BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

This Book of Abstracts provides a comprehensive overview of the session content and is structured into three main sections:

I. Session Description – an introduction to each session, including its objectives and expected outputs
II. Session Program – a detailed schedule for each session, including speakers and timing
III. List of Abstracts – a complete compilation of all accepted abstracts

I. SESSION DESCRIPTION

ID: X16

Are we there yet? Enhancing implementation of the ecosystem services framework with science-policy-practice interfaces and national networks

Hosts:

	Name	Organisation	E-mail
Host (s):	Jan Daněk	Global Change Research Institute CAS (CzechGlobe)	danek.j@czechglobe.cz
Co-host(s):	Davina Vačkářová	Global Change Research Institute CAS (CzechGlobe)	vackarova.d@czechglobe.cz

Abstract:

There have been numerous calls to minimize the gap between ecosystem services (ES) knowledge and its implementation in policy, decision making, and practice, which reflect the mission-oriented nature of ES assessments. Lately, there has been a rise in participatory and transdisciplinary approaches providing stakeholder engagement and potentially also increasing the impact of ES assessments. A key tool in this aspect is a functional science-policy (and practice) interface which can aid implementation of the ES framework across a range of policies and decision-making processes. The importance of such interfaces is well acknowledged in ESP by establishing national networks which "aim to improve decision making on ecosystem services by providing a platform for researchers, government, non-government, business, industry and communities to exchange information and experiences on the theoretical and practical application of ecosystem services at local to national scales." Several networks already exist in the European region and new ones are emerging, such as the one in the Czech Republic.

In this policy- and practice-oriented session we aim to create space for the exchange of experiences with implementation of the ES framework. We invite representatives of ESP national networks as well as other researchers and stakeholders who can share information and experiences on various aspects of moving ES knowledge into practice. We are especially interested in experiences with science-policy-practice interfaces and national networks. Acknowledging that real-world examples of ES implementation are still somewhat rare, we highly appreciate presentations on various examples of achieving impact in policy and decision-making including key factors enhancing ES knowledge uptake in each specific case. Participants in this session will have the opportunity to meet and discuss with members of the Czech National Platform for Ecosystem Services (NPES, https://www.jednapriroda.cz/en/o-npes/) who will also be invited to this session. These members are key national level stakeholders who have joined annual platform meetings since 2022. This session will thus create a unique space for researchers and stakeholders with shared aim in minimizing the existing gap between science and practice.

Goals and objectives of the session:

This session aims at discussing and advancing knowledge on implementation of the ES framework from two interlinked perspectives: a) experiences with science-policy-practice interfaces and national networks; b) experiences with achieving impact in policy and practice – practical applications of ecosystem services at local to national scales.

Planned output / Deliverables:

The outcome might be a joint paper on perspectives and insights into implementation of the ES framework based on presentations and discussions.

Session format:

Presentations (1,5h) including invited contacts of ESP national networks, invited members of NPES, voluntary contributions

Discussion (1,5h) including panel discussion and moderated discussion

Related to ESP Working Group:

Regional chapters/ National Networks & TWG 14 & TWG 18

II. SESSION PROGRAM

Room: A2
Date of session: Thursday 21, May 2026
Time of session: 11:00 – 12:30

Timetable speakers:

Time	First name	Surname	Organization	Title of presentation
11:00-11:05				Introduction to the session
11:05-11:15	Jan	Daněk	CzechGlobe - Global Change Research Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences	An overview of the Czech National Platform for Ecosystem Services – what we achieved and the road ahead
11:15-11:25	Karsten	Grunewald	Leibniz Institute of Ecological Urban and Regional Development (IOER)	From concept to impact – experiences with implementing the ecosystem services approach in Germany
11:25-11:35	Stoyan	Nedkov	National Institute of Geophysics, Geodesy and Geography – Bulgarian Academy of Sciences	Towards the development of the Bulgarian Biodiversity Knowledge Hub
11:35-11:45	Alessandra	Longo	University of Trento	Blending public goals and private interests in the production and use of ecosystem service evidence
11:45-11:55	Pinar Pamukcu	Albers	University of Bonn	Operationalizing the Ecosystem Services Framework in Türkiye: Current State and Drawbacks
11:55-12:05	Zichang	Xu	Zhejiang University	Reconsidering Ecosystem Services Marketization: Provincial-Level Government Behaviour and Motivation in China
12:05-12:30				Discussion

