

Improving Interfaces between EU research projects and policy-making

From the recognition of a need, to recommendations for concrete actions

The need to improve the evidence base for environmental policy making is widely acknowledged. It is one of the nine priority objectives currently proposed for the future **7th EU Environmental Action Programme** (7th EAP). This stems from the complexity of environmental issues and their inescapable link to some of the biggest societal challenges of our times. Improving the evidence base does not only require improving our knowledge, it also implies improving the interfaces between science, policy, and the wider society. In this context, strategically improving processes of science-policy interfaces between European research and policy-making is urgent. The time is ripe for improving Science-Policy Interfaces, as the future European programme for research and innovation, **Horizon 2020**, is currently being fine-tuned and the proposal for the 7th EAP being drafted by the European Commission.

In the more recent Framework Programmes for Research (FPs), EU-funded research projects were increasingly asked to include policy and societal dimensions into their work plans and strengthen their dissemination and science-policy interface activities. Open and transparent communication between scientists and policy makers and other stakeholders, especially at the European level, have become more common-place, but many hindering factors remain.

Building on the broad experience of researchers and policy-makers, the SPIRAL project (Science-Policy interfaces for biodiversity – Research, Action and Learning)¹ studies science-policy interfaces specifically for biodiversity. Many of its findings are, however, relevant to environmental research more broadly.

The following recommendations have been developed in the context of a workshop on *“Better interfacing EU research projects and EU policy-making”*, organised by SPIRAL jointly with the European Commission Directorate General for Research and Innovation (DG RTD), with the participation of the European Environmental Agency (EEA). The workshop brought together coordinators and other representatives of EU-funded biodiversity research projects and science-policy experts, including representatives from the European Commission Directorate General for Environment (DG ENV). Participants brought experience from over 50 projects funded under the current and past framework programmes for research. The recommendations presented in this report compile the results of the workshop’s discussions, taking into account additional relevant work carried out in SPIRAL. They address strategic as well as operational aspects of science-policy interfaces. They also critically explore the potential contributions of the Biodiversity Information System for Europe (BISE)² and Eye on Earth (EoE)³, to science-policy interaction processes.

¹ SPIRAL is an interdisciplinary research project funded under the European Community’s 7th Framework Programme, contract number: 244035., www.spiral-project.eu

² See <http://biodiversity.europa.eu/>, for a more detailed introduction to BISE see according section in this document

³ See <http://www.eyeonearth.org/>, for a more detailed introduction to EoE see according section in this document



Integration of research results into policy making

Recommendations to policy-makers

There is no single solution to improving the science-policy interface and many avenues need to be addressed.⁴ A key challenge on the policy side is to stimulate the development of science-policy interaction processes and institutions that respond to policy needs in an effective manner.

The following recommendations may contribute to address this challenge:

- **Reinforce the strategic dialogue.** A long term consultative strategic dialogue between science and policy can contribute to ensuring that policy has access to, and uses, best available knowledge. It can also bring about a better focus of research questions to meet policy needs. This entails reinforcing the capacity to formulate policy needs and questions as well as forward looking approaches and horizon scanning as part of the process.
- **Recognise that good interfaces are resource intensive.** Too often research contribution to policy initiatives (e.g. involvement in assessments, participation in advisory committees, drafting of policy briefs, information papers to support international negotiations, etc.) is under-resourced. These activities are time consuming and need to be appropriately funded, both by research funders and by policy institutions.
- **Increase SPI skills.** Find creative ways to increase the skills of staff in policy and research communities operating at the science-policy interface. This could include specific training, dedicated summer schools opened to both scientists and policy-makers, and secondments of policy-makers or scientists.
- **Strengthen the role and effectiveness of chief scientists and their units.** By working more closely together and in collaboration with scientific networks, chief scientist units in different Directorates General of the EC could strongly support the integration of knowledge across DGs, hence also supporting environmental integration and policy coherence.
- **Consider establishing science-policy platforms.** Collecting information needs from policy, facilitating the strategic dialogue, and synthesizing research via science-policy platforms could be an effective and efficient way to fill some of the key gaps at the science-policy interfaces.
- **Remember that there is no one-size-fits-all SPI science-policy interface.** A combination of processes will be needed spanning policy levels, policy areas and governance systems. Be creative, learn by doing, and leave space for evolution and adaptation of processes.
- **Identify areas of research needing long-term support:** As part of the strategic dialogue, policy-makers⁵, the scientific community and civil society should jointly identify research areas and types of research, which need to be maintained in a long-term perspective. This should be reflected in particular in successive calls in Horizon 2020 in order to maintain the research flow, the long-term data sets needed for environmental research, the policy links and the development of the European Research Area.

