

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/121755/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

McKinley, Emma , Pagès, Jordi F., Wyles, Kayleigh J. and Beaumont, Nicola 2019. Ecosystem services: A bridge or barrier for UK marine stakeholders? *Ecosystem Services* 37 , -. 10.1016/j.ecoser.2019.100922

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2019.100922>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



Ecosystem Services: A bridge or barrier for UK marine stakeholders?

Highlights:

- This paper examines UK marine and coastal stakeholders' perceptions of the concept of ecosystem services and its role and usefulness within the marine and coastal science-policy-practice interface.
- Overall, stakeholders provided favourable opinions about the ecosystem services concept, with findings similar across respondents with the exception of industry; which used it less, was less confident with it and believed it to be less important for effective marine and coastal management.
- For the ES concept to be successful, it must be recognised that there will be no 'one size fits all' definition or approach that can be applied to all marine and coastal contexts across the UK.
- As the conversation around societal interactions and relationships with the natural environment continues to evolve, the ES concept should be considered one tool within a wider suite of options for marine and coastal management.

Ecosystem Services: A bridge or barrier for UK marine stakeholders?

Abstract

Ecosystem services conceptualises the multiple interactions between ecosystems and the people and communities benefitting from their direct or indirect use, aiming to provide stakeholders and scientists with a common language. While some users appear to have adopted this language and terminology, there are concerns that the complexities associated with the concept make it inaccessible and, rather than providing stakeholders with a tool to explain complex relationships, the language and terminology itself may disengage. Through surveying UK-based coastal and marine stakeholders ($n=158$), this study examines stakeholders' perceptions of the concept of ecosystem services and its role and usefulness within the marine and coastal science-policy-practice interface. Overall, stakeholders provided favourable opinions, with findings similar across respondents with the exception of industry; which used it less, was less confident with it and believed it to be less important. The results provide an evidenced argument for the benefits of the ecosystem services approach, including communication, supporting management and linking environment to humans. The analysis also details the required advancements to ensure effective future use, including improved terminology, pluralistic valuation and shared learning. Finally, the paper highlights challenges and benefits relating to the term, creating links to ongoing discussions about effective scientific communication for marine and coastal management.

Keywords: environment, policy, governance, management, practitioners, coastal

1. Introduction

The Ecosystem Services (ES) concept has been in use since the 1970's (Westman 1977, Costanza et al., 1997, Daily 1997) but was formally defined and classified in 2005 by the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA 2005) as "the benefits people obtain from ecosystems. These include provisioning services such as food and water; regulating services such as flood and disease control; cultural services such as spiritual, recreational, and cultural benefits; and supporting services, such as nutrient cycling, that maintain the conditions for life on Earth". Since the publication of the MA (2005), interest in the ecosystem service concept has grown substantially and there are now a multitude of definitions and classifications, for example: The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity classification (TEEB, de Groot et al., 2010b); the United Kingdom's National Ecosystem Assessment classification (NEA 2011). Further classifications have been developed by the Crown Estate (Saunders et al., 2010), Fisher et al., (2009), Atkins et al., (2011), Cognetti and Maltagliati (2010), Beaumont et al., (2007), Balmford et al., (2011), as well as more recent contributions from the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) (Diaz et al., 2018) (also see Gomez-Baggethun et al., 2010 for a historical summary). Accompanying this has been an explosion of ES focused research across all areas of environmental, and more recently economic and social, sciences (e.g. Beery et al., 2016; Willcock et al., 2016; Costanza et al., 2014; Braat and de Groot, 2012).

The ES concept aims to provide a common language through which diverse audiences and users can communicate about the natural world (Tallis et al., 2008; Steger et al, 2018). Over time, it has evolved to reframe the human-nature relationship (Costanza et al, 2014), and has become acknowledged as an effective management and policy tool (Beery et al., 2016; Willcock et al., 2016; Dempsey and Robertson, 2012; De Groot et al, 2010; Norgaard, 2010; Tallis et al., 2008, Beaumont et al., 2018), and as a concept through which the environment and societal wellbeing can be better connected (Armsworth et al., 2007). Advantages of the application of the ecosystem service concept have been found to include improved understanding of environmental benefits, improved

60
61
62 1 transparency of potential trade-offs under different management scenarios, and the enabling of
63 2 discussion and shared learning between stakeholders and with the wider academic community,
64 3 resulting in improved long-term relationships between these groups (Beaumont et al., 2018).

65
66 4 However, despite the perceived benefits of applying the ES concept within environmental
67 5 management, concerns have been raised. In fact, within the Intergovernmental Science-Policy
68 6 Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), the framework was perceived as so political
69 7 by some countries that a new shared terminology was introduced (Borie and Hulme 2015, Diaz et al.,
70 8 2018), sparking intense debate (see for example responses by Braat 2018 and Kenter 2018). To
71 9 tackle some of these challenges, there have been some recent Special Issues focusing on the
72 10 ecosystem services debate. Examples include a Special Issue of Ecosystem Services presents a series
73 11 of papers working towards the successful operationalisation of the ES concept (Van Dijk et al., 2018),
74 12 as well as a further Special Issue of the International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem
75 13 Services & Management focused on the operationalisation of marine and coastal ecosystem services
76 14 (Rodrigues et al., 2018). A common theme throughout these publications is the recognition that,
77 15 although ES is a recognised concept within global environmental policy, challenges remain in its
78 16 application (Jax et al., 2018). First, although valuation is an optional rather than inherent aspect of
79 17 the ecosystem service concept, many recent interpretations have favoured economic valuation, with
80 18 a resultant key criticism that it instigates a migration towards market-led, economically driven
81 19 environmental policy (Kallis et al., 2013; Dempsey and Robertson, 2012). This is accompanied by a
82 20 growing body of research, which argues against the commodification of nature and the feasibility of
83 21 assigning a price or value to ecosystems (Kallis et al., 2013; Dempsey and Robertson, 2012,
84 22 Pendleton et al., 2016). A second concern arises from the deliberation as to a correct and shared
85 23 definition and classification of ES and a fundamental confusion arising from the vast array of
86 24 complex terminology (Beery et al., 2016; Thompson et al., 2016; Schroter et al., 2014; Dempsey and
87 25 Robertson, 2012; Braat and de Groot, 2012; de Groot et al., 2010; Norgaard, 2010, Metz et al.,
88 26 2010). A third and final concern is that the concept is overly simplistic and anthropocentric focused,
89 27 conflicting with global conservation and biodiversity goals, and lacking in necessary detail to deliver
90 28 benefit for both society and the environment (Schroter et al., 2014).

91
92
93
94
95 29 With a backdrop of a continually developing conversation around the contribution of nature to
96 30 society (Diaz et al., 2018), and owing to their often peripheral nature, coastal and marine
97 31 environments are particularly in need of careful management and a common language between
98 32 stakeholders. In addition, marine and coastal ecosystems are experiencing a growing level of
99 33 pressure on resources, and an accompanying unprecedented deterioration in ecosystem health,
100 34 biodiversity and functionality (Nursery-Bray et al., 2013; Barbier et al., 2011; UNEP, 2006;
101 35 UNEP/GPA, 2006; Worm et al., 2006; GESAMP, 2001; Turner, 2000). In response to this, marine and
102 36 coastal governance has shifted towards the ecosystem approach, which aims for integrated
103 37 management of land, water and living resources that promotes conservation and sustainable use in
104 38 an equitable way (Granek et al., 2010; CBD 2000; Turner, 2000). However, although there is a great
105 39 deal of marine and coastal science being undertaken, gaps remain between the science and its
106 40 inclusion in policy (Rivero and Villisante, 2016; Nursery-Bray et al., 2013). In principle, the ES concept
107 41 should provide support to bridge these gaps, but within the marine and coastal realm, similar
108 42 concerns as those posed above are being raised about the widespread acceptance and application of
109 43 the ES concept (Beaumont et al., 2018). Further to this, from a societal perspective, numerous
110 44 scholars have examined public understanding of ES in the context of a range of environments and
111 45 situations (e.g. Metz and Weigel, 2010), with others examining the link between ecosystem services
112 46 and successful delivery of policy (e.g. the EU's Blue Growth policies – see, for example, Lillebo et al.,
113 47 2017) . For the most part, these studies have highlighted gaps in public understanding of ES, and
114
115
116
117
118

119
120
121 1 indeed, a feeling that the use of terms deemed to be scientific jargon can prove challenging for
122 2 science communication (Beery et al., 2016; Thompson et al., 2016). While the majority of these
123 3 studies have focused on public perceptions of ES, recent studies suggest that a lack of understanding
124 4 and a feeling of redundancy associated with the term may exist within the environmental science
125 5 and practitioner community (Beery et al., 2016). Accompanying the adoption of the ecosystem
126 6 service concept as a bridge between academic disciplines and environmental management and
127 7 policy making, there has also been a growth in the number of barriers. Whether the concept is
128 8 sustainable will only be observed over time; decided by its ease of use and accompanying benefits,
129 9 but also whether it is seen as morally and ethically appropriate. As the world of marine and coastal
130 10 natural resource management negotiates its way between a myriad of management and valuation
131 11 approaches (e.g. ES, natural capital, natural accounting, marine spatial planning, marine protected
132 12 areas), this paper presents a timely interrogation of the views of marine and coastal stakeholders in
133 13 the United Kingdom, on the concept of ES. In a bid to obtain responses from a diverse range of
134 14 marine and coastal stakeholders (i.e. in terms of geographical spread across the UK and that has a
135 15 range of expertise and experience), an online questionnaire framed around 4 key themes was used
136 16 to undertake this task: i. Current use and experiences; ii. Factors that influence use and experience;
137 17 iii. Strengths and obstacles to use; and iv. Ways of improvement. Through analysis of these themes
138 18 using both quantitative and qualitative questions, the study provides a novel and unique insight into
139 19 stakeholders' use and experience of the ecosystem services concept, whether the concept is seen to
140 20 be beneficial, and if it succeeds in acting as a bridging and common language between the science-
141 21 policy-practice interface of marine and coastal management or if it is actually an unintended barrier.

