



***Ecological Economics and Civil Society  
Organisations:  
A Blueprint for Collaboration***



September 2010



## List of CEECEC Partner Organisations

### NGO Partners

- [Centre for Science and Environment, India](#)
- [Centre pour l'Environnement et le Développement, Cameroon](#)
- [Acción Ecológica, Ecuador](#)
- [Ecological Society Endemit, Serbia](#)
- [A Sud - Ecologia e Cooperazione, Italy](#)
- [Vlaams Overleg Duurzame Ontwikkeling, Belgium \(Flanders\)](#)
- [Sunce, Association for Nature, Environment and Sustainable Development, Croatia](#)
- [Instituto Rede Brasileira Agroflorestal, Brazil](#)

### Research Institutions

- [ICTA, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain](#) (CEECEC Coordinators)
- [IFF, Universität Klagenfurt, Austria](#)
- [GEPAMA, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina](#)
- [Foundation of the Faculty of Sciences and Technology, New University of Lisbon, Portugal](#)
- [Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium](#)
- [SERI Nachhaltigkeitsforschungs und Kommunikations GmbH, Austria](#)

## Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	4
2	Phase 1: Developing a Shared Framework for Communication.....	5
2.1	Framework for Case Study Drafting.....	6
3	Phase 2: Case Study Development.....	7
3.1	Process for Drafting of Case Studies.....	8
4	Phase 3: Workshops.....	7
4.1	Workshop 1: Vienna.....	9
4.2	Summary of Vienna Workshop Outputs.....	12
4.3	Vienna Workshop Evaluation Form.....	15
4.4	Summary of Feedback on Vienna Workshop.....	17
4.5	Workshop 2: Rome.....	18
5	Phase 4: Materials Development and Dissemination.....	18
6	Conclusion: The Fruits of CSO/Ecological Economics Capacity Building.....	19

# 1 Introduction

This report by the [CEECEC project](#) aims to provide a blueprint for capacity building activities for collaborative research between civil society organisations (CSOs) and researchers (in this case, ecological economists, but also for other “sustainability scientists”) working on issues of environmental conflict. CEECEC (**C**ivil **S**ociety **E**ngagement with **EC**ological **EC**onomics) is a European Commission FP7 funded Science in Society project that aims to enable CSOs to engage in and lead collaborative ecological economics research. The overall focus is not on theory but on case study learning, whereby CSOs and academics co-operate to identify and explore key issues for research based on CSO needs and interests.

Key to the case study approach was a process that involved four stages: first, an initial meeting where CSO partners presented their topics of interest to research partners who listened and made initial proposals for approaches, and the development and distribution of a framework by which CSOs could describe the issues at stake in greater detail; second, an ongoing electronic exchange of case study drafts, guided, monitored and supported by the project co-ordinators; third, the running of two workshops, held in Vienna and Rome, where partners explored the issues at stake and methods and tools at their disposal in greater depth, developing a shared language order to co-write CSO stories embedded with the concepts and tools of ecological economics. In the fourth and final stage, final drafts were submitted to the coordination unit to ensure that the concepts and tools illustrated within the chapters were presented in the correct context and in language accessible to a CSO audience. The chapters were then placed on the project website for dissemination through the broad CEECEC network of international CSOs and research institutes, before being compiled into online learning/teaching materials - an electronic [Course](#) and a separate [Handbook](#) designed uniquely – from the bottom-up, based on CSO needs and experience.

The fruits of the entire process have been significant, producing not only the educational materials they intended to, but also producing [reports](#) identifying research gaps and opportunities for further CSO / ecological economics collaboration. One, entitled “*From Activism to Policy Research: Key Issues and Topics for Future Collaborative Sustainability Research*” takes an international view, and another, “*A Study of Environmental Conflicts and Issues in South-Eastern Europe: Possible Collaboration between CSOs and Ecological Economists*” concentrates specifically on that region. Both of these reports contain real-life topics, ripe for a collaborative approach, that are highly relevant to the work of the contributing CSOs. It is our sincere hope that this report, *Ecological Economics and Civil Society Organisations: A Blueprint for Collaboration*, will help to prepare the ground for future co-operative research.

