Discussion I: Key Policy Recommendations

Thursday, 2nd of June 2016. Knappgården, Särna, Sweden
What do the results tell us?

- Most of those supporting nature protection, and who are willing to pay for it, are probably not motivated by their own use, although they may retain an option use value.

- WTP exists and increases with the size of the extended area to be protected.

- WTP for the domestic part is greater in both samples – no perfect international public good?

- Difference between WTP for domestic and foreign extension is lower in Sweden than in Norway.

- Both samples attached somewhat more importance to the extension of the national park within their national border.

- Most respondents understood well the questionnaire.
Which should be the key policy recommendations based on results?
Contextual reality

- Conflicts
  - National vs. Local
  - Conservationism vs. Industry (forestry, tourism)

- Recentness
  - Lack of knowledge
  - Insufficiently rooted

- Lack of interest?

- Scandinavian nature protection traditions
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- Is extension of the protected area "politically possible" in the near future?
- Can “people's voice" / WTP be emphasized in decisions?
- Would estimated positive WTP constitute a strong enough argument for decision-makers?
- Would this WTP for park extension “make up” for a renewed conflict with forestry and local interests?
- May policy makers be willing to adopt this novel “renaturation” perspective?
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- Do you conceive Fulufjäll as part of a larger protected area?
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- Is the protected area is "big enough"?
- Do you conceive Fulufjäll as part of a larger protected area?
- To whom should policy recommendations be addressed?
Further discussion topics

- What would need to contextually change so that key policy recommendations turn feasible?
Further discussion topics

- What would need to contextually change so that key policy recommendations turn feasible?
- How does the existence of the border affect the TNPA from a natural, socio-economic and organisational perspective?
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