⁴ For more information, see the collection of SPIRAL briefs currently being developed: <http://www.spiral-project.eu/content/documents> and also see the recent report: Milleu Ltd. / Collingwood Environmental Planning Ltd. (2012): Assessing and Strengthening the Science and EU Environment Policy Interface.- European Commission, Technical Report 2012-059

⁵ At EU level these include in particular policy makers from DG RTD, DG ENV, DG CLIMA, other policy DGs as appropriate, EEA, and JRC.



Adding and sustaining the value of research

Recommendations for research funding institutions

For research to more effectively support policy processes, research funders face a series of challenges, including:

- ⊙ **Research strategies with a societal purpose:** designing funding strategies that incorporate policy-relevant topics in a timely manner, anticipate policy needs and help to raise awareness of the need for policy activities
- ⊙ **Effective and flexible support:** encouraging and supporting projects in their efforts to interface with policy;
- ⊙ **Legacy and access:** ensuring that the knowledge gained in past projects is maintained and openly available for on-going and future projects, but also for policy processes, end-users and the wider society;
- ⊙ **Learning and fostering:** taking stock of lessons learnt on science-policy interactions and fostering improved practises in new projects.

The following recommendations may contribute to address these challenges:

- **Support early and continuing policy connection of projects.** Projects may need explicit help to make early policy connections and identify relevant beneficiaries of their work. This may also help avoid policy makers being bombarded by untargeted information from research. Possible measures include:
 - ✓ **Memory of science-policy interactions:** DG RTD and other funding agencies could implement a process to develop a “memory of science-policy interactions”, where new projects can gather knowledge on how to plan and conduct such interactions and avoid repeating mistakes from other projects.
 - ✓ **Memory of policy landscape mapping:** A dynamic “map of the policy landscape” could be established to ease access to relevant policy information, building on policy landscape analyses made in previous projects, to serve as a resource for, and be dynamically updated by, new projects.
 - ✓ **Partnering of parallel projects:** Bringing together thematically-related research projects in regular meetings and other forms of interaction to exchange information and best practice about communication needs, formats, options, and to support the implementation of joint SPI activities. Existing and future examples include partnering of HERMIONE & CoralFish; BeSAFE & BioMOT; OpenNESS & OPERA.
- **Fund specific brokerage and dissemination projects:** For some policy areas, establishing support projects that promote wide dissemination of research results and science-policy interactions by pro-actively acting as knowledge brokers for other projects. Existing examples include the knowledge brokerage projects⁶, the KNEU support action⁷ and the MarineTT support action⁸. This may be particularly useful when policy processes require the collection and synthesis of information from different projects.
- **Ensure availability of *ad hoc* flexible funding for SPIs:** Flexible and rapid funding mechanisms should be available in Horizon 2020 to allow for rapid response to specific science-policy

⁶ examples for knowledge brokerage projects from different areas: SPIRAL, RESPONDER: www.scp-responder.eu; WATERDISS 2.0: www.waterdiss.eu; PSI-CONNECT: www.psiconnect.eu

⁷ www.biodiversityknowledge.eu

⁸ www.marinett.eu



interface activities as policy priorities evolve. This could include funding for science-policy workshops and synthesis processes.

