or otherwise among the YESS community, and
652 contributed to building the community itself.

654 4.3 *Conclusion*

655 Critical analysis of the ES framework can already be found in literature, however, the innovative character
656 of this research was that such analysis was systematically structured using a SWOT characterisation,
657 allowing us to derive strategies for further development of the ES field. Another important feature of this
658 research is that it reflects the views and perceptions of early career researchers and practitioners, who
659 will help shape the ES field in the future. Our work emphasizes that the ES framework can be viewed not
660 only as a way of improving decision-making, but also as a means for more widely interpreting and
661 communicating the complexities of the interaction between humanity and nature. Further, it is suggested
662 that the ES framework is only likely to truly find traction in implementation when more deeply merged with
663 existing policies and incorporating existing tools. Interestingly, the ES framework appears in some senses
664 contradictory – being valued by specialists as a simple means of communicating the importance of nature
665 conservation, whilst also being potentially an oversimplification and characterised by ambiguous
666 language, and this tension suggests its relevance as a bridge between research and practice. Provided
667 sufficient funding and political will is maintained, e.g. through initiatives such as IPBES, the ES framework
668 may yet provide a powerful means for facilitating interdisciplinary research, and for better incorporating
669 sustainability into policy and practice.

672 **Acknowledgements**

673 All authors are members of the Young Ecosystem Service Specialists (YESS) group. We thank those
674 members of YESS not named as co-authors who completed surveys, all YESS workshop participants at
675 the 2013 Ecosystem Service Partnership conference in Bali, and the Ecosystem Service Partnership
676 (ESP; www.es-partnership.org) for their support of YESS.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

677
678 Albert, C., Aronson, J., Fürst, C. and Opdam, P. (2014) Integrating ecosystem services in landscape
679 planning: requirements, approaches, and impacts. *Landscape Ecology*, **29**:1277-1285.
680

681 Baker, J., Sheate, W.R., Phillips, P. and Eales, R. (2013) Ecosystem services in environmental
682 assessment—help or hindrance? *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, **40**(0):3-13.
683

684 Baral, H., Keenan, R.J., Fox, J.C., Stork, N.E. and Kasel, S. (2013) Spatial assessment of ecosystem
685 goods and services in complex production landscapes: a case study from south-eastern Australia.
686 *Ecological Complexity*, **13**:35-45.
687

688 Barbier, E.B. (2012) Progress and challenges in valuing coastal and marine ecosystems. *Review of*
689 *Environmental Economics and Policy*, **6**(1):1-19.
690

691 Beaudoin, Y. and Pendleton, L. (eds.) (2012) Why value the oceans? The Economics of Ecosystems and
692 Biodiversity [available at: [http://www.teebweb.org/wp-](http://www.teebweb.org/wp-content/uploads/Study%20and%20Reports/Additional%20Reports/TEEB%20for%20oceans%20think%20piece/TEEB%20for%20Oceans%20Discussion%20Paper.pdf)
693 [content/uploads/Study%20and%20Reports/Additional%20Reports/TEEB%20for%20oceans%20think](http://www.teebweb.org/wp-content/uploads/Study%20and%20Reports/Additional%20Reports/TEEB%20for%20oceans%20think%20piece/TEEB%20for%20Oceans%20Discussion%20Paper.pdf)
694 [%20piece/TEEB%20for%20Oceans%20Discussion%20Paper.pdf](http://www.teebweb.org/wp-content/uploads/Study%20and%20Reports/Additional%20Reports/TEEB%20for%20oceans%20think%20piece/TEEB%20for%20Oceans%20Discussion%20Paper.pdf)].
695

696 Bennett, E.M., *et al.* (2015) Linking biodiversity, ecosystem services, and human well-being: three
697 challenges for designing research for sustainability. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*,
698 **14**: 76-85.
699

700 Böhnke-Henrichs, A., *et al.* (2014) YESS – The network for Young Ecosystem Services Specialists.
701 *Ecosystem Services*, DOI: 10.1016/j.ecoser.2014.06.001.
702

703 Braat, L.C. and de Groot, R. (2012) The ecosystem services agenda: bridging the worlds of natural
704 science and economics, conservation and development, and public and private policy. *Ecosystem*
705 *Services*, **1**(1):4-15.
706

707 Bryan, B.A. (2013) Incentives, land use, and ecosystem services: Synthesizing complex linkages.
708 *Environmental Science and Policy*, **27**:124-134.
709

710 Bull, J.W., Bryant, C., Baker, J. and Milner-Gulland, E.J. (2015) Developing, measuring and
711 communicating the outcomes of corporate biodiversity strategies. Wild Business Ltd; London, UK.
712