## 2 Stage 1: Developing a Shared Framework for Communication

In April 2008, delegates of the CEECEC network came together for the first time in Paris, France, for the project kick-off meeting and to commence work. CSO partners had been asked to prepare and bring slide presentations describing topics of work that they thought might benefit from the application of an ecological economics perspective, and that would eventually be developed into case studies for use in learning/teaching materials. There was no instruction or guidance from the academic partners of what the cases should be. The CSOs chose the case with total freedom, often large socio-environmental conflicts of immediate relevance to them. The process was very different from advising a doctoral student to choose a clearly delimited and manageable topic for a thesis. Roughly, the proposed topics were:

- i) Accion Ecologica, Ecuador: the Manta-Manaos Axis and the “Cordillera del Condor” mining conflict
- ii) A Sud, Italy: TAV Torino-Lione (Pan European Corridor 5) and Waste in Campania
- iii) CSE, India: Mendha Lekha and Hiware Bazar, application of Rural Employment Act
- iv) Endemit, Serbia: “Djerdap” National park and “Nikola Tesla” Obrenovac Thermo power plant
- v) REBRAAF, Brazil: agrofuels, ecological services and Amazon conservation
- vi) Sunce, Croatia: Nautical Tourism impacts in Lastovo, Croatia
- vii) VODO, Belgium: Sanitation of soil and ecological debt by UMICORE Belgium
- viii) CED-FoEI, An analysis of logging concessions in Cameroon

Some further cases were added later, notably a case of Payment for Environmental Services from CSE India. Amongst the 8 CSO partners there existed quite a broad spectrum of “activist knowledge” in the field of ecological economics and therefore a degree of enthusiasm in carrying out the project (learning and teaching ecological economics), but there was also uncertainty regarding what issues to present and what to focus on within often long-running and complex topics. The discussion began with each CSO taking it in turn to present in only 10-20 minutes the topic(s) that they had in mind for development into case studies. After each presentation, researchers posed questions in order to elucidate the issues at stake, and to try to conceive of which methods/tools of the field might be relevant to each particular case. It quickly became apparent as the jargon and acronyms began to fly in both directions that a shared framework was needed to facilitate communication between CSO and research partners, one that could accommodate the relevant issues in all their complexity and dynamism from the CSO perspective, and at the same time order them in a way that was coherent to researchers, providing sufficient information on existing socio-economic conditions, current trends and data availability. Perhaps most important of all though, was the need to make explicit both CSO and research partners’ goals and expectations of the collaboration process.

With these needs in mind a framework (see overleaf) was drawn up during the Paris meeting by Mariana Walter (ICTA-UAB) and Simron Jit Singh (IFF) as a guideline for CSOs to follow in developing the first draft of their case studies. We emphasise here that we really did mean it to be used as a guideline only, wishing to avoid being prescriptive in defining what was “important” for CSOs to include initially. The framework was designed to help CSOs describe their topics in a way that was understandable to researchers and others

## 2.1 Framework for Case Study Drafting

### 1) Introduction: The Context of the Case

Introducing the location (maps could be useful), region geography (terrain, natural resources endowments) the demography, the socio-economic and cultural context. The political and legal setting (the relevant regulations, governance and decision making structures).

### 2) Describing the community using “the triangle” (a), b) and c)

#### *a) Describing the living conditions of the people*

(What do they do to make a living (in the subsistence and market economies)? How do they live? What are their assets? Etc...)

#### *b) Local affluence definition*

How do they determine their social status? (in other words, to what do they attribute value (money, land, livestock, employment, leadership qualities and mediation qualities, etc)?)

#### *c) Patterns of resource use*

What resources do they extract from nature? In what way (which technology, for what purpose - subsistence or market)? What pressures do these patterns of resource extraction cause in the environment?

### 3) Actors and trends

#### *a) Brief description and analysis of the social and historical context.*

-Who are the main actors?

-What are their main motives and interests? (values? ...)

-What is the current state of the situation?

-What are the windows of opportunity (legislation, social movements)?

- Describe the relevant trends/drivers/dynamics in this process

#### *b) CSO vision:*

What kind of intervention is desired? What trend do they want to achieve?

### 4) Goal of intervention

Who is the target group to benefit from this intervention?

### 5) Expectations

What do you as a CSO expect from ecological economics (EE)? What are the concepts and tools of EE that you would want to use? What do you expect from the research partners (Universities)?

(eventual users of the teaching/learning materials) with no idea of the context. These descriptions would also be useful for researchers providing advice and further support in the next steps of case study development.