- **Combine research and implementation:** In some cases, combining research and implementation projects can significantly improve science-policy interactions. Here the project formats of COST actions could be a starting point. LIFE projects or INTER-REG projects could be potential partners for research projects.
- **Ensure long-term availability of information and data:** Maintaining long-term information and data should be considered a project goal in its own right, alongside specific “new questions” in each funding period. This could be strengthened through contractual obligations and in-project evaluations and reviews.
- **Develop and use information systems such as BISE as knowledge hubs:** The role of the Biodiversity Information System for Europe (BISE) as a major hub and entry point to biodiversity and ecosystems research results should be strengthened. (See detailed recommendations on BISE). Projects should be required from the start to commit to making data and research results available in BISE, or similar relevant systems in other areas, e.g. through inclusion of the task in the Description of Work.
- **Require minimum mandatory policy-relevant information from projects:** In order to support the information hub function of platforms such as BISE, all research projects in Horizon2020 should provide basic information on their science-policy related work, including (a) a policy-focused project description including yearly updates on relevant activities, and the right key words, and (b) specific reporting products for policy-relevant results. Such elements could become part of the evaluation processes of on-going projects.
- **Develop a SPI survival kit for projects:** DG RTD could develop and make a series of tools and resources available to projects to help them develop and implement their SPIs. This could include guidelines on how to prepare a policy brief, the forthcoming SPIRAL handbook on SPIs, a list of potential policy contacts and relevant EU institutions.
- **Systematically inform projects about key science-policy events:** Projects should be made better aware of key event such as Green Week, Bridging the Gap, side events at UN Conferences of the Parties of Environmental Treaties, and how they can get engaged. This could be done via a regular information mailing to coordinators, and through direct contact on a case by case basis.
- **Strengthen use of EC research information media:** The Commission should promote its own popular science journals and policy services (RTD Info, Research EU, Science for Environment Policy) and websites, and strongly encourage all projects to publish policy-relevant activities and results there. These media could include articles on successful interfacing from both a science and a policy perspective. This would also address the problem of the plethora of unconvincing business-driven research dissemination magazines approaching projects, sometimes claiming that they are mandated by the EC.
- **Brief evaluators and reviewers.** Evaluators of proposals and project reviewers, as well as RTD scientific officers moderating evaluation panels, should receive more guidance on how to assess the science-policy interface and dissemination activities in projects.



Improving the use and impact of your research

Recommendations to EU research projects

Environmental research projects recognise their responsibility to contribute to addressing societal problems and the importance of developing strong science-policy interfaces. Yet projects are still facing basic challenges in planning and implementing the interface work, including:

- ⊙ **The broader picture:** framing the project in the broader policy and societal context;
- ⊙ **Endurance:** engaging with policy and other actors throughout the lifetime of the project;
- ⊙ **Quality:** communicating better and more broadly;
- ⊙ **Cooperation:** working with other projects and learning from their experiences.

The following recommendations could help to overcome these challenges, particularly if complemented by funders' supporting actions, as indicated above:

