Supply Chain Stewardship Tool Review
Regulatory Tools

TABLES Project 2012: Mini reviews	
Guidance	*Using your experience and expertise, consider the following tasks in relation to the tool. It may not be possible to complete all tasks for each tool due to a lack of available information, the task not applying to the tool, etc.* **Please note where this is the case by writing in the reason in the space provided***. Please use a maximum of 6 pages of A4 (excluding diagrams and appendices).* **Your responses are required in the white spaces***.*
Task 1: Basic information	
Name of the tool	Supply chain stewardship schemes
Type of tool (list all that apply) *Learning and skills (pedagogic); participatory; regulatory; collaborative; mapping; valuation; modelling; decision; futures; financial; ecosystem services*	Financial (although 'economic' may be better in this case), creating markets linking 'suppliers' of ecosystem services with their 'consumers'
Group members *(minimum size 3 members, must include a BCU rep)*	1. Mark Everard
Please provide a brief synopsis of the tool *This may include: background context, development (and ownership if appropriate), current use and applications etc.* *Please also note any desired outcomes of the tool so that you can make reference back to these in Task 7: SWOT analysis*	Supply chain stewardship schemes comprise a diverse group of accreditation mechanisms intended to certify that products of services transparently meet published sets of standards. Many established schemes predate contemporary wider acceptance of ecosystem services as a framework. Consequently, most if not all stewardship schemes today address only on or a few services, and may do so only at certain stages in the value chain. The most rigorous examples require independent auditing that standards are met. These include, for example, Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) requiring certification from sustainable and equitable forestry practices rights through to manufacture of finished forest-derived products. The Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) scheme emulates FSC but addresses capture fishery products, whilst the nascent Aquaculture Stewardship Council (ASC) is seeking the same for aquaculture products. In farming, the Organic standard is also well-known and independently verified. Other certification schemes are self-certifying, entailing lower transaction costs but arguably at the expense of rigour. Limitation of certification to only part of the societal life cycle – for example FSC, MSC and Organic products can still bear the logo if flown half-way round the world – and to a less than complete set of ecosystem services is both a current weakness but also an opportunity, though many certification schemes (Red Tractor, Responsible Care, Nordic Swan, Freedom Foods, Rainforest Alliance, Fairtrade, etc.) have served to advance aspects of environmentally and socially responsible production. Nevertheless, extension of the principles of supply chain stewardship schemes to address more elements of the ecosystem services framework, and to do so more comprehensively along value chains, may represent a valuable and established means to 'mainstream' the

	ecosystem approach into markets.

Task 2: Use of the tool

Position / Use	Stage	Currently used	Could be used
*If you can, please indicate which **stage(s) of the decision / policy making process** your tool is / could be used in (these stages were identified in the specification document)*	Ideas	Not currently applied beyond a few focal services as noted above	In principle, assurance that ecosystem services have been considered, self-certified or independently, could advance the 'mainstreaming' of the ecosystem approach
	Survey	Not currently applied beyond a few focal services as noted above	In principle, assurance that ecosystem services have been considered, self-certified or independently, could advance the 'mainstreaming' of the ecosystem approach
	Assess	Not currently applied beyond a few focal services as noted above	Could be readily applied to 'screen' ecosystem service implications of proposals, products or services
	Policy / decision	Not currently applied beyond a few focal services as noted above	Could be applied as a means to independently certify the sustainability of policies or decisions
	Implement	Not currently applied beyond a few focal services as noted above	Could be applied as a means to guide implementation
	Evaluate	Not currently applied beyond a few focal services as noted above	Could be applied as a means to independently determine the sustainability outcomes of policies or decisions

Task 3: Existing literature about the tool

Are you aware of any KEY policy and / or academic literature evaluating your tool? *(e.g. reports, journal articles, books)*	Please add any further comments here:

		Author & Date	Title Vol pages	Web link (if available)
		Forest Stewardship Council	-	www.fsc.org
		Marine Stewardship Council	-	www.msc.org
		Organic standards	-	www.soilassociation.org

Task 4: Your experience of working on the tool

Have you done any research/consultancy work on this tool in terms of its development, testing and/or evaluation? *If so, please provide an outline.*	The potential of supply chain certification schemes to internalise the value of biodiversity has featured in my book 'The Business of Biodiversity' (Everard, M. 2009. WIT Press) whilst its wider contribution to mainstreaming the ecosystem approach is considered in my book 'Common Ground' (Everard, M. 2011. Zed Books)
Guidance	For Tasks 5-7, please also try to consider the **future** development and application of this tool in the TABLES project in your answers.

Task 5: Incorporating the ecosystem approach (EA) and ecosystem services (ES)
Please refer to the summary text about ES for concept clarification at the end of this template (appendix)

Using examples (from practice, research or consultancy), explain how EA and/or ES are currently incorporated in/by the tool	As indicated in the preamble, this is more about potential than current practice, though some stewardship schemes certainly embody certification of some ecosystem services.
How could the ecosystem approach and/or ecosystem services be (further) incorporated within the existing tool?	In theory, a more complete range of relevant ecosystem services could be integrated into established certification schemes, or else new schemes be developed based on their tested principles, to ensure independent or at least self-certified scoring.