145 22 **2. Methodology**

148 23 **2.1. Questionnaire Respondents**

149 24 To access UK marine and coastal stakeholders, the Communications and Management for
150 25 Sustainability (CMS) network was used. CMS boasts a membership of over 6000 individuals,
151 26 representing a range of marine and coastal stakeholders working within a number of different
152 27 disciplines and sectors. This includes academic researchers (within education & consultancy),
153 28 industry representatives (ports, fishing, shipping, defence, aquaculture, tourism to name just a few),
154 29 Government departments and organisations (e.g. Department for Food and Rural Affairs, the Marine
155 30 Management Organisation, Marine Scotland, the Environment Agency, Natural Resources Wales),
156 31 and Environmental Non-Government Organisations and charities (NGOs – e.g. World Wildlife
157 32 Foundation, Marine Conservation Society, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds). The network
158 33 was chosen as it would give the authors access to a representative group of marine and coastal
159 34 stakeholders within the UK with a view to comparing results between sector groups, research
160 35 disciplines, career stage, as well as country (Scotland, Wales, England and Northern Ireland). The
161 36 questionnaire was sent out to individuals registered with the CMS network on four occasions in
162 37 2017. The survey was opened 345 times, with 181 respondents completing the entire survey (52.5%
163 38 completion rate). The inclusion criteria were that respondents were over the age of 18 and identified
164 39 themselves as practitioners, researchers and/or decision makers who work across marine and
165 40 coastal disciplines and sectors within the UK. Consequently, 23 non-UK respondents were omitted,
166 41 resulting in a final sample of 158. As shown in Table 1, roughly half of the sample was male, the
167 42 majority were aged between 25 and 54, were based in England, and had a postgraduate qualification
168 43 or above. The majority of respondents were in full-time employment, had been working in this field
169 44 for over 10 years, and self-identified themselves as working within one of six sectors: education /
170 45 academic research, consultancy research, working within government & policy, and to a lesser

1 extent, non-government organisations (NGOs), industry and other (e.g. self-employment, journalism,
2 and in temporary work; see Table 1).

	N	%		N	%
Demographics			Work Related		
Gender			Employability Status		
Male	76	48.1	Employed full time	113	71.5
Female	75	47.5	Employed part time	23	14.6
Prefer not to say	7	4.4	Retired	4	2.5
Age Group			Volunteer	1	.6
18-24	10	6.3	Student	9	5.7
25-34	34	21.5	Other	7	4.4
35-44	50	31.6	Sector		
45-54	34	21.5	Education/Academic Research	42	26.6
55-64	18	11.4	Consultancy Research	26	16.5
65 or over	12	7.6	Govt & policy	41	25.9
Current residency			NGO	20	12.7
Scotland	27	17.1	Industry (mixed)	15	9.5
England	113	71.5	Other	14	8.9
Wales	16	10.1	Duration in field		
Northern Ireland	2	1.3	Under 1 Year	11	7.0
Education			Between 1 and 5 years	22	13.9
GCSE/ O Level or equivalent	1	0.6	Between 5 and 10 years	29	18.4
A Levels or equivalent	1	0.6	Between 10 and 20 years	50	31.6
Undergraduate degree	28	17.7	Over 20 years	44	27.8
Postgraduate Masters Qualification	63	39.9			
Postgraduate Doctoral Qualification	54	34.2			
Professional Qualification	11	7.0			

4 Table 1. The demographic and work profile of the final sample (n = 158)

5 **2.2 Procedure & Measures -**

6 To pilot the questionnaire, the authors invited their personal networks of marine and coastal
7 ecosystem services research and management to complete the survey (pilot sample =11) with minor
8 changes to the wording of questions made where necessary before undertaking the full study. CMS
9 members were invited to participate by following a link to an online questionnaire survey (using
10 Qualtrics software) between the months of June and September 2017.

11 Following a short introduction to the study, respondents completed a mix of open and closed
12 questions focusing on: (i) their understanding of the concept of ES, (ii) their use of the term within
13 marine and coastal management, (iii) their evaluation of ES, and (iv) socio-demographic information.

14 (i) *Understanding of ecosystem services* - To assess current understanding and perceptions about
15 the overall concept, an open-ended question was used to allow respondents to spontaneously
16 "describe the term 'ecosystem services'" in their own words. Quantitative items were also used
17 where respondents rated how informed they felt about the term (from not at all informed [1] to
18 having a high expertise [5]) and their level of agreement to numerous statements (e.g. "overall I like
19 the terminology used in the ecosystem services approach" and "Ecosystem services are difficult to

237
238
239 1 understand” [negatively coded]. To increase the sensitivity and variance within responses, a 7 point
240 2 scale was used (strongly disagree [1] to strongly agree [7]) and a “don’t know” response was
241 3 included to reduce ambiguity for the neutral response option “neither agree nor disagree [4]”
242 4

243 5
244 6 (ii) *Use of ecosystem services* – To explore the frequency and application of ES in their work,
245 7 respondents were asked how often they apply the concept in their job and a qualitative item asked
246 8 how ES are used within their work. They were also asked to rate their level of agreement to a range
247 9 of statements that looked at their confidence in using the concept (e.g. “I feel confident about using
248 10 ecosystem services within my role / activities”), the importance of the concept in their line of work
249 11 (e.g. “The ecosystem service approach is important within my role / activities”), perceived
250 12 opportunities to apply it (e.g. “There are opportunities for using the Ecosystem Service Approach
251 13 within my role / activities”), and social support in using it (e.g. “Everyone I work with understands
252 14 what is meant by ecosystem services”). All statements were rated on the scale from strongly
253 15 disagree [1] to strongly agree [7] or don’t know.

254 16
255 17 (iii) *Evaluation of ecosystem services* – When reflecting on their experience of the ecosystem service
256 18 concept in their work, open questions were used to give respondents the opportunity to
257 19 qualitatively express their views on it. These questions focused on three key elements; notably, what
258 20 they saw as the “advantages of using ecosystem services”, “what barriers/challenges, if any, are
259 21 associated with the use of ecosystem services”, and “what improvements, if any, [they] could think
260 22 could be made to the use of the ecosystem services in [their] field”.

261 23
262 24 (iv) *Socio-demographic information* – The questionnaire concluded with a set of closed personal
263 25 questions to gather further information on this sample, such as gender, age group, country of origin,
264 26 and education and employment level.

267 26 **2.3 Data Analysis**

268 27 **Quantitative Data Analysis**

269 28 For the quantitative questions, the overall trends are reported (means and standard deviations). To
270 29 test respondents’ agreement with statements, one-sample t-tests examined if the responses
271 30 statistically differed from the mid-point (i.e. neither agree nor disagree). Further analyses looked at
272 31 whether responses differed according to individual differences (e.g. demographics and work
273 32 experience) and how the different measures related to one another. For the individual differences, if
274 33 data was normally distributed, multiple analyses of variances (ANOVAs) were run, if the data did not
275 34 fulfil the criteria for parametric tests, non-parametric alternatives were used (i.e. Kruskal-Wallis). To
276 35 look at how the different responses related to one another, a Principal Components Analysis (PCA)
277 36 was applied to the responses from the sections ‘*Understanding of ES*’ and ‘*Use of ES*’ of the
278 37 questionnaire. PCAs emphasise variation and bring out strong patterns in a dataset. The scores for the
279 38 1st and 2nd components from each PCA were plotted in a biplot for further interpretation. PCAs were
280 39 performed using the package *vegan* (Oksanen et al., 2016) in R (R Development Core Team, 2017).

281 40 **Qualitative Data Analysis**

282 41 For all of the open response questions, a manual coding process to interrogate the data was used.
283 42 Thematic analysis was undertaken in a variety of ways. For the majority of these questions, a
284 43 bottom-up inductive coding was used where the qualitative data was reviewed to identify prominent
285 44 emergent categories in each question through a data reduction and thematic coding process, these
286 45 were then developed and revised after numerous reviews of the data to identify the dominant

1 themes and sub-themes (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Additional content analysis was applied to
 2 quantify the prominence of particular themes and sub-themes in our sample's responses, whereby
 3 the number of mentions or quotes that aligned with each theme were collated. For one of the
 4 qualitative questions, a top-down a-priori coding process was also applied. One of the initial
 5 questions asked respondents to provide a definition of the term 'ecosystem services', of which we
 6 were interested in what respondents spontaneously said and how this compared with existing
 7 definitions. Respondents' answers were consequently compared to an a-prior framework. This
 8 involved comparing their answers to a list of published ecosystem service definitions derived from
 9 both marine research and practical applications in aquatic management (See Table 1 in
 10 Supplementary Material). Key words from those ES definitions were identified, and then these key
 11 words were searched for within the respondents' responses (see Table 2).

ES Categories	Contributories	Beneficiaries	Outcome
Regulating	Environment	Human	Benefits
Supporting	Environmental	People	Processes
Provisioning	Ecosystem	Society	Services
Cultural	Nature	Population	Goods
	Natural Resources	Humankind	Wellbeing
			Health
			Value

12 Table 2: Search protocol developed through review of key ecosystem services definitions.

13 The qualitative data analysis provided additional insights into how respondents currently apply the
 14 concept of ES within the context of marine and coastal management in the UK, and their views on
 15 the challenges, benefits and opportunities for improving the use of the concept might be. These key
 16 themes are discussed in parallel to findings of the quantitative analysis, with quotes presented in
 17 italics to support the discussion where appropriate. Although analysis of qualitative data is
 18 inherently subjective, to check for inter-rater reliability two of the authors independently coded 20%
 19 of the data. Cohen's kappa found satisfactory agreement between coders across the three
 20 qualitative data questions at an average of 67% (Landis and Koch, 1977).

21 3. Results

22 3.1 Understanding of ecosystem services

23 The definitions provided by respondents varied in the level of detail. Some were very brief and
 24 concise "*Flows of benefits from natural systems*" whereas some definitions included very specific
 25 information, presumably connected to the individual respondents' experience, for example
 26 "*Recognising the benefits (and 'true' economic values) of natural environmental systems such as*
 27 *land, water, flora and fauna. Ecosystem services benefits are often ignored in traditional economic*
 28 *evaluations. An example would be the scrub/ buffer/ hedgerows around agricultural field that are the*
 29 *home to pollinating insects that are an essential part in maximising yields of grain and food stuffs. If*
 30 *you ploughed all the land that supports the pollinating insects, you might expect an increase in the*
 31 *amount of food produced, but if you destroy the habitat where the pollinators live then the yields will*
 32 *often dramatically decrease. Ecosystem services recognise the true benefits and economic values of*
 33 *the pollinators and their habitat is much greater than the extra land that would be released for*
 34 *agriculture. Similar benefits could be achieved for reduction in rainfall runoff and reduced risk by*
 35 *leaving buffer strips around fields that slow down water entering streams and rivers, thus reducing*
 36 *flooding downstream. These buffer strips act as an ecosystem service to people and property at risk*
 37 *of flooding further downstream a catchment*".

Using the search protocol from Table 2, 95% of respondents used at least one of the key words in their definition (see Figure 1) – on average, the number of key terms used in respondent definitions was 3, although this varied from none to five. For the four groupings of search terms (see Table 2), 4.5% of responses noted at least one of the ES categories, 34% emphasised contributors, 20% noted beneficiaries, with analysis showing the highest level of emphasis (41.5%) on outcome related terms. The terms most commonly used by respondents were ‘benefits’, ‘ecosystem’, ‘services’, ‘human’ and ‘environment’ (Figure 1.). Other words commonly used to define ES included ‘natural capital’, ‘economic value’ and ‘function’ – the inclusion of economic valuation language in respondents’ definitions, and the implications of this for the ongoing use of ES concept within marine and coastal management is addressed in later sections. Furthermore, it is interesting to note the dominance of ‘benefits’ as a key word within definitions, compared with the other ES terms of services and processes.




