A comparison of arguments surrounding the Biodiversity Strategy 2020
Content

- *What did we compare?*
- *How did we compare?*
- *What did we learn from it?*
- *Policy relevance and recommendations*

- *Discussion in groups (+/- 20mn)*
- *Feedback from groups and plenary discussion*
What do we look at

- Key aspects: commonalities and differences in argument categories
  - Compare occurrence of arguments categories in between countries and EU
  - Compare the composition/build-up of categories between countries and EU
- Relate context information to arguments categories
- Make argumentation explicit both in research and policy recommendation
Live debate arguments vs text arguments
Figure 2: Framework for the interviews. In red, the national players. The arrows depict the argument transmissions we want to identify using the interviews. The questions were designed to cover each direction on the horizontal and vertical axis. This framework focuses on existing documents and debates about the EU biodiversity strategy 2020.
Methodology

- ‘Helicopter’ interviews at EU and member state level
  - Document selection + key informants
  - Context information
  - At EU level: selection of 3 claims
- Document analysis
  - Argument maps
  - Interviews with key informants
Figure 1: Research framework with key inputs and outputs for the comparative study from WP3.
Selected claims

- CLAIM 1: Biodiversity is essential in order to progress towards a green and resource efficient economy.
- CLAIM 2: Building a green infrastructure is important to maintain biodiversity, but also beneficial to land users and society at large.
- CLAIM 3: The EU needs to mainstream Biodiversity into major forestry, agriculture and aquatic/fisheries policies.
EU – national/regional levels
EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020

Flanders  England  Netherlands  Finland, Poland, Germany.
Implicit...

1A
(There is a lack of knowledge on the sustainable use of biodiversity in a large range of sectors)

2A
The knowledge of the ways to conduct farming taking into account the needs of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, is too low.

2B
The knowledge on how to manage fisheries and aquaculture taking into account the needs of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, is too low.

2C
(Mainstreaming BD to different sectors policies may increase knowledge on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity)

3A
The effectiveness of measures taken to promote ecological methods of farming largely depends on knowledge and awareness of farmers on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.
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Results

• 21 arguments maps
  • Belgium, Germany, Finland, Netherlands, Poland & UK + EU
• Classification of broad argument categories
• Comparison between member states and EU level
Some results

• Strong emphasis on economy-nature relationship
• Facts dominate
• Little argumentation in political documents, most in ‘scientific’ documents
• Political or moral/ethical arguments are few and often implicit
  • ‘Responsible economic growth’
  • ‘Fair access’ (to nature areas)
• Terminology differences depending on document type
  – Rather specific: Biodiversity, Ecosystem services
  – Rather broad: Nature, environment
• Rather uniform spread of argument categories but different interpretations of concepts, and different emphasis
  – e.g. Green infrastructure =(natural ‘patches’ vs connectivity)
  – e.g. BE: Green infrastructure to address high fragmentation, GER focus on species and genetic resources
Policy relevance and recommendations

- **Overview of large and complex debates**
  - Quickly identify conflicting views
  - Make arguments explicit

- **Discrepancies between EU – Member states**
  - *Match debates on different governance levels*

- **Particularities of Member states**
  - Identify specific issues at member state level

- **Other recommendations?**
  - How could this type of research (reasoning/argument mapping) contribute to your area of expertise?
Any questions?

Contact: dieter.mortelmans@inbo.be