III. LIST OF ABSTRACTS

The first author is the presenting author unless indicated otherwise

1. An overview of the Czech National Platform for Ecosystem Services – what we achieved and the road ahead

First author: Jan Daněk
Other author(s): Davina Vačkářová
Affiliation: Global Change Research Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Brno, Czech Republic
Contact: danek.j@czechglobe.cz

In this contribution, we present an overview of the National Platform for Ecosystem Services (NPES) which is a unique science-policy interface for ES in the Czech Republic. The platform was established in 2022 and had four meetings each year until 2025. In 2026, the platform marks an important milestone as it has been implemented into the new action plan of the national biodiversity strategy for 2026-2030. Now, when the platform is about to transition from the One Nature IP LIFE project, is a good time to look back at what has and has not been achieved regarding main goals of the platform such as integration of scientific knowledge in the policy-making and decision-making in and beyond the nature protection sector. We reflect on the feedback provided by members of the platform and discuss the current and future challenges for continuing and strengthening the role of NPES as a long-term and effective national science-policy interface.

Keywords: ecosystem services, implementation, science-policy interface, national platform

2. From concept to impact – experiences with implementing the ecosystem services approach in Germany

First author: Karsten Grunewald
Other author(s): Ralf-Uwe Syrbe
Affiliation: Leibniz Institute of Ecological Urban and Regional Development (IOER), Dresden, Germany
Contact: k.grunewald@ioer.de

The ecosystem services concept undoubtedly offers many opportunities and (partly) new approaches to solving environmental problems. The main advantages of the concept are that it opens our eyes to the diverse values of nature, both for our immediate existence and for the well-being of society. In Germany, the approach has been receiving greater attention since the TEEB initiative (The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity, starting in 2008), and is now being promoted by IPBES (Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services) and SEEA-EA (System of Environmental-Economic Accounting—Ecosystem Accounting). Triggered by the EU Biodiversity Strategy 2020 and the MAES process (Mapping and Assessment of Ecosystem Services), national ecosystem service indicators have been developed in recent years. A few of these have gained political relevance and are being monitored and are linked to target values. In addition to national biodiversity strategies, the statistical SEEA-EA system, which requires EU countries to report on ecosystem services in accordance with this UN-standard, is now particularly important. The presentation will highlight the development process in Germany over the last decade. The question arises as to which the approach and indicator results are communicated to the public, to planners, and which are relevant for policy makers and economic decisions. Which institutions provide which information? And what are the channels of information? What do decision-makers and practitioners expect from science in terms of ecosystem service indicators? While the German MAES report is only available in English and received little public attention, some ecosystem service indicators, such as “Accessibility of green spaces suitable for recreation in cities” have been included in strategic policy documents (German Sustainability Strategy, National Biodiversity Strategy).

Keywords: Community of Practice, Ecosystem assessment, Government, Science-Policy-Practice interface

3. Towards the development of the Bulgarian Biodiversity Knowledge Hub

***First author*:** Stoyan Nedkov
***Other author(s)*:** Hristina Prodanova, Vanya Stoycheva, Pavel Stoev, Desislava Raykova
***Affiliation*:** National Institute of Geophysics, Geodesy and Geography – Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
Contact: snedkov@gmail.com