Figure 1: Inclusion of ES terms in respondent definitions of ‘ecosystem services’.

Note. Bars in blue refer to the terms associated with ‘ES Categories’, green is ‘contributors’, yellow ‘beneficiaries’ and red ‘outcome’.

With regards to the level of understanding of ES, when asked to rate how informed they perceived themselves to be, respondents felt ‘moderately’ to ‘very informed’ about ES, on average ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 0.88$).

Overall, the sample statistically varied from the mid-point with regard to liking the term, and strongly agreed that it is a useful management tool and helps to assign meaningful value to marine resources. They also agreed that it aids communication, supports management plans, and generally like the terminology (see Table 3). The responses to the question “Ecosystem Services are difficult to understand” and “Ecosystem Services cover all aspects....” remained closer to the mid-point but had greater standard deviation indicating greater variation in the responses.

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation
How informed do you feel about the term “ecosystem services”? ⁱ	3.39	0.88
a) Using ecosystem services makes communication easier and more effective. ⁱⁱ	4.64***	1.47
b) Ecosystem services are difficult to understand (-ive) ⁱⁱ	4.05	1.70
c) The ecosystem services approach is a useful management tool. ⁱⁱ	5.46***	1.33
d) Ecosystem services allow us to assign a meaningful value to marine and coastal resources ⁱⁱ	5.17***	1.52
e) The ecosystem services approach supports integrated management and plans of our coasts and seas. ⁱⁱ	4.64***	1.47
f) Ecosystem services cover all aspects of marine and coastal environments. ⁱⁱ	4.32	2.00
g) Overall, I do not like the concept of ecosystem services (-ive) ⁱⁱ	2.77***	1.68
h) Overall, I like the terminology used in the ecosystem services approach ⁱⁱ	4.46***	1.53

Note. Scale ⁱ ranged from not at all informed [1] to high expertise [5]; scale ⁱⁱ strongly disagree [1] to strongly agree [7]. “Don’t know” responses are not included in this analysis. (-ive) denotes negative wording of statement. N varies as some respondents said “don’t know” to individual items, thus are not included in the analysis. *** denotes statistically different to the mid-point (4) to a $p < 0.001$

Table 3. The average rating (and standard deviation) for each statement looking at perceptions towards ecosystem services ($n = 149-158$).

PCA analysis found that the first axis of the PCA for respondents’ understanding of ES explained 45% of the variance and was clearly an axis of ‘ES appeal’, as shown by the loadings of ‘overall I like the terminology’ responses (overall dislikes in opposite direction, see Figure 2). The fact that ES supports integrated management, is a useful management tool, allows to assign meaningful values and makes communication easier also loaded PC1, and were strongly correlated to how much respondents liked the ES framework. In contrast, the fact that the ES framework is difficult to understand and that it covers many aspects did not influence the axis of ‘ES appeal’ (PC1) as much.




Figure 2. PCA biplot showing the scores of each respondent (black points) and the loadings of each variable (blue arrows) on the 1st and 2nd principal components, in response to 'views about ES'.

Note: The angles between arrows approximate to their correlations (smaller angles imply high correlations between variables, and perpendicular arrows imply zero correlation). Points close together correspond to observations that have similar scores on the PCA components.

As shown in Figure 2, respondents who liked the ES concept (those on the right of the central line in Figure 2) also thought it was useful as a management tool, that it allowed to assign a meaningful value and that supported integrated management. Conversely, respondents on the left side of the graph did not like the concept, did not think it was a useful management tool, did not find it allowed to assign a meaningful value, and did not think it supported integrated management.

3.2 Use of ecosystem services

The majority of respondents (84.8%) have used this concept in their work, with 43.0% using it occasionally, 33.5% using it frequently, and 8.2% of the sample using it on a daily basis. When exploring respondents' experiences in using the concept in their work (see Table 4), they do not believe that everyone understands ES. Overall, respondents agreed that there are opportunities to use ES in their work, it is important within their role, and they understand how it can be used in management plans. They also agree (but to a lesser extent) that they are confident in using ES and communicating about ES, and that it helps to collaborate with other sectors. Demonstrating a greater variability in responses, respondents did not necessarily agree that "My organisation / line manager encourages me to use ecosystem services".

Statement	Mean	(Standard Deviation)
a) I feel confident about using ecosystem services within my role / activities	5.15***	(1.60)
b) The ecosystem service approach is important within my role / activities	5.22***	(1.55)
c) There are opportunities for using the Ecosystem Service Approach within my role / activities	5.56***	(1.52)
d) I feel confident communicating about ecosystem services to colleagues and stakeholders	5.18***	(1.44)
e) I understand how ecosystem services can be used in management plans.	5.10***	(1.53)
f) Everyone I work with understands what is meant by ecosystem services	2.83***	(1.63)
g) My organisation / line manager encourages me to use ecosystem services	4.17	(1.97)
h) The concept of ecosystem services makes it easier to collaborate with different sectors.	4.64***	(1.58)

1 Table 4. The average rating (and standard deviation) for each statement looking at respondents' use
2 of ecosystem services in their work ($n = 145-157$).

3 Note. Scale ranged from strongly disagree [1] to strongly agree [7]. N varies as some respondents said "don't
4 know" to individual items, thus are not included in the analysis. *** denotes statistically different to the mid-
5 point (4) to a $p < .001$.

6 Further analysis on this set of questions was conducted to examine the relationship between the
7 ratings that individuals gave to the various questions. The first axis of the PCA for 'Use of ES'
8 explained 48% of the variance and was an axis of 'ES perceived usefulness'. PC1 was loaded with
9 responses to how confident respondents felt when using ES, how important this framework was
10 within their role, the opportunity of using ES, how encouraged they were to use this concept, or
11 whether the concept made it easier to collaborate with different sectors (Fig. 3). In contrast,
12 whether others understood the concept did not influence the 'perceived usefulness' of the ES
13 concept. Respondents on the right side of the Fig. 3 tended not to use the concept, didn't feel
14 confident communicating it, or felt that it wasn't an important concept within their role. In contrast,
15 respondents on the left side of the graph used the concept and were confident using it, among other
16 responses.




Figure 3. PCA biplot showing the scores of each respondent (black points) and the loadings of each variable (blue arrows) on the 1st and 2nd principal components, in response to 'using ES'.

Note: The angles between arrows approximate to their correlations (smaller angles imply high correlations between variables, and perpendicular arrows imply zero correlation). Points close together correspond to observations that have similar scores on the PCA components.

Relating to this, respondents were asked to qualitatively describe how they currently use the concept of ES. Analysis of the data found there to be a myriad of ways in which UK marine and coastal practitioners use the concept of ES, with the majority of respondents indicating that they have current or previous experience in using the concept. Using a thematic analysis approach, a number of themes relating to use were identified including: supporting sustainable management and decision making, understanding and communicating the connections between different aspects of the seas and coasts (including cultural and heritage components), education and research, assessment of ES and natural resources, communication between stakeholders, improving understanding of the benefits and importance associated with the marine and coastal environment, and understanding and assigning value (both monetary and non-monetary) to resources, including the application of natural capital/ accounting approaches to decision making. The multiple uses of the ES concept were also neatly summarised by one respondent who stated that they had used the concept in numerous ways - "1) education - providing lectures on the subject to both undergrad and postgrad students; 2) with stakeholders as a method to stimulate discussion surrounding management of MPAs [Marine Protected Areas]; 3) with MPA site managers by developing a matrix approach; 3) as the basis of ecological valuation; 4) as the basis for economic valuation; 5) as the basis for social valuation; 6) as the basis of peer-reviewed publications for the academic community".

Comments on the application and use of the ES concept within marine and coastal management highlighted its complexity, and potentially its limitations, as a concept with one respondent stating that "ecosystem services give the appearance of quantifying importance but there are too many possible future scenarios for us to be able to prioritise what is/will be the most important things to

650
651
652 1 *manage/protect*)". Another respondent highlighted ongoing work to improve the accessibility of the
653 2 approach – “*I am working on projects that aim to make the ecosystem services approach applicable*
654 3 *and useful for marine management, planning and conservation.*”
655 4

656 5 It is worth noting that although the respondents were all individuals working within marine and
657 6 coastal management in some way, 13% of respondents indicated that they have never/ currently do
658 7 not use the concept of ES – one even stated that they are “*an ecological consultant and I cannot*
659 8 *recall an occasion when I have used the concept of Ecosystem Services*”. Furthermore, one
660 9 respondent commented that they had used the ES concept in the past, but this was before “*the term*
662 10 *natural capital was in common usage*”, perhaps indicating a natural evolution in terminology.

664 11 **3.3 Differences in perceptions towards the ES framework**

665 12 Secondary analyses were conducted to explore the relationship between respondents'
666 13 'understanding of the ES framework' and 'use of ES' and respondents' demographic and work
667 14 profile. When looking at individual differences, the most significant effects were sector and
668 15 experience of using ES in their work. Respondents across the six sector groups responded similarly
670 16 regarding their general perceptions of ES (see Table 5). However, there were significant differences
671 17 regarding how informed individuals felt about the concept ($p = 0.04$, see Table 5). Whilst
672 18 respondents from the industry sector self-categorised their knowledge as between 'understanding
673 19 of the basics' and 'feeling moderately informed', post-hoc analysis found that this was statistically
674 20 lower than those from other sectors, namely education/academic research ($p = 0.04$) and NGOs ($p =$
676 21 0.02). More statistical differences were found when further examining respondents' use of the
677 22 concept (Table 5), with respondents from industry tending to give lower ratings. The largest effect
678 23 was found for the statement “*My organisation / line manager encourages me to use ecosystem*
679 24 *services*”: unlike the other sectors, respondents from industry overall disagreed with this statement,
680 25 giving it a statistically significantly lower rating to respondents from all other sectors ($ps < 0.03$). For
681 26 the other statements, there was a general agreement, with respondents within the industrial sector
682 27 feeling less confident in using the concept within their work (compared to education/academic
683 28 research and consultancy research, $ps = .04$); did not see it as important within their work compared
684 29 to others (education/academic research, consultancy research, government & policy, and NGOs, $ps <$
686 30 0.04), and perceived fewer opportunities to use the ecosystem service concept (e.g. than those
687 31 within consultancy research, NGOs, and government & policy, $ps < 0.01$).

688 32 In agreement with the results from the PCAs (Fig. 3), there were also linear main effects of how
689 33 often ES are used and how informed respondents felt about the concept on their ratings. With the
690 34 exception of the statement “*Everyone I work with understands what is meant by ecosystem*
692 35 *services*”, respondents who use ES in their work more regularly and felt more informed about the
693 36 concept gave more positive ratings and were more confident in using it ($ps < 0.02$). Using this
694 37 analytical approach, no demographic main effects were identified (e.g. gender, age, and education
695 38 level were not seen to have an overall main effect on respondents' ratings, $ps > 0.06$).