It was agreed at the first meeting, that the case studies would go through several drafts and the final versions would be from 20 to 30 pages in length. Each case study would then become a chapter in an online Handbook, illustrating relevant concepts and tools of ecological economics. The results of the first meeting were rather inconclusive however. The development of the case studies was left a bit in the air. This would change when the first workshop took place in Vienna almost one year later, when the drafting process was already well underway. One conclusion we drew was that the kick-off meeting would have been far more effective had it been longer, in the form of a workshop, as the CSOs left the Paris meeting less than entirely clear on what they should have been expecting from their university partners.

### **3 Stage 2: Case Study Development**

With work on the initial case study drafts underway, the remainder of the drafting process was planned and shared with partners (overleaf). This process was guided, monitored and supported by project co-ordinator ICTA-UAB at every stage with a four person team, reinforced when appropriate by ICTA UAB graduate students whose work was financed from other funds (scholarships). These students were very familiar with the countries (Croatia, Cameroon, Ecuador) where the studies were being written.

When all initial drafts had been received, CEECEC Co-ordinators allocated working groups based on shared interests and their expertise, to work on specific case studies. The allocated groupings were:

- i) Accion Ecologica, Ecuador: Manta-Manaos Axis and the Cordillera del Condor mining conflict (ICTA-UAB, GEPAMA)
- ii) A Sud, Italy: TAV Torino-Lione (FFCT-UNL) and Waste in Campania (ULB)
- iii) CSE, India: Mendha Lekha and Hiware Bazar and Rural Employment Act (IFF)
- iv) Endemit, Serbia: "Djerdap" National park (ICTA-UAB)
- v) REBRAf, Brazil: ecological services and Amazon conservation (ICTA-UAB)
- vi) Sunce, Croatia: Nautical Tourism in Lastovo, Croatia (FFCT-UNL, ICTA-UAB)
- vii) VODO, Belgium: Environmental liability of Umicore Belgium (ULB)
- viii) CED-FoEI an analysis of logging concessions in Cameroon (ICTA-UAB)

Partners then continued work through the process outlined above, with the support and guidance of members of ICTA-UAB and other university partners. One CSO (REBRAf) already had its own internal university connection. CSO and research partners exchanged documents by email, communicating by phone or Skype, and meeting in person when circumstances permitted. Although there was a schedule in place, flexibility in the process of academic advice in terms of partnerships and timing was crucial to the success of the drafting process.

### **4 Stage 3: Workshops**

Embedded within the drafting process were two scheduled workshops. These were key events, allowing partners to meet in person in order to better understand the case studies

and methods and tools involved. There were two workshops, one in Vienna, Austria organised by Willi Haas and Simron Jit Singh of [IFF \(The Institute of Social Ecology\)](#), and a second one organized by Lucie Greyl and colleagues in Rome Italy at [A Sud's CDCA](#) (Centro di Documentazione sui Conflitti Ambientali).

#### **4.1 Process for Drafting of Case Studies**

The aim of the project is to produce a Handbook of ecological economics (EE) based on 10-12 case studies for online teaching and learning. The necessary steps were discussed in Paris (19/04/08) and have been revised in agreement with the CEECEC work plan. The case studies will be developed through a process of ongoing drafting and review by all consortium members. The timing and logic of the drafting process is as follows:

##### **First Draft**

The initial case study description by CSO partners can be informed by the guidelines set out in the Framework for Case Study Drafting. The first draft is due for submission to ICTA-UAB in **September 2008**.

##### **Second Draft:**

Once the first drafts have been approved following their submission in September, a process of open/horizontal consultation between CSOs and research partners will begin in which a shared framing of the conflict is developed. Agreement will be reached on the definition of the conflicts and concepts and tools of ecological economics that could be useful for understanding the case studies. This will be accomplished by the organisation of working groups which will communicate electronically to discuss the case studies and exchange materials. The second draft of case studies is due for submission to ICTA-UAB **mid December 2008**.

##### **Third Draft:**

From December consultation will continue to determine the most appropriate tools, methods and indicators of ecological economics to be applied to the case studies. Following from the **February workshop in Vienna**, a separate short report should be produced arguing the utility and shortcomings of the various tools, methods and indicators under consideration for each case study. This document should inform the development of the third draft which is due **mid April 2009**.

