

CCF 16th ANNUAL SYMPOSIUM

WHOSE CONSERVATION - BREAKOUT SESSION FEEDBACK

Ideas for how Cambridge Conservation can turn the diversity of conservation motivations into a strength through more coherent and coordinated activity.

1. To harness the diversity of all of our different framings and bring them together into a *de bono* style six thinking hats.
2. With 60 conservation organisations in Cambridge working together, we should recognise and utilise our diverse values to connect more effectively with a growing range of stakeholders.
3. (i) The diversity in Cambridge provides checks and balances against one of the approaches becoming over-bearing. (ii) The range of expertise enables conversation with all the audiences to achieve the goals of framing 'Nature for itself'.
4. For the UK, to look at the gains and losses in habitats and species as we move through the different framing phases and look at whether there is an optimal balance.
5. (i) CCF could create a tool to help organisations and individuals understand where they sit in relation to their values and how to reach people at project level using this. (ii) CCF could also bring together case study examples for when different framings have been used successfully for different organisations.
6. (i) Organise debates that include people from different perspectives, especially bringing in politicians and political candidates for two-way discussion to further understanding of perspectives. (ii) Undertake work on the impact of presenting things in the framing of ecosystem services on political uptake/how much they influence policy in practice.
7. Work together to develop a matrix of categories of what has worked well in terms of framing of nature to different audiences: industry, government, etc.
8. (i) Work together to identify the most important framing to actually effect some change. (ii) Expand the interpretation of ecosystem services, as the main driver, by bringing in the other framings to avoid conflict and unify.

Questions to the panel, focussing on how to reconcile a particular inconsistency or potential conflict between approaches.

1. If pursuing framings 3 and 4, how do you ensure you are still conserving threatened biodiversity (eg REDD+)?
2. Is it possible to have a conservation movement equivalent to the 2 degree climate change target?
3. What is success for 'People and nature'? In other words, if 'People and nature' is measured on many axes, how do you measure the success of it?
4. Where is the funding coming in relation to this scheme of four framings, and does where it come from drive our institutional motivations?
5. From the intrinsic values argument for conservation, how do we identify the limits (e.g. pestulant or otherwise damaging organisms)? And how do you bridge the divide between theory and practice?
6. If you read the literature, you would think there is a polarised debate, but in our experience there are different views/aspects within all our organisations and projects. Do we need to worry about these motivations at all?
7. Is there such a thing as intrinsic value, and if there is, is it useful? If conservation is a religion, does it help us in the common cause for nature?
8. If we choose one framing as a driver, how do we not lose sight of the others? (In particular, 'Nature for itself')