39
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749

Statement	Education/ Research (n = 37-42)	Consultancy Research (n = 21-26)	Govt & Policy (n = 38-41)	NGO (n = 19-20)	Industry (n = 13-15)	Other (n = 13-14)	Statistical difference
Perceptions of Ecosystem Services							
How informed do you feel about the term "ecosystem services"? ⁱ	3.50 (0.83)	3.50 (0.91)	3.34 (0.91)	3.65 (0.75)	2.73 (0.80)	3.36 (0.93)	F (5,152) = 2.36, p = .04, η ² = .07
a) Using ecosystem services makes communication easier and more effective. ⁱⁱ	4.67 (1.51)	4.76 (1.56)	4.58 (1.41)	4.90 (1.52)	4.50 (1.29)	4.29 (1.59)	n.s.
b) Ecosystem services are difficult to understand (-ive) ⁱⁱ	3.81 (1.89)	3.88 (1.66)	4.39 (1.56)	4.40 (1.79)	4.29 (1.38)	3.36 (1.60)	n.s.
c) The ecosystem services approach is a useful management tool. ⁱⁱ	5.68 (1.21)	5.38 (1.79)	5.15 (1.31)	5.60 (0.82)	5.57 (0.94)	5.57 (1.60)	n.s.
d) Ecosystem services allow us to assign a meaningful value to marine and coastal resources ⁱⁱ	5.24 (1.51)	5.38 (1.65)	5.02 (1.39)	4.90 (1.29)	5.71 (1.38)	4.86 (2.11)	n.s.
e) The ecosystem services approach supports integrated management and plans of our coasts and seas. ⁱⁱ	4.67 (1.51)	4.76 (1.56)	4.58 (1.41)	4.90 (1.52)	4.50 (1.29)	4.29 (1.59)	n.s.
f) Ecosystem services cover all aspects of marine and coastal environments. ⁱⁱ	4.32 (2.16)	4.72 (2.01)	3.95 (1.80)	4.26 (1.97)	4.92 (1.66)	4.15 (2.41)	n.s.
g) Overall, I do not like the concept of ecosystem services (-ive) ⁱⁱ	2.70 (1.56)	2.69 (1.95)	2.80 (1.50)	2.60 (1.85)	2.79 (1.19)	3.21 (2.26)	n.s.
h) Overall, I like the terminology used in the ecosystem services approach ⁱⁱ	4.59 (1.50)	4.38 (1.84)	4.48 (1.48)	4.30 (1.49)	4.21 (1.31)	4.64 (1.65)	n.s.
Use of Ecosystem Services							
a) I feel confident about using ecosystem services within my role / activities	5.46 (1.47)	5.46 (1.24)	5.17 (1.72)	5.40 (1.31)	3.80 (1.78)	4.71 (1.77)	X ² = 12.89, df = 5, p = .02
b) The ecosystem service approach is important within my role / activities	5.07 (1.49)	5.23 (1.77)	5.63 (1.43)	5.80 (1.01)	3.73 (1.28)	5.15 (1.72)	X ² = 21.49, df = 5, p = .001
c) There are opportunities for using the Ecosystem Service Approach within my role / activities	5.40 (1.55)	5.96 (1.22)	5.85 (1.42)	5.95 (0.89)	4.00 (1.65)	5.50 (1.83)	X ² = 20.76, df = 5, p = .001
d) I feel confident communicating about ecosystem services to colleagues and stakeholders	5.18 (1.39)	5.42 (1.42)	5.29 (1.57)	5.40 (0.75)	4.07 (1.49)	5.29 (1.64)	n.s.
e) I understand how ecosystem services can be used in management plans.	5.23 (1.40)	5.35 (1.65)	5.00 (1.70)	5.40 (1.27)	4.33 (1.45)	4.93 (1.49)	n.s.
f) Everyone I work with understands what is meant by ecosystem services	2.92 (1.64)	3.22 (1.57)	2.71 (1.69)	3.25 (1.74)	2.14 (1.10)	2.43 (1.65)	n.s.
g) My organisation / line manager encourages me to use ecosystem services	4.14 (1.78)	4.43 (1.86)	4.10 (1.96)	5.37 (1.64)	2.14 (1.41)	4.50 (2.18)	X ² = 22.55, df = 5, p < .001
h) The concept of ecosystem services makes it easier to collaborate with different sectors.	4.54 (1.33)	4.22 (2.00)	5.10 (1.45)	4.75 (1.55)	4.13 (1.85)	4.71 (1.49)	n.s.

Note. Scale ⁱ ranged from not at all informed [1] to high expertise [5]; scale ⁱⁱ strongly disagree [1] to strongly agree [7]. "Don't know" responses are not included in this analysis. (-ive) denotes negative wording of statement. N varies as some respondents said "don't know" to individual items, thus are not included in the analysis.

Table 5. Comparing respondents according to their self-identified sectors on their average rating (and standard deviation) for each statement looking at perceptions and use of ecosystem services.

750
751
752
753 1 **3.4 Evaluation of ecosystem services**

754 2 In addition to identifying trends in understanding and use related to ES, three open questions were
755 3 posed to further evaluate the stakeholders' views, focusing on the perceived advantages, challenges
756 4 and potential opportunities for improvement. Open questions were used in this section to capture
757 5 as broad an input as possible, and because it was not possible to predetermine what these
758 6 responses might be.
759 7

760 7
761 8 **3.4.1. Advantages**

762 9 A vast majority of respondents shared positive experiences, with 92% providing a response to this
763 10 question. As explained above, thematic coding highlighted a range of advantages identified by
764 11 survey respondents (summarised in Table 2 in Supplementary Material). While these advantages
765 12 were described in varying ways, a dominant theme of communication and improving understanding
766 13 was identified as a key advantage of the concept of ES services. A total of 25% of responses (under
767 14 complementary thematic categories of common language and improved dialogue and
768 15 communication) emphasised that the ES concept acts as a way of supporting effective
769 16 communication and increasing understanding of the various components of marine and coastal
770 17 environments, providing a more integrated and holistic way of viewing *and* valuing a diverse set of
771 18 ecosystems, resources and user groups. There was a feeling that the ES concept provides "*common*
772 19 *ground*" and therefore a useful lens through which these complex socio-ecological interactions can
773 20 be simplified, engendering an increased level of understanding across diverse audiences.
774 21

775 22 In addition to providing a "*common language*" that supports communication, 10% of responses
776 23 indicated that the ES concept can be used to improve stakeholder and public understanding of the
777 24 value of these resources to society. Further to supporting communication between different sectors
778 25 and user groups, respondents indicated that the ES concept has been a useful tool through which
779 26 the various values (both monetary and non-monetary) associated with the marine environment can
780 27 be articulated in an accessible way. Monetary valuations were seen as being particularly useful in
781 28 the context of linking wider society, the economy and the environment. This aspect of ES valuation
782 29 was seen as having particular relevance for management and decision making was also identified,
783 30 with one respondent indicating that "*it can be useful for management plans that consider the*
784 31 *economic value of nature*". This was supported by another respondent who stated that "*People*
785 32 *realise that the monetary value [associated with the ES concept] provides a common currency for*
786 33 *discussion. If issues are not valued then they are excluded and not taken into account event though*
787 34 *they are very important*". There was a feeling from some that this quantification of marine and
788 35 coastal systems would be an ongoing trend within management and governance, with one
789 36 respondent suggesting that "*At the planning level, in [Environmental Impact Assessments],*
790 37 *ecosystem services will increasingly be quantified, and contribute to decisions to approve, and/or*
791 38 *attach planning conditions relating to ecosystem services*".
792 39

793 40 Finally, under the theme of communication, a further benefit of using the concept as a
794 41 communication tool leading to improved reputation of certain sectors and activities was suggested.
795 42 An example of this was given by one respondent who stated that "*using this term to describe the*
796 43 *more environmentally favourable forms of aquaculture helps with winning hearts and minds*".
797 44

800 45 **3.4.2. Barriers and Challenges**

801 46 While respondents highlighted a significant number of positive connotations associated with the
802 47 concept of ES, it was evident that there are a number of challenges facing the effective use of
803
804
805
806
807
808

1 concept within UK coastal and marine management, with 93% of respondents providing responses
2 to this question. The most commonly noted challenges and/or barriers were linked to the complexity
3 of the term (10%), the use of jargon/ inaccessible language associated with it (10%), and a lack of
4 both stakeholder and public understanding both around the concept and the science related to it
5 (19%).
6

7 Although the overarching view was that ES as a concept supports communication and dialogue
8 between different users, there was a recognition that challenges remain. One respondent summed
9 this up, by stating that the common language it provides is beneficial *"if we could all agree..."*
10 alluding to the ongoing debate surrounding the concept. There was an overarching view amongst
11 respondents that the concept remains complicated, complex, *"poorly understood"* and too full of
12 *"jargon"*. As shown in Table 3 in Supplementary Materials, respondents characterised the concept as
13 *"narrow"*, with a need for improved integration of heritage aspects within the language of ES
14 identified by one respondent, while another highlighted the challenges associated with the *"variety*
15 *of issues, and the varying approaches that [need to] be applied"*. Further comments were made by
16 4% of responses stressing not only the complexity of the concept, but also that of the marine and
17 coastal environment it is being applied to. There was a feeling that numerous gaps in knowledge and
18 understanding remain, posing a significant challenge to effectively embedding the ES concept within
19 marine and coastal management.
20

21 Given the ongoing conversation around the validity of attributing economic values to natural
22 resources, the theme of monetary valuation was examined through the analysis. Although, concerns
23 about monetary valuation have become part of the ES dialogue, this theme was only identified as a
24 concern and an ongoing challenge in 11% of responses, with one individual stating, *"There is often a*
25 *desire to reduce it down to a financial figure which I am not sure is possible or appropriate"*. This
26 concern was supported by another response who commented that they *"worry that if there's an*
27 *important ecosystem that needs protecting for its intrinsic environmental value but it doesn't have a*
28 *very strong economical case that these important sites will be overlooked"*. Within the broader
29 theme of monetary values, respondents highlighted the challenge of assigning monetary value to the
30 entire marine and coastal system, recognising that many ES and benefits are not marketable and
31 that monetary valuation is just one method of valuing nature and may not always be the most
32 appropriate method. With this in mind, there was a suggestion that the concept of ES *"must be used*
33 *as one tool in an arsenal rather than solo"* within marine and coastal management.
34

35 One respondent questioned the appropriateness of grounding policy development in the ecosystem
36 service concept, recognising gaps in current levels of knowledge and understanding of marine and
37 coastal ES, and directly questioning *"whether it is appropriate, helpful or meaningful to have marine*
38 *planning policies relating specifically to ecosystem services"*. There was a feeling derived from a small
39 group of responses (2%) that, perhaps, the ES concept should be better aligned with other initiatives
40 and policy drivers, for example *"[the] well-being of local communities; protecting MPA networks and*
41 *biodiversity; protecting/improving water quality etc. are more 'implementable', and should support*
42 *the provision of ecosystem services."*
43

44 While interdisciplinarity and taking an integrated view of marine and coastal systems was seen as a
45 strength of the ES concept, concerns that this bringing together of these diverse sectors and
46 disciplines also posed a significant challenge to successfully applying the concept within marine and
47 coastal management in the UK were evident in 5% of responses. One respondent articulated a
48 concern that *"there are also still very strong sectoral barriers to working across disciplines in a*

1 *practical sense - these barriers can be financial (e.g. funding for particular work coming from one*
2 *area and therefore that being the focus of the work rather than a broader approach). The barriers*
3 *can also be political (government, regional and local) and at an individual level where people don't*
4 *want to engage. I also think that a focus on ecosystem services can be seen to (and can actually)*
5 *prevent progress in specific work areas, e.g. biodiversity protection”.*

7 A further barrier identified within 19% of responses is that the concept remains complex and difficult
8 for different audiences to connect with, particularly the wider public. There were concerns
9 expressed that the intricacies of socio-ecological interactions between society and the UK seas and
10 coasts required more than an academic concept to improve public understanding, but that the
11 additional resources and time would be difficult to obtain, with one interviewee commenting that
12 “Sometimes, 'the bigger picture' is too big and there is simply no way to tackle an issue on an
13 ecosystem wide level without significant additional resources. Furthermore, the term ecosystem
14 services does not engender much enthusiasm amongst the general public”.

