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1. Study Area

The Cevennes

The Cevennes is a mountainous region in Southern France and a national park covering 372'000 hectares. Its diverse cultural landscape is marked by agro-pastoral highlands in the north and forested mountains (chest nut) in the south. The remarkable interaction and transformation between human and environment led to its inscription as a World Heritage site of the UNESCO in 2011. Aiming to preserve traditional transhumanance and open grassland, the national park encourages extensive agricultural and economic activity even in its inhabited core zone.

2. Context

- Changing landscapes can be represented as different Ecosystem Service (ES) bundles, each containing interactions and dependencies (Maudseppe-Hearne et al., 2010).
- How to integrate landscape as ES bundle in valuation exercises instead of focussing on individual services (Busse et al., 2015)? How to include cultural ES (Miran et al., 2016)?
- Does it help to apply a deliberative approach to obtain a “richer” valuation (Kenter et al., 2016)?
- Is it a matter of information, familiarity (Lafliivre et al., 2014), distance (Hein et al., 2006)?

We take the example of natural reforestation and the loss of cultural landscape to approach these questions and how the landscape should evolve in the eyes of a local, rural or a near-by, urban population?

3. Study design

- 2 focus groups per region: “experts” and “habitants” ➔ elaboration of questionnaire and Choice experiment attributes ➔ test of questionnaire in 2 more groups
- Montpellier
  - Treatment 1
  - Treatment 2
- Cevennes
  - Treatment 1
  - Treatment 2

- Basic Information
- Discussion
- Non-Questionnaire (Choice Card)
- Questionnaire about discussion

40 to 50 individuals per treatment and per region; 6 to 13 participants per discussion group

- Elaboration and test of questionnaire by focus groups
- 2 Treatments in each of two regions (Montpellier and Cevennes)
- Organization of group discussion with buffet
- Participants compensated by gift basket containing local products

Design allows for:
1. Comparison among regions
2. Comparison among groups with or without preliminary discussion

4. Method: Choice experiment

- Questionnaire includes Choice experiment:
  - Respondents are confronted with two scenarios and the real situation (4 columns in the Choice Card)
  - Each of these three alternatives contain five attributes (rows in the Choice Card):
    1. Forest Cover
    2. Proportion of different tree species
    3. Level of tourism infrastructure
    4. Level of cultural heritage conservation
    5. Payment (donation to local association)

- Respondents choose one alternative from each Choice Card

- Utility differences among alternatives can be calculated using Logit Model (Train, 2009)

- Follow-up questions allow to identify ES associated to attributes and whether interdependencies were considered

5. Hypotheses

1) The conservation of cultural landscape is more preferred at place than in near-by Montpellier.

2) Tourism is less appreciated by people from Montpellier in order to preserve the “authentic” character of the Cevennes. Meanwhile, it is more important for local people as a source of income.

3) The categories of ES considered in valuation will be more diverse in groups with preliminary discussion than in groups without. Therefore, deliberation helps to foster the representation of landscape as ES bundle instead of individual ES.

4) Given that discussion groups in Cevennes already hold better local knowledge, the process of deliberation will have less impact than in groups at more distant Montpellier.

5) The overall diversity of information will be higher at local groups in the Cevennes than in Montpellier. Therefore, a trade-off between small-scale local well-informed valuations and higher-scale regional less-informed valuations exists.
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