##### **Fourth (Final) Draft:**

Following the workshop, electronic consultancy will continue to define the support needed from EE in terms of tools and methods in order to rewrite the case studies. Key issues to consider will be what EE can provide to CSOs and what the limitations are. This will result in the fourth draft, due **beginning of June 2009**, before the **second workshop in Rome June 23-27**), the ESEE conference in Ljubljana (June 29/July 2), and the drafting of the Handbook (from July). The final draft of each case study should contain abstracts, keywords, maps and photos, and should be approximately 30 pages.

## 4.2 Workshop 1: Vienna

The Vienna workshop was highly structured, designed to deepen CSO and research partners knowledge of each others' expertise, very much in the spirit of transdisciplinary research, whereby "boundaries between and beyond disciplines are transcended and knowledge and perspectives from different scientific disciplines as well as non-scientific sources are integrated" (Flinterman et al, 2001). The objectives and structure of the workshop is set out below (overleaf), with the programme on the following pages.

**Workshop for the Development of Case Studies  
Institute for Social Ecology, Vienna Austria,  
Feb 23-27 2008**

**Objectives:**

- (a) To introduce various ecological economics tools to the CSOs,
- (b) illustrate the application of these tools in the context of CSO case studies
- (c) to evaluate progress in case study development for the Handbook for Ecological Economics and the on-line course, and
- (d) to clarify expectations and agree on next steps.

**Structure:**

The first two days will consist of presentations by researchers of various ecological economic tools. Each presentation will be 30 minutes with the remaining 30 minutes for discussion and CSO reflection on tools of interest.

Toward the end of Day 2, there would be a need to identify appropriate tools for each case study, and form three working groups (marketplace).

The mornings of days 3 and 4 will consist of CSO presentations of case studies to the entire group. In the afternoons the 3 working groups (across which 11 CSO participants will be dispersed), will explore the possibilities for the application of specific tools to case studies.

The last day will be used for presentation and reflection of collaborative efforts by the CSOs, and an open discussion about next steps.

## Workshop Programme

<b>Day 1: Inputs</b>	
9.00 – 9.30	Introduction of participants and the programme
9.30 – 10.00	What is Ecological Economics? <b>Joan Martinez Alier</b>
10.00 – 11.30	Material Flows in Ecuador and International Trade <b>JMA and Maria Cristina Vallejo (ICTA-UAB)</b> Material Flows and Energy Accounting based on based on IFF Handbook of local studies, and the Nicobarese case study. <b>Willi Haas/ Simron Singh (IFF)</b>
11.30 – 12.00	Coffee break
12.00– 13.00	HANPP and land use <b>Karlheinz Erb/Helmut Haber/Annabella Musel (IFF)</b>
13.00 – 14.30	Lunch Break
14.30 – 15.30	Virtual Water <b>Leah Temper (ICTA-UAB)</b>
15.30 -16.30	Languages of Valuation <b>JMA, Ivana Logar (contingent valuation) (ICTA-UAB) Paula Antunes and Rui Santos (FFCT-UNL)</b>
16.30 – 17.00	Coffee Break
17.00 -18.00	Tourism and economic environmental policy <b>Ivana Logar (ICTA-UAB)</b>
<b>Day 2: Inputs and Marketplace</b>	
9.00 – 10.00	Languages of Valuation (Session II) and Conflicts CBA of Mangroves and Shrimp <b>JMA (ICTA-UAB)</b> and Actors in Environmental Conflicts <b>Lea Sebastian (ULB)</b>
10.00 – 11.00	Participatory Multi-Criteria Evaluation and Scenarios <b>Paula Antunes and Rui Santos (FFCT-UNL)</b>
11.00 – 11. 30	Coffee break
11. 30-12. 30	Science for Policy and Post-normal science <b>Mariana Walter (ICTA-UAB)</b>
12.30 – 14.00	Lunch break
14. 00 – 15. 00	Property rights and resource management, Payment for Environmental Services <b>Mariana Walter (ICTA-UAB), Supriya Singh (CSE)</b>
15.00 – 16.00	“Marketplace” Identify interests and needs of CSOs and form groups for NGO-science collaboration
16.00 – 16.30	Coffee break
16.30 – 17. 30	“Marketplace” (contd.) Identify interests and needs of CSOs and form groups for NGO-science collaboration
<b>Day 3:</b>	
<b>Morning: CSO presentations of case studies and discussion with whole group about possible tools/approaches</b>	
<b>Afternoon: Working Groups for CSO/Research Collaboration</b>	
9:00-9:30	<b>CSE</b> Participatory Forest Management
9:30-10:00	<b>A Sud</b> High Speed Train Conflict (TAV)
10:00-10:30	<b>REBRAF</b> Deforestation and REDD Measures in the Amazon
11:00-11:30	<b>CED</b> Forestry and Communities in Cameroon
11:30-12:00	<b>ACEC</b> Manta-Manaos Mega-project: Nature, Capital and Plunder
12:00-12:30	<b>Sunce</b> Nautical Tourism Impacts