Task 6: Situating the tool within priority questions/criteria arising from the scoping interviews

	Priority question/criteria	Does your tool address/implement this question/criteria? Or does it have the potential if it was better integrated with an EA/ES approach? *Please explain how.*
Explain how the tool can be situated within the priority questions/criteria that arose in the scoping interviews *Complete as many boxes as required*	**Language and communication**	
	1. Contribution to aiding the development of shared vocabulary within which principles of EA and ES can be shared with multiple stakeholders across built and/or natural environment	As for the potential to incorporate the ecosystem services framework into EIA, SEA and planning application determination, stewardship schemes provide a relevant and established mechanisms for mainstreaming.
	2. Capacity of the tool to develop	Can help link common thinking and interdependencies

		shared understandings of the many identities and values of places from the perspectives of multiple visitors, residents and businesses	along value chains.
	3.	Capacity of the tool to improve or enable engagement across different publics so avoiding the usual suspect problem	Can help link common thinking and interdependencies along value chains.
	Learning from experience/pedagogy		
	4.	Capacity of the tool to help reveal and value 'hidden' assets that are not recognised by communities or publics that use them	Can help link common thinking and interdependencies along value chains.
	5.	Extent to which tool is building on other tools or EA/ES progress	As noted above, this is an established set of tools into which the ecosystem approach could be integrated.
	6.	Extent to which tool is locally derived or grounded or can be adjusted to closely reflect 'local' context. Is the tool suitable for an open source approach?	As noted above, this is an established set of tools into which the ecosystem approach could be integrated.
	7.	Extent to which the tool is open to interpretation and application in a variety of forms (that reflect 'cultural' differences)	This tool can be developed on a context/product-specific basis, in the way that current stewardship schemes have fixed standards yet operate across different cultural contexts.
	Developing and selecting tools		
	8.	Is the tool dependent on a specific funding source? How onerous is the application procedure? What are the chances of success?	The transaction costs of developing a stewardship schemes based on ecosystem services is significant, its ongoing transaction costs depending on self-certification or independent accreditation. Most established schemes have been led with business partners with a vested interest in securing sustainable supplies (FSC and Kingfisher Group, MSC and Unilever, etc.) so this may be a good model.
	9.	Does skills development (essential or optional?) and support exist for the tool or is there a body to ensure the optimal and correct use of it?	Learning is available from both existing successful certification schemes and other ecosystem services-based tools, though there is no bespoke skills development resource for this application.
	10.	Extent to which current statutory hooks can be exploited by the tool or will benefit the quality or application of the tool (e.g. NNPF's duty to cooperate,	Various commitments in the UK White Paper on the Natural Environment, *The Natural Choice*[1], may be argued to be statutory 'hooks'.

---

[1] HM Government. (2011). The Natural Choice: Securing the Value of Nature.
www.defra.gov.uk/environment/natural/whitepape

	SUDS, ecol. networks)	

Informing resultant policies effectively

	11. Extent to which the tool informs or improves policies/decisions. What does the tool cover? (full range of positive and negative economic, social and environment impacts / tradeoffs?)	The tool has potential but this is not yet tested in terms of mainstreaming ecosystem services.
	12. How does the tool link into the planning system (applications and processes). At what cost / extra burden?	The tool could be linked with the planning system if so designed.

Delivering management objectives

	13. Suitability or capacity of the tool to assist with managing visitor needs and pressures within protected areas / the considered area? How?	The tool could adapted for this purpose if so designed.

Local ownership/new governance

	14. To what extent can the tool assist in developing statutory plans (local and management plans) and improve ownership and use by publics?	Uncertain
	15. To what extent does/could the tool contribute to a new form of community governance in management of the environment?	Communities could determine the standards to be met, requiring all plans and suppliers to demonstrate compliance with these ecosystem service outcomes.

Improved tools: understanding flows, interconnections and spatial issues

	16. Capacity to improve spatial understandings of the flows and interactions of various ecosystem services between sectors and at different scales	Not yet explored
	17. Capacity of the tool to reconcile assessments of options and benefits across different scales (and sectors)	Not yet explored, but the focus on value chains inherently links spatial scales
	18. Extent to which the tools is capable or can be manipulated to work across sectoral and administrative boundaries	Not yet explored, but the focus on value chains inherently links sectoral boundaries
	19. Extent to which the tool can handle data shortages and gaps (or is effectiveness considerably compromised?)	Not yet explored
	20. To what extent has/could the tool put landscape/nature conservation and designated species/sites on the radar	Not yet explored, but the wider focus on services rather than narrow certified outcomes would bias it towards systemic outcomes from landscapes

	(positively or resulting in resentment?)	
	Please add any further comments here:	

Task 7: A SWOT analysis of the tool	

Referring back to the relevant policy and academic literature (listed in Task 3), plus your own expertise (listed in Task 4) and the way in which the tool is situated within the priority questions/criteria (listed in Task 6), please complete a summary SWOT analysis ensuring that each point is well justified *Where possible, this analysis should reflect the tool's past and current application, as well as its effectiveness in policy and decision making processes*	**Strengths** *(of the tool in delivering intended outcomes)* • Based on established tools • Variable levels of self- or independent certification
	Weaknesses *(factors that detract from the tool's ability to deliver intended outcomes)* • Potentially high transaction costs • 'Weak' certification processes may erode confidence/delivery
	Opportunities *(consider opportunities for application of the ecosystem approach and services)* • Linking stewardship schemes with the ecosystem approach offers great potential
	Threats *(factors which negatively affect the tool and its outcomes)* *Classify these by their "seriousness" and "probability of occurrence" in the table below, and pay particular attention to the threats associated with potential use of ecosystem approach/ecosystem services.*

Threat	Seriousness (high, medium, low)	Probability of occurrence (high, medium, low)
Commoditisation of the natural world is a potential threat if there is not common understanding about the underpinning ecosystem approach	High	Medium

Please add further comments here:

Guidance	*Please now use the remainder of the document (box below) to make any general comments, observations or analyses of the tool*
Further comments	