The Bulgarian ESP National Network was established in 2014 with the main objective to support the implementation of ecosystem services (ES) science and practice at national and local levels, and especially by contributing to national assessments and policy evaluations. The main driver behind its development has been the research community that has led to the accumulation of significant scientific production in the form of publications that cover almost all important aspects of the ES concept (Nedkov et al. 2024). However, the ES concept has still not been sufficiently implemented in Bulgaria's decision-making process, and therefore, it is necessary to find better approaches for ES uptake (Prodanova and Stoycheva 2024). The interactions with decision-makers have been active, mainly through research projects involving communities of stakeholders, which achieve particular results but usually disintegrate shortly after the end of the project. The Community of Practice (CoP) established under the EU-funded SELINA project aims to develop more sustainable activity beyond the project frame. A good practice in this direction could be the cross-project interactions of the stakeholders' communities. The newly founded Community-Driven Biodiversity Knowledge Hub within the Green Talent project is a good example of such interaction. It is focused on strengthening the CoP by integrating museum and biodiversity records and data, and incorporating IPBES and IPCC outputs for public and private decision-making. By doing this, the hub will help increase the uptake of biodiversity, ecosystem services, and climate change topics into practice. More specifically, it aims to contribute to the recruitment of new and motivated participants into IPBES activities and to establish a strong representation of Bulgaria within the platform.

***Keywords*:** SELINA CoP, Community-Driven Biodiversity Knowledge Hub, IPBES, Seeds of Change

4. Blending public goals and private interests in the production and use of ecosystem service evidence

***First author*:** Alessandra Longo
***Other author(s)*:** Jarumi Kato Huerta, Davide Geneletti
***Affiliation*:** University of Trento
***Contact*:** alessandra.longo-1@unitn.it

The intensification of interconnected and complex environmental challenges has placed unprecedented pressure on ecosystems, requiring decision-making processes that explicitly account for ecological limits and the trade-offs among competing objectives. As environmental responsibility shifts from public authorities to further include the private sector, governance systems have become more complex, requiring systemic, cross-sectoral approaches to the production, integration, and use of ecosystem knowledge in environmental planning and policy. This is exemplified, for instance, in domains such as urban planning, where quality assessments and related constraints inform regulatory and compensatory mechanisms (e.g., Biodiversity Net Gain in the UK). While integrated public–private settings for such decisions already exist, their effectiveness depends not only on the scientific quality of the ecosystem evidence produced, but also on the institutional and relational arrangements that shape how this evidence is shared, interpreted, and used.
The localised nature of these arrangements also limits the capacity to understand whether and how effective evidence-based decisions are continuous or scalable across sectors and contexts. Moreover, the management of trade-offs within these contexts remains insufficiently explored, often hindered by an uneven distribution of responsibilities, risks and benefits among stakeholders. To address this gap, this research investigates how interactions between actors and institutions in integrated public–private arrangements influence the production, use, and long-term sustainability of shared ecosystem service evidence. More specifically, the study aims to identify i) the institutional and relational factors enabling or hindering evidence use, ii) how actors envision the extensions of these practices across scales and iii) the perceived relationship between scaling efforts and cost, effort and efficiency. Methodologically, the research first reconstructs the relevant theoretical background on public-private partnerships and applies it to an analysis of real-world case studies within the Horizon Europe Research and Innovation project

SELINA. Building on the latter, this research outlines and discusses the preconditions needed for sustainable collaborations between public and private actors, exploring their potential transferability and scalability to other decision contexts. In doing so, the findings highlight the mechanisms necessary to institutionalise shared ecosystem evidence, ensuring its longevity as a key element of environmental planning and governance.