- **Establish a dialogue through the lifetime of the project:** Remember that effective SPIs and communication should not be end-of-pipe. In many cases, establishing a dialogue with policy makers and other stakeholders from the onset, and keeping them involved in the formulation or refinement of research questions, can significantly contribute to effective science-policy interactions. Steps to support this include:
 - ✓ **Ensure early links with relevant actors at EU level:** Projects should ask the project officer at the EC to support an early meeting with appropriate policy officers from relevant DGs at the start of the project, preferably before the kick-off meeting of the project to allow work package leaders responsible for communication and the project coordinator to meet key individuals face-to-face and understand their information requirements.
 - ✓ **Develop a strong strategy for science-policy interfaces and dissemination:** Such a strategy should be implemented and revised as appropriate, and include in particular timed and targeted actions for different audiences, but also for different types of knowledge (some knowledge may not be directly policy-relevant yet still worth communicating to policy-makers as background information). Maintain a database of key contacts and build the 'brand' of your project. Include an internal evaluation process in the strategy. Allocate enough resources to the implementation of the strategy.
 - ✓ **Make scientist aware of how policy works:** Inform scientist in your project about policy processes, policy cycles, the societal context and what types of results are useful for policy.
 - ✓ **Ensure you have knowledge brokers on board:** Make use of people or teams in the consortium who are good knowledge brokers. Both young and more senior scientists may be interested in contributing to science-policy or science-society interfaces. Consider bringing in partners with specific knowledge brokering skills, and/or providing a PhD position in the project to focus on science-policy interface aspects in the project.
 - ✓ **Improve involvement of policy-makers at relevant levels:** Interact with policy-makers from sub-national to international level as appropriate. Be sure to also include some policy implementing partners such as local administrations or NGOs in the project.
 - ✓ **Use advisory boards and stakeholder groups:** These can include carefully selected policy makers and other key stakeholders. If well run, with the right people involved, they are extremely useful to identify key research avenues of value to policy, identify policy-relevant results, provide input to the implementation plan, alert researchers to priority issues on the policy agenda, help bring research progress rapidly to the attention of policy-makers and other potential users, and help developing targeted policy relevant outputs from the projects.



- ✓ **Use existing science-policy institutions:** Institutions such as the EEA, national environment agencies and national biodiversity platforms can be very useful to learn more about policy needs and to disseminate results.
 - ✓ **Develop policy section on websites:** A dedicated section on the project website could make policy-relevant information easily accessible and act as a forum where policy makers can ask questions that could be answered by the project.
 - ✓ **Ensure interaction events at the end of the project, and beyond:** Projects must ensure there is sufficient time and resources set aside for interaction via personal meetings and larger events with policy makers when the final results have been produced. In order to foster the uptake of project results in policy, it might be relevant to maintain a dialogue beyond the project's duration.
 - ✓ **Engage with users when developing scenarios, storylines, models and decision-support tools:** Involve policy-makers and other stakeholders in the development of scenarios, storylines, models, policy options and decision-support tools to ensure that they are adapted to user needs.
- **Connect with past and present projects working on related topics:** It may be helpful and efficient to cluster projects for science-policy interactions and broader dissemination. Such SPI alliances of projects can enhance joint learning, make it easier for policy makers to engage (fewer meetings) as well as provide a broader picture and a more refined input to policy. This can be top-down driven if supported by funding agencies (see recommendations to funders) or more informal and bottom-up when initiated by projects.
 - **Produce targeted and attractive briefs:** Such briefs are one major policy-relevant product and make them widely and systematically available, e.g. via information systems such as BISE. Briefs need to be targeted and readable, they should link the issues to relevant policies or at least provide a “policy hook”, an explanation as to why this matters, and when appropriate what policy could do about it. Briefs should include a short summary, suggest further reading, and provide a point of contact. Explore innovative ways of producing and updating briefs, e.g. “wiki-briefs”.
 - **Make use of existing science-policy dissemination channels:** Projects should more systematically provide articles to *Science for Environment Policy*, the news and information service set up by DG ENV and to similar SPI channels. There are more and more peer-reviewed environmental science journals accepting commentaries or papers with an explicit science-policy focus, in which projects could aim to publish.
 - **Use open policy meetings for dissemination:** A number of broader open policy meetings exist (e.g., high level conferences, Bridging the Gap series, Green Week), where projects can improve their impact and recognition. Also joint presentations of related research results from several projects showcasing on-going research can be a good way to reach policy makers.
 - **Disseminate more broadly:** Better dissemination to the wider public is key. Possible actions include: striving for more dissemination through the media, including European ones (e.g. Euronews); production of popular or children's books; using new media such as video via Youtube and social media (e.g. Twitter); using tools such as Eye on Earth. Projects should explore opportunities to use specific partners for dissemination, including NGOs, professional communicators, Science Museums, Aquaria, Planetaria.
 - **Provide training in science-policy activities:** Educating and training researchers in communicating beyond the scientific community is still a major task. This should play a broader role in university education, but could also be part of larger



projects or clusters, e.g. via summer schools that address policy, SPI and communication issues.

