



JNcc/NGOs UKOT/CD workshop

Afternoon session

Common areas of shared interest

5th May 2015

To find more about JNCC's OT and CD programme visit:
<http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/default.aspx?page=4079>

Contents

Background to the workshop.....	3
Aims.....	5
Outputs	5
Participation	5
Key messages and outcomes:	6
Annex 1: Proposed areas of common/shared interest.....	8
Annex 2: Participants list.....	9
Annex 3: 'Raw' notes from the group discussions as recorded on flip charts.....	10
Group 1	10
Group 2.	14
Group 3	17
Group 4:	20

Background to the workshop.

- A 2013 government review of JNCC¹ provided positive endorsement for the work that JNCC does. There were 6 conclusions identifying areas where we could improve and these have been taken on board and JNCC are committed to implementing them. One of these conclusions was around working with Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) '*JNCC will build on its current partnership working with stakeholders and in particular improve engagement with civil society, including with the Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies*'. As a result of this a group for liaison between JNCC and UK-based NGOs working in nature conservation in the Overseas Territories has been created.
- The JNCC/NGO group has met quarterly throughout 2014 to discuss and develop the concept of identifying areas of shared interest between UK organisations so that support to OT's can be better co-ordinated, collaborative and avoid duplication.
- Background papers on the group and the outputs of these discussions are available [here](#)

Background speeches:

Paul Rose (JNCC) introduced the session:

- JNCC had established a group for UK based NGO's with an interest in Overseas Territories and that this group has decided that identifying shared priorities for work in the Overseas Territories is something it wants to do. Shared priorities lead to partnerships and efficient working that is so important when resources are so short. The purpose of the day is to present the groups' work on shared priorities to a wider audience including some of the Overseas Territories administrations and to collect further views.

Mike Pienkowski (UKOTCF) highlighted the following:

- UKOTCF and other NGOs have long been concerned at the need for a strategic approach in deploying the limited resources available in Britain to support conservation in the UKOTs.
- This is not to determine strategies in territory – that is for UKOTs themselves (and we have tried to facilitate this in the past with several territories at their request, such as facilitating the development of strategies to mainstream environment and fulfil the Environment Charter commitments).

¹ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/209391/triennial-rev-jncc.pdf

- We recognise need to find ways of meeting international commitments, such as those summarised in the Environment Charters and more recently Aichi Targets, at the same time fulfilling local needs.
- UKOTCF organised workshops on this in 2010, 2011 and 2012 – and several people in this workshop participated, as did others by Skype from the territories.
- NGOs welcomed the further opportunity in early 2014 when a review of JNCC led to the setting up a JNCC/NGOs group to restore better collaboration between NGOs and UK Government over matters concerning the UK Overseas Territories (UKOTs) and Crown Dependencies (CDs).
- All agreed that the priority was to try and work towards an agreed framework of priorities for support from GBNI² for conservation work in UKOTs. It was not to set out priorities for UKOTs, as this was for each of them to do, but to see how resources from GB and NI could be deployed most effectively.
- Some progress had been made in this area. UKOTCF had volunteered at the second meeting of the main group to undertake a consultation to secure views on priorities from individual organisations. Whilst some, including all UK Governmental bodies and some NGOs had not replied substantively, others had. The responses used different levels and approaches, but had been valuable in putting together an initial overview. (UKOTCF had incorporated views from its member and associate bodies and others in the UKOTs, where available, and had kept these bodies informed of the process, while not troubling them to make full responses).
- Responses were collated for the third meeting and circulated as a Word document (Paper 2014/14 - Proposed priority conservation actions for the UKOTs/CDs – August 2014: listed as Paper 3 for 3rd meeting on 12th September 2014 on the draft agenda and the paper itself; Paper 2 on the final agenda). This used the Aichi targets as a way of organising input, following on from a workshop UKOTCF had held for the same purpose in 2011 – see weblink above).
- Subsequently, JNCC had tried to pull in UK Government input, secured mainly by extracting information from existing documents, and had added this to UKOTCF's existing document, also converting this from a Word table to an Excel spreadsheet. This had been reported at the fourth (latest) meeting in December. Both UKOTCF and JNCC had attempted to extract and summarise some possible priorities for the group to consider.
- The group recognised that, whilst it was necessary to keep the links to both the Environment Charters and the Aichi Targets, the structure of neither was convenient

² Minutes of the main group have noted: There is a general problem in that "UK" is widely used to mean both of two different concepts: (1) Great Britain and Northern Ireland (GBNI); and (2) all UK territory (including GBNI, UK Overseas Territories (UKOTs) and Crown Dependencies (CDs)). In this document, we try to be clear on meanings, and so use GBNI for (1) and UK for (2), partly to avoid a very long phrase for the latter.

for day-to-day consideration of the agreed priority areas. So the group identified these areas and appointed a sub-group to check them, and also to set up a workshop to get some wider views on these.