1
2
3
4 713 Bullock, J.M., Aronson, J., Newton, A.C., Pywell, R.F., Rey-Benayas, J.M. (2011) Restoration of
5 714 ecosystem services and biodiversity: conflicts and opportunities. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*,
6 715 **1418**:1-9.
7
8 716
9
10 717 Carpenter, S.R., *et al.* (2009). Science for managing ecosystem services: beyond the millennium
11 718 ecosystem assessment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*
12 719 *America*, **106**(5):1305-1312.
13
14 720
15
16 721 Chan, K.M.A., *et al.* (2012) Where are cultural and social in ecosystem services? A framework for
17 722 constructive engagement. *BioScience*, **62**(8):744-756.
18
19 723
20
21 724 Chan, K.M.A., Pringle, R.M., Ranganathan, J., Boggs, C.L., Chan, Y.L., Ehrlich, P.R., *et al.* (2007) When
22 725 agendas collide: human welfare and biological conservation. *Conservation Biology*, **21**:59-68, DOI:
23 726 10.1111/j.1523-1739.2006.00570.x.
24
25 727
26
27 728 CBD (Convention on Biological Diversity) (2010) Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011 – 2020 [available at:
28 729 <http://www.cbd.int/>].
29
30 730
31
32 731 Chan, K.M.A., Satterfield, T. & Goldstein, J. (2012) Rethinking ecosystem services to better address and
33 732 navigate cultural values. *Ecological Economics*, **74**, 8–18.
34
35 733
36 734 Costanza, R. (2008) Ecosystem services: Multiple classification systems are needed. *Biological*
37 735 *Conservation*, **141**:350-352.
38
39 736
40
41 737 Costanza, R., *et al.* (1997) The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital. *Nature*,
42 738 **387**:253-260.
43
44 739
45 740 Costanza, R., *et al.* (2014) Changes in the global value of ecosystem services. *Global Environmental*
46 741 *Change*, **26**:152-158.
47
48 742
49 743 Cowling, R.M., *et al.* (2008) An operational model for mainstreaming ecosystem services for
50 744 implementation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*,
51 745 **105**(28):9483-9488.
52
53 746
54
55 747 Daily, G.C. (1997) *Nature's services*. Island Press; California, USA.
56
57 748
58
59 749 Daily, G.C., *et al.* (2000) The value of nature and the nature of value. *Science*, **289**(5478):395-396.
60 750
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 751 Daniel, T.C., *et al.* (2012) Contributions of cultural services to the ecosystem services agenda.
5
6 752 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **109**, 8812–8819.
7 753
8
9 754 de Groot, R.S., Alkemade, R., Braat, L., Hein, L. and Willemsen, L. (2010) Challenges in integrating the
10 755 concept of ecosystem services and values in landscape planning, management and decision
11 756 making. *Ecological Complexity*, **7**:260-272.
12
13 757
14
15 758 Ehrlich, P. and Mooney, H. (1983) Extinction, substitution, and ecosystem services. *Bioscience*, **33**(4):
16 759 248-254.
17
18 760
19 761 Fisher, B., Turner, R.K. and Morling, P. (2009). Defining and classifying ecosystem services for decision
20 762 making. *Ecological Economics*, **68**:643-653.
21
22 763
23
24 764 Gibbons, J.M., Nicholson, E., Milner-Gulland, E.J. and Jones, J.P.G. (2011) Should payments for
25 765 ecosystem services be based upon action or results? *Journal of Applied Ecology*, DOI:
26 766 10.1111/j.1365-2664.2011.02022.x.
27
28 767
29
30 768 Goldstein, J.H., *et al.* (2012) Integrating ecosystem-service trade-offs into land-use decisions.
31 769 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **109**(19): 7565–
32 770 7570.
33
34 771
35
36 772 Gómez-Baggethun, E. and Ruiz-Pérez, M. (2011) Economic valuation and the commodification of
37 773 ecosystem services. *Progress in Physical Geography*, **35**(5): 613-628.
38
39 774
40
41 775 Haines-Young, R.H. and Potschin, M.P. (2010) The links between biodiversity, ecosystem services and
42 776 human well-being. In: Raffaelli DG, Frid CLJ (eds). *Ecosystem Ecology: A New Synthesis*.
43 777 Cambridge: BES Ecological Reviews Series, Cambridge University Press.
44
45 778
46
47 779 Helfenstein, J. and Kienast, F. (2015) Ecosystem service state and trends at the regional to national level:
48 780 a rapid assessment. *Ecological Indicators*, **36**: 11-18.
49
50 781
51