- **Make your data available to other researchers, policy makers, and the public:** Options to do this include BISE or Eye on Earth (discussed below). Projects should ensure they set aside enough resources to prepare and upload data to repositories in a format that is appropriate for future uses.



Making better use of existing and emerging tools

Recommendations on BISE and Eye on Earth

Environmental policy-makers and other societal actors need up-to-date and high quality information. In recent years, several key developments have taken place to increase the information basis, availability and exchange. These include the INSPIRE Directive⁹, The Shared Environmental Information System (SEIS¹⁰) and Global Monitoring for Environment and Security (GMES¹¹) for data and monitoring, but also dedicated information systems such as The Water Information System for Europe (WISE) and the Biodiversity Information System for Europe (BISE), and innovative data presentation tools such as Eye on Earth (EoE)¹².

Focusing on the latter two, it appears that the links to data, information and knowledge from EU research projects through BISE are still underdeveloped and need to be improved. Similarly, EoE has a broad potential as a science-policy tool. Practitioners and researchers at the SPIRAL workshop explored ways and options to make best use of these tools to reinforce the science-policy interfaces of research projects, and came up with the following recommendations for BISE and Eye on Earth.

Biodiversity Information System for Europe:

The Biodiversity Information System for Europe (BISE) is a single entry point for data and information on biodiversity in Europe. It is a partnership between the European Commission (DG Environment, Joint Research Centre and Eurostat) and the European Environment Agency. Bringing together facts and figures on biodiversity and ecosystem services, it links to related policies, environmental data centres, assessments and research findings from various sources. It is being developed to strengthen the knowledge base and support decision-making on biodiversity. One of the five entry points of the BISE portal is research. That part of BISE is still in its infancy and input from both researchers and users of research results on how to develop it could ensure that it is adapted to needs and that it is relevant, credible, legitimate, and ultimately helpful for biodiversity-related policy and management.

The following recommendations to further develop BISE were discussed:

- **BISE as a standard entry point:** With its general approach, BISE has the best potential to become the starting place for all biodiversity-related information in Europe. In particular, it can become the central and long-term access point for policy-relevant research output. Yet the link to research results is still underexploited. It is also a potentially powerful way to increase the visibility of research projects.
- **Networking beyond BISE:** Although BISE should be an entry point for research information and knowledge, further networking in research will be needed outside BISE to strengthen science-policy activities.

⁹ The INSPIRE Directive of May 2007 establishes an infrastructure for spatial information in Europe to support Community environmental policies, and policies or activities which may have an impact on the environment. (<http://inspire.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>).

¹⁰ SEIS aims to create an integrated web-enabled, EU-wide environmental information system, by simplifying and modernizing existing information systems and processes. (<http://www.eea.europa.eu/about-us/what/information-sharing-1/shared-environmental-information-system>).

¹¹ GMES is the European Programme for the establishment of a European capacity for Earth Observation (<http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/space/gmes/>).

¹² Eye on Earth is a 'global public information network' for creating and sharing environmentally relevant data and information online through interactive map-based visualisations (<http://www.eyeonearth.org>).