14:30 – 16:00 16:30 – 18:00	<b>MFA / HANPP / Unequal Trade / Ecological Debt</b> Willi Haas/Simron Singh / Annabella Musel / Karlheinz Erb (IFF) / Maria Cristina Vallejo (ICTA-UAB)	<b>Economic Valuation</b> Paula Antunes / Rui Santos (FFCT-UNL)	<b>Multi Criteria Evaluation</b> Joan Martinez Alier / Mariana Walter (ICTA-UAB)
Coffee break: 10:30-11:00      Lunch: 13.00 – 14.30      Coffee break: 16.00 – 16.30			
<b>Day 4:</b> <b>Morning: CSO presentations of case studies and discussion with whole group about possible tools/approaches</b> <b>Afternoon: Working Groups for CSO/Research Collaboration</b>			
9:00-9:30	<b>ASud</b> Campania Waste Crisis		
9:30-10:00	<b>CSE</b> Local Governance and Environment Investments		
10:00 – 10:30	<b>Endemit</b> Djerdap National Park and Local Communities		
11:00 – 11:30	<b>ACEC</b> Mining Conflict in Cordillera del Cóndor		
11:30 – 12:00	<b>VODO</b> Environmental Justice / Ecological Debt in Belgium		
14:30 – 16:00 16:30 – 18:00	<b>MFA / HANPP / Unequal Trade / Ecological Debt</b> Willi Haas/Simron Singh / Annabella Musel / Karlheinz Erb / Maria Cristina Vallejo	<b>Economic Valuation</b> Paula Antunes / Rui Santos	<b>Multi Criteria Evaluation</b> Joan Martinez Alier / Mariana Walter
Coffee break: 10:30-11:00      Lunch: 13.00 – 14.30      Coffee break: 16.00 – 16.30			
<b>Day 5: Presentation of case studies by CSOs and Conclusion</b>			
9.00 – 11.00	Presentation by CSOs on their experience (case studies 1- 4) Results of collaborative effort, feedback on collaboration, current state of affairs, future perspective and needs		
11.00 – 11.30	Coffee break		
11.30 – 13:00	Presentation by CSOs on their experience (case studies 5-7) Results of collaborative effort, feedback on collaboration, current state of affairs, future perspective and needs		
13:00 – 14.00	Lunch break		
14.00 – 16.00	Presentation by CSOs on their experience (case studies 8-11) Results of collaborative effort, feedback on collaboration, current state of affairs, future perspective and needs		
16.00 – 16.30	Coffee break		
16.30 – 18:00	Closing and Evaluation		

By day 5, CSO partners had decided on keywords, concepts and methods to address within their case studies, but moreover, had clear ideas of the concepts and tools that were most relevant to their case studies and how they might be applied. The table below summarises the outputs of the workshop:

### 4.3 Summary of Vienna Workshop Outputs

	<b>Case Study and (Partner)</b>	<b>Keywords/ Concepts/Tools</b>	<b>Notes</b>
1.	UMICORE – Flanders (VODO)	Lead health risks, soil pollution, Ecological Debt, Environmental liabilities, value of human life, Corporate accountability, Post-normal science, uncertainty manufacture	Work on Ecological Debt calculation for Umicore
2.	Lastovo – Croatia (Sunce)	Carrying capacity, resilience, Quotas, Economic instruments for tourism management, Golf and virtual water	<p>Economic evaluation, WTP tool, implement questionnaire for tourists entrance, today's, 3 E, expected to increase, see how much it can increase without losing tourists, demand curb. See what services tourists would be interested to pay, what services they want. Think a about quota to protect environment, think which criteria for quota, carrying capacity, through physical indicators, number of boats, resilience's ecosystem. Also see local community perceptions. Important have more statistics of park. Eco-taxes. Zoning system (fishing, boats, etc), also number permits.</p> <p>Do multicriteria with local stakeholders, what are the opportunities interests. Also think about stakeholder tools to identify for each stakeholders what is their relationship with other actors of the island</p>