- This is the origin of this afternoon's workshop. Participants will be pleased to know that we are not going to inflict on them the long classification documents – these are necessary but not a good input into a workshop. Instead we are inputting the seven areas (Annex 1) that we managed to group these priorities into. They are obviously overlapping and some activities would fall into more than one. However, we do need some focal areas if we are to discuss. We note also that capacity building is not listed separately but is integral to all.
- The main group and sub-group reaffirmed the need for all the parties in GB & NI working on the UKOTs and CDs to know what were the most important conservation actions to undertake, even if not all organisations were directly involved in undertaking them, as this enabled the collective focus of effort and energy, bringing cohesion and synergy in a resource-constrained world. This is to reflect that the parties are those based in Great Britain & Northern Ireland (see footnote on the previous page).
- The purpose of having a list of priority areas was to enable partnerships to develop and to allow natural partnerships to form, to enable resources to be used most efficiently, to help direct funds which may become available, to focus future work, and to demonstrate the need for further resources.
- It was agreed that these should be discussed with a wide range of stakeholders. This workshop is a key component of this wider discussion and wider stakeholder input into defining and developing these common areas of interest.

Aims

The specific aims of the workshop were:

- To bring together UK organisations who currently work/are interested in working in the UK Overseas Territories to discuss common areas of focus and explore opportunities for synergy and collaboration.

Outputs

- The key output of this workshop session was to create a list of agreed common areas of interest, and identification of organisations interested in partnering to address these areas.

Participation

- Participants came from a number governments, academic institutions and NGOs. The participants list is attached in Annex 2

Key messages and outcomes:

There were a lot of interesting and pertinent points that were raised in the discussions – these are outlined in detail in [Annex 3](#). Points that the groups thought were most important are highlighted here:

- The **seven ‘areas’ presented are not comparable** in that they contain different levels of detail and focus, and some are themes/outcomes (Restoring threatened species and ecosystems, including dealing with invasives; Marine Conservation, including both protected areas and making sustainable users champions for conservation; Terrestrial Planning and complementing/reinforcing this by getting businesses depending on the natural resources to become champions; Ecosystem Services and Natural Capital); and some are supporting processes/activities (Improving, collating and sharing evidence and knowledge; Environmental education and awareness; Resource Mobilisation)
- **Different organisations around the table had different areas of focus**, however everyone worked on some (if not all) of these 7 areas. The discussions/exercise **highlighted the need to work together**.
- The **wording** of these common areas of interest was important particularly from the following aspects:
 - Different words reflect different approaches to conservation e.g.
 - protection vs restoration vs sustainable use.
 - Important vs threatened. (species)
 - Don't use jargon – it is difficult to convey the meaning behind some of the terms.
- There were a number of key points that were highlighted around the **fundamental importance of working with and fully recognising the input of the local community**
 - This is a key component of any initiative.
 - Most funds for projects stay outside the local community
 - No one is starting from scratch. We need to recognise the work that has already been done in/by OTs.
 - Sharing and exchange can be between OTs, it doesn't always need to be from UK to OTs.
 - **The foundation for any input into OTs should be OT Plans.**
- It was suggested that **additional areas** should be included (although it was noted that most were embraced by the existing list):
 - Legislation –

- Need to value the environment
 - Capacity building
 - Climate change
 - Renewable energy
 - Data for analysis.
- **Co-ordination** is an important component of making this work. This could happen through existing co-ordination mechanisms (see Annex 1 group 4) but creating a mandate to co-ordinate this type of collaboration was probably required if this is to move forward.

Conclusions and next steps.