52 782 Jacobs, S., Burkhard, B., van Deelee, T., Staes, J. and Schneiders, A. (2015) The Matrix Reloaded: a
53 783 review of expert knowledge use for mapping ecosystem services. *Ecological Modelling*, **295**: 21-30.
54 784
55
56 785 Jahn, T., Bergmann, M. and Keil, F. (2012) Transdisciplinarity: Between mainstreaming and
57 786 marginalization. *Ecological Economics*, **79**:1-10.
58
59 787
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 788 Jax, K., *et al.* (2013) Ecosystem services and ethics. *Ecological Economics*, **93**, 260–268.
5
6 789
7 790 Jobstvogt, N., Watson, V. and Kenter, J.O. (2014) Looking below the surface: the cultural ecosystem
8
9 791 service values of UK marine protected areas (MPAs). *Ecosystem Services*, **10**:97-110.
10 792
11
12 793 Keeler, B.L., *et al.* (2012) Linking water quality and well-being for improved assessment and valuation of
13
14 794 ecosystem services. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*
15
16 795 *America*, **109**:18619-18624.
17 796
18 797 Kenter, J.O., *et al.* (2015) What are shared and social values of ecosystems? *Ecological Economics*, **111**,
19
20 798 86–99.
21 799
22 800 Kremen, C. and Ostfeld, R.S. (2005) A call to ecologists: measuring, analyzing and managing ecosystem
23
24 801 services. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, **3**(10):540-548.
25
26 802
27 803 Lamarque, P., Quetier, F. and Lavorel, S. (2011). The diversity of the ecosystem services concept and its
28
29 804 implications for their assessment and management. *Comptes Rendus Biologies*, **334**:441-449.
30 805
31
32 806 Lang, D.J., *et al.* Transdisciplinary research in sustainability science: practice, principles, and
33
34 807 challenges. (2012) *Sustainability Science*, **7**(1): 25-43.
35 808
36 809 Larigauderie A, Mooney HA (2010) The Intergovernmental science-policy Platform on Biodiversity and
37
38 810 Ecosystem Services: moving a step closer to an IPCC-like mechanism for biodiversity. *Current*
39
40 811 *Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **2**(1–2):9-14.
41 812
42 813 Liu, S., Costanza, R., Farber, S. and Troy, A. (2010) Valuing ecosystem services: theory, practice, and
43
44 814 the need for a transdisciplinary synthesis. *Ecological Economics Reviews*, **1185**:54-78.
45 815
46
47 816 Long, R. (2011). The Marine Strategy Framework Directive: A New European Approach to the Regulation
48
49 817 of the Marine Environment, Marine Natural Resources and Marine Ecological Services. *Journal of*
50
51 818 *Energy and Natural Resources Law*, **29**(1):1-44.
52 819
53 820 Mace, G. (2014) Whose conservation? *Science*, **345**(6204):1558-1560.
54
55 821
56 822 Martín-López, B., Gómez-Baggethun, E., García-Llorente, M. and Montes, C. (2014) Trade-offs across
57
58 823 value-domains in ecosystem services assessment. *Ecological Indicators*, **37**:220-228.
59 824
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 825 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005). Ecosystems and Human Well-being. Washington, D.C.;
5
6 826 Island Press.
7 827
8
9 828 Nahlik, A.M., Kentula, M.E., Fennessy, M.S. and Landers, D.H. (2012) Where is the consensus? A
10 829 proposed foundation for moving ecosystem service concepts into practice. *Ecological Economics*,
11
12 830 **77**:27-35.
13 831
14
15 832 Naidoo, R., *et al.* (2008) Global mapping of ecosystem services and conservation priorities. *Proceedings*
16 833 *of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **105**(28):9495-9500.
17
18 834
19 835 Nelson, E.J. and Daily, G.C. (2010) Modeling ecosystem services in terrestrial systems. *F1000 Biology*
20 836 *Reports*, **2**:53-59.
21
22 837
23
24 838 Nicholson, E., *et al.* (2009) Priority research areas for ecosystem services in a changing world. *Journal of*
25 839 *Applied Ecology*, DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2664.2009.01716.x.
26
27 840
28
29 841 Norgaard, R.B. (2010), Ecosystem Services: from eye opening metaphor to complexity blinder. *Ecological*
30 842 *Economics*, **69**:1219-1227.
31
32 843
33 844 O'Neill, J., Holland, A. and Light, A. (2008) Environmental Values. Routledge; London, UK.
34
35 845