3.	Logging in Cameroon (CED-FoEI)	Property rights and resource management, commodity chains (filière), environmental services, social metabolism, Ecologically unequal exchange, certification, consumer blindness, eco-taxes, natural capital depletion, environmental services, voluntary partnership agreement.	Critics of certification. Improve them for social & environmental sustainability.  Discussion with EU (forest stewardship council.)  What is legal timber?? Management plants for sustainability.  International trial? Present in court, there is international cases. European directive on environmental liabilities.
4.	Waste in Campania – Italy (ASUD)	Hazardous waste, material flows, Ecomafia, externalities as cost shifting, post-normal science, “Zero waste”, incinerators, CBA Lawrence summer principle, DPSIR	Post-normal science, Cost Benefit incinerator Democracy
5.	NP Djerdap and local communities, Serbia (Endemit)	Dams, depopulation, NP management, local livelihood opportunities, scenarios, multi-criteria evaluation	Institutional analysis, identification of relevant factors, rules, traditions, see instruments, organization of NP Management, construct scenarios (business as usual, positive scenarios) map Drivers, before do interviews/focus groups to know what is happening. MCE to analyse scenarios. Ecosystem services,
6.	REDD in Mato Grosso, Brazil (REBRAf)	Avoided deforestation, carbon trade, valuation, payment for environmental services, ecological-economic zoning, HANPP, opportunity cost, institutional innovations , public policy	Embedded HANPP Perception of value
7.	Nicobar Island – India (UNI UKL)	Humanitarian / disaster aid, , distributional conflicts, ecological consequences, dependency, vulnerability, social metabolism, metabolic increases, EROI, unequal exchange, despondency, vulnerability	
8.	TAV in Val de Susa – Italy (ASUD)	Transport and energy, Material Flow, Participatory democracy, CBA+ MCE	

9.	Mendha Lekha - India (CSE)	Forest rights, Gross Nature product, biomass economy, self study/regulation, inclusive democracy, GDP of the poor, HANPP, Institutions, metabolic profile, DPSIR	Institutional analysis, rules for NNRR management, why are rules successful HANPP Idea for policy makers to work on the bottom up direction (small scale). Link biophysical with social indicators, see who flows work, (MFA; water, energy). Define material profile,
10.	Hiware Bazar – India (CSE)	Environmental investments, institutional innovation, watershed management, resource management, village poverty line, rural employment, rural energy, virtual water. DPSIR, metabolic profile	This village more integrated in the economy, agricultural economy, their changed their economy, improved the productivity of the agriculture, availability of water. How frame cases to see factors of successful. Institutions: Management aspects, rules, successes. Drivers, institutional change, DPSIR
11.	Kuhan in Himachal Pradech – a mountain village (CSE)	Environmental services, monetary valuation, environmental policy, collaborative decision making	
12.	Mining in Cordillera del Cónдор – Ecuador (ACEC)	Net present value of a mine, (virtual wealth), environmental and social costs, cultural values, indigenous rights, ILO 169, Material Flows	
13.	The Manta-Manaos corridor – Ecuador ACEC)	Material Flows, International Trade, “maquila” industry, conservation and indigenous rights, conservation and indigenous rights, multinational companies, Civil Disobedience.	
14.	Tana Delta – Kenya (ICTA UAB)	HANPP, EROI, Food security, Bio-fuels	

Following the workshop, evaluation forms were distributed to the partners electronically. The forms asked partners to give feedback on the Vienna workshop, particularly on the usefulness of the tools/concepts presented to CSO work. The survey that was distributed is shown on the next 2 pages below:

#### 4.4 Vienna Workshop Evaluation Form

Only one evaluation form per partner organisation is required, although we encourage the written expression of all participants. Type your comments directly on the page taking as much space as you need.

##### **Section 1**

1. What were your expectations of the workshop?
2. Were those expectations met? Why / Why not?
3. Do you think the Vienna workshop was useful for the case study drafting process? Why / Why not?
4. What do you think was missing?
5. What did you find most relevant? Why?
6. What did you find least relevant? Why?
7. Please make any suggestions on how a workshop like this could be improved.