- **Sharing data from projects:** Beyond the formal data flows managed by the EEA and available via BISE, BISE could also make use of data and knowledge from research projects as an additional resource for long-term availability. The following initial activities should be considered to further explore their potential of their products in relation to the EU strategy:
 - ✓ Explore the use of indicator-related projects and the data produced there to support the work on indicators for the EU Biodiversity Strategy.
 - ✓ Develop or use existing data storage standards to develop standard system for storing data from research projects in a platform where they could be linked to BISE (or link to other archives using them). Accordingly, key elements for such a joint platform and the related BISE standards need to be identified, which may include (a) a link to core areas of BISE content (Biodiversity Strategy targets), (b) historical data, (c) connections between species and habitats, and (d) meta-data availability.
 - ✓ Conduct a feasibility study with biodiversity as potential case study/showcase for other areas of data needs in the work of the EEA.
 - ✓ Consider making project "speed-presentations" (e.g., videos or overview slides) on projects available through BISE.
 - ✓ Explore further the links to data-related projects and infrastructures, e.g. LifeWATCH.
- **Further develop the database of research projects in BISE.** The recently established database in BISE on research projects related to biodiversity¹³, hosted by the EEA Biodiversity Data centre, is a good starting point to promote further projects results. This effort would benefit from additional elements such as:
 - ✓ mandatory minimum input from all EU-funded biodiversity projects, with clear guidelines;
 - ✓ direct links to project websites (and their products pages);
 - ✓ direct upload/download possibility for policy briefs and other products (exploring the possibility of using a DOI approach);
 - ✓ policy-focused project description in a standard format, accessible to a broad audience, and stressing policy and societal relevance of research (delivered as mandatory input by projects)
 - ✓ standard list of keywords, including "policy-related" ones;
 - ✓ a list of project co-ordinators or project contact point to which policy-makers can address their requests and invitations to contribute.
- **Managing and opening the project section of BISE.** The project section of the BISE website could furthermore be opened by a guided content management system for projects to post their material. New content would need to be checked by a "research hub" facility (via DG RTD, or outsourced) in order to ensure quality and coherence. Network projects such as ALTER-Net, MARBEF, LifeWATCH or KNEU could help in this respect.
- **Long-term archiving of project knowledge.** After the lifetime of projects, their knowledge often gets lost. It should be explored whether BISE could become a long-term archive of the results, products and website contents after completion of projects. The EEA is currently developing Data Stewardship Agreements with a series of projects, which could develop into a more systematic approach for this.

¹³ <http://www.eea.europa.eu/themes/biodiversity/document-library/other-reference-documents-and-lists/research/view>



- **Explore the option of a BISE-RTD project.** To help implement the above mentioned actions, a research project supporting the inclusion of research knowledge into BISE, similar to the WISE-RTD project in the water area¹⁴, could be funded.
- **Include data from other sectors:** As biodiversity and ecosystem issues require broader environment data, BISE should try to host/mirror some data from other sectors (e.g. agriculture) that would be of use to biodiversity researchers. For certain official data, this would require dialogue with other DGs.
- **Promote BISE in the research community.** The research community should be made more aware of BISE. This could be done through promotional material and newsletters and presentations at specific biodiversity-research workshops and conferences.
- **BISE as provider of research-relevant information on policy.** A function in BISE that could be developed is the provision of an entry point for researchers to better understand the policy context of their research.
- **Create an Assessment Panel for BISE.** At a later stage, an assessment panel of users, including researchers, stakeholders and policy-makers which regularly checks BISE content and accessibility could help improve its relevance, quality and user-friendliness. Incentives for participation would be needed.

Eye on Earth (EoE)

Eye on Earth is a 'social data website' for creating and sharing environmental information. Data and information can come in a variety of formats such as maps, graphs and tabular spreadsheets, alongside various tools. Maps can be viewed, created, interacted with, manipulated and shared. Users can choose to share information with closed groups or everyone. Examples of potential users include policy makers, environmental organizations, emergency responders, GIS professionals, communities and citizens. Eye on Earth is facilitated by EEA. It is potentially a very powerful tool for research projects to link with their various communities of users.