16 3.4.3. Opportunities for Improvement

18 Recognising the dominance of ES as a fundamental concept within marine and coastal management,
19 this work sought to identify ways in which its application and use could be improved. Analysis of the
20 data found that 81% of respondents felt some form of improvement could be made to how the ES
21 concept is currently being used within UK marine and coastal management, with the dominant
22 themes discussed in the following sections (summarised in Table 6). Those with more than 10
23 mentions have been included in bold font; it is worth noting that the theme ‘Improved stakeholder
24 and public understanding of the science and the application of the concept - including more research
25 and improved communication’ has significantly higher counts than any other thematic category.
26 Other themes frequently mentioned by respondents included: the need for improved knowledge of
27 marine and coastal ecosystems; the need for standardisation across the ES concept; the need to
28 reduce jargon and improve communication supporting a common, user-friendly language; a desire
29 for improved guidance and provision of evidence of success through case studies; and, finally, a need
30 to consider a range of values, not just focusing on economic value and the Natural Capital approach.

Theme	Number of mentions	Evidence (quotes from respondent responses)
Improved stakeholder and public understanding of the science and the application of the concept - including more research and improved communication	47	<p><i>"Educate, educate, educate policy makers, politicians, local communities"</i></p> <p><i>"Lay person briefing sheets summarising the key ecosystem services would be of great value"</i></p> <p><i>"Better definition of ecosystem services for marine areas"</i></p> <p><i>"Further research to identify components of ecosystems which provide mental health and wellbeing benefits"</i></p> <p><i>"Great understanding and awareness of services that are apparent at a local scale"</i></p>
User Friendly language and better communication	20	<p><i>"Change the term for something more widely understandable - even the term ecosystem is a barrier to many..."</i></p> <p><i>"More/better communication of successes in integrating ecosystem services into decisions onto coastal management."</i></p> <p><i>"Use of accessible and appropriate language according to the field."</i></p>
Develop integrated valuation – taking all values into consideration, but including links to the Natural Capital approach.	14	<p><i>"A shift away from numerical values to a traffic light system: Green meaning things are better, Red meaning things are worse"</i></p>
Standardisation and development of common methods and tools	13	<p><i>"Standardisation of metrics, including valuation, and methods of assessment"</i></p>
Improved guidance for better application	12	<p><i>"More clarity on how knowledge of ecosystem services could be used in everyday management issues and casework. E.g. practical examples of how they've been used to implement a change in management."</i></p>
Improved knowledge of marine and coastal ES	11	<p><i>"For the marine environment in particular, we are still a long way from understanding how the different components of the ecosystem inter-relate, making evaluation difficult. So more basic research to support the concept is needed in order to avoid trade-offs that lead to long-term environmental deterioration"</i></p> <p><i>"Better stakeholder understanding of the marine ecosystem."</i></p>
Evidence of Success	11	<p><i>"Use of ecosystem services/the natural capital approach is still at a relatively early stage so although there is a lot of talk about it there still isn't much evidence of it influencing decision making at either a management or a policy level. Hopefully this may start to change with the Defra 25 year environment plan and the Pioneer areas which have been established to trial this approach"</i></p> <p><i>"Good applied case studies moving to real application"</i></p>
Use of best available and innovative science, data and methods.	6	<p><i>"Use the most up to date equipment to measure ecosystem effects...However crucially need to then use data and incorporate it into the data protocols system"</i></p>
Improved policy landscape to better support the ES concept	6	<p><i>"Introduce legal obligation to take ES into account in decision-making"</i></p> <p><i>"It is important to recognize the services provided by the environment when developing a policy framework for planning and development, this can then set the direction of travel down the line at the plan or project level to influence ecosystem service goals"</i></p>

986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044

Theme	Number of mentions	Evidence (quotes from respondent responses)
Improve inclusion to and understanding of culture and heritage.	5	<i>"Further delineation and refinement of the Cultural Ecosystem Services concept."</i>
Better recognition of the assumptions that underpin ES	5	<i>[Need for] more intellectual input and genuine thought about network behaviour rather than tabulating well known connections and arguing about words and their meaning genuine efforts to understand how non-linear interconnections and networks behave, including human behaviour and economics"</i>
Need for funding	3	<i>"More financial resources would allow me to utilise ecosystem services on a wider scale and perhaps start to tackle some of the bigger issues. There needs to be more investment in government conservation bodies to lead this change, so that all conservation can be based around what's best for the ecosystem (and in turn the services we depend on) rather than a single site or species."</i>
Recognition that the ES concept is part of a suite of management tools	3	<i>"To recognise that this is not the complete answer, it is just a tool which can help to make some comparative values clearer - there is a danger that the concept becomes the important thing and not the place"</i>

1 Table 6: Summary of suggested improvements for future application of the ES concept within UK
2 marine and coastal management.

3 **4. Discussion**

4
5 This paper provides insight into marine and coastal stakeholder perceptions and attitudes towards
6 ecosystem services (ES) and its role within UK marine and coastal management. Despite becoming
7 increasingly embedded within environmental decision-making and management, this study found
8 that while stakeholders indicated positive views towards the ES concept, questions, concerns and
9 scepticism remain. Indeed, respondents found a lot of room for improvement as shown by both the
10 volume and diversity of responses identified through the open questions. Many of these were linked
11 to the need for standard procedures to evaluate ES in marine and coastal settings, for clear (e.g.
12 simplified) terminology and classifications, pluralistic valuations, and the need for examples of
13 success stories using the concept within a marine and coastal context. While some of these are
14 already being addressed by both academia and practitioners (see e.g. Pascual et al., 2017), more
15 research in these areas is clearly required.

16 **Views and attitudes towards ES as a concept**

17 Analysis of the results from this study found that most respondents felt informed about ES, liked the
18 terminology, and found it a useful management tool, with some specifically welcoming it as a
19 mechanism through which values (both monetary and non-monetary) can be assigned to marine and
20 coastal ecosystems. We found that the more respondents used the concept, the more they liked it
21 (or vice versa), and the more they liked it, the more confident in using the concept they felt. Across
22 sectors, respondents from the industry sector felt less informed and encouraged to use the ES
23 framework. When asked to define ES, most respondents linked the concept with words such as
24 'environment', 'ecosystem', 'nature/natural', 'human' and 'benefits/services', terms found in the
25 most commonly accepted definitions and frameworks of ES (MA, 2005; de Groot 2010b; NEA 2016).
26 This highlights that, overall, this particular sample of stakeholders had a very accurate idea of the

1045
1046
1047 27 concept, liked the terminology and found it useful as a management tool, across the diverse
1048 28 backgrounds of respondents.

1050 29 With this in mind, it is possible that the ES concept and its application within marine and coastal
1051 30 management should be reviewed, and definitions and approaches to assessment should evolve if
1052 31 necessary, (as discussed by Fisher et al., 2009) to ensure applicability to a complex environmental
1053 32 and governance landscape. As expected, respondents identified both advantages and challenges
1054 33 associated with the use of the ES concept within marine and coastal management in the UK.
1055 34 Synthesising all responses given throughout the questionnaire we propose that the main advantages
1056 35 of the ES approach can be summarised in 5 key themes:

- 1058 36 1) Supports the understanding of the multiple (plural) values of the environment;
- 1059 37 2) Reduces complexity and provides a holistic view of the environment;
- 1060 38 3) Provides a common language that improves communication between sectors, and increases
1061 39 public understanding;
- 1062 39 4) Links society to the environment; and
- 1063 40 5) Supports management.

1064 41
1065
1066 42 While numerous advantages were identified through this study, it remains clear that there are a
1067 43 variety of challenges tied up with the application of the ES concept within contemporary marine and
1068 44 coastal management. Bringing together the key findings from this study, we propose that these
1069 45 challenges can be grouped into 5 main categories:

- 1071 46 1) Problems of understanding and lack of specificity (unknowns);
- 1072 47 2) Terminological problems (vagueness, openness);
- 1073 48 3) Concerns linked to the commodification of nature and the dominance of economic
1074 49 valuation;
- 1075 50 4) Difficult application to a real-world context; and
- 1076 51 5) Illustration of the need for increased support from the political landscape.

1078 52 The benefits and challenges identified by respondents in this study are not necessarily unexpected,
1079 53 and similar observations have been made by other authors (see for example - Maes et al., 2018;
1080 54 Borie and Hulme, 2015; Chan et al., 2012; Armsworth et al., 2007), serving to highlight the
1081 55 complexity and challenge associated with the ongoing ES debate. Indeed, it could be said that this
1082 56 itself illustrates the complexity of societal interactions with the environmental world. Despite the
1083 57 range of challenges and potential pit falls identified by respondents, the unique contribution of this
1084 58 work remains in its assessment of the opportunities for future improvements.

1087 59 ***Opportunities and Recommendations for Improvement***

1088 60 Although other studies have examined perceptions towards the ES concept (Thompson et al., 2016),
1089 61 this paper presents an evaluation not only of current views, thereby identifying trends in perceptions
1090 62 whilst giving an insight as to why those views are held, but also of the challenges and potential
1091 63 opportunities for improvement in the future. Analysis of the stakeholder responses generated 5 key
1092 64 areas for improvement with regards to the application of the ES concept within marine and coastal
1093 65 management:

- 1096 66 • Need for standardisation and more guidance than currently available,
- 1097 67 • Need for improved and clear terminology, including a simplification of classifications that does
1098 68 not disengage the general public,

1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162

- 69 • Need for multilevel/multi-metric/pluralistic valuations, allowing greater connection to culture
70 and heritage,
- 71 • Need for a collection of success stories to be used as case studies,
- 72 • Improvements beyond ES (e.g. increased funding, increased scientific education for politicians
73 and policy makers).