Keywords: public-private, ecosystem service evidence, environmental policy and planning

5. Operationalizing the Ecosystem Services Framework in Türkiye: Current State and Drawbacks

First author: Can Vatandaslar
Other author(s): Esra Başak, Nuket Ipek Cetin, Pinar Pamukcu Albers, Muhammed Hakan Çakmak, Özge Balkız, Basak Avcioglu Cokcaliskan
Presenting author: Pinar Pamukcu Albers
Affiliation: Faculty of Forestry, Artvin Coruh University, 08100 Artvin/Türkiye
Contact: ppamukcu@uni-bonn.de

Based on the results of our earlier nationwide review (Başak et al. 2022), we found that the ecosystem services (ES) knowledge and implementation experiences in Türkiye were limited and that the research domain was largely dominated by academia. These limitations hindered the full operationalization of the ES concept on the ground. However, recent developments in the policy sphere have begun to reshape the science-policy-practice interface. In line with national policy documents, legal frameworks, and international agreements(i.e. National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, the Strategic Plans of the General Directorate of Forestry (GDF), and the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework), new institutional units have been established within governmental bodies, including ES-related units under the General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks and GDF.

Türkiye's National Geographic Information Platform, launched in 2025, provides free access to selected GIS datasets that can support ES assessments. In parallel, several pilot projects have been initiated by governmental agencies, local branches of international organizations, and NGOs. These projects commonly involve participatory planning with local stakeholders, ES mapping, and linking ES to sustainable land management. Other examples involve spatial planning, urban planning and water resource management, such as the Preparation of Türkiye Spatial Strategy Plan Project, regulations for drinking water basins, and efforts to integrate ES into metropolitan planning processes. Although ES-related projects in Türkiye have primarily focused on forestry, urban planning, and water management, sustainable financial solutions for biodiversity and ES management have recently emerged as a core discussion topic.

Despite notable progress at the national administrative level, constraints remain, including limited access to both spatial and biophysical data, lack of comparable trade-off and economic analyses, limited consistency in biodiversity and natural resource management, absence of comprehensive ES-based regulatory tools, and persistent conceptual uncertainty regarding ES. In conclusion, substantial efforts are still required to fully operationalize the ES framework in practice in Türkiye.

Reference: Basak, E., Cetin, N. I., Vatandaslar, C., Pamukcu-Albers, P., Karabulut, A. A., Caglayan, S. D., et al. (2022). Ecosystem services studies in Turkey: A national-scale review. Science of the Total Environment. 844:68. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.157068

Keywords: Ecosystem services knowledge, science-policy-practice interface, nationwide ES assessment, national networks, ESP Türkiye

6. Reconsidering Ecosystem Services Marketization: Provincial-Level Government Behaviour and Motivation in China

***First author*:** Zichang Xu
***Other author(s)*:** Hongwei Hu, Rong Tan
***Affiliation*:** School of Public Affairs, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310058, China
***Contact*:** 12222079@zju.edu.cn

Despite the growing application of market-based instruments such as payments for ecosystem services (PES) and eco-labels, the effectiveness of ecosystem service marketization (MES) in advancing ES provision remains contested. Subnational governments are pivotal in enacting MES, and their heterogeneous support critically shapes its outcomes—a topic that has received scant scholarly attention. We develop a theoretical framework grounded in three interdependent dimensions—capacity, pressure, and incentive—to explain heterogeneous MES support by subnational governments. In the context of China's national initiative of Ecosystem Product Value Realization, we apply fuzzy-set Qualitative Comparative Analysis (fsQCA) to examine the willingness of 31 provincial-level governments to support this initiative and to identify the configurational conditions shaping their responses. The results are as follows: (1) No single condition sufficiently accounts for provincial-level support for MES; (2) When all three dimensions, including capacity, pressure and incentive, are present concurrently, they produce the most stable and robust pathway to high MES support. When two dimensions are present, outcomes become heterogeneous—both the "capacity–pressure" and "pressure–incentive" combinations are associated with high MES support, whereas the "capacity–incentive" configuration is linked to non-high MES support. When only a single dimension is present, provincial-level governments consistently exhibit non-high support for MES. (3) Pressure emerges as a core dimension leading to high MES support, yet its effectiveness materializes only when coupled with either capacity or incentive. Building on these findings, this study provides new insights into the feasibility of MES from the perspective of subnational governments.

***Keywords*:** Ecosystem services marketization, Subnational government behaviour, Capacity, Pressure, Incentive