In the summing up session, key conclusions drawn from the meeting were:

1. The workshop had been very worthwhile and some new and important perspectives on priority work had been put forward.
2. Input from the Overseas territories governments had been particularly valuable.
3. More work is needed to ensure that Overseas Territory government priorities are fully represented.
4. The work will be briefly presented to the meeting of Overseas Territories Training and Steering Group meeting in Gibraltar on 11th July 2015.
5. The work was seen as valuable but more input is needed to complete it.
6. The value of the work is probably greater than just identifying where organisations can work together so more thought needs to be given to wider uses of the information
7. The results so far will now be taken back to the JNCC/UK NGO group to consider next steps in more detail

Annex 1: Proposed areas of common/shared interest.

1. Restoring threatened species and ecosystems, including by addressing Invasive Alien Species.
2. Marine Conservation, including both protected areas and making sustainable users champions for conservation
3. Terrestrial Planning and complementing/reinforcing this by getting businesses depending on the natural resources to become champions
4. Improving, collating and sharing evidence and knowledge
5. Environmental education and awareness
6. Ecosystem Services and Natural Capital (see also 2 and 3)
7. Resource Mobilisation

Noting that gaps include

- The notable absence of capacity building;
- More detail was needed under marine conservation;
- The priorities should be related to Aichi strategic goals;
- The level of detail needs to be defined;
- Input from UKOTs needs to be considered further.

Annex 2: Participants list

Attendee	Organisation
Alan Gray*	Centre for Ecology and Hydrology
Alexandra Cunha	Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Catherine Wensink	UK Overseas Territories Conservation Forum
Charles Parchment	Cayman Islands Government
Charli Mortimer	Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Chris Gilligan	Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Christopher Lyal	Natural History Museum
Clare Fitzsimmons	Newcastle University
Colin Clubbe	Royal Botanical Gardens Kew
David Righton	Centre for Environment, Fisheries & Aquaculture Science
Diego Juffe-Gigoli	United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre
Fiona Llewellyn*	Zoological Society of London
Helen Peat	British Antarctic Survey
Jacqui Christian	Pitcairn Government
Janice Panton	Montserrat Government
Jim Kerr	Tristan Da Cunha Government
Jonathan Hall	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
Katie Medcalf	Environment Systems
Kedell Worboys	St Helena Government
Koen Vanstaen	Centre for Environment, Fisheries & Aquaculture Science
Maria Taylor*	South Atlantic Environmental Research Institute
Mark Eaton	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
Mark Stevenson	Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs
Matt Smith	Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Matthew Gollock	Zoological Society of London
Mike Pienkowski	UK Overseas Territories Conservation Forum
Nicholas Jeria	British Virgin Islands Government
Paul Brickle	South Atlantic Environmental Research Institute
Paul Rose	Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Roderick Bowis	British Ecological Society
Steve Wilkinson	Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Sukey Cameron	Falkland Islands Government
Tara Pelembe	Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Tom Appleby	University of the West of England
Tracey Bradshaw	British Virgin Islands Government
Vicky Kindemba	Buglife

Annex 3: 'Raw' notes from the group discussions as recorded on flip charts.

Group 1

Group 1
<i>Catherine Wensink (UKOTCF)</i>
Matthew Gollock (ZSL)
Koen Vanstaen (CEFAS)
Kedell Worboys (St. Helena)
Jonathan Hall (RSPB)
Jim Kerr (Tristan da Cunha)
Tracey Bradshaw (BVI)
Clare Fitzimmons (UCL)

Restoring threatened species and ecosystems including IAS

NCL working on IAS – lionfish. Not top level priority – may come up in marine strategy

Life Plus bid

Darwin lots of bids on lionfish

OTs put it up very high

Systems basis approach needed

Highlights need to work together

Is it realistic to eradicate?

Control

Transboundary issues

CERAs marine in UK

Government and researcher different views

NCL social research – coral reef health – looking at problem from a different angle

All fit together – all 7 interlinked

Tristan – mice – sagina controlled by team there every year. Tristan Albatross.

Inaccessible unspoiled. No invasives, flax removed.

Nightingale visited by tourists kept invasive out

Tristan Christmas Tree – garden plant – some concern

Islanders not too bothered – local attitude.

