METHOD FACTSHEET

Deliberative valuation

Introduction

Deliberative valuation is not one particular valuation method, but it is a valuation paradigm (Raymond et al. 2014) providing a framework to combine various tools and techniques that bridge citizens and academia, as well as different disciplines within science. Deliberative valuation is based on the assumption that valuation is a social process in which values are discovered, constructed and reflected in a dialogue with others (Wilson and Howarth 2002). Therefore, deliberative valuation invites stakeholders and citizens (the general public) to form their preferences for ecosystem services together through an open dialogue, which allows consideration of ethical beliefs, moral commitments and social norms beyond individual and collective utility (Aldred 1997, Satterfield 2001, Wegner and Pascual 2011).

Keywords

Deliberation; Public engagement; Participation; Discourse; Relational values; Social values; Equity.

Why would I chose this approach?

Deliberative valuation is considered particularly appropriate when valuing ecosystem services and benefits derived from them, because they are common goods, the existence of which have consequences for other people, in other parts of the world, and across generations. These choices are fundamentally ethical and hence the right question is not what "I want for me" (reflecting the self-oriented values that follow individual rationality) but rather what is "right to do" (reflecting the others-oriented values that follow collective rationality) (Vatn 2009, Chan et al. 2012). Open discourse, generated by deliberative techniques, is able to unfold relational values and reflect upon the social context of valuation. Therefore, deliberative methods are also proposed to account for social equity issues in valuation (Wilson and Howarth 2002). Deliberative valuation is particularly suited for understanding the meanings that people attribute to ecosystems and their services, such as holistic concepts of the land, and it can accommodate diverse world views and forms of information. Therefore, deliberative valuation is found helpful for addressing cultural ecosystem services such as traditional knowledge, sense of place, spiritual value and cultural diversity (e.g. Chan et al. 2012, Kenter et al. 2011), and can also be used to promote social learning (Kenter et al. 2015) by engaging the general public in an open discussion about the intrinsic (ecological) value of ecosystem functions and processes (e.g. Kelemen et al. 2013) or the value of nature for future generations (i.e. bequest values).

As previous field experiences prove, deliberative valuation can be applied in several decision contexts including; 1) awareness raising through learning at the individual or the group level (e.g. Aldred and Jacobs 2011, Kenter et al. 2011), 2) priority setting (e.g. Randir and Shriver 2009), 3) instrument design (see e.g. Maynard et al. 2015 where deliberative valuation of ecosystem services served as a basic input for renewing regional development plans and nature protection rules), 4) mediation between conflicting interests

(rather than liability) (e.g. Málovics and Kelemen 2009) and 5) opening up institutional mechanisms to bottom-up decision making processes and public engagement. In more rigid, top-down institutional systems deliberative valuation might seem to be less relevant for decision makers. Since deliberative valuation employs a huge number of tools and techniques from various disciplinary backgrounds, both the spatial scale and the spatial resolution of the valuation process range from the very small to the very high.

What are the main advantages of the approach?

- Contributes to balancing the power asymmetries between stakeholders:
  - by giving voice to more marginalized social groups and
  - by empowering them (if necessary) ;
- Integrates various knowledge forms (e.g. local, traditional, expert, scientific);
- Allows for social learning among the participants and the general public ;
- Improves the understanding of plural and incommensurable values and hence contributes to framing and managing conflicts;
- Increases the legitimacy of decisions that build on the outcomes of deliberation.

What are the constraints/limitations of the approach?

- Operates with small samples which are not statistically representative (although political representativity can be achieved);
- Timely process requiring professional skills;
- It has to be combined with other approaches (e.g. MCDA) to reach quantitative results;
- Its success of partly depends on participants' availability and general debating culture;
- Participation fatigue might emerge;
- Some institutional contexts are less open towards public participation.

What types of value can the approach help me understand?

Deliberative valuation is highly appropriate to elicit sociocultural values and those value dimensions which are directly related to the quality of life (human well-being). They can also be used to elicit economic values if they are combined with monetary approaches (e.g. deliberative monetary valuation), although the interpretation of results might be challenging from a philosophical point of view.

How does the approach address uncertainty?

Uncertainty can be addressed in the public dialogue, mainly qualitatively.

How do I apply the approach?

Since deliberative valuation is not one method per se, it is difficult to provide a stepwise description of how it goes in practice. In Table 1 we propose a toolbox approach along three major steps within a general deliberative valuation process.