74 Language, in a number of guises, was seen to be a key theme throughout the various aspects of this
75 research, both on the positive and negative side of the conversation. This discussion is one that has
76 been ongoing for some time, with numerous authors presenting different views and definitions
77 associated with the concept (see Fisher et al., 2009 for examples). A fundamental concern expressed
78 by stakeholders about the application of ES within marine and coastal management was a feeling
79 that the ES language and terminology is complex, inaccessible and hard for people to connect with.
80 Recent research has examined the influence that language and terminology can have on how a
81 concept is accepted or used (Raymond et al., 2013). Concerns about the semantic implications of
82 ecosystems providing services to people's wellbeing stem from the presentation of people and
83 nature as separate entities, with directional flows just from nature to people (Raymond 2017, Kenter
84 2018). Respondents referred to these issues, with the ES concept seen to 'disengage the general
85 public'. Concerns about the level of uncertainty and knowledge gaps relating to ES, and how the
86 concept can be applied, are not new (Wallace, 2007; Metz and Weigel, 2010; Dempsey and
87 Robertson, 2012; Schroter et al., 2014; Thompson et al., 2016; Potschin-Young et al., 2018), and,
88 evidently, this remains the case for marine and coastal management in the UK. Previous studies
89 argue that the dominance of the ES concept, and the economic valuation often associated with it,
90 can result in a diminished relationship between society and nature, rather than supporting strong
91 connections (Peterson et al., 2009; Schroter et al., 2014, Raymond et al., 2013; Diaz et al., 2018).
92 However, and interestingly, in many instances respondents found the same topic as both
93 advantageous and a disadvantage: e.g. vagueness-openness of the term, topics linked to making
94 communication easier between disciplines, offering a common ground, linking society to the
95 environment and providing a holistic view of the environment.

96 The areas for improvement detailed above are already being tackled by many groups, although this
97 is lacking a collective approach with moves towards improvement being steered by specific sub-
98 disciplines or sectors. For example, the Blue Carbon Initiative produced a manual (Howard et al.,
99 2014) 'with the goal of standardizing protocols for sampling methods, laboratory measurements,
100 and analysis of blue carbon stocks and fluxes'. The manual provides scientists and coastal managers
101 with 'a practical tool to produce robust blue carbon data'. This manual has turned into the current
102 gold standard for evaluation of global carbon stocks in marine ecosystems. Adopting a similar
103 approach to standardisation and the production of real-world examples to support implementation
104 for all ES and benefits, including those associated with culture and heritage, would make the ES
105 concept even more used and applicable to the real world. Another example of a trial to improve the
106 concept has been the recent presentation by the IPBES of the notion of 'Nature's Contributions to
107 People' (NCP) (Diaz et al., 2018). While the aim of developing this 'new' term was to come up with a
108 simpler more inclusive terminology that was accepted among different world views and disciplines
109 (Borie and Hulme 2015), the heated debate that has prompted (e.g. de Braat 2018), does not
110 envisage a resolution to this pending improvement. However, what has been praised from the IPBES
111 framework is the pluralistic valuation approach (one of the opportunities for improvement identified
112 in this study), which should be able to accommodate different world views by taking into account
113 not only economic values, but also social, ecological, cultural and indigenous and local knowledge
114 ones (See Pascual et al., 2015 for IPBES, but also Chan et al., 2012a, b). If the ES concept is to realise
115 its potential as a common tool that can be used by the multitude of actors involved in marine and

1163
1164
1165 116 coastal management, more work is required to sufficiently embed these plural values within the
1166 117 ongoing ES conversation and application.

1168 118 **5. Concluding Comments and Recommendations**

1169
1170 119 Regardless of ongoing efforts to further embed the ES concept within marine and coastal
1171 120 management, and despite the ever-growing literature base aimed at further developing the concept
1172 121 and its application, the fact remains that there continue to be concerns as to how, and if, the ES can
1173 122 be appropriately applied to the intricate and complex systems of the global seas and coasts. As
1174 123 shown in this study, despite an overwhelmingly and, indeed, unexpectedly positive response from
1175 124 UK marine and coastal stakeholders towards the ES concept, the perceived opportunities for
1176 125 improvement are vast. With this in mind, the following sets out a series of recommendations:

- 1178 126 • While support for the ES concept within the governance sphere is evident through its inclusion
1179 127 in recent policy (e.g. UK's 25 Year Environment Plan (Defra, 2018)), there remains a call for
1181 128 greater political support. We therefore recommend increased explicit consideration of ES
1182 129 provided from specific marine and coastal environments within high level national legislation
1183 130 and key policy drivers in the UK, as has been recently highlighted for Wales (McKinley et al.,
1184 131 2018).
- 1185 132 • For the ES concept to be successful, it must be recognised that there will be no 'one size fits all'
1186 133 definition or approach that can be applied to all marine and coastal contexts across the UK.
1187 134 However, for the benefits associated with culture and heritage to be appropriately recognised
1188 135 within wider ES dialogue, a revised definition and perhaps, an interdisciplinary suite of
1190 136 approaches and methodologies with the capacity to take account of pluralistic values and uses,
1191 137 is recommended.
- 1192 138 • Alongside a revised definition, it is suggested that users of the ES concept carefully consider
1193 139 the audience and adopt appropriate language when communicating or discussing the ES
1194 140 concept and how it might impact their use of the UK coast and sea. By taking account of the
1195 141 heterogeneity of public audiences, and tailoring language fittingly should reduce the concerns
1196 142 raised regarding complexity, jargon and technical language commonly associated with the ES
1197 143 concept.
- 1199 144 • While we found high levels of favourable attitudes towards the ES concept in a UK context, we
1200 145 propose that such rates of stakeholder acceptance and use will not be achieved in other
1201 146 countries of the world (Pagès and McKinley 2018) due to among other things, the influence of
1202 147 differing world views across communities and user groups (Pascual et al., 2018, Borie and
1203 148 Hulme 2015), as well as concerns about the application of monetary valuation to marine and
1204 149 coastal management (Raymond et al., 2013). It is therefore recommended that the work
1205 150 presented in this paper is reapplied internationally to explore this in more detail, with a view to
1206 151 supporting global marine and coastal governance endeavours to develop, agree on, and
1207 152 implement consistent approaches for marine and coastal management on a global scale.
- 1209 153 • With a view to improving uptake, understanding and application of the ES concept within
1210 154 marine and coastal management in the UK, the generation of success stories and best practice
1211 155 examples of a multi-use/ value application of ES in an appropriate context is recommended.
1212 156 Stakeholders could use these as evidence and support tools when developing Ecosystem based
1213 157 management approaches.
- 1214 158 • Crucially, we recommend that, as the conversation around societal interactions and
1215 159 relationships with the natural environment continues to evolve (see, for example, the
1216 160 emphasis on natural capital in the UK's recent 25 Year Environment Plan (Defra, 2018)), the ES

1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280

161 concept should be considered one tool within a wider suite of options for marine and coastal
162 management.

163

164 **Acknowledgements**

165 The Authors acknowledge the financial support provided by the Welsh Government and Higher
166 Education Funding Council for Wales through the Sêr Cymru National Research Network for Low
167 Carbon, Energy and Environment. Additionally, this research formed part of the Valuing Nature
168 Programme (valuing-nature.net) which is funded by the Natural Environment Research Council, the
169 Economic and Social Research Council, the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council,
170 the Arts and Humanities Research Council and the Department for Environment, Food and Rural
171 Affairs. This research was supported by the UK Research Councils under Natural Environment
172 Research Council award NE/N013573/1, Title CoastWEB: Valuing the contribution which COASTal
173 habitats make to human health and WEllBeing, with a focus on the alleviation of natural hazards

1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339

175 **References**

176 Armsworth, P., R., Chan, K., M., A., Daily, G., C., Ehrlich, P., R., Kremen, C., Ricketts, T., H., and
177 Sanjayan, M., A. (2016) Ecosystem service science and the way forward for conservation.
178 *Conservation Biology* 21(6): 1383-1384

179 Armsworth, P., R., Chan, K., M., A., Daily, G., C., Ehrlich, P., R., Kremen, C., Ricketts, T., H.,
180 Sanjayan, M., A. 2007 Ecosystem-service science and the way forward for conservation.
181 *Conserv. Biol.* **21**, 1383–1384. (doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2007.00821.x)

182 Atkins, J.P., Burdon, D., Elliott, M., Gregory, A.J., 2011. Management of the marine environment:
183 Integrating ecosystem services and societal benefits with the DPSIR framework in a systems
184 approach. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 62, 215-226.

185 Balmford, A., Fisher, B., R.E., G., Naidoo, R., Strassburg, B., Turner, R.K., Rodrigues, A.S.L., 2011.
186 Bringing ecosystem services into the real world: an operational framework for assessing the
187 economic consequences of losing wild nature. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 48, 161-175.

188 Beaumont N.J., M.C. Austen, J. Atkins, D. Burdon, S. Degraer, T.P. Dentinho, S. Derous, P. Holm, T.
189 Horton, E. van Ierland, A. H. Marboe, D.J. Starkey, M. Townsend, T. Zarzycki. Identification, Definition
190 and Quantification of Goods and Services provided by Marine Biodiversity: Implications for the
191 Ecosystem Approach. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 54 (2007) 253-265

192 Beaumont N.J., T. Hooper, R. Mongruel (2018) Practical application of the Ecosystem Service
193 Approach (ESA): Lessons Learned and recommendations for the future. *International Journal of*
194 *Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services & Management*. In Press

195 Barbier, E., B., Hacker, S., D., Kennedy, C., Kock, E., w., Stier, A., C., and Silliman, B., R. (2011) The
196 value of estuarine and coastal ecosystem services. *Ecological Monographs* 81(2): 169-193

197 Beery, T., Stalhammer, S., Jonsson, K., I., Wamsler, C., Bramryd, T., Brink, E., Ekelund, N., Johansson,
198 M., Palo, T., Schubert, P. (2016) Perceptions of the ecosystem services concept: Opportunities and
199 challenges in the Swedish municipal context. *Ecosystem Services* 17: 123-130

200 Borie M, Hulme M. 2015. Framing global biodiversity: IPBES between mother earth and ecosystem
201 services. *Environmental Science and Policy* 54:487–96.

202 Braat LC. 2018. Five reasons why the Science publication “Assessing nature’s contributions
203 to people” (Diaz et al., 2018) would not have been accepted in *Ecosystem Services*.
204 *Ecosystem Services* 30:A1–2.