Global importance of Albatross - £7.5 million to remove mice from Gough

Macquarie island (AUS) an example of mouse eradication success

Chagos rats

Henderson

12 years RSPB work on Tristan mice

St Helena flax – water table impacted

RSPB high priority

Eradications

South Atlantic

Pacific
Biosecurity
Monitoring
All terrestrial

Tristan oil rig – Brazilian species (monitoring)
Restoring? Marine system understanding is less known
Identifying – baseline data
Freshwater somewhere – doesn't fit
Tristan understanding of marine environment needed
ZSL – invasives EDNA (not in UKOTs)
Looking at this in aquatic systems
Mangroves in Chagos
Shark work not as threatened as others but may be heading that way.
Damage minimisation
Prevention instead of cure
ZSL Mountain Chicken Montserrat
In marine context bit behind to say restoring
Restoring a fishery or natural population?
Protecting or restoring?
No planning in marine
Minimize further decline
Area not here in legislation
If not biosecurity then vulnerable to more invasions
Biosecurity big issue
St. Helena has legislation and person to deal with
Tristan can learn from this
Ballast
Priorities
Are there other organisations to support that
Capacity building a gap
Maintain ecosystem services
How do invasives fit under that?
How is baseline working never mind what lionfish is doing
Keep species in – funder like that e.g. lionfish but have other implications

Level seems to be right
4 and 5—improving evidence

Keep education separate
Tristan very important

Think 4 and 5 are different
Ecosystem services

Legislation missing

Lack of drafting capacity

St Helena would have liked to have someone to turn to help do this there

Don't want UK government or NGO to talk about governance

Frame in a different way

6. Need to value environment

Capacity building and legislation

Build society's capacity

Powerful tool = education (schools – start very early)

Pressure needed on politicians

Can we put 8 + 9 – capacity building (training, expertise)

Legislation

So important on Tristan. Need help. Sharing resources.

Pester power – kids influencing parents' behaviour.

8. Capacity building

Chagos community in UK

Someone from community involved in expeditions

RSPB..

Support for local salaries – 6 territories

Travel to conferences

Technical

Post training visits

Policy areas

Sabbaticals after 7 years one month

Do offer UKOTs to come (Tristan 3 months)

Ad hoc

Want to do more

Wide support for this as a huge opportunity for UKOTs

RSPB involvement in Chagos

Kew Secondment

MSC coastal management – NCL

Research programme training coral reef monitoring and assessment training

GIS work

Scholarship – chevening

Difficult process

Knowing barrier entry requirements

Reading and Exeter JNCC OTEP, MSc

UKOTA – Bermuda and Anguilla

Helps UKOTs become more self-sufficient

Use own people – need experience and qualifications.

Legislation

Aichi targets too specific

They cover everything – good guide

FIELD/RSPB review – update end 2015 identify gaps

5 new laws – celebrate

Environment profile for EU

Thematic programme 11th EDF looking at profiles

That link to all OCTs in particular climate change and disaster relief

Can use the information collected to seek new funding

Territories need to see benefit

As territories develop need to update legislation

Is there an alternative to 'the term' governance

Social networks

Advising not telling to strengthen

Can support the development of legislation

How do you share what is already there?

Comments on the content of the 7 areas

- Area 1: Restoring threatened species' sounds odd. What do we mean by restore and how is threat identified?
- Area 2: Didn't know why Marine had been separated – protected areas and sustainable use also apply to terrestrial and freshwater
- Area 3: Similarly, aquatic planning is important.
- Areas 4-7: These seemed more like principles that should underpin the above.

Group 2.

Group 2
<i>Alexandra Cunha (JNCC)</i>
Mike Pienkowski (UKOTCF)
David Righton (CEFAS)
Paul Brickle (SAERI)
Janice Panton (Montserrat)
Roderick Bowie (RGS)
Jacqui Christian (Pitcairn)
Vicky Kendemba (Buglife)

8. Restoring threatened species and ecosystems, including by addressing Invasive Alien Species.

- Does your organisation work in any of these areas? (please name organisations alongside areas);

All the organizations said they work with this topic; furthermore they added that S. Georgia gov. do it as well.

- What do you think about these areas?

Eradication is extremely hard although there are some successful cases;

The results are not the ones expected because interactions with the ecosystem as a whole, is not well understood in most cases;

Local knowledge has not been considered in most cases and this need to be integrated;

More involvement with stakeholders and local people is needed;

Needs to be based on sound science;

Monitoring and prevention should always been included in this kind of projects;

- Is there anything that should be amended/added?