Table 1. Steps within a Deliberative Valuation process

Steps of the valuation process	Main objective	Proposed tools
Problem framing	Understand the main problems related to ecosystem management through the eyes of local stakeholders and commit them to the valuation process	Stakeholder analysis and in-depth interviews (these are general techniques with no deliberative characteristics)
Knowledge co-generation	Co-generate knowledge with local stakeholders and citizens on the local perceptions of ecosystem services, and initiate an open dialogue to form preferences to ecosystem services collectively	citizens' science applications, photovoice method, focus groups variations (concept mapping groups, photo elicitation groups)
Decision support	Broaden and democratize the decision making process by involving the general public and / or the local stakeholders	citizens' juries, MCDA

Requirements

Data	□ Data is available □ **Need to collect some new data (e.g. participatory valuation)** □ Need to collect lots of new data (e.g. valuation based on surveys)	The amount of new data to be collected depends on existing knowledge and information about the situation. In most cases the joint problem framing and the knowledge co-generating phase involves data collection.
Type of data	□ **Quantitative** □ **Qualitative**	Both qualitative and quantitative data can be used in DV processes.
Expertise and production of knowledge	□ Working with researchers within your own field □ **Working with researchers from other fields** □ **Working with non-academic stakeholders**	In most cases DV processes engage researchers from different disciplines. Public participation is an inherent part of DV.
Software	□ **Freely available** □ License required □ Advanced software knowledge required	Many DV tools and techniques are low-tech by nature, but if DV is used in combination with other approaches (e.g. choice experiment, MCDA), licences may be required.
Time resources	□ Short-term (less than 1 year) □ **Medium-term (1-2 years)** □ Long-term (more than 2 years)	The length of DV processes varies between a few months and several years, depending on the issue at hand and the commitment of the decision maker and stakeholders.
Economic resources	□ Low-demanding (less than 6 PMs) □ **Medium-demanding (6-12 PMs)** □ High-demanding (more than 12 PMs)	The organization and facilitation of the DV events as well as the analysis and communication of results require a rather strong involvement on behalf of the scientists.
Other requirements	Professional facilitation and communication skills.	

Where do I go for more information?

Contact: Eszter Kelemen (kelemen.eszter@essrg.hu) and Heli Saarikoski (heli.saarikoski@syke.fi)

Aldred, J., 1997. Existence Value, Moral Commitments and In-kind Valuation. In: Foster, J. (ed) Valuing Nature? Economics, Ethics and the Environment. London: Routledge, p. 155–169.

Aldred, J., Jacobs, M. 2001. Citizens and Wetlands: Evaluating the Ely's Citizens Jury. Ecological Economics, 34: 217-232

Chan, K., Satterfield, T. & Goldstein, J. 2012. Rethinking ecosystem services to better address and navigate cultural values. Ecological Economics 74: 8-18.

Kelemen, E., Nguyen, G., Gomiero, T., Kovács, E., Choisis, J. P., Choisis, N. & Balázs, K. (2013). Farmers' perceptions of biodiversity: lessons from a discourse-based deliberative valuation study. Land use policy, 35, 318-328.

Kenter, J. O., O'Brien, L., Hockley, N., Ravenscroft, N., Fazey, I., Irvine, K. N. & Williams, S. (2015). What are shared and social values of ecosystems? Ecological Economics, 111, 86-99.

Kenter, J.O., Hyde, T., Christie, M., Fazey, I. 2011. The importance of deliberation in valuing ecosystem services in developing countries—Evidence from the Solomon Islands. Global Environmental Change, 21(2), 505-521.

Málovics, Gy., Kelemen, E. 2009. Non-monetary valuation of ecosystem services: A tool for decision making and conflict management. Manuscript for the 8th ESEE Conference. URL: http://www.essrg.hu/ecoservice/dok/Malovics-Kelemen2009.pdf

Maynard, S., James, D., Davidson, A. 2015. Determining the value of multiple ecosystem services in terms of community wellbeing: Who should be the valuing agent? Ecological Economics, 115: 22-28.

Randir, T., Shriver, D.M. 2009. Deliberative valuation without prices: A multi-attribute priorisation for watershed ecosystem management. Ecological Economics, 68: 3042-3051

Raymond, C. M., Kenter, J. O., Plieninger, T., Turner, N. J., & Alexander, K. A. (2014). Comparing instrumental and deliberative paradigms underpinning the assessment of social values for cultural ecosystem services. Ecological Economics, 107, 145-156.

Satterfield, T. 2001. In Search of Value Literacy: Suggestions for the Elicitation of Environmental Values. Environmental Values 10(3): 331–359.

Vatn, A. 2009. An institutional analysis of methods for environmental appraisal. Ecological Economics, 68(8-9): 2207–2215.

Wegner, G & Pascual, U. 2011. Cost-benefit analysis in the context of ecosystem services for human well-being: a multidisciplinary critique. Global Environmental Change 21: 492-505.

Wilson, M.A., Howarth, R.B. 2002. Discourse-based valuation of ecosystem services: establishing fair outcomes through group deliberation. Ecological Economics, 41(3): 431–443.

Factsheet prepared by Eszter Kelemen and Heli Saarikoski