205

206 Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative*
207 *Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

208

209 CBD Secretariat (2000) Decision V/6 Ecosystem approach. Document UNEP/CBD/COP/5/6.
210 Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Nairobi, Kenya

211 Chan, K., M., A., Satterfield, T., and Goldstein, J. (2012) Rethinking ecosystem services to better
212 address and navigate cultural values. *Ecological Economics* 74:8-18

213 Chan, K., M., A., Guerry, A., D., Balvanera, P., Klain, S., Satterfield, T., Basurto, X., Bostrom, A.,
214 Chuenpagdee, R., Gould, R., Halpern, B., S., Hannahs, N., Levine, J., Norton, B., Ruckelshaus, M.,
215 Russell, R., Tam, J., and Woodside, U. (2012) *Bioscience* 62(8): 744-756

1340
1341
1342 216 Chan K., M., A., *et al.* (2012) Where are Cultural and Social in Ecosystem Services? A Framework for
1343 217 Constructive Engagement. *Bioscience* **62**, 744–756. (doi:10.1525/bio.2012.62.8.7)

1345 218 Cognetti, G., Maltagliati, F., 2010. Ecosystem service provision: an operational way for marine
1346 219 biodiversity conservation and management. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* **60**, 1916-1923.

1348 220 Costanza, R., d'Arge, R., de Groot, R., Farber, S., Grasso, M., Hannon, B., Limburg, K., Naeem, S.,
1349 221 O'Neill, R.V., Paruelo, J., Raskin, R.G., Sutton, P., van den Belt, M., 1997. The value of the world's
1350 222 ecosystem services and natural capital. *Nature* **387**, 253-260.

1352 223 Costanza, R., de Groot, R., Sutton, P., van der Ploeg, S., Anderson, S., J., Kubiszewski, I., Farber, S.,
1353 224 and Turner, R., K. (2014) Changes in the global value of ecosystem services. *Global Environmental*
1354 225 *Change* **26**: 152-158

1356 226 Daily, G., 1997. *Nature's services: societal dependence on natural ecosystems*. Island Press,
1357 227 Washington DC.

1359 228 Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs (Defra) (2018) 'A Green Future: Our 25 year plan
1360 229 to improve the environment. January 2018. Available from:
1361 230 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/25-year-environment-plan>

1363 231 De Groot, R., S., Alkemande, R., Braat, L., Hein, L., and Willeman, L. (2010a) Challenges in integrating
1364 232 the concept of ecosystem services and values in landscape planning, management and decision-
1365 233 making. *Ecological Complexity* **7**: 260-272

1366 234 de Groot, R.S., Fisher, B., Christie, M., Aronson, J., Braat, L., Haines-Young, R., Gowdy, J., Maltby, E.,
1368 235 Neuville, A., Polasky, S., Portela, R., Ring, I., 2010b. Integrating the ecological and economic
1369 236 dimensions in biodiversity and ecosystem service valuation, in: Kumar, P. (Ed.), *The Economics of*
1370 237 *Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB): Ecological and Economic Foundations*. Earthscan, London, pp. 9-
1371 238 40.

1373 239 Dempsey, J., and Robertson, M., M. (2012) Ecosystem Services: Tensions, impurities and points of
1374 240 engagement within neoliberalism. *Progress in Human Geography* **36(6)**: 758-779

1376 241 Díaz S, Pascual U, Stenseke M, Martín-López B, Watson RT, Molnár Z, Hill R, Chan KMA, Baste IA,
1377 242 Brauman KA, Polasky S, Church A, Lonsdale M, Larigauderie A, Leadley PW, Van Oudenhoven APE,
1378 243 Van Der Plaats F, Schröter M, Lavorel S, Aumeeruddy-Thomas Y, Bukvareva E, Davies K, Demissew S,
1379 244 Erpul G, Failler P, Guerra CA, Hewitt CL, Keune H, Lindley S, Shirayama Y. 2018. Assessing nature's
1380 245 contributions to people. *Science* **359**:270–2.

1382 246 Fisher, B., Turner, K., Zylstra, M., Brouwer, R., Groot, R.d., Farber, S., Ferraro, P., Green, R., Hadley,
1383 247 D., Harlow, J., Jefferiss, P., Kirkby, C., Morling, P., Mowatt, S., Naidoo, R., Paavola, J., Strassburg, B.,
1384 248 Yu, D., Balmford, A., 2008. Ecosystem services and economic theory: integration for policy-relevant
1385 249 research. *Ecological Applications* **18**, 2050-2067.

1387 250 Fisher, B., Turner, K., R., and Morling, P. (2009) Defining and classifying ecosystem services for
1388 251 decision making. *Ecological Economics* **68**: 643-653

1390 252 GESAMP (IMO/FAO/ UNESCO-IOC/ WMO/ WHO/ IAEA/ UN/ UNEP Joint Group of Experts on
1391 253 Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection) and Advisory Committee on Protection of the
1392 254 Sea (2001) *A sea of Troubles*. Rep. Stud. GESAMP No. 70 35pp.

1394
1395
1396
1397
1398

1399
1400
1401 255 Gomez-Baggethun, E., de Groot, R., Lomas, P., L., and Montes, C. (2010) The history of ecosystem
1402 256 services in economic theory and practice: From early notions to markets and payment schemes.
1403 257 *Ecological Economics* 69: 1209-1218
1404
1405 258 Granek, E., F., Polasky, S., Kappel, C., V., Reed, J., D., Stoms, D., M., Koch, E., W., Kennedy, C., J.,
1406 259 Cramer, L., A., Hacker, S., D., Barbier, E., B., Aswani, S., Ruckelhaus, M., Perillo, G., M., E., Silliman, B.,
1407 260 R., Muthiga, N., Bael, D., and Walnski, E. (2010) Ecosystem services as a common language for
1408 261 coastal ecosystem-based management. *Conservation Biology* 24(1): 207-216
1409
1410 262 Hicks, C., C., Cinner, J., C., Stoeckl, N., and McClanahan, T., R. (2015) Linking ecosystem services and
1411 263 human-values theory. *Conservation Biology* 29(5): 1471-1480
1412
1413 264 Howard, J., Hoyt, S., Isensee, K., Pidgeon, E., Telszewski, M. (eds.) (2014). Coastal Blue
1414 265 Carbon: Methods for assessing carbon stocks and emissions factors in mangroves, tidal
1415 266 salt marshes, and seagrass meadows. Conservation International, Intergovernmental
1416 267 Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO, International Union for Conservation of Nature.
1417 268 Arlington, Virginia, USA.
1418
1419 269 Irvine, K., N., O'Brien, L., Ravenscroft, N., Cooper, N., Everard, M., Fazey, I., Reed, S., M., and Kenter,
1420 270 J., O. (2016) Ecosystem Services and the idea of shared values. *Ecosystem Services* 21:184-193
1421
1422 271 Jax, H., Furman, E., Saarikowski, H., Barton, D., N., Delbaere, B., Dick, J., Duke, G., Gorg, C., Gomez-
1423 272 Baggethun, E., Harrison, P., A., Maes, J., Perez-Soba, M., Saarela, S., Turkelboom, F., van Dijk, J., and
1424 273 Watt, A., D. (2018) Handling a messy world: Lessons learned when trying to make the ecosystem
1425 274 services concept operational. *Ecosystem Services*. 29:415-427
1426
1427 275 Kenter JO. 2018. IPBES: don't throw out the baby whilst keeping the bathwater; Put people's values
1428 276 central, not nature's contributions. *Ecosystem Services In Review*:40-3.
1429
1430 277 Kildow, J., T., and McIlgorm, A. (2010) The importance of estimating the contribution of the oceans
1431 278 to national economies. *Marine Policy* 34: 367-374
1432
1433 279 Klain, S., C. and Chan, K., M., A. (2012) Navigating coastal values: Participatory mapping of ecosystem
1434 280 services for spatial planning. *Ecological Economics* 82: 104-113
1435
1436 281 Lillebo, A., Pita, C., Garcia Rodrigues, J., Ramos, S., Villasante, S. (2017) How can marine ecosystem
1437 282 services support the Blue Growth agenda? *Marine Policy* 81: 132-142.
1438
1439 283 Maes J, Burkhard B, Geneletti D. 2018 Ecosystem services are inclusive and deliver multiple values. A
1440 284 comment on the concept of nature's contributions to people. *One Ecosyst.* 3, e24720.
1441 285 (doi:10.3897/oneeco.3.e24720)
1442
1443 286 McKinley, E., Ballinger, R., C., and Beaumont, N. (2018) Saltmarshes, ecosystem services, and an
1444 287 evolving policy landscape: A case study of Wales. *Marine Policy*. 91: 1-10
1445
1446 288 Metz, D., and Weigel, L. (2010) Key Findings from Recent National Opinion Research on Ecosystem
1447 289 Services. A report for The Nature Conservancy. Public Opinion Strategies.
1448
1449 290 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005) Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Synthesis. Island
1450 291 Press, Washington DC.
1451
1452 292 Norgaard, R., B. (2010) Ecosystem Services: From eye-opening metaphor to complexity blinder.
1453 293 *Ecological Economics* 69: 1219-1227
1454
1455
1456
1457