36 846 Perrings, C., *et al.* (2010) Ecosystem Services for 2020. *Science*, **330**:323-324.
37
38 847
39 848 Peterson, M.J., Hall, D.M., Feldpausch-Parker, A.M. and Peterson, T.R. (2010) Obscuring ecosystem
40 849 function with application of the ecosystem services concept. *Conservation Biology*, **24**:113-119.
41
42 850
43
44 851 Petz, K., Minca, E.L., Werners, S.E. and Leemans, R. (2012) Managing the current and future supply of
45 852 ecosystem services in the Hungarian and Romanian Tisza River Basin. *Regional Environmental*
46 853 *Change*, DOI: 10.1007/s10113-012-0284-7.
47
48 854
49
50 855 Petz, K. and van Oudenhoven, A.P.E. (2012) Modelling land management effect on ecosystem functions
51 856 and services: a study in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem*
52 857 *Services & Management*, DOI: 10.1080/21513732.2011.642409.
53
54 858
55
56 859 Pickton, D.W. and Wright, S. (1998) What's SWOT in strategic analysis? *Strategic Change*, **7**(2):101-109.
57 860
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 861 Ranganathan, J., *et al.* (2008) Ecosystem Services: a guide for decision makers. World Resources
5
6 862 Institute; Washington, D.C.
7 863
8
9 864 Ressurreição, A., *et al.* (2012) Towards an ecosystem approach for understanding public values
10 865 concerning marine biodiversity loss. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, **467**:15-28.
11
12 866
13 867 Reyersa, B., Nela, J.L., O'Farrell, P.J., Sitasa, N. and Nele, D.C. (2015) Navigating complexity through
14
15 868 knowledge coproduction: Mainstreaming ecosystem services into disaster risk reduction.
16 869 Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA, **112**(24):7362-7368.
17
18 870
19 871 Ruckelshaus, M., *et al.* (2013) Notes from the field: lessons learned from using ecosystem service
20 872 approaches to inform real-world decisions. *Ecological Economics*, **115**:11-21.
21
22 873
23
24 874 Schröter, M., *et al.* (2014) Ecosystem services as a contested concept: a synthesis of critique and
25 875 counter-arguments. *Conservation Letters*, DOI: 10.1111/conl.12091.
26
27 876
28 877 Schulp, C.J.E., Alkemade, R., Goldewijk, K.K. and Petz, K. (2012) Mapping ecosystem functions and
29 878 services in Eastern Europe using global scale data sets. *International Journal of Biodiversity*
30 879 *Science, Ecosystem Services & Management*, iFirst:1-13.
31
32 880
33
34 881 Sitas, Nadia, Prozesky, H.E., Esler, K.J. and Reyers, B. (2014) Opportunities and challenges for
35 882 mainstreaming ecosystem services in development planning: perspectives from a landscape level.
36 883 *Landscape Ecology*, **29**(8): 1315-1331.
37
38 884
39 885 Sommerville, M.M., Milner-Gulland, E.J. and Jones JPG (2011) The challenge of monitoring biodiversity
40 886 in payment for environmental service interventions. *Biological Conservation*, **144**(12):2832-2841.
41
42 887
43
44 888 Teddlie, C. and Tashakkori, A. (2011). Mixed Methods Research *In* Denzin NK, Lincoln YS (eds). The
45 889 SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research (4th ed). SAGE Publications, Inc.; Thousand Oaks,
46 890 California.
47
48 891
49
50 892 TEEB (The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity) (2012) The Economics of Ecosystems and
51 893 Biodiversity in Local and Regional Policy and Management. Wittmer H & Gundimeda H.(eds).
52 894 Earthscan; London, UK, & Washington DC, USA.
53
54 895
55
56 896 UK National Ecosystem Assessment. (2011) The UK National Ecosystem Assessment: Synthesis Report.
57 897 UNEP-WCMC, Cambridge.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

898

UK National Ecosystem Assessment. (2014) *UK National Ecosystem Assessment Follow-on Phase: Synthesis Report*. UNEP-WCMC, Cambridge.

901

Wallace, K. (2007) Classification of ecosystem services: Problems and solutions. *Biological Conservation*, **139**:235-246.

904

Wallace, K. (2008) Ecosystem services: Multiple classifications or confusion? *Biological Conservation*, **141**:353-354.

907

Yousefpour, R., *et al.* (2012) A review of decision-making approaches to handle uncertainty and risk in adaptive forest management under climate change. *Annals of Forest Science*, **69**(1):1-15.

910