##### **For CSOs**

Choose at least 7 of the tools in Section 2 on the following page and comment on the following issues:

- a) *Did you know of this tool (or concept) before Vienna? Have you used it before in your work / campaigns? (How?)*
- b) *Do you think these tools could be useful for your campaigning work? How?*
- c) *Which advantages and disadvantages can you identify?*
- d) *Is there any extra information (examples of application, more references, etc) you would like to have? (Please specify)*

## Workshop Evaluation Form Cont'd

### Section 2

	<b>Ecological Economics tools</b>	<b>Feel free to use all the space you need.</b>
1.	<b>Valuation (cost benefit analysis and other languages of valuation)</b> Joan Martinez- Alier (ICTA-UAB)	a) b) c) d) Other comments:
2.	<b>HANPP</b> Annabella Musel (IFF)	a) b) c) d) Other comments:
3.	<b>Material Flow Analysis</b> Willis Haas, Simron Jit Singh and Maria Cristina Vallejo (IFF, ICTA-UAB)	a) b) c) d) Other comments:
4.	<b>Economic valuation tools (contingent valuation, willingness to pay and economic policy instruments)</b> Ivana Logar (ICTA-UAB)	a) b) c) d) Other comments:
5.	<b>Virtual Water</b> Leah temper (ICTA-UAB)	a) b) c) d) Other comments:
6.	<b>Actors in 4 Dimensions Tool</b> Lea Sebastien (ULB)	a) b) c) d) Other comments:
7.	<b>Multi-criteria evaluation (MCE) and scenarios</b> Paula Antunes and Rui Santos (FFCT-UNL)	a) b) c) d) Other comments:
8.	<b>Post-normal science</b> Mariana Walter (ICTA-UAB)	a) b) c) d) Other comments:
9.	<b>Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES)</b> Supriya Singh (CSE)	a) b) c) d) Other comments:
10.	<u>Other tools:</u>	a) b) c) d) Other comments:

## 4.5 Summary of Feedback on Vienna Workshop

Feedback indicated that researchers valued the opportunity to understand the case studies better, and define the future scope of the case study texts. They also appreciated the chance to learn about each others' methodologies.

CSOs knew of some of the tools and concepts presented, but had never used them before. In other cases CSOs said that they were already using similar tools in lobbying (CBA was cited) and that the workshop helped to frame the application of specific tools to case studies under development. The following observations were made:

**CBA:** CBA could be useful to highlight environmental costs and for showing the economic unfeasibility of projects. There were concerns however about the amount of data required do CBA well and over the fact that depending on the inputs chosen, it could be used to oppose or support projects with environmental impacts.

**HANPP:** could be very useful for connecting biodiversity loss with human activities for policy makers.

**MFA:** A useful tool for looking at material flows on a local level (eg. In Djerdap National Park) but data availability and CSO capacity for analysis could pose problems.

**MCE:** Working sessions simplified the application of this tool and it was useful to compare different scenarios transparently. It was seen as a potentially very useful tool by many CSO participants.

**PES:** Some questioned the ethics of putting economic value on environmental good/services but it was seen as having the potential to improve resource management and livelihoods

It was also sometimes the case that CSOs had never heard of some tools/concepts. Sunce (Croatia) for example had never heard of virtual water, and thought it could add value to lobbying activities for more sustainable use of water, for example against the development of golf courses and some forms of agriculture.

CSOs furthermore noted that they had valued time spent discussing methodologies in small groups with experts, where they discussed how to apply the tools to specific cases, adding that even in cases where methods didn't relate directly to their case studies, they were appreciative of having been exposed.

## 4.6 Workshop 2: Rome

The second Workshop for the Application of Ecological Economics to CSO Case studies took place at ASUD's Centro di Documentazione sui Conflitti Ambientali (CDCA), in Rome. This session was less structured than the Vienna one, with time allotted for continued collaborative work on case studies and a field trip to Campania. Some case studies were nearing the final stages of drafting. Evaluation of this session was informal compared with the Vienna workshop, collected via an open discussion. Feedback expressed the opinion that the opportunity to work in person again and clarify outstanding questions on the case studies had been a welcome one. Furthermore, dissemination activities in Rome and in Naples were most useful for some CEECEC participants forcing them to improve their presentation of the case studies. A "team feeling" was created as multi-national CEECEC participants talked to the public, to the press, and visited the Campania villages at the centre of the controversy on waste dumping, together with local activists who had been contacted by A Sud.