1458
1459
1460 294 Nursery-Bray, M., J., Vince, J., Scott, M., Haward, M., O'Toole, K., Smith, T., Harvey, N., and Clarke, B.
1461 295 (2015) Science into policy: Discourse, coastal management and knowledge. *Environmental Science*
1462 296 *and Policy*
1463
1464 297 Pages, J., F., and McKinley, E. (2018) SS 8: Ecosystem Services: A Bridge or Barrier? Workshop Session
1465 298 at the Ecological Society of America Annual Conference, New Orleans, Louisiana. August 2018.
1466
1467 299 Pascual U, Balvanera P, Díaz S, Pataki G, Roth E, Stenseke M, Watson RT, Başak Dessane E, Islar M,
1468 300 Kelemen E, Maris V, Quaas M, Subramanian SM, Wittmer H, Adlan A, Ahn SE, Al-Hafedh YS,
1469 301 Amankwah E, Asah ST, Berry P, Bilgin A, Breslow SJ, Bullock C, Cáceres D, Daly-Hassen H, Figueroa E,
1470 302 Golden CD, Gómez-Baggethun E, González-Jiménez D, Houdet J, Keune H, Kumar R, Ma K, May PH,
1471 303 Mead A, O'Farrell P, Pandit R, Pengue W, Pichis-Madruga R, Popa F, Preston S, Pacheco-Balanza D,
1472 304 Saarikoski H, Strassburg BB, van den Belt M, Verma M, Wickson F, Yagi N. 2017. Valuing nature's
1473 305 contributions to people: the IPBES approach. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 26-
1474 306 27:7-16.
1475
1476 307 Pendleton L.H., O. Thébaud, R.C.Mongruel, H. Levrel (2016) Has the value of global marine and
1477 308 coastal ecosystem services changed? *Marine Policy* Volume 64, February 2016, Pages 156-158
1478
1479 309 Peterson, M., J., Hall, D., M., Feldpausch-Parker, A., M., and Peterson, T., R. (2009) Obscuring
1480 310 ecosystem function with application of the ecosystem services concept. *Conservation Biology* 24(1):
1481 311 113-119
1482
1483 312 Posner, S., Getz., C., and Ricketts, T. (2016) Evaluating the impact of ecosystem service assessments
1484 313 on decision-makers. *Environmental Science and Policy* 64: 30-37
1485
1486 314 Potschin-Young, M., Haines-Young, R., Gorg, C., HEink, U., Jax, K., and Schleyer, C. (2018)
1487 315 Understanding the role of conceptual frameworks: Reading the ecosystem service cascade.
1488 316 *Ecosystem Services* 29: 428-440
1489
1490 317 Raymond, C., M., Singh, G., G., Benessaiah, K., Bernhardt, J., R., Levine, J., Nelson, H., Turner, N., J.,
1491 318 Norton, B., Tam, J., and Chan, K., M., A. (2013) Ecosystem services and beyond: Using multiple
1492 319 metaphors to understand human-environment relationships. *BioScience* 63(7): 536-546
1493
1494 320 Raymond, C.M., Giusti, M., Barthel, S., 2017. An embodied perspective on the co-pro-duction of
1495 321 cultural ecosystem services: toward embodied ecosystems. *Journal of Environmental Planning and*
1496 322 *Management* 1, 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09640568.2017.1312300>.
1497
1498 323 Rivero, S., and Villasante, S. (2016) What are the research priorities for marine ecosystem services?
1499 324 *Marine Policy* 66: 114-133
1500
1501 325 João Garcia Rodrigues, J., G., Villasante, S., Drakou E., G., Kermagoret, C., and Beaumont, N. (2017)
1502 326 Operationalising marine and coastal ecosystem services, *International Journal of Biodiversity*
1503 327 *Science, Ecosystem Services & Management* 13:3
1504
1505 328 Saunders, J. Tinch, R., Ozdemiroglu, E., and Hull, S. 2010. Valuing the Marine Estate and UK Seas:
1506 329 Initial Static baseline assessment. The Crown Estate, 50 pages, 2010. ISBN 978-1-906410-17-9
1507
1508 330 Schroter, M., van der Zander, E., H., van Oudenhoven, A., P., E., Remme, R., P., Serna-Chavez, H., M.,
1509 331 de Groot, R., D., and Opdam, P. (2014) Ecosystem services as a contested concept: A synthesis of
1510 332 critique and counter-arguments. *Conservation Letters* 7(6): 514-523
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516

1517
1518
1519 333 Steger, C., Hirsch, S., Evers, C., Branoff, B., Petrova, M., Nielsen-Pincus, M., Wardropper, C., and van
1520 334 Riper, C., J. (2018) Ecosystem Services as Boundary Objectives for Transdisciplinary Collaboration.
1521 335 Ecological Economics 143: 153-160
1522
1523 336 Tallis, H., Kareiva, P., Marvier, M., and Chang, A. (2008) An ecosystem services framework to support
1524 337 both practical conservation and economic development. PNAS. 105 (28): 9457-9464
1525
1526 338 Thompson, J., L., Kaiser, A., Sparks, E., L., Shelton, M., Brunden, E., Cherry, J., A., and Cebrian, J.
1527 339 (2016) Ecosystem – what? Public Understanding and Trust in Conservation Science and Ecosystem
1528 340 Services. Frontiers in Communication 1: 1- 9
1529
1530 341 Turnpenny, J., Russel, D., and Jordan, A. (2014) The challenge embedding an ecosystem services
1531 342 approach: patterns of knowledge utilisation in public policy appraisal. Environment and Planning C:
1532 343 Government and Policy 32: 247-262
1533
1534 344 Turner, R., K. (2000) Integrating natural and socio-economic science in coastal management. Journal
1535 345 of Marine Systems 25: 447-460
1536
1537 346 UK National Ecosystem Assessment (2011) The UK National Ecosystem Assessment: Synthesis of the
1538 347 Key Findings. UNEP-WCMC, Cambridge.
1539
1540 348 UK National Ecosystem Assessment Follow-on (2014) The UK National Ecosystem Assessment
1541 349 Follow-on: Synthesis of the Key Findings. UNEP-WCMC, LWEC, UK.
1542
1543 350 UNEP (2006) Marine and coastal ecosystems and human wellbeing: A synthesis report based on the
1544 351 findings of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. UNEP 76pp. UNEP/GPA. The Hague
1545
1546 352 UNEP/GPA (2006) The state of the marine environment: Trends and Processes
1547
1548 353 Van Dijk, J., Dick, J., Harrison, P., Jax, K., Saarikoski, H., and Furman, E. (editors) Synthesizing
1549 354 OpenNESS. Ecosystem services, Special issue. Volume 29, Part C, Pages 411-608 (February 2018).
1550
1551 355 Wallace, K., J. (2007) Classification of ecosystem services: Problems and solutions. Biological
1552 356 Conservation 139:235-246
1553
1554 357 Westman 1977 How Much Are Nature's Services Worth? Science 02 Sep 1977: Vol. 197, Issue 4307,
1555 358 pp. 960-964
1556
1557 359 Willcock, S., Hoofman, D., Sitas, N., O'Farrell, P., Hudson, M., D., Reyers, B., Eigenbrod, F., and
1558 360 Bullock, J., M. (2016) Do ecosystem service maps and models meet stakeholders' needs? A
1559 361 preliminary survey across sub-Saharan Africa. Ecosystem Services 18: 110-117
1560 362
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575

Supplementary Materials

	Definitions of Ecosystem Services
Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005)	Ecosystem services are the benefits people obtain from ecosystems. These include provisioning services such as food and water; regulating services such as flood and disease control; cultural services such as spiritual, recreational, and cultural benefits; and supporting services, such as nutrient cycling, that maintain the conditions for life on Earth
UK National Ecosystem Assessment (2011)	Ecosystem services are the benefits provided by ecosystems that contribute to making human life both possible and worth living.
TEEB (2010)	The direct and indirect contributions of ecosystems to human wellbeing. The concept “ecosystem goods and services” is synonymous with ecosystem services.
JNCC (2014)	Ecosystem processes can be considered value-neutral, whilst their goods and services are considered to have a value to society. Ecosystem services therefore are the benefits people obtain from ecosystems.
Fisher et al. 2009	“the aspects of ecosystems utilised (actively or passively) to produce human well-being”
Ecosystemservices.org (2018)	Ecosystem services are the processes by which the environment produces resources utilised by humans such as clean air, water, food and materials.

Table 1: Summary of key definitions of ES currently used within academic literature and policy guidance

Theme	Number of mentions	Evidence (example quotes from responses)
Improves understanding of costs, benefits and value associated with the environment	39	<i>"Ecosystem services make things clearer to those people who want to quantify benefits."</i>
Supports 'bigger picture' thinking, interdisciplinarity, integration and a holistic view	28	<i>"Ecosystem services also bring different disciplines together to discuss landscapes in a more holistic manner."</i>
Supports dialogue, communication and discussions	25	<i>"Easily relatable to all stakeholders, incentivises protective action from most stakeholders if the benefits can be connected to their livelihoods/responsibilities. Good at starting discussions"</i>
Common language, framework and tool	24	<i>"We can use it as a framework for a common language, it already has traction in business and policy. It is a helpful framework to communicate across sectors."</i>
Improves public understanding and perceptions	20	<i>"Aquaculture has negative public perceptions attached because of mistakes that certain sectors made many years ago. Using this term to describe the more environmentally forms of aquaculture helps with winning hearts and minds."</i>
Links society with the environment e.g. economy, human wellbeing	16	<i>"If the benefit of environmental protection/management or the impacts of human activities can be translated in to positive/negative effects on human wellbeing, then this gives a stronger, more meaningful message to the public/developers than presenting raw scientific findings."</i>
Supports effective management and policy	15	<i>"Encourages a holistic approach to marine management"</i>
Provides a monetary valuation	14	<i>"Assigning a monetary/service/value to an ecosystem can alert people outside of environmental sciences to the use of preserving ecosystems"</i>
Supports an understanding of different values	10	<i>"Provides a basis for a discussion with others. A different lens through which to look at a project or plan or a locality. Understating what people value and what they want out of the place can generate a different type of discussion"</i>
Reduces complexity	5	<i>"Using an ecosystem service framework allows the complexity of the marine environment to be broken down into its respective components. This can then be understood by non-scientists, policy-makers, managers, etc."</i>

Table 2: Advantages of the Ecosystem Services concept identified through qualitative analysis and content analysis based examination of respondents' answers.

Theme	Mentions	Evidence (quotes from responses)
Skills and knowledge gaps, coupled with low levels of stakeholder and public understanding and/or different interpretations of the concept [understanding]	43	"Assumes a basic understanding of natural science"
Difficult to communicate [terminology]	26	"It's complicated and difficult to communicate to people. Placing numerical values on activities / areas can be misleading and have to be explained as to what has been considered."
Concerns about the focus on monetary values [not conclusive?]	25	"Not everything should be quantified as money, or if so, other elements should be considered as the longer/broader terms, both geological and evolutionary values."
Use of Jargon/ people don't understand the terminology [understanding]	23	"People don't understand the terminology, concept or how to apply it to daily work."
Lots of unknowns remain [not conclusive]	19	"It is still relatively unknown from a technical point (although the words are used a lot)"
Difficult to value all aspects of the environment appropriately e.g. nature for nature's sake is difficult to value [not conclusive]	19	"Misconceptions about the term - many people seem to use and understand the phrase in terms of a monetary value, but its actual meaning applies to so many other benefits"
Complex [not conclusive]	18	"It is a complex area of work and there are not easy to use, readily available tools to help with this. It is so complex that it is hard to work out the values we receive from Ecosystem services."
Challenge of interdisciplinary working [application]	12	"Historical barriers to communication, differing goals within industries"
Lack of understanding of marine and coastal ecosystems, and a need for examples of success. [not conclusive]	9	"Many environmental services are poorly known or understood." "Having concrete examples to work with / better understand."
Needs greater consistency and standardisation [approach]	8	"Use of a consistent approach with standard metrics/ways of measuring value across disciplines."
The ES concept is narrow and vague [not conclusive]	7	"The language and definitions are too narrow"
Need for better guidance/ explanation about the usefulness of ES [application]	7	"Relatively new, and complex - many benefits of healthy ecosystems can be hard to prove, especially in short term."
Need for greater political will and improved inclusion in policy and management [application]	7	"Largely absent from policy and decision making"
Not enough consideration of culture and heritage [not conclusive]	3	"I think that the challenges I face in using ecosystem services relate to the reluctance of natural environment professionals to consider the historic environment and natural environment together"

Table 3: Challenges of the Ecosystem Services concept identified through qualitative analysis and content analysis based examination of respondents' answers.