The following recommendations to further develop EoE were discussed:

- **High potential of EoE:** Eye on Earth has a high potential for use by research projects. It can serve (i) in the dissemination of results (including attracting the attention of specific user groups such as policy-makers); (ii) as a science-policy interface tool; (iii) for joint work in projects and with stakeholders, and (iv) in involving the wider society. These potential functions need to be further explored and demonstrated through practical examples (success stories), including example where resulting policy action is demonstrated. The current risk is that EoE be seen as just another gadget.
- **Highlighting the added value of EoE for research compared to other tools:** For this, better promotional material on EoE aiming at environmental researchers should be developed, which highlights what the advantages of EoE are compared to other tools such as Google Earth (e.g., data property right remains with researchers, restricted communities possible) or GIS. This will also require the improvement of FAQs on the EoE website.
- **Develop showcase examples:** Examples on the use of EoE by projects would help to develop EoE further and adapt it to user needs. The HERMIONE collection of EoE Map Books on anthropogenic impacts in the deep sea currently being developed is a good example. Other projects such as VECTORS and SCALES have already indicated their interest in using EoE.

¹⁴ <http://www.wise-rtd.info>



- **Use EoE for European Ecosystem Assessment:** EoE is potentially a very useful tool and platform on which to develop the European Mapping and Assessment of Ecosystems and their Services (MAES). It could facilitate the provision of input by relevant data holders and motivate a broader community of researchers to contribute to the MAES.
- **Training needed:** EEA and other partners should consider best ways to provide EoE user training to environmental researchers. Options include: (i) better tutorial and help functions; (ii) specific sessions at EoE user conferences, provided the research community is informed about them; (iii) specific workshops which could serve the triple purpose of promoting EoE as a tool for research projects, training research users on how to use EoE and how to add data/content, and allow for these users to suggest formats and functions that would be useful to them; (iv) a summer school on EoE.
- **Implement a dataset citation system:** In order to make EoE attractive for researchers and to encourage researchers to add and share data and use EoE to its full potential, it is essential to implement a dataset citation system (e.g., DOIs) and clarify property rights issues.
- **Early uptake of EoE by projects:** if EoE is used by projects, the earlier it is taken up in the project life the better, as it can contribute to the permanence of access to project data and information after the end of a project.
- **Ensure connections between LifeWatch and EoE:** LifeWatch and the EoE team should liaise closely to explore joint work and services and avoid duplication of work (e.g., developing separate spatial data interfaces).



Workshop participants (20/21 September, 2012)

Participant	EU Project	Institution	Email
Adrian Peres		EU Commission, DG Research and Innovation	Adrian.PERES@ec.europa.eu
Allan Watt	SPIRAL	Centre for Ecology and Hydrology CEH	adw@ceh.ac.uk
Andy Sier	ROBIN	Centre for Ecology and Hydrology CEH	arjs@ceh.ac.uk
Annamarie Krieg	SPIRAL	NIOZ	annamarietkrieg@gmail.com
Anne Teller		EU Commission, DG Environment	Anne.TELLER@ec.europa.eu
Carsten Neßhöver	SPIRAL, KNEU	Helmholtz-Centre for Environmental Research - UFZ	carsten.nesshoever@ufz.de
Christina Corbane	MS.Monina	National Research Institute of Science and Technology for Environment and Agriculture (irstea)	christina.corbane@teledetection.fr
Christoph Schröder	MS.Monina	University of Málaga	christoph.schroder@uma.es
Cliona Ní Cheallacháin	AquaTT	AquaTT	cliona@aquatt.ie
Eeva Furman	Alter-Net	Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE)	eeva.furman@ymparisto.fi
Franz Daffner		EEA	Franz.daffner@eea.europa.eu
Geoffrey Gooch	LiveDiverse	University of Dundee	geoffrey.gooch@liu.se
Heidi Wittmer	SPIRAL	Helmholtz-Centre for Environmental Research - UFZ	heidi.wittmer@ufz.de
Jason Papathanasiou	TESS	University of Macedonia	jasonp@uom.gr
Jeniffer Locket	Vector	Plymouth Marine Laboratory	jelo@pml.ac.uk
Johannes Timaeus	SPIRAL	Helmholtz-Centre for Environmental Research - UFZ	johannes.timaeus@ufz.de
Jörg Freyhof	Biofresh	Leibniz Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries (IGB)	freyhof@igb-berlin.de



Karin Zaunberger		EU Commission, DG Environment	Karin.Zaunberger@ec.europa.eu
Katarina Hedlund	SOILSERVICE	Lund University	katarina.hedlund@ekol.lu.se
Marcus Zisenis		ETC biodiversity	zisenis@mnhn.fr
Martin Sharman		EU Commission, DG Research and Innovation	Martin.Sharman@ec.europa.eu
Mette Lund		EEA	mette.lund@eea.europa.eu
Oliver Schweiger	Alarm	Helmholtz-Centre for Environmental Research - UFZ	oliver.schweiger@ufz.de
Pam Berry	Rubicode/ Climsave	University of Oxford	pam.berry@eci.ox.ac.uk
Phil Weaver	Hermione	National Oceanography Centre	ppew@exchange.nerc.ac.uk
Rania Spyropoulou		EEA	Rania.Spyropoulou@eea.europa.eu
Rob Jongman	EBONE	ALTERRA	rob.jongman@wur.nl
Rob Tinch	SPIRAL	Median	robtinch@gmail.com
Sabine Roscher		ETC Biodiversity	roscher@mnhn.fr
Sybille van den Hove	SPIRAL, SCALES, HERMIONE	Median	sybille@median-web.eu



Acronyms

7th EAP	7th EU Environmental Action Programme
ALARM	Assessing Large scale Risks to biodiversity with tested Methods (FP6 project)
Alter-Net	Europe's biodiversity research network - A Long-Term Biodiversity, Ecosystem and Awareness Research Network (former FP6 Network of Excellence)
AquaTT	international foundation on project management and training services to support the sustainable development of Europe's aquatic resources (supported by FP7)
BeSAFE	Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services: Arguments for our future Environment (FP7 project)
BioMOT	MOTivational strength of ecosystem services and alternative ways to express the value of BIOdiversity (FP7 project)
BISE	Biodiversity Information System for Europe
CoralFish	Ecosystem based management of corals, fish and fisheries in the deep waters of Europe and beyond (FP7 project)
DG CLIMA	European Commission Directorate General for Climate Action
DG	Directorate General
DG ENV	European Commission Directorate General for Environment
DG RTD	European Commission Directorate General for Research and Innovation
EEA	European Environmental Agency
EoE	Eye on Earth
GMES	Global Monitoring for Environment and Security
HERMIONE	Hotspot Ecosystem Research and Man's Impact On European Seas (FP7 project)
INSPIRE	Infrastructure for Spatial Information in the European Community
JRC	Joint Research Centre
KNEU	Developing a Knowledge Network for EUropean expertise on biodiversity and ecosystem Services to inform policy making and economic sectors (FP7 project)
LifeWatch	E-science European Infrastructure for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Research
MAES	Mapping and Assessment of Ecosystems and their Services
MarineTT	Knowledge Transfer and Uptake of Results from European Marine Research Projects funded under EU FP6 & FP7 (FP7 project)
MS.Monina	Multi-scale Service for Monitoring NATURA 2000 Habitats of European Community Interest (FP7 project)
OpenNESS	Forthcoming project on ecosystem services in FP7
OPERAS	Forthcoming project on ecosystem services in FP7
SCALES	Securing the conservation of biodiversity across administrative levels and spatial, temporal, and ecological scales (FP7 project)
SEIS	The Shared Environmental Information System
SPI	Science-Policy Interface
SPIRAL	Science-Policy interfaces for biodiversity – Research, Action and Learning (FP7 project)
VECTORS	VECTORS of Change in Oceans and Seas Marine Life, Impact on Economic Sectors