Whaling, overexploitation;

Lack of knowledge of terrestrial invertebrates.

- Any issues/constraints/additional thoughts for consideration?

Climate change;

Decision on timescales – what is considered pristine? What's the baseline?

Finance constraints

Some/ most sites are of difficult access (e.g. marine litter)

9. Marine Conservation, including both protected areas and making sustainable users champions for conservation.

- Does your organisation work in any of these areas? (please name organisations alongside areas).

All entities apart from Bugs Life but they are interested in starting;

- What do you think about these areas?

Pitcairn getting ready for a large non-take MPA which has been achieved with collaboration with many NGOs for the last 5 years; still local gov. feels that the process is been driven externally, it need more collaboration with local gov. Also money wise, most funds stays outside the local community, it doesn't reach the local community.

- Is there anything that should be ammended/added?

Montserrat gov. mention fisheries legislation is needed; also sustainable fishing training for younger/future fisherman;

Scale and connectivity still to be addressed;

Enforcement as well!

Improve stakeholder and public involvement;

Include/discuss the idea of different types of management – problems can be solved in many different ways , not necessarily just with MPAs.

- Any issues/constraints/additional thoughts for consideration?

Money wise, most funds stays outside the local community it doesn't reach the local community;

MPAs, target mainly the seafloor and do not cover mobile species – what to do in this case?

A lack of understanding of marine environment.

10. Terrestrial Planning and complementing/reinforcing this by getting businesses depending on the natural resources to become champions.

- Does your organisation work in any of these areas? (please name organisations alongside areas)

Most governments work in this area; Bugs Life has some pilot/key projects going on;

Many NGOS working on Impact Assessments projects;

CEFAS and SAERI involved in freshwater (river basins?) planning projects

- What do you think about these areas?

Education is key and needs to be done across the board (e.g including government officers and adults);

There's problems with privately owned properties so work with stakeholders is fundamental;

- Is there anything that should be amended/added?

Long-term planning needed;

Climate change needed to be considered;

Conflict between short-term economics and long-term value to be estimated and explained.

- Any issues/constraints/additional thoughts for consideration?

Renewable energy to be considered;

Creative thinking/ creative projects needed!

Improved knowledge about species and habitats distribution needed.

11. Improving, collating and sharing evidence and knowledge

The group felt this item was fully discussed in the morning and didn't go further.

12. Environmental education and awareness

- Does your organisation work in any of these areas? (please name organisations alongside areas)

Most Gov. institutions and Bugs Life work in this area. EE is included in Montserrat school curriculum.

- What do you think about these areas?
Everyone agreed this is fundamental!
- Is there anything that should be amended/added?
- Any issues/constraints/additional thoughts for consideration?
Teachers should have more time to explore this issue – they are very tied up with other school duties and don't have time;
Environmental Education can be very regional and local and programs should be tailored to local needs;
Adults and gov. officers should be targets of environment education campaigns.

13. Ecosystem Services and Natural Capital (see also 2 and 3)

- Does your organisation work in any of these areas? (please name organisations alongside areas)

Nobody from group 2 works in this subject;

- What do you think about these areas?

Related to 2 and 3 topics above;

- Is there anything that should be amended/added?

Scientific challenge behind information;

- Any issues/constraints/additional thoughts for consideration?

Difficulty in understanding the meaning, the science and methods behind it and the terms and economic jargon;

Confusing concepts;

Subjectivity;

Difficult to communicate.

14. Resource Mobilisation

We didn't have time to cover this one; also the group felt we had already covered it in the morning exercise.

Group 3

Group 3
<i>Tara Pelembe (JNCC)</i>
Katie Medcalf (Env systems)
Helen Peat (BAS)
Mark Eaton (RSPB)
Sukey Cameron (Falklands)
Christopher Lyal (NHM)
Paul Rose (JNCC)
Mark Stevenson (Defra)
Diego Juffe-Bignoli(UNEP-WCMC)
Tracy Bradshaw (BVI)

Which areas organisations would best input into – building on the strengths and core-focus of the organisations.

	Evidence and data	Education and awareness	Resource mobilisation
1 species and ecosystems			
2 Marine			
3 Planning			
6 Natural capital			

Falkland Island Government – ALL

NHM – all or components of ALL

Defra – ALL (through Darwin funding)

JNCC – Not education and awareness, not planning, not resource mobilisation

BVI Government – ALL

BAS

Note:

Under resource mobilisation need to think of

The ethics of funding (dont want to take money from any organisation)

Finding money.

Under education and awareness – need to also think about raising awareness (of OTs) in UK

Also – capacity and prioritisation are important.

Principles

- Recognise the work that has already been done by/in UKOTs – not starting from scratch
- Sharing between OTs – not always looking to UK
- Plan/co-ordination mechanism (to avoid duplication and facilitate collaboration)
- Research community/NGOs/JNCC – coordination needed?
- Get outcomes right – be clear about the drivers.

Propose additions

- Climate change
- Data for analysis

Restoring threatened species and ecosystems including by addressing IAS

Threatened should add or important (to include economically important for example).

Finer level of detail required before action – territory specific. Which species and ecosystems and why?

The information about this probably exists in the OTs

Where it doesn't exist support the creation of this information.

Who does what in this area at the moment?

NHM

Defra – support to OT governments

Environment Systems – Darwin+ project on this

BAS – work with SG with threats for introduced plants (BAT and SGSSI)

FIG – work with Falkland's conservation in the Falklands.

Refer to the table for additional information in this for each of the common areas of interest.

Gaps –

Monitoring

Research community

Proposed solution.

Note: refers to both marine and terrestrial environment

Co-ordination

Cross- territory + UK – territory + cross UK
Existing groups and mechanisms include
OCTA, JMS, JNCC_NGO/OT, UKOTCF, OTTRSG, OTBG, Technical workshop
(practicioners + experts)
Gap = a business sector group.

Outcomes
Restoration
Protect/sustainably manage
Plan
Natural Capital (ecosystems, Climate chagge included here)

Means/Activities (applies to all outcomes)
4-7 +
Sharing best practice
Research and development (economic, social, natural sciences)
Survey
Education
Mainstreaming
Monitoring
Designation
Management
Evaluation

Foundation: **OT Plans** which provide OT-identified actions and priorities.

Group 4:

Group 4 (skype)
<i>Charli Mortimer (JNCC)</i>
Alan Gray (CEH)
Maria Taylor (SAERI FLK)
Edward Lewis (UNEP-WCMC)
Charles Parchment (CAY)
Thomas Appleby (UWE + Blue marine Foundation)
Colin Clubbe - (Kew)
Nicholas Jeria (BVI)

Blue marine

Pitcairn and Ascension islands – need to have community buy-in

LLMA inshore and total exclusion within EEZ (Pitcairn)

Sustainable fishing in Ascension?

BVI – How to control resource use – using MPAs, empowering organisations

BGS – input into Falklands

CEH – mainly terrestrial but some cross overs

Identification and support of sustainable users

e.g. Lyme Bay, BVI

How to deal with empowerment issue?

UKOT – Award for ‘grass – routes’ conservation champion.

Terrestrial planning – business to become champions.

BGS, Kew, CEH, BVI Gov

Have to have good understanding of environment – problem with gaps in knowledge

Eco-tourism – niche? Should be the norm

But expansion in terms of tourism? = pressure on resources e.g. BVI – marine cruise ships no infrastructure.

Needs to be a 'post planning' stage – built into commercial interests

Query about management of water and catchment – useful to approach terrestrial planning.

Restoration and invasive species

Blue marine – overfishing example

Kew – species level for threatened species – provide science

Provide conservation and science input to restoration e.g. seedbank

Identify invasive plants and track dispersal

CEH – yes but on a smaller scale –(invasive)

BVI – Lionfish

Expensive – introduce biosecurity measures – resource issues and promote use of native species

Good land management programmes.

Means Outcomes	Improving evidence and knowledge sharing and	Education awareness and	Resource mobilisation
Species and ecosystems	More science (kew BGS) Metadata catalogue	Stories Crowd Disseminate Biosecurity	Trust Constitutions Body to receive funding.
Marine conservation	Lionfish (BVI) Pitcarin Ascension	Identifying sustainable users and supporting Eg Lyme Bay	PhDs Community buy-in e.g. BVI environment champions
Terrestrial planning	Retro-planning Water catchment management	Drop the 'eco' on eco tourism – e.g. BVI	Harness users

Ecosystem services and natural capital	Science/service link	£ \$	£ \$
		What does nature do for you	