## 5 Stage 4: Materials Development and Dissemination

The submission of final drafts took place between end of 2009 and March 2010, nearly two years after the kick-off meeting. The timing of the work from CSOs was sometimes disrupted by unexpected urgent demands on their time, and one of our partners (Accion Ecologica) was temporarily suspended by the government of Ecuador for a couple of months. The final drafts comprised all the foreseen chapters from the CSOs in CEECEC plus two more chapters (from IFF Vienna on the role of NGOs in changing the economy of the Nicobar islands after the tsunami of 2004, and from ICTA UAB and Nature Kenya on the Tana Delta). The project co-ordinators at ICTA-UAB reviewed them, ensuring the quality of the English versions, and making sure that the relevant principles, concepts and methods of ecological economics had been brought out clearly in each case study in language accessible to a primarily CSO audience. All 14 case study chapters were then placed on the [CEECEC website](#) (where they remain). The next step was to put the chapters into a single document together with a Glossary, developed in parallel with the case study chapters, to form the online [CEECEC Handbook, "Ecological Economics from the Bottom-Up"](#). The Glossary contains over the 90 different keywords featured in the case studies and also some other terms.

It was a laborious process to put the Glossary together, again through collaboration between university partners and CSOs. The Handbook (including the Glossary) was a core resource in the CEECEC online ecological economics [course](#) that was piloted from April to July 2010 (with technical help from CEECEC partner SERI), and is now available as a freely accessible stand-alone resource for teaching and learning ecological economics through CSO experience. The on-line course was taken by 25 students, mainly from CSOs. Hundreds of prospective students showed interest in taking the course, and there are plans to repeat the experience after the CEECEC project ends in October 2010. There are conversations to publish a revised version of the Handbook not only in the web but also as a printed book with a commercial publisher specialized in environmental issues. Translations of many of the chapters in the Handbook into French and Spanish have also been prepared and are now being circulated.

## 6 Conclusion: The Fruits of CSO/Ecological Economics Capacity Building

The collaborative processes employed within the CEECEC network were designed to bridge the gaps in expertise and languages that existed between the two very distinct realms of academia and activism in order to co-produce new knowledge. However, they also had to respond to partners' needs and situations as they evolved. As a result of the flexible approach used, the project succeeded in co-producing case studies of urgent, and highly relevant environmental issues and conflicts. The success of the project however has not been limited to the development of educational materials. For the CSOs of the CEECEC network (and for others from outside the network that engaged with the project), the benefits have been greater. CEECEC's CSO partners attending the final dissemination event in [Oldenburg Germany](#) at the [ISEE Biennial Conference](#) in August 2010 summarised these, speaking of: new competencies gained for engaging in scientific research; enlarged networks of new partners now within reach, and new proposals springing from these partnerships; the creation of opportunities to connect the efforts of scientists, policymakers and activists; the increased profile and legitimacy of CSO work in doing so; being able to engage with researchers to generate high quality data and use technical language from ecological economics, and in doing so deepening the legitimacy of CSO research outputs; even new opportunities to publish in academic journals, thereby reaching out to new audiences; and the ability to integrate ecological economics concepts and tools into CSO outreach activities targeted at smaller CSOs (building their capacity to engage with the field as well) but also at the general public.

For the researchers involved in CEECEC the benefits of collaboration were no less valuable. The CEECEC project exposed its academics to new audiences and issues of often immediate relevance, making vivid to them the presence of "activist knowledge" amongst the CSOs, and led to the development of partnerships that will continue beyond the life of this particular project. Moreover, it increased their understanding of the challenges of working with real life issues and with civil society organizations engaged with these. Through CEECEC the academic partners came to understand the existence of a variety of CSO that we call now EJOs, environmental justice organizations. The ecological economists had to understand and overcome the different logics and institutional frameworks they were confronted with in order to find a meaningful means of collaboration. The mere intention to make science useful was not enough – researchers realised that there were structural and ideological issues that needed to be discussed and understood. Researchers also became aware that CSOs sometimes had the impression that the scientists had the answers to all problems, or if they did not have them readily available, could find them. These expectations forced researchers to reflect upon the role of science and its use in generating solutions to real-world problems. In effect, the CEECEC project provided researchers with an excellent opportunity to come to terms with many important issues related to co-operative research, preparing them for future work with civil society. CEECEC research partners have furthermore become more engaged in transdisciplinary work with civil society, ultimately contributing to an academic community that shares such experiences and that will lead to the development of better frameworks for such collaborations.