

Results Policy Debate Building with Nature at Mid-term Event

Debate Title; How to get beyond the pilot phase?

Thursday March 8th, 13h00 – 14h30 at Mid-term Event

Number of participants: Approximately 40 participants, divided in 5 groups.

The goal of the debate is to make participants aware of the importance of upscaling the concept of Building with Nature (BwN).

Central question for the debate is **“How to get beyond the pilot phase?”**.

Essential for the BwN-Interreg project is to have impact. The debate is focused on the four pillars of the BwN-framework, with a special focus on Governance.

- 1: Evidence Base
- 2: Business Case
- 3: Governance
- 4: Opportunity Mapping

To have impact, the project must involve/reach practitioners, policy makers and decision makers. We want to reflect on barriers in the field of governance, performance (evidence base), cost-benefit analysis (business case) and participation and stakeholders (opportunity mapping/governance).

The Policy Learning Group has a special interest in the debate since it can provide input for policy learning within the group and within their own networks.



Discussion theme and results	
1	<p>Discussion theme 1: Participation and Stakeholders</p> <p>PLG moderators: Jim Hansom + Merete Lovschall + Niels Philip Jensen</p> <p>How to convince stakeholders (in the design phase)? Don't try to over-persuade stakeholders but engage and inform them, look for a win-win situation.</p> <p>BwN requires more participation than traditional measures. What is the real problem? Look at this together and don't jump to conclusions/solutions. Have an open conversation. BwN can be one of the options.</p> <p>Does more participation means less resistance? Resistance often means involvement, don't try to avoid resistance but embrace it and remember it takes time to engage stakeholders.</p> <p>Do we need a marketing specialist? Identify the champions of BwN and let the champions themselves tell their story, meet with stakeholders.</p>

2	<p>Theme 2: Business Case</p> <p>PLG Moderator: Ivo Terrens</p> <p>General assumption: <i>We have taken 2 years in this project to identify the problems and barriers, now let's take the next 2 years to find the solutions.</i></p> <p>In the long run, BwN measures are always cheaper. In general, BwN will be cheaper when you only consider investment costs. Maintenance costs might be higher. Difficulty of different organizations being responsible for different costs.</p> <p>There still is a lack of knowledge; not everyone is confident BwN works. Decisions about BwN measures are hindered by the fact that you cannot monetarize the benefits.</p> <p>Which benefits cannot be monetarized? Monetarizing the different benefits is not simple. It is even more complicated because some benefits are realized outside the targeted area. Furthermore, the benefits are not honestly spread.</p> <p>What barriers do you encounter when it comes to business case development? We are not used to make business cases. It costs too much time. And there are not really scenario's to be discussed: that depends largely upon the situation, location, legislation, knowledge etc. Local communities see business cases as too complicated and leading only to more problems. So we have to learn to make business cases and to see their benefits (incorporating the other aspects).</p>
3	<p>Theme 3: Governance and Ownership</p> <p>PLG-moderators: Thomas Hansson + Ola Melin</p> <p>The governance framework in my country is beneficial to the implementation of BwN-measures. There is a need for national strategies to enhance the uptake of BwN. But we also need evidence/proof that the concept work in order to convince politicians. When it comes to safety, people want guarantees. A BwN framework can help the development of a BwN-enhancing strategy.</p> <p>Does the structure of financing aid to implementation of BwN? There are different structures for financing because of a division of responsibilities, which is not helpful towards implementing BwN. The maintenance costs of BwN measures tend to be higher.</p> <p>How do you make sure you have a clear division of responsibility for flood protection? Organizations are comfortable with applying traditional measures. Also the problem of monofunctional organization, while BwN is a more holistic approach</p> <p>Is it worth dividing up the projects? Decision makers are very focused on the figure on the last page. While BwN-measures may be costly, there are a lot of additional benefits to be realized, like ecosystem services. By dividing the project in different stages you can make an more appealing story for the BwN-measures.</p>
4	<p>Theme 4: Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation</p> <p>PLG Moderator: Alistair Rennie</p> <p>BwN is unique, so what monitoring is necessary to upscale? The term 'unique' is over- and often mis-used. Everywhere is unique and every engineered seawall is also unique. There is a view that all you can do with unique examples is wonder about their uniqueness, which is not helpful. There are specifics and comparable attributes in</p>

	<p>any (BwN or engineered) scheme.</p> <p>Is monitoring essential or are other aspects more important like state of mind or cost-benefit or drivers like spatial quality? Monitoring is essential, but given the objectives and outcomes of BwN are broader (ecosystem benefits) then for the monitoring to be informative, it must inform a broad range of aspects. Pre and Post-installation is key to ensure the efficacy / performance is robustly analyzed. Given the broader benefits and importance for stakeholder engagement, appreciating others' perspective may be useful.</p> <p>How do we get evidence to be able to help to upscale? Communication is key, in extracting the pertinent/relevant points from your science to ensure applicability elsewhere. This not only deals with the successes but also failures. This is relevant not only for the physical sciences (shoreline hydrodynamics, geology, sediment supply etc) but also for the other factors (Governance, Politics etc). Perhaps summary videos on each of the examples would prove effective.</p> <p>To what extent does BwN contribute to resilience? It is a challenge to quantify the effect of BwN-measures on resilience and adaptation towards climate change. One of the critical differences is that BwN allows future adjustments (adaptations) to be included with limited fuss, this is often not the case with traditional approaches. BwN have wider and longer indirect and / or consequential benefits which will contribute to resilience, thus reflecting on these even qualitatively must be beneficial?</p>
5	<p>Theme 5: Handshake between Policy and Practice</p> <p>PLG-moderator: Chris Spray</p> <p>General assumption: <i>We need to invest in connections with policy makers, we need to find ambassadors. And make them comfortable with a mix of solution (BwN and traditional)</i></p> <p>Practitioners and policy makers don't speak the same 'language' and this hinders wider uptake of the BwN approach. Politicians are issue-oriented and look for short-term results, adapt your story to this. Invest time in your connection with policy makers and look for ambassadors.</p> <p>How politically driven is BwN? Climate change adaptation is not a political issue, everyone agrees there is an issue and we need to solve this in a sustainable way. This is an advantage for BwN, you can approach everyone with this issue.</p> <p>How to get beyond the pilot phase? The implementation of BwN is hindered by framing them as controversial, unproven pilot trials. Whilst we've yet to mainstream all of these concepts yet, we must be bolder in our language and robust in evidencing the benefits. Nature has been protecting our assets for thousands of years. We just haven't been collecting the evidence with this in mind. Start with this; don't call the living labs of BwN 'pilots' anymore.</p>
	<p>General conclusions, summarized by Chair of the Policy Learning Group, Rein van der Kluit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➔ Don't try to over-persuade stakeholders but engage and inform them. ➔ Monetizing the different benefits of BwN measures is not simple. ➔ System of financing measures, can work against the uptake of BwN. ➔ Politicians are short term oriented, BwN is a long term approach, adapt your story! ➔ We need ambassadors for BwN, especially in the area of policy making. ➔ Don't use the work 'pilot' anymore